

An Introduction to Categorical Proof Theory

Amirhossein Akbar Tabatabai
Institute of Mathematics, Czech Academy of Sciences

Contents

1	A Historical Introduction	3
1.1	Proofs as Auxiliary Objects	3
1.2	Gentzen and his Consistency Proof	7
1.3	Categorical Proof Theory	8
1.4	Type Theory	11
1.5	Landmarks in Categorical Proof Theory	12
1.6	A Word to the Reader	14
2	Preliminaries	15
3	Categories, Functors and Natural Transformations	18
3.1	Categories	19
3.2	Functors	24
3.3	Natural Transformations	29
4	Some Universal Constructions	33
4.1	Cartesian Structure	34
4.2	Cocartesian Structure	41
4.3	Exponential Objects	45
4.4	Structure-preserving Functors	51
4.5	Free Structured Categories	54
5	BHK Interpretation and Variable Sets	57
5.1	Provability via the BHK interpretation	60
5.2	Proofs via the BHK interpretation	61
6	Classical Deductions	64
7	Categories as Semantics	69
7.1	The Existence Problem	71
7.1.1	BHK Existence-completeness	74
7.2	The Equivalence Problem	77
7.2.1	Equivalence-completeness for NN	78
7.2.2	Equivalence-completeness for NJ	80

7.3	The Identity Problem	82
7.3.1	Tarski's High School Algebra Problem	82
7.3.2	The Propositional Identity	83
8	Higher-order Theories	85
8.1	Constructive Theories of Arithmetic	88
8.2	Non-classical Axioms and Consistency	89
8.3	Information Extraction	95
9	Realizability	96
9.1	Propositional Realizability	96
9.2	\mathcal{C} -sets and Higher-order Realizability	98
9.3	Projective \mathcal{C} -sets and the Axiom of Choice	103
10	Realizability for Arithmetical Theories	105
10.1	A Recursive and a Continuous World	105
10.2	Natural Numbers Object	107
10.3	Realizability	114

1 A Historical Introduction

“It is equally stupid and simple to consider mathematics to be just an axiom system as it is to see a tree as nothing but a quantity of planks [89].” L.E.J. BROUWER

Proof theory was the child of a great panic. Attacked by a wild wave of paradoxes, the foundation of mathematics was in great danger, and to save it, Hilbert came up with a formalistic program to reduce mathematics (or at least its consistency) to its trusted finitary core. His idea was to first formalize mathematics as a purely syntactical theory and then show the *consistency* of that theory using what he vaguely called the *finitary methods*. This way, he hoped to bring peace back to the shaking foundation. From the very beginning, though, it was quite clear that for most interesting theories (e.g. Peano arithmetic), the usual strategy of proving consistency by model construction was not an option, simply because the models of such theories were usually infinite and hence beyond our trusted core. Therefore, the only remaining option was to work directly with the syntactical proofs, the *finitary* and tame objects that mathematicians use every day to communicate. As expected, Hilbert’s strategy was to investigate the structure of *all* possible proofs of a proposition in a purely combinatorial way to hopefully rule out the contradiction as a provable proposition. Even more ambitious, through a pure formal investigation of the possible proofs of a theorem, he hoped to be able to prove the *conservativity* of mathematics over its finitary core by eliminating all possible ideal infinitary entities as helpful auxiliary tools that we use for our convenience, yet we know they have no real effect.

As Gödel showed in 1931, the program, as stated above, fails dramatically. In fact, there is no way to prove the consistency of mathematics (not even finitary mathematics) within finitary mathematics itself. This failure to prove consistency also shows the failure to prove conservativity, as the consistency of finitary mathematics is a simple finitary claim about the non-existence of a proof as a finitary object. This consistency statement, however, is provable in mathematics using the axiom of the existence of an infinite set, while it is unprovable in finitary mathematics based on what Gödel proved. As disappointing as it seems, the story, of course, has not ended with this huge negative impact of Gödel’s theorems, and we are going to explain how. But before going any further, let us pause for a moment to consider the role of proofs in Hilbert’s proof theory.

1.1 Proofs as Auxiliary Objects

As is clear even from our brief explanation of Hilbert’s program, Hilbert employs proofs as a *tool* to learn something about the theorems of a given theory. For him, what has the central role in proof theory is not the proofs but the *provability*. Consistency is the unprovability of contradiction, and conservativity means that whatever is provable in a bigger theory is also provable in the smaller one.

Even in many formalizations of constructive mathematics, where the constructions—and hence the proofs—must have the central role, people usually follow Hilbert-style proof theory and focus mostly on provability rather than on proofs. Such an interest in the shadows of an entity rather than the entity itself, such a move from the intensional to the extensional, from a notion to its extension, has similar incarnations in many mathematical fields. For instance, in the early days of the theory of computation, the central role was given to computability, or to a lesser extent to the functions that algorithms compute, rather than to the algorithms themselves. As is clear today, the crown of the central notion in the theory of computation must be awarded to computation itself, and not to mere computability. In a similar fashion, one can argue that proof theory must be elevated to a theory about proofs rather than merely provability.

To illustrate how auxiliary proofs are even within their own home of proof theory, let us consider the most basic questions a mathematician might ask herself when encountering a new mathematical concept: namely, what is the *definition* of the concept, and what is its corresponding *identity*? For the first question, the answer seems straightforward. A proof is a *syntactical* object constructed within a syntactical calculus, starting from certain axioms and following certain rules. This definition aligns with the aims of Hilbert’s program, as it provides a sound and complete definition for the program’s main interest: provability. However, it is fair to say that this definition is more of a practical first draft than a polished final answer. Here are two reasons to support this claim.

The first concern is the role of syntax in the definition. A proof, regardless of its nature, must be a *formal* entity distant from any sort of content. This is a philosophically acceptable assumption. However, the definition provided does not encompass form in its general sense. Instead, it relies on a specific kind of syntax as a substitute, and this reduction introduces its own problems. In Hilbert’s program, equating the formal with the syntactical serves a technical purpose, as it allows for the use of combinatorial techniques to investigate the structure of proofs. However, one can argue that form is a much richer notion than any type of syntax can capture, and even if it could, the result would not meet modern standards of mathematics. To illustrate this, let us consider an abstract mathematical entity, such as a ring. A ring is indeed constructed from elements, but what a ring theorist is truly interested in is the abstract structure of the ring beyond the nature of its elements. This structure is what can be referred to as the form of the ring.

Is it possible to reduce this form to a kind of syntax? For rings—and let us emphasize that this is not necessarily true in general—the answer is affirmative. In fact, one can observe this possibility by examining the nineteenth-century approach to “ring theory”, which employed polynomials as its syntax. The theory begins with a given set of variables as the generic, meaningless generators of the ring and then imposes certain equations as the expected relationships among the resulting polynomials. Although it is possible to develop ring theory in this manner, it is clear that the form of rings extends beyond their polynomial representations. Mathematically, it is fair to assert that the significant advances

in ring theory during the twentieth century owe their success to liberation from such polynomial presentations or any other form of presentation, for that matter. Taking this analogy seriously, one might even contend that the overly tight interdependence of proofs and syntax is a primary reason behind the relative narrowness of proof theory:

There ought to be a vibrant specialty of “proof theory”. There is a subject with this title, started by David Hilbert in his attempt to employ finitistic methods to prove the correctness of classical mathematics... In 1957, at a famous conference in Ithaca, proof theory was recognized as one of the four pillars of mathematical logic (along with model theory, recursion theory and set theory). But the resulting proof theory is far too narrow to be an adequate pillar... [56]

The form-to-syntax reduction is not merely an abstract philosophical problem; it also carries practical implications. For instance, consider the immaterial yet necessary choices that any use of syntax compels us to make. Is a proof a sequence of formulas in a given Hilbert-style system, or is it a tree of formulas in the sense of natural deduction? There are numerous proof systems that employ various syntactical choices, making it difficult to assert that any single system is the true representation of real abstract formal proofs. Most likely, all these proof systems offer different presentations of a single abstract notion, akin to the various presentations of a ring through different generators and relations. The ring exists beyond its presentations, and so does the proof

The second problem with the conventional definition of a proof is its *reductive* nature. It characterizes a proof as a sequence or a tree of propositions, thereby reducing proofs to formulas. This reductive approach is analogous to the usual interpretation of an interval as a collection of points, a function as a specific type of relation, and movement as a sequence of snapshots. From a philosophical standpoint, it is far from trivial to believe whether the former can be faithfully reduced to the latter. Even mathematically speaking, one can argue that, even if this reduction is indeed possible, the outcome may not be desirable, as it could restrict the independence of the former and thus inhibit some of its alternative yet interesting interpretations.

For instance, consider the following three examples. First, we have Brouwer’s refusal to reduce the continuum to its points, which unearthed alternative notions of real numbers that later reemerged as natural constructions in classical geometry via Grothendieck toposes [57]. These alternative notions compel all functions over the reals to be continuous or even smooth, as a geometer might expect. They also allow for the existence of a non-zero real number ϵ satisfying $\epsilon^2 = 0$, making the development of differential geometry easier and even synthetically possible [43].

Secondly, consider the point-free approach to real numbers, where subsets are not merely collections of points but specific equivalence relations over the open sets of the reals. This shift in perspective provides more refined subsets and addresses some anomalies, such as the existence of non-measurable subsets of real numbers [78].

Finally, consider the conceptual leap in modern mathematics that places homomorphisms on equal footing with their algebraic structures. This leap has enabled the elegant progress of modern mathematics. Taking the analogy in these three examples seriously, one can argue that a proof, whatever it may be, is more than a mere collection of propositions. It must be an independent notion that interacts with the propositions but is not necessarily reducible to them. In short, it is a tree, not a quantity of planks.

So far, we have examined several arguments against the conventional definition of a proof, illustrating the satisfaction of Hilbert’s proof theory with a minimal working definition of proofs as mere auxiliary tools within the theory. Now, let us continue this line of reasoning by addressing the second significant yet overlooked problem: the identity problem, which has two facets: *proof equivalence* and *propositional identity*. As noted, Hilbert’s proof theory has largely ignored these issues. The reason is straightforward: these identities were unrelated to the provability that the program was originally concerned with. Consequently, the program had no impetus to investigate these problems seriously. This lack of interest further underscores the auxiliary role that proofs play in Hilbert’s proof theory. Where else in mathematics, the central notions of a theory do not even have their own notion of identity?

As a concluding remark in this subsection, let us briefly elucidate the two identity problems mentioned and their interrelationship. The first is the *equivalence problem* for proofs. This problem is profound and intriguing, connecting programming languages on one side and *coherence problems* in category theory and homotopy theory [25] on the other. As we will explain later, proof equivalence is typically founded on *redundancy elimination*. For instance, consider the following two derivations:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_1 & D_2 & \\ \frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \wedge I & & D_1 \\ \frac{A \wedge B}{A} \wedge E_1 & & A \end{array}$$

One might argue that these derivations are equivalent, as the left one is merely the derivation D_1 with a redundant step that does not alter the essence of the proof. However, when redundancies are absent, the meaning of equivalence becomes unclear. For instance, consider the following two derivations:

$$\frac{A \wedge A}{A} \wedge_1 E \quad \frac{A \wedge A}{A} \wedge_2 E$$

It is not intuitively clear whether they are equivalent in any meaningful sense. Additionally, the problem becomes even more complex when we are tasked with comparing two proofs that exist within different systems.

For the identity problem concerning propositions, there is fortunately an intuitive definition: two propositions are considered identical if and only if they hold the same meaning, allowing one to be used in place of the other in any context. The challenge lies in formalizing this *propositional identity* in a formal and abstract manner without delving into the specifics of their meanings.

The most straightforward formalization that comes to mind is the logical equivalence relation, which asserts that two propositions logically imply each other. In other words, there exists a proof D_1 of B from A and a proof D_2 of A from B . However, this formalization proves to be inadequate. To illustrate this, let us represent the propositions A and B as sets of their respective proofs. In this context, logical equivalence merely indicates the existence of a function mapping from the set of proofs for A to the set of proofs for B , and vice versa. If A and B are truly identical propositions, one would expect their associated sets of proofs to also be identical. This necessitates that there is a bijection between the two sets, which can be induced by composing the two proofs, D_1 and D_2 . Therefore, we require these proofs to be inverses of each other, such that $D_1 \circ D_2 = id$ and $D_2 \circ D_1 = id$, where \circ denotes the composition of the two proofs and id represents the trivial proof of a proposition by itself.

It is evident that the formalization of propositional identity necessitates a formalization of equivalence between the proofs themselves. Furthermore, it is important to note that even when our primary concern is the propositions rather than the proofs or their provability, certain purely propositional issues may still require an examination of proofs and their equivalence.

1.2 Gentzen and his Consistency Proof

In the opening of this section, we explained how Hilbert's proof theory emerged as a natural response to the foundational crisis of the early twentieth century, and we deviated from the narrative to emphasize how auxiliary the notion of a proof is in Hilbert's proof theory. Now, it is time to return to the rest of the story. We stated that Gödel demonstrated the impossibility of proving the consistency of mathematics (even finitary mathematics) within finitary mathematics itself. This is actually not entirely accurate. The formal statement of Gödel's incompleteness theorem shows that no recursively axiomatizable theory that is strong enough can prove its own consistency, and this theorem applies to Hilbert's program if we assume that his finitary mathematics is recursively axiomatizable. Although such an assumption is quite reasonable, it can also be argued that there is no way to formalize all of finitary mathematics but only its proper parts. Therefore, for any consistent theory T , it may still be possible to find a strong enough finitary theory F_T that is sufficiently powerful to prove the consistency of T . The only thing that Gödel's incompleteness theorem establishes is that this finitary theory F_T cannot be a subtheory of the theory T . This is precisely how Gentzen began to investigate the situation. For him, the theory T was Peano Arithmetic, PA, for which he identified the corresponding finitary theory F_T as the theory PRA, a very basic quantifier-free theory, along with quantifier-free transfinite induction up to the ordinal ϵ_0 . One might object that such a theory cannot be considered finitary, as it operates with infinite ordinals. However, it is important to recognize that what we are actually working with is merely a finitary representation of the ordinals below ϵ_0 as complex combinatorial objects, and the set-theoretical language of ordinals is employed solely to aid our understanding of this intricate combinatorial structure.

What we are truly interested in here is not Gentzen’s proof of the consistency of arithmetic, but rather his strategy. We observed that to prove the consistency of a theory, one must investigate all possible proofs of a contradiction in a purely combinatorial manner. However, it should have been quite clear from the very beginning that proofs, as combinatorial objects, are extremely complex and challenging to analyze. To understand why, we do not need to delve into any specific proof theory; it is sufficient to consider how mathematicians grapple with their conjectures every day. If it were easy to determine what is provable and what is not, any conjecture could be resolved with a sufficient amount of combinatorial effort in proof theory.

However, this observation does not imply that there is absolutely no hope in investigating the proofs of simple statements in natural theories, such as the contradiction in PA. To systematically investigate all possible proofs, Gentzen devised an elegant strategy. The first step involved developing a well-behaved and easily controllable proof system. In fact, he created two elegant proof systems known as *natural deduction* and *sequent calculus*. The primary characteristic of these systems, aside from their natural usability, is the capacity to transform their proofs into simpler forms in a certain formal sense. This process is referred to as *normalization* in *natural deduction* and *cut elimination* in *sequent calculus*. By achieving the simplest possible form of a proof, one may gain the insight needed to discern its structure; using that structure, one can demonstrate that the contradiction does not have a simple proof, and thus not any proof, within the system. It is even possible to employ this framework to prove certain conservativity results by showing that the simplest proofs in a stronger theory actually reside within the weaker one. We hope the reader can recognize the irony here. To accomplish the primary objective of proof theory, namely proving consistency, even though we are primarily interested in provability, we are mathematically compelled to be meticulous about the formalization we choose for proofs, the structure of those proofs within that formalization, and the proof transformations that serve as witnesses for proof equivalence. In short, understanding the full structure of the proofs is essential for comprehending the seemingly simpler concept of provability!

Inspired by Gentzen’s elegant work, interest in proof theory flourished. However, it primarily followed Gentzen’s footsteps in investigating the form of proofs to gain insights into the associated theories, ranging from their consistency to the characterization of the functions that the theory can define. It also inherited the Hilbertian attitude, wherein proofs remained syntactical, mostly confined to one formalization and serving the theorems they prove. It is true that proof theorists became increasingly interested in the structure of proofs, but this was largely because they were compelled to do so.

1.3 Categorical Proof Theory

Gentzen’s elegant work also gave birth to an alternative type of proof theory—a theory in which proofs play the main role, elevating their status from the planks of provability to a truly alive tree of proofs. The first such theory is Dag

Prawitz’s *general proof theory*, a term he coined to distinguish his approach from what he termed *reductive proof theory* [67, 68]. The latter essentially represents the Hilbertian proof theory, using proofs as tools to reduce one theory to another to demonstrate consistency and conservativity. In contrast, general proof theory shifts the focus from provable propositions to the proofs themselves. Here, proofs are treated as elements of an *algebraic structure* where the rules function as its operations. The study of this structure is the primary goal of general proof theory.

However, this algebraic structure is presented to us in an indirect manner. The situation resembles the style of nineteenth-century matrix theory. While matrices can be defined as certain algebraic entities with corresponding operations, these arrays of numbers actually represent the linear transformations that are of primary interest. The challenge lies in the fact that a single linear transformation can be represented by multiple matrices, depending on the basis used for the underlying vector spaces. Since we are interested in the transformations rather than their representations, our initial task is to determine when two matrices represent the same transformation, or in other words, when they are *equivalent*. A similar scenario occurs in general proof theory. Proofs are represented within a proof system, specifically natural deduction, and the main challenge is to find an appropriate notion of equivalence between them.

Prawitz’s solution was intriguing; he utilized proof transformations and demonstrated that any proof can be simplified to a unique simplest possible form known as the *normal form*. Thus, two proofs can be considered equivalent if they have the same normal form. This can be likened to algebraic simplifications. For example, two polynomials, $x(x + 1) + x$ and $x^2 + x + x$, are deemed equivalent when their simplest forms, namely $x^2 + 2x$, are equal. General proof theory, however, extends beyond this equivalence problem. It also seeks to understand the meanings of logical constants based on their roles within proofs. Nonetheless, it is fair to assert that the equivalence problem is central to the theory.

As intriguing as Prawitz’s general proof theory is, it comes with its own limitations. It conflates form with syntax, reduces proofs to propositions, and confines itself to a single fixed system—namely, natural deduction.¹ At this juncture, a reader might argue that while the notion of liberation from syntax and reduction to propositions is appealing, it remains unclear whether a non-reductionist definition of proofs is even feasible. A similar skepticism can be applied to linear transformations: if we aim to avoid representations, how can we discuss linear transformations directly? The answer lies in understanding the

¹It is important to clarify that general proof theory does not entirely restrict itself to syntax. Prawitz explicitly differentiates proofs from their syntactical representations. Moreover, for him, natural deduction is not merely one syntactical system among many; rather, it serves as a canonical framework for elucidating how proofs behave and what the logical constants signify. One can easily discern the early influences of the later categorical approach within these ostensibly syntactical aspects of general proof theory. That said, it is also notable that during the normalization process, proofs are identified through the syntactical derivations of propositions, making the process an algebraic simplification of syntax, where the aforementioned drawbacks emerge.

two orthogonal mindsets typically involved in defining a mathematical notion.

The *internal* mindset favors constructing new mathematical entities from existing ones, using the latter as building blocks. However, this approach can inadvertently incorporate unintended aspects, such as construction methods, into the new mathematical entity. To eliminate these extraneous elements, one must introduce an equivalence relation to collapse them, working with the entity only up to this relation to maintain statements about the entity rather than its representation. The process of constructing proofs from propositions and deriving linear transformations from real numbers exemplifies this internal mindset. Dually, the *external* mindset focuses on defining a mathematical entity based on its *relative* behavior rather than on its constituents or construction. The modern approach to linear algebra is a prime example of this external mindset, as it does not define vectors and linear transformations in terms of arrays of real numbers; instead, it characterizes them as abstract objects that behave as expected within their respective contexts.

Modern mathematics owes its external mindset to Hilbert’s strong emphasis on form, positing that mathematics is concerned with form rather than content. However, Hilbert’s proof theory is more of an internal endeavor; it seeks to define a proof using a more fundamental notion, which, in this context, is the proposition. To modernize Hilbert’s proof theory in alignment with his vision, we must axiomatize the algebraic structure of a proof system, where both propositions and proofs reside. To achieve this, we first need a natural mathematical candidate for such two-sorted structures, which is identified as a category.

Categories are algebraic structures comprised of two largely independent entities: objects and morphisms that connect these objects. One can conceptualize a proof system as a category in which the objects represent propositions and the morphisms signify the deductions between them. This approach leads to an attempt to find an axiomatization of proof systems framed as *structured categories*. This perspective on proof theory is termed *categorical proof theory*. Inspired by Lawvere’s thesis [52], the theory began with Lambek’s comprehensive exploration of proof systems as presented in [46, 47, 48], and was further developed in [45, 83]. For a succinct overview, see [26, 25].

Interestingly, the abstract structure of proof systems uncovered by categorical proof theory is not confined strictly to proof theory; it is a well-recognized construct across various branches of mathematics known as the *cartesian closed structure* and *bicartesian closed structure*, depending on connectives the language uses. Leveraging the richness of this structure allows one to hypothesize that many mathematical frameworks, ranging from computable functions to continuous maps, can be viewed as different forms of proof systems. By utilizing these mathematical structures as semantic interpretations of conventional syntactical proofs, we can gain intriguing insights into both the nature of proofs and the concept of provability.

As a concluding remark to this part, we will summarize the potential solutions that categorical proof theory offers for the problems previously discussed. Firstly, regarding the issue of form-to-syntax reduction, proof systems within categorical proof theory are viewed as algebraic structures, where their essence

is captured in the abstract structure they embody. This perspective parallels how a ring can be regarded as a formal object independent of any syntactical representation. Consequently, in categorical proof theory, the specific representations of proof systems through various syntaxes become inconsequential. Two proof systems are deemed equivalent if their underlying structures align. Turning to the issue of reducing proofs to propositions, it is noteworthy that in a category, morphisms cannot be reduced to objects; they maintain an independence analogous to the relationship between deductions and proofs. In addressing the equivalence problem, it is important to recognize that a category inherently possesses its own notion of equality among morphisms. Thus, in categorical proof theory, there is no need to define the equivalence of proofs, as this concept emerges as a fundamental notion. However, this does not permit arbitrary definitions, as we expect our category to exhibit certain desirable properties. Finally, the identity of propositions is effectively captured by the established notion of isomorphic objects within categories.

1.4 Type Theory

Parallel to the categorical approach to proof theory, there is a type-theoretical approach that is more syntactic and thus closer to the usual practices of proof theory. Despite the primary focus of logical theories on formulas, the language of type theory incorporates two fundamental notions: types and terms. Over this syntax, a type theory consists of a series of type and term formers, along with rules that describe the expected behavior of these formers.

Type theories have many informal interpretations. Types and terms can be understood as propositions and proofs, sets and elements, or data types and programs. This versatility arises from an unexpected similarity between these concepts, known as the *Curry-Howard correspondence* or *propositions as types* dictum [37, 81]. For example, the simplest type theory is the typed lambda calculus, designed to capture the behavior of sets and functions in the presence of products and function spaces [45]. This type theory can be extended with sums as disjoint unions, resulting in a syntactical system for sets as well as propositional deductions. Additionally, it is possible to extend typed lambda calculus to dependent type theories, where types can depend on the elements of other types. This allows us to formalize families of sets, on the one hand and first-order deductions, on the other.

Type theories are typically motivated by their role in formalizing data types and programs rather than proofs and propositions. However, some type theories have foundational or even proof-theoretical motivations. For instance, the well-known Martin L of type theory [61] is a fundamental dependent type theory influenced by Prawitz’s work on the equivalence of proofs via normalization, aiming to formalize what constructions—and, consequently, proofs—mean in constructive mathematics. Due to this connection with data types, type theory garners significant interest from the theoretical computer science community, and it is fair to say that most developments in both categorical and type-theoretical approaches to proofs are inspired by these interests.

Finally, to connect categorical proof theory to type theory, one can interpret the former as the categorical semantics for the latter. For example, cartesian closed categories provide a semantics for the typed lambda calculus. In this chapter, we will not cover type theories; for more information on type theories, especially their connection with categories, see [17, 39, 84, 34, 45].

1.5 Landmarks in Categorical Proof Theory

As mentioned before, categorical proof theory essentially began with Lambek [46, 47, 48], who sought to formalize *propositional* deductive systems as structured categories. He starts with substructural proof systems and demonstrates that the required structure is the *monoidal structure*. Then, he moves to the intuitionistic deductive systems over the fragment $\{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$ and shows that the structure is nothing other than the well-known *cartesian closed structure*. Later, Lambek shows that the categorical approach to propositional intuitionistic proofs and the type-theoretical one using typed lambda calculus coincide [45]. For a thorough investigation of the intuitionistic case, see [83, 45]. For the substructural setting, especially linear logic, see [7, 8, 10, 11, 74, 18].

Lambek’s use of categorical machinery is beneficial for both category theorists and proof/type theorists. For the first community, it provides a combinatorially manageable syntax to investigate the properties of categories. Specifically, it aids in axiomatizing equalities between morphisms in a given family of categories in terms of a few easy-to-check equalities. Such problems are referred to as *coherence problems*, with the primordial example being MacLane’s work on monoidal and symmetric monoidal categories [54]. In fact, Lambek was the one who introduced Gentzen’s proof-theoretical methods into category theory, which Mac Lane and Kelly later exploited to solve a major coherence problem for closed categories [41]. For more on these coherence problems and their connection to proof theory, see the comprehensive book by Došen and Petrić [23]. It is also worth consulting [55].

For the proof/type theory community, category theory provides a rich semantics that is useful for providing counterexamples. Here, there are three main problems of interest. First, the *existence problem* concerns the existence of terms in a type or proofs of a proposition. The second is the *equivalence problem*, which addresses the equivalence of terms or proofs, and the third is the *identity problem*, asking whether two types or propositions are identical. In each of these problems, one can use categories to demonstrate that some types (resp. propositions) are empty (resp. unprovable), some terms (resp. proofs) are unequal, or some types (resp. propositions) are non-isomorphic; for more see Section 7. One can even go further and ask whether a given family of categories is *complete* for the problem, meaning that to solve the problem, it is sufficient to check only the interpretations in those categories.

For the existence problem, since we are only concerned with the existence of proofs, it is sufficient to relax the categorical structure to posets. Finding concrete yet complete posets is an interesting line of inquiry. For instance, regarding the existence of intuitionistic propositional proofs, it is enough to

consider the bicartesian closed poset $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R})$, which consists of the open sets of the topological space \mathbb{R} [9]. Although it is not strictly necessary, using concrete non-posetal categories for the existence problem is also intriguing. The first example of such a category was $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, which was studied by Laüchli [49]. His original paper does not employ categorical language; instead, it assigns a pair (X, σ_X) of a set and a bijection on it to propositions, and interprets deductions as usual functions that respect the bijection. The modern categorical presentation, along with its generalizations, can be found in [33]. The categorical interpretation is also generalized to the first-order setting in [59, 60].

For the equivalence problem, Friedman [29] and, independently, Plotkin [65, 66] demonstrated that beta-eta conversion is complete for deriving all equalities between the (simply-typed) lambda-definable functionals in the category of sets. Building on this result, Čubrić showed that the category of sets is complete for the equivalence problem [90] for the fragment $\{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$ of intuitionistic proofs. The result is further reduced to the category of finite sets by Solovev [80]. This reduction can be employed to prove the decidability of the equivalence of proofs in the mentioned fragment. Later, Simpson [79] established that a cartesian closed category is complete for the equivalence problem for the fragment $\{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow\}$ if and only if it is not a preordered set. This theorem has a significant philosophical consequence, as it states that the equivalence between proofs is the maximum congruence relation one can impose on proofs without collapsing the entire proof structure to mere provability. For further details, see [24]. Recently, Scherer [72] demonstrated that the category of finite sets is complete for the equivalence problem of the full propositional intuitionistic language leading again to the decidability of the equivalence of proofs problem. Using the argument provided by Simpson [77], one can show that a bicartesian closed category is complete for the full language if and only if it is not a preordered set.

For the identity problem concerning the fragment $\{\wedge, \top, \rightarrow\}$, it is known that a finite set of simple identities (see Subsection 7.3) axiomatizes all identities between propositions. It has also been proven that the category of finite sets is complete for this problem, which leads to the decidability of identities between propositions in the fragment. For the fragment $\{\wedge, \vee, \top, \rightarrow\}$, it is known that the canonical finite set of axioms, referred to as *Tarski's high school identities*, is not complete. Furthermore, [28] showed that the problem is not finitely axiomatizable. For the full language, the situation is more complicated. It is still not finitely axiomatizable [28]. We also know that the category of sets cannot be complete, as it considers the formulas $\neg p \vee \neg\neg p$ and \top to be isomorphic, despite the fact that they are not even intuitionistically equivalent. To the best of our knowledge, the decidability of the propositional identity problem for the the last two fragments remains open. For a survey of the results and applications of the propositional identity problem, see [20, 19].

So far, we have discussed the propositional language. To some extent, the theory has been generalized to more expressive languages by Lawvere [53, 50] using hyperdoctrines, and to first-order languages by Bénabou [6], Seely [73, 75], and Makkai [59, 60] through a special family of fibrations. In this chapter, we

will not cover these investigations. However, to provide a glimpse into the use of categorical machinery in higher-order settings, we will restrict our focus to the special yet rich case of *realizability*. The main idea is to use maps in a structured category or terms in a type theory as constructions. These constructions are usually called *realizers*. Realizability originated with Kleene, who employed algorithms as realizers [42]. This approach proved useful for establishing meta-mathematical theorems about constructive arithmetic. For instance, one can prove the consistency of classically invalid Church-Turing thesis, which asserts that all functions on natural numbers are computable. It is also beneficial to extract computational information from constructive proofs. For example, if $\forall x \exists y A(x, y)$ is provable in constructive arithmetic, then there exists a computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $A(n, f(n))$ holds for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This machinery has been generalized in various ways [85]. The categorical version we are interested in emerged in [38], where Hyland used algorithms to realize higher-order theories. His framework was further generalized in [13, 2] to allow for the use of structured categories or typed theories to formalize constructions. For a comprehensive explanation, see [12, 2, 88, 3].

1.6 A Word to the Reader

The categorical language can pose a significant conceptual barrier for those wishing to understand the applications of categorical methods in proof theory. To mitigate this issue and reach a broader audience—particularly among proof theorists—we have decided to structure the material without assuming prior familiarity with category theory. We only require a very basic understanding of mathematical logic, including the fundamentals of natural deductions, the basics of order theory and topology, and a basic familiarity with the theory of computation.

As a consequence, the chapter begins with a slow and somewhat extensive introduction to category theory. In our explanation, we employ numerous examples and motivate the introduced categorical concepts using logical and, in particular, proof-theoretical ideas. To make the introduction easier to digest, we refrain from using any unnecessary categorical notions. For instance, we avoid discussing limits and colimits, representable functors, or adjunctions. This categorical part is addressed in Sections 3 and 4, where we also introduce the basic structure of a propositional proof system. Readers with a solid background in category theory may skim through these sections to see the connection with proof theory and start reading from Section 5. In Section 5, we will explain and formalize the BHK interpretation and demonstrate how it fits into the broader context of categorical proof theory. In Section 6, we will briefly discuss classical deductions. In Section 7, we will utilize the categorical framework established in the previous sections as a form of semantics for syntactical proofs. To transition from propositional to higher-order cases, in Section 8, we will introduce higher-order theories in general and some constructive theories of arithmetic in particular. In Section 9, we will apply categorical proof theory to gain insights into general higher-order theories using a semantical machinery called realizabil-

ity. Finally, in Section 10, we will use realizability to prove some consistency results in arithmetic and also extract information from the arithmetical proofs. In each section, we will provide numerous philosophical discussions and examples to convey the fundamental ideas, the constructions, and, at times, sketches of the proofs. However, we will generally leave the computational details of the examples to the reader. We will also prove the simpler theorems to demonstrate how the concepts work in practice while referring readers to external sources for the proofs of more complex results.

Acknowledgement. We wish to thank the organizers of the TACL 2022 summer school and Rosalie Iemhoff for their invitation, the participants of the summer school and the fundamental computing team at the Bernoulli institute who organized and actively participated in the lectures on the present text and the editors of the present volume, especially Maria Manuel Clementino, for their support and patience without which this chapter would never come to the existence. We are also grateful to Steve Awodey, Andrej Bauer, Pino Rosolini, Alex Simpson, Thomas Streicher and the anonymous referees for their very helpful comments, suggestions and corrections on the first draft. Support by the FWF project P 33548, the Czech Academy of Sciences (RVO 67985840) and the GAČR grant 23-04825S is also gratefully acknowledged.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we will recall some basic notions from order theory, algebra, propositional proof theory and computability theory, to refresh our memory, emphasize the less known points and fix the notation. Many other notions such as spaces, compactness and local compactness in topology, first-order theories in logic and Turing machines in computability theory are assumed without any further explanation.

A *preordered set* is a pair (P, \leq) of a set P and a preorder \leq , i.e., a reflexive and transitive binary relation $\leq \subseteq P \times P$, i.e., $x \leq x$, for any $x \in P$ and if $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$ then $x \leq z$, for any $x, y, z \in P$. If this relation is also anti-symmetric, i.e., if $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$ implies $x = y$, for any $x, y \in P$, then the preorder is called a *partial order* and (P, \leq) is called a *poset*. A poset (P, \leq) is called *linear*, if for any $x, y \in P$, either $x \leq y$ or $y \leq x$. A poset (P, \leq) is called a *tree*, if for any element $x \in P$, the poset $\{y \in P \mid y \leq x\}$ with the induced order is finite and linear. A tree is called *rooted*, if it has the least element, i.e., an element $m \in P$ such that $m \leq x$, for any $x \in P$.

For any two preordered sets (P, \leq_P) and (Q, \leq_Q) , an *order-preserving* map $f : (P, \leq_P) \rightarrow (Q, \leq_Q)$ is a function $f : P \rightarrow Q$ such that $f(x) \leq_Q f(y)$, if $x \leq_P y$. It is called an *order-embedding* if it is order-preserving and $f(x) \leq_Q f(x)$ implies $x \leq_P y$, for any $x, y \in P$. Two prototypical examples of posets that we will use in this chapter are the poset of the opens of a topological space X , denoted by $\mathcal{O}(X)$, and the poset of all the upward-closed subsets (upset, for short) of a preordered set (P, \leq) with the inclusion, denoted by $U(P, \leq)$. Note

that the upsets of (P, \leq) also form a topology called the *upset topology* and any space with a topology induced in that way is called an *Alexandrov space*. For a poset (P, \leq) , define $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$ as the poset of all order-preserving maps from (P, \leq) into $\mathbf{2}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ is the poset $(\{0, 1\}, \leq)$ and \leq is the usual order on numbers. Note that $U(P, \leq)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$. Hence, we use them interchangeably.

A *monoid* is a tuple (M, \cdot, e) , where M is a set, $\cdot : M \times M \rightarrow M$ is a binary operation on M and $e \in M$ is an element such that $e \cdot x = x \cdot e = x$, for any $x \in M$ and $x \cdot (y \cdot z) = (x \cdot y) \cdot z$, for any $x, y, z \in M$. *Groups* are the monoids where any element has an inverse, i.e., for any $x \in M$, there exists $y \in M$ such that $x \cdot y = y \cdot x = e$.

Let $\mathcal{L}_p = \{\top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ be the propositional language and recall that $\neg A$ is an abbreviation for $A \rightarrow \perp$. We define the *natural deduction* system **NJ** by its usual rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\top} (\top) \qquad \frac{D}{\perp} (\perp) \\
\\
\frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{\frac{A}{A \wedge B} \frac{B}{A \wedge B}} (I \wedge) \quad \frac{D}{\frac{A \wedge B}{A}} (E \wedge_1) \quad \frac{D}{\frac{A \wedge B}{B}} (E \wedge_2) \\
\\
\frac{D}{\frac{A}{A \vee B}} (I \vee_1) \quad \frac{D}{\frac{B}{A \vee B}} (I \vee_2) \quad \frac{D \quad [A]^i \quad [B]^j}{\frac{A \vee B \quad C}{C}} (E \vee_{i,j}) \\
\\
\frac{[A]^i \quad D}{\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}} (I \rightarrow_i) \quad \frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{\frac{A \quad A \rightarrow B}{B}} (E \rightarrow)
\end{array}$$

where i and j are natural numbers to refer to the assumptions. One can compose these rules to construct rooted trees that we will use to define derivations. Here are some conditions we impose on the use of superscripts in trees. First, all leaves are formulas with a superscript. Second, in any tree, any number i must be used for a unique formula. However, it is possible to have one formula with different superscripts. Third, in $(E \vee_{i,j})$, the indices i and j cannot occur in D , the index i cannot occur in D_2 and j cannot occur in D_1 .

We define a *derivation* of A from the set $\Gamma = \{[\gamma_1]^{i_1}, [\gamma_2]^{i_2}, \dots, [\gamma_n]^{i_n}\}$ of assumptions as a tree with the leaves inside Γ . Note that it is not necessarily that every formula in Γ appears in the tree. When the set of assumptions is clear from the context, especially when Γ is equal to the set of formulas in the leaves, we omit Γ and simply talk about the derivations of A . If D is a derivation of A from the assumptions Γ , a sub-derivation E of D is a full subtree of D . It proves the formula in its root and its assumptions can be canonically computed from Γ by adding the eliminated assumptions in the path from the root of E to the root of D . If D is a derivation of A from the assumptions in Γ and for any

$[\gamma_i]^{n_i}$, we have a derivation D_i of γ_i from Σ , then by composition of D with the D_i 's, we mean gluing D_i to the leaf $[\gamma_i]^{n_i}$ of D and eliminating the $[-]^{n_i}$'s. The resulting tree is a derivation of A from Σ . We identify two derivations if one is reachable by the other by changing the names of the superscripts in a bijective manner. For instance, the following two derivations of $B \rightarrow A \wedge B$ from the assumptions $\{[A]^3, [B]^5\}$ and $\{[A]^4, [B]^7\}$, respectively, are considered as equal:

$$\frac{\frac{[A]^3 \quad [B]^5}{A \wedge B} (I \wedge)}{B \rightarrow A \wedge B} (I \rightarrow_5) \quad \equiv \quad \frac{\frac{[A]^4 \quad [B]^7}{A \wedge B} (I \wedge)}{B \rightarrow A \wedge B} (I \rightarrow_7)$$

Consider the following family of *basic β -equivalences*:

$$\frac{\frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{A \quad B} (I \wedge)}{\frac{A \wedge B}{A} (E \wedge)} \quad \equiv \quad \frac{D_1}{A}$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[A]^i}{D_2} \quad B}{A \rightarrow B} (I \rightarrow_i) \quad \frac{D_1}{A} (E \rightarrow)}{B} \quad \equiv \quad \frac{D_1}{A} \quad \frac{D_2}{B}$$

$$\frac{\frac{D}{A} (IV) \quad \frac{\frac{[A]^i}{D_1} \quad [B]^j}{C} (E \vee_{i,j})}{A \vee B} (I \vee)}{C} \quad \equiv \quad \frac{D}{A} \quad \frac{D_1}{C}$$

$$\frac{\frac{D}{B} (IV) \quad \frac{\frac{[A]^i}{D_1} \quad [B]^j}{C} (E \vee_{i,j})}{A \vee B} (I \vee)}{C} \quad \equiv \quad \frac{D}{B} \quad \frac{D_2}{C}$$

Moreover, consider the following *basic η -equivalences*:

$$\frac{\frac{D_1}{A \wedge B} \quad \frac{D_1}{A \wedge B}}{A \wedge B} \quad \equiv \quad D_1 \quad \frac{\frac{D_2}{A \rightarrow B} \quad [A]^1}{\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}^1} \quad \equiv \quad D_2$$

$$\frac{\frac{[A]^1}{A \vee B} \quad \frac{[B]^2}{A \vee B}}{A \vee B} \quad \equiv \quad D_3$$

Note that in the right side, we always consider the used derivations from the left side as a sub-derivation. Hence, their assumptions are equal. For \top and \perp , the basic η -equivalences are the identifications of any two derivations of a fix formula from \perp and any two derivations of \top from a fixed family of assumptions. These basic β - and η -equivalences² give rise to an equivalence relation defined as the least equivalence relation on derivations extending the above-mentioned β - and η -equivalences and respecting the composition of derivations. We always consider derivations up to this equivalence relation.

The systems **NM** and **NN** are defined similarly for the fragments $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp, \vee\}$, respectively, by eliminating all the rules for the missing connectives. The *intuitionistic propositional logic*, **IPC**, is defined as the set of all formulas $A \in \mathcal{L}_p$ such that there exists a derivation of A in **NJ** from the empty set of assumptions. Similarly, one can define the *minimal propositional logic*, **MPC**, using the system **NM**.

The class of all *primitive recursive functions* are defined as the least class of functions over natural numbers, containing the basic functions $Z = 0$, $s(x) = x + 1$ and $I_k^i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = x_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and closed under composition and *primitive recursion*, i.e., for any primitive recursive functions $g : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $h : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the function $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by:

$$\begin{cases} f(0, \bar{x}) = g(\bar{x}) \\ f(y + 1, \bar{x}) = h(y, \bar{x}, f(y, \bar{x})) \end{cases}$$

is also primitive recursive. Turing machines are defined in their usual way. It is possible to encode Turing machines by natural numbers. We call these numbers the *codes* of the algorithms or machines. Recall that there is a *universal Turing machine* U that reads the pair (e, n) of the code e of an algorithm and the input n and provides the output of the algorithm e on the input n . We denote $U(e, n)$ by $e \cdot n$. Note that U is a partial function. When $U(e, n)$ is (resp. is not) defined, i.e., when the algorithm e halts (resp. does not halt) on the input n , we write $e \cdot n \downarrow$ (resp. $e \cdot n \uparrow$). One interesting theorem that we will use later is Kleene's S_n^m *theorem*:

Theorem 2.0.1. *There exists a primitive recursive function S such that for any code e of a function $f(x, y)$ with two variables, we have $S(e, x) \cdot y = f(x, y)$, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$.*

3 Categories, Functors and Natural Transformations

In this section, we will introduce the basic notions of categories, functors, and natural transformations. We will also present many instances of these concepts

²These equivalences also appear in lambda calculus and more complex type theories as the basic computational rules on terms.

to provide concrete toy examples to familiarize readers with such abstract notions. These examples will also be required later in the chapter when we aim to provide a categorical formalization for a proof system.

3.1 Categories

Let us start this subsection with the definition of a category.

Definition 3.1.1. A *category* \mathcal{C} consists of the following data:

- a collection of *objects*, denoted by $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$,
- a collection of *morphisms* or *maps*, denoted by $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$,
- for any morphism $f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$, an object $s(f)$ called the *source* of f ,
- for any morphism $f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$, an object $t(f)$ called the *target* of f ,
- for any object $A \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, a morphism id_A , called the *identity* on A ,
- for any two morphisms $f, g \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$ such that $s(f) = t(g)$, a morphism $f \circ g$, called the *composition* of f and g ,

satisfying the following properties:

- $s(id_A) = t(id_A) = A$,
- $s(f \circ g) = s(g)$ and $t(f \circ g) = t(f)$,
- $f \circ id_A = f = id_B \circ f$, if $s(f) = A$ and $t(f) = B$,
- $f \circ (g \circ h) = (f \circ g) \circ h$.

Since composition is a partial function, by the above equalities, we mean that if one side is defined, the other must also be defined, and they must be equal. For any $f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$, we present the data $s(f) = A$ and $t(f) = B$ by $f : A \rightarrow B$. For any two objects $A, B \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, by $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ or $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$, we mean the collection of all morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$. A category is called *small* if $\text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})$ is a set. It is called *locally small* if $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ is a set, for any two objects A and B . Sometimes, for simplicity, we drop \circ in $f \circ g$ and denote the composition by fg . A map $f : A \rightarrow B$ is called an *isomorphism* iff there exists $g : B \rightarrow A$ such that $gf = id_A$ and $fg = id_B$. If there is an isomorphism between A and B , we write $A \cong B$.

Philosophical Comment 3.1.2. To have an informal interpretation in mind, consider the objects of a category as the entities of a given discourse, the maps as the transformations between these entities, the composition as the composition of these transformations, and the identity as the do-nothing transformation. More specifically, objects in a category can be interpreted as *propositions*, and morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$ as the *deductions* of B from the assumption A . Thus, the identity map $id_A : A \rightarrow A$ can be seen as the canonical deduction of A from itself, and the composition as the process of applying two deductions sequentially. In this sense, any category can be viewed as a kind of *proof system*.




Table 1: A schematic diagram of a category


In the following, we will present many examples of categories. These examples are intended to provide a proper sense of what categories are. In each example, we will also attempt to interpret the introduced category as a proof system.

Example 3.1.3. The collection of all (resp. finite) sets as the objects and functions as the morphisms, with the usual composition and identity, constitutes a category denoted by **Set** (resp. **FinSet**). We can think of the set A as the set of all *proofs* of the proposition associated with A , denoted by ϕ_A . Then, the function $f : A \rightarrow B$ can be read as a *deduction* of ϕ_B from ϕ_A , transforming any proof of ϕ_A into a proof of ϕ_B .


Example 3.1.4. The collection of all topological spaces as the objects and continuous functions as the morphisms, with the usual composition and identity, constitutes a category, denoted by **Top**. We can think of the space X as the space of all proofs of the proposition associated to X , denoted by ϕ_X . These proofs can be infinitary. However, the topology of the space ensures that only a finite amount of information encoded in such infinitary proofs is used. More precisely, we can think of an open subset of X as a subset of all possible proofs of ϕ_X that extend a given finite amount of information. For instance, a proof of $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, A(x)$ can be an infinite sequence $\{\pi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where each π_n is a proof of $A(n)$, and the open sets are the subsets consisting of all sequences $\{\pi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ that extend a finite initial segment. In this interpretation, a deduction of Y from X is a *finitary* function transforming any proof of X into a proof of Y , where finitary means that it only uses a finite amount of information from its input to compute the output. The continuity condition simply encodes this finiteness condition. For example, in our case, a finitary deduction of B from $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, A(x)$ must only use a finite initial segment of the proof $\{\pi_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, A(x)$.

Example 3.1.5. (*Discrete categories*) A category \mathcal{C} is called *discrete* if it has only identity maps. Therefore, any set can be considered as a small discrete

category. For example, the set $\{A, B, C\}$ can be viewed as the following category:



Example 3.1.6. (*Finite categories*) These are some finite categories:



The category **0** has no objects and no morphisms. The category **1** has one object and one morphism, namely, the identity of the object. We did not draw the identity map in the above diagram and will continue this practice of omitting identity maps in diagrams. The category **2** has two objects and one non-identity morphism. Throughout this chapter, we always use the notation **2** for this category, which should not be confused with the discrete category containing two elements.

Example 3.1.7. (*Preorders*) Any preordered set (P, \leq) can be interpreted as a small category, where the objects are the elements of P , and there is a unique morphism from p to q iff $p \leq q$. Note that the identity and composition correspond to the reflexivity and transitivity of the preorder, respectively.

Philosophical Comment 3.1.8. It is useful to think of preordered sets as the shadows of usual categories, reducing all transformations between two objects to a single *transformability* between them. In the logical interpretation, this means that we collapse all deductions between two statements into one *deductibility* map.

Example 3.1.9. (*Monoids*) Any monoid (M, \cdot, e) can be interpreted as a category with a single object $*$, where each element of M is a morphism from $*$ to $*$, e is the identity morphism id_* , and \cdot represents the composition of morphisms.

Philosophical Comment 3.1.10. (*Groups and identity*) Being monoids, groups can also be read as categories with one object $*$. One can read any element of the group or equivalently any morphism over $*$ as a proof of the equality $* = *$. With this interpretation, it is easy to see that the identity e is the *trivial* proof of $* = *$ and its existence is the proof-sensitive version of the reflexivity of the identity relation, while the composition and the inverse operation of the group are the proof-sensitive versions of its transitivity and symmetry, respectively.

Remark 3.1.11. A category combines the two extreme cases previously mentioned: a preordered set and a monoid. The first handles the existence of different objects in a category, while the second addresses the different morphisms between any two objects. From a proof-theoretic perspective, one can say that the first describes the propositions and the deductibility relation between them, whereas the second incorporates the actual deductions into the picture.

Example 3.1.12. (*Baby variable sets*) Consider the collection of functions

$$\begin{array}{c} A_1 \\ \uparrow \\ f \\ \downarrow \\ A_0 \end{array}$$

as the objects and define a morphism $\alpha : f \rightarrow g$ to be the pair of functions (α_0, α_1) , where $\alpha_0 : A_0 \rightarrow B_0$ and $\alpha_1 : A_1 \rightarrow B_1$ such that $\alpha_1 f = g \alpha_0$:


$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & B_1 \\ \uparrow f & & \uparrow g \\ A_0 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} & B_0 \end{array}$$

These collections, with the evident composition and identity, constitute a category denoted by \mathbf{Set}^2 . Any object $f : A_0 \rightarrow A_1$ in \mathbf{Set}^2 can be interpreted as a *variable set*, varying over the discrete structure of time $\{0 \leq 1\}$. The set A_0 represents the elements of the variable set available at the moment $t = 0$, while the set A_1 represents its elements at the moment $t = 1$. Moving from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$, there are three main possibilities: either new elements are created, some elements remain unchanged (up to renaming), or some distinct elements in A_0 become equal in A_1 . These scenarios are all formalized by the function f . The elements outside the range of f represent new elements at $t = 1$, while the elements within the range come from $t = 0$, reflecting the latter two possibilities. Any map between these variable sets naturally corresponds to a pair of maps, each representing the state of the sets at different moments in time, and must respect the changes that occur over time. From a proof-theoretical perspective, these variable sets can be interpreted as propositions whose proofs evolve over time. New proofs can be discovered, or two existing proofs may be found to be identical upon closer examination.


Remark 3.1.13. In the previous example, there is nothing special about the structure $\{0 \leq 1\}$ and it can be replaced by any other preordered set or even by any small category. We will see how later.

Example 3.1.14. (*Dynamical systems*) A pair (A, σ_A) of a set A and a function

$\sigma_A : A \rightarrow A$



is called a *dynamic system*, where A is interpreted as the set of the states of the system and $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow A$ as its dynamism. Let (A, σ_A) and (B, σ_B) be two dynamic systems. A map $f : A \rightarrow B$ is called *equivariant* if $f \circ \sigma_A = \sigma_B \circ f$:




The equivariant maps are simply the functions that respect the dynamism, as we expect from any map between dynamic systems. The collection of all dynamic systems as the objects and equivariant maps as the morphisms with the evident composition and identity constitute a category, denoted by $\mathbf{Set}^{(\mathbb{N}, +)}$ or $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$, for short. (We will see the motivation of this rather strange denotation later). If we restrict the morphisms to equivariant maps that are also bijections, we reach the category of *reversible dynamic systems*, denoted by $\mathbf{Set}^{(\mathbb{Z}, +)}$ or $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, for short. It is possible to apply the same idea to define dynamic topological systems, dynamic monoids, and so on, using a topological space with one continuous map over it, a monoid with a homomorphism over it, and so on. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that a reversible dynamic system (A, σ_A) can be read as a proposition. The set A stores all possible proofs of that proposition, the bijection σ_A is a way to make the proof $a \in A$ identical to $\sigma_A(a)$ and we want to consider the proofs up to that identity. In this sense, an equivariant map $f : (A, \sigma_A) \rightarrow (B, \sigma_B)$ is just a function to transform the proofs of A to the proofs of B , respecting the newly put symmetry on the proofs.

Example 3.1.15. Let $\mathcal{L}_p = \{\top, \perp, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ be the propositional language and A and B be two formulas in \mathcal{L}_p . By a morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$, we mean a derivation of B from the assumption A in \mathbf{NJ} , up to $\beta\eta$ -equivalence. The collection of all the formulas in \mathcal{L}_p and morphisms with the identity on A as the trivial derivation of A from itself and composition as simply putting derivations one after another is a category. We denote this category by \mathbf{NJ} . In a similar fashion, one can restrict oneself to the fragments $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp, \vee\}$ and define the categories \mathbf{NM} and \mathbf{NN} , respectively.

We conclude this subsection by presenting some simple methods for constructing new categories from existing ones.

Example 3.1.16. (*Opposite category*) Let \mathcal{C} be a category. By its dual (opposite), denoted by \mathcal{C}^{op} , we mean a category with the same collections of objects and morphisms as of \mathcal{C} with the source and the target assignments swapped and

$$f \circ' g = g \circ f:$$



Example 3.1.17. (*Product of categories*) Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two categories. By $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$, we mean the category with the pairs (C, D) as the objects, where C and D are the objects of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} , respectively, and the pairs $(f, g) : (C, D) \rightarrow (E, F)$ as the morphisms, where $f : C \rightarrow E$ and $g : D \rightarrow F$ are morphisms in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} , respectively. Note that this construction generalizes the product of monoids and posets, on the one hand, and the product of sets as discrete small categories, on the other.


Example 3.1.18. (*Preorder and Poset reflection*) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category. By its *preorder reflection*, we mean the preordered set $(\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), \leq)$ where $A \leq B$ iff $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ is non-empty. The *poset reflection* of \mathcal{C} , denoted by $\text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$, is the poset of the preorder reflection, i.e., the objects are the equivalence classes of the objects of the preorder reflection under the equivalence $A \sim B$ if $A \leq B$ and $B \leq A$ while the order is just the order induced by the preorder reflection.

3.2 Functors

Reading a category as a proof system, one naturally needs to formalize a transformation between proof systems as a map that respects the compositional structure of deductions.

Definition 3.2.1. (*Functors*) Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two categories. By a *functor* $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ we mean a pair of two assignments F_0 and F_1 , such that F_0 maps any object A of \mathcal{C} to an object of \mathcal{D} , denoted by $F_0(A)$, and F_1 maps any morphism f of \mathcal{C} to a morphism in \mathcal{D} , denoted by $F_1(f)$, respecting the source, target, identity and composition operations as depicted in the following

schematic diagram:



Usually, for simplicity, one drops the subscripts in F_0 and F_1 and denotes both of the assignments by F .

Philosophical Comment 3.2.2. It is possible to read a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ as a way to interpret the discourse \mathcal{C} into the discourse \mathcal{D} , as a way to realize \mathcal{C} in \mathcal{D} , as a \mathcal{C} -indexed family in \mathcal{D} or a \mathcal{C} -variable object in \mathcal{D} . When we interpret \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} as two proof systems, F may be read as an interpretation of the first proof system into the second.

Example 3.2.3. Homomorphisms between monoids and order-preserving maps between preordered sets are examples of functors. In fact, as categories are a common generalization of preordered sets and monoids, functors are also a common generalization of monoid homomorphisms and order-preserving maps.

Example 3.2.4. The assignment mapping any set A to its powerset $P(A)$ and any function $f : A \rightarrow B$ to the function $P(f) : P(A) \rightarrow P(B)$, defined by $P(f)(S) = f[S] = \{f(a) \mid a \in S\}$ is a functor from **Set** to itself. Similarly, the functor $P^\circ : \mathbf{Set}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, mapping any set A to its powerset $P(A)$ and any map $f : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathbf{Set}^{op} (i.e., a function $f : A \rightarrow B$) to the function $P^\circ(f) : P(B) \rightarrow P(A)$, defined by $P^\circ(f)(S) = f^{-1}(S) = \{a \in A \mid f(a) \in S\}$ is a functor.

Example 3.2.5. The assignment mapping any object (A, B) in $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ to the set $A \times B$ and any morphism $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ of $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ to the function $f \times g : A \times B \rightarrow C \times D$ defined by $[f \times g](a, b) = (f(a), g(b))$ is a functor, denoted by $(-) \times (-) : \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. Reading proof-theoretically, we can interpret this functor as the *conjunction operation* encoding the idea that a proof of a conjunction is a pair of the proofs of each component.

Example 3.2.6. The assignment mapping any object (A, B) in $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ to the set $A + B = \{(0, a) \mid a \in A\} \cup \{(1, b) \mid b \in B\}$ and any morphism $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ of $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ to the function $f + g : A + B \rightarrow C + D$ defined by $[f + g](0, a) = (0, f(a))$ and $[f + g](1, b) = (1, g(b))$ is a functor, denoted by $(-) + (-) : \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. Reading proof-theoretically, we can

interpret this functor as the *disjunction operation* encoding the idea that a proof of a disjunction is a pair, where the first component states which of the disjuncts we are proving and the second component provides the proof.

Example 3.2.7. Let A be a fixed set. Define the assignment $(-)^A : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, mapping the set B to B^A i.e., the set of all functions from A to B and mapping the function $f : B \rightarrow C$ to the function $f^A : B^A \rightarrow C^A$, defined by $f^A(g) = fg$. Then, $(-)^A : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a functor, generalizing the finite power functor $A \mapsto A^n$ generated by the iteration of the product functor. Similarly, it is possible to define the assignment $A^{(-)} : \mathbf{Set}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, mapping the set B to the set $A^B = \{f : B \rightarrow A\}$ and the map $f : C \rightarrow B$ in \mathbf{Set}^{op} (i.e., the function $f : B \rightarrow C$) to the function $A^f : A^C \rightarrow A^B$, defined by $A^f(g) = gf$. Then, $A^{(-)} : \mathbf{Set}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a functor, generalizing the functor $P^o = 2^{(-)}$. It is possible to unify these two functors in one functor $(-)^{(-)} : \mathbf{Set}^{op} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ mapping (B, C) to C^B and (f, g) to the function $g^f : C_1^{B_1} \rightarrow C_2^{B_2}$ defined by $g^f(h) = ghf$, where $f : B_2 \rightarrow B_1$ and $g : C_1 \rightarrow C_2$ are two functions. Reading proof-theoretically, we can interpret this functor as the *implication operation* encoding the idea that a proof of the implication $B \rightarrow C$ is a function mapping any proof of B to a proof of C .

Example 3.2.8. (*Forgetful functors*) It is customary to have a category of some structures and then, for some reason, forget some of the structures the objects possess and the maps preserve. This way, one can think of the same data as it lives in a richer context. Functors can formalize such situations, and in these settings, they are called *forgetful functors* as they forget some parts of their input data. Let us provide three examples of such situations. First, the assignment U mapping any topological space X and any continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ in \mathbf{Top} to themselves in \mathbf{Set} is a functor. The functor U forgets that there is a topology on the spaces that the continuous maps respect. For the second example, for any $i \in \{0, 1\}$, define the assignment $\pi_i : \mathbf{Set}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, by mapping any $f : A_0 \rightarrow A_1$ to A_i and any $\alpha : f \rightarrow g$ to $\alpha_i : A_i \rightarrow B_i$, where $f : A_0 \rightarrow A_1$ and $g : B_0 \rightarrow B_1$. Both π_0 and π_1 are functors. By making two snapshots of a variable set in the two possible moments, π_0 and π_1 forget that the variable set actually varies. For the third, consider the assignment $U : \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ mapping any dynamic system to its set and any equivariant map to itself. The assignment U is a functor that forgets the dynamism of the dynamic space.

Conversely to the idea behind the forgetful functors, sometimes we want to add more structure to the existing object, and of course, there might be many ways to add these structures. In the following, we will see some examples of such a situation.

Example 3.2.9. Define the assignment $Disc : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ mapping the set X to the discrete space X (i.e., where all subsets are open) and the function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to itself. This assignment is a functor. Similarly, if we define $InDisc : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$, mapping the set X to the indiscrete space X (i.e., where

the opens are \emptyset and X) and the function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to itself, we also obtain a functor.

Example 3.2.10. Define the assignment $St : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ mapping the set X to the *static* dynamic system (X, id_X) and the function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to itself. This assignment is a functor.

There are several functors that are generally available over arbitrary categories. Here are a few examples.

Example 3.2.11. Let \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{E} be some categories. Then, note that the identity functor $id_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ mapping any object and morphism of \mathcal{C} to itself is a functor. Moreover, if $F : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ and $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are two functors, then the composition $FG : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ with its evident definition is also a functor. For any object D of \mathcal{D} , the assignment $\Delta_D : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ mapping all objects of \mathcal{C} to D and all maps of \mathcal{C} to id_D is a functor.

Example 3.2.12. Let \mathcal{C} be a locally small category. The assignment $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, defined by $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) = \{f : A \rightarrow B \mid f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C})\}$ and $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(g, h) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C, D)$ as $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(g, h)(f) = hfg$, for any maps $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : C \rightarrow A$ and $h : B \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{C} , is a functor. This functor captures the whole structure of the category \mathcal{C} and is called the Hom functor.

Example 3.2.13. Let \mathcal{C} be a locally small category. For any object A in \mathcal{C} , there is a canonical functor $y^A = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, capturing the behavior of the maps above A . It is defined by $y^A(B) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ and $y^A(f) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, C)$ as $y^A(f)(g) = fg$, for any $f : B \rightarrow C$. Similarly, there is a canonical functor $y_A = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(-, A) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, capturing the behavior of the maps below A . It is defined by $y_A(B) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, A)$ and $y_A(f) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, A)$ as $y_A(f)(g) = gf$, for any $f : B \rightarrow C$. These functors are just the Hom functor where we fix one of the components.

Example 3.2.14. Let \mathcal{C} be a small category. Define the assignment $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$, mapping an object A to its class $[A]$ and a map $f : A \rightarrow B$ to the unique map from $[A]$ to $[B]$. This assignment is a functor. From a proof-theoretical perspective, we can interpret this functor as the *collapsing operation*, which forgets all deductions between two propositions and retains only the record of their mere existence, encoded in the deductibility relation.

To conclude this subsection, we will introduce three families of functors that will be important later in this chapter.

Definition 3.2.15. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is called *faithful* if for any two morphisms $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , if $F(f) = F(g)$, then $f = g$.

Example 3.2.16. Any functor with a preordered set as its domain is faithful, as in any preordered set, there is at most one map between any two objects. A homomorphism between two monoids is faithful iff it is injective. The forgetful functors from \mathbf{Top} and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathbf{Set} are faithful, simply because they map the

continuous functions and the equivariant maps to themselves. The functors $Disc, Indisc : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ and $St : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are all faithful, as they also do not change the functions. The functor $\pi_0 : \mathbf{Set}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is not faithful, as it forgets the value of the variable set at the point $t = 1$. More precisely, consider the inclusion function $i : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as an object of \mathbf{Set}^2 and define the map $\alpha : i \rightarrow i$ by setting $\alpha_0 : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0\}$ as the identity function and $\alpha_1 : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as the switch function, i.e., $\alpha_1(0) = 1$ and $\alpha_1(1) = 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{0, 1\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \{0, 1\} \\ \uparrow i & & \uparrow i \\ \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} & \{0\} \end{array}$$

It is clear that $\pi_0(\alpha) = \alpha_0 = \pi_0(id_i)$, but $\alpha \neq id_i$ as $\alpha_1 \neq id_{\{0,1\}}$.

Definition 3.2.17. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is called *full* if for any morphism $g : F(A) \rightarrow F(B)$ in \mathcal{D} , there exists a map $f : A \rightarrow B$ such that $F(f) = g$. It is called *weakly-full* if the non-emptiness of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(F(A), F(B))$ implies the non-emptiness of $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$.

Example 3.2.18. An order-preserving map between two posets is weakly-full iff it is full iff it is an order-embedding. A homomorphism between two monoids is always weakly-full but it is full iff it is surjective. The forgetful functors from \mathbf{Top} and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to \mathbf{Set} are not full as there are functions that are not continuous or equivariant. However, these forgetful functors are both weakly-full. The forgetful functor $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$ is full and hence weakly-full. The functors $Disc, Indisc : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ are trivially full. The functor $\pi_0 : \mathbf{Set}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is not full, because not all functions give rise to a map between variable sets. For instance, consider the inclusion function $! : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0\}$ and the identity function $id_{\{0,1\}} : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as the objects of \mathbf{Set}^2 and let $\alpha_0 = id_{\{0,1\}} : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the identity function:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \{0, 1\} \\ \uparrow ! & & \uparrow id_{\{0,1\}} \\ \{0, 1\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_0=id_{\{0,1\}}} & \{0, 1\} \end{array}$$

It is clear that there is no function $\alpha_1 : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to make the diagram commutative and hence α_0 is not $\pi_0(\alpha)$, for any map $\alpha : ! \rightarrow id_{\{0,1\}}$.


Philosophical Comment 3.2.19. We noted that from a proof-theoretic perspective, functors should be understood as interpretations between proof systems. In this context, faithful functors can be viewed as faithful interpretations that preserve the structure of deductions. Full functors, on the other hand, are

interpretations that do not introduce any new deductions between propositions. Weakly full functors may add some new deductions, but they do not render non-deductible propositions deductible. In other words, they do not alter the logic of the proof system.

3.3 Natural Transformations

Reading a category as a proof system and a functor as an interpretation, one can go one step further to think of the possible formalization of the transformations between the interpretations.

Definition 3.3.1. (*Natural transformations*) Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two categories and $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be two functors. By a *natural transformation* $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$, depicted as:




we mean an assignment mapping any object of \mathcal{C} to a morphism $\alpha_C : F(C) \rightarrow G(C)$ in \mathcal{D} such that for any morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 F(A) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_A} & G(A) \\
 F(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow G(f) \\
 F(B) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_B} & G(B)
 \end{array}$$

Philosophical Comment 3.3.2. Reading the functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ as \mathcal{C} -variable objects in \mathcal{D} , a natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$ serves as a natural candidate for a transformation between these variable objects. Naturally, any transformation between variable objects must specify the way we change the object $F(C)$ to the object $G(C)$ in \mathcal{D} , for each parameter $C \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$. These changes cannot be arbitrary; they must respect the variation of the parameter

C in \mathcal{C} , as illustrated in the following schematic diagram:



It is intuitively helpful to think of a natural transformation as a way of changing $F(C)$ to $G(C)$, *smoothly* in the parameter C .

It is also possible to interpret the functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ as two *construction methods* that take an object in \mathcal{C} and transform it into an object in \mathcal{D} . When can we consider F and G to be “equal” as methods of construction? We certainly do not want to restrict ourselves to strict equality, which requires the functors to be the same on both objects and morphisms, as this is overly restrictive. For instance, consider $F, G : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ as $F(A) = A \times \{0\}$ and $G(A) = A \times \{1\}$. Although F and G are not strictly equal, they must be considered as the same methods of construction, as they are only different up to an isomorphism. Using this criterion, one natural candidate for the intended equality between F and G is the existence of an isomorphism between $F(A)$ and $G(A)$, for any object A in \mathcal{C} . However, it is clear that any random assignment of isomorphisms between $F(A)$ and $G(A)$ does not suffice; the isomorphisms must be assigned in a *uniform* way, as we want F and G to be equal as two methods of construction not two mere structureless assignments. This uniformity requires that the isomorphisms be somewhat independent of the specific choice of the object A . Of course, one may object that the isomorphisms clearly depend on the object A (the source and the target of the isomorphism, for instance), but at the same time it is intuitively meaningful to talk about the constructions that apply the *same* method to *different* objects. An example may be more illuminating. Consider the canonical isomorphism $s_{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow B \times A$ defined by $s_{A,B}(a, b) = (b, a)$ that shows the order in the product of two sets is not important. This map clearly depends on the choice of A and B , but at the same time it is defined in a uniform way of “swapping the elements in a pair” which does not use the sets in an essential way. Natural transformations is historically developed for the sole purpose of capturing this very intuition of uniformity.

Example 3.3.3. The assignment $s : id_{\mathbf{Set}} \Rightarrow P$ defined by $s_A : A \rightarrow P(A)$ as $s_A(a) = \{a\}$ is a natural transformation. It is natural, because for any map $f : A \rightarrow B$, if f maps $a \in A$ to $f(a) \in B$, then $P(f)$ maps $\{a\}$ to $f[\{a\}] = \{f(a)\}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{\{-\}} & P(A) \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f[-] \\
B & \xrightarrow{\{-\}} & P(B)
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
a & \xrightarrow{\{-\}} & \{a\} \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f[-] \\
f(a) & \xrightarrow{\{-\}} & \{f(a)\}
\end{array}$$

Example 3.3.4. Let $Ex : \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$ be the exchange functor, i.e., $Ex(A, B) = (B, A)$ and $Ex(f, g) = (g, f)$ and $(-) \times (-) : \mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be the product functor. Then, the assignment $s : (-) \times (-) \Rightarrow [(-) \times (-)] \circ Ex$ defined by $s_{(A,B)} : A \times B \rightarrow B \times A$ as $s_{A \times B}(a, b) = (b, a)$ is a natural transformation as for any map $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ in $\mathbf{Set} \times \mathbf{Set}$, we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A \times B & \xrightarrow{s_{(A,B)}} & B \times A \\
\downarrow f \times g & & \downarrow g \times f \\
C \times D & \xrightarrow{s_{(C,D)}} & D \times C
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{ccc}
(a, b) & \xrightarrow{s_{(A,B)}} & (b, a) \\
\downarrow f \times g & & \downarrow g \times f \\
(f(a), g(b)) & \xrightarrow{s_{(C,D)}} & (g(b), f(a))
\end{array}$$

Example 3.3.5. Let (P, \leq_P) and (Q, \leq_Q) be posets and $F, G : (P, \leq_P) \rightarrow (Q, \leq_Q)$ be two order-preserving maps. Then, there is at most one natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$, as there is at most one map from $F(p)$ to $G(p)$, for any $p \in P$. This unique natural transformation exists iff $F(p) \leq_Q G(p)$, for any $p \in P$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(p) & \overset{\alpha_p}{\leq} & G(p) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
F(q) & \underset{\alpha_q}{\leq} & G(q)
\end{array}$$

A similar phenomenon occurs when we replace (P, \leq_P) with any other category. Specifically, for any category \mathcal{C} and any functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow (Q, \leq_Q)$, there is at most one natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$, and it exists if $F(A) \leq_Q G(A)$ for every object A in \mathcal{C} .

Example 3.3.6. Let M and N be two monoids and $F, G : M \rightarrow N$ be two homomorphisms. Then, a natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$, by definition, is an element $\alpha_* = n \in N$ such that $nF(m) = G(m)n$, for any $m \in M$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F(*) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_* = n} & G(*) \\
\downarrow F(m) & & \downarrow G(m) \\
F(*) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_* = n} & G(*)
\end{array}$$

Example 3.3.7. Let \mathcal{C} be a category and $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a map. Then, the assignment $y_f : \text{Hom}(-, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(-, B)$ defined by $(y_f)_C = f \circ (-)$ is a natural transformation as for any map $g : C \rightarrow D$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(D, A) & \xrightarrow{f \circ (-)} & \text{Hom}(D, B) \\ \downarrow (-) \circ g & & \downarrow (-) \circ g \\ \text{Hom}(C, A) & \xrightarrow{f \circ (-)} & \text{Hom}(C, B) \end{array}$$

Example 3.3.8. (*Non-natural transformations*) Let α be an assignment choosing a function $\alpha_A : A \rightarrow A$ for any set A . Then $\alpha : id_{\mathbf{Set}} \Rightarrow id_{\mathbf{Set}}$ is a natural transformation iff $\alpha_A = id_A$, for any set A . It is clear that setting $\alpha_A = id_A$ for any set A makes α a natural transformation. For the converse, assume α is a natural transformation and consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\{0\}}} & \{0\} \\ \downarrow \hat{a} & & \downarrow \hat{a} \\ A & \xrightarrow{\alpha_A} & A \end{array}$$

where $a \in A$ is an arbitrary element and $\hat{a}(0) = a$. It is clear that $\alpha_{\{0\}} = id_{\{0\}}$. Hence, $\alpha_A \circ \hat{a} = \hat{a}$. Applying both sides on 0, we have $\alpha_A(a) = a$. As $a \in A$ is arbitrary, we reach $\alpha_A = id_A$. Using the above characterization, it is enough to pick assignments that are not identity over at least one A to have non-natural transformations.

With functors and natural transformations at our disposal, we can generalize the notion of a variable set by generalizing the underlying temporal structure from the poset $\{0 \leq 1\}$ to any small category:

Example 3.3.9. (*Variable sets over \mathcal{C}*) Let \mathcal{C} be a small category. Then, a *variable set* over \mathcal{C} is a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. Variable sets over \mathcal{C} with natural transformations and canonical identity and composition form a category denoted by $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$. The exponentiation-like notation suggests that $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$ collects all functors from \mathcal{C} to \mathbf{Set} similar to collecting all functions from A to B in B^A . It is evident that if \mathcal{C} is the category $\mathbf{2}$, then a variable set over \mathcal{C} corresponds to the notion of a variable set we had previously established. Additionally, when \mathcal{C} is taken to be the monoid $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ or $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$, variable sets over \mathcal{C} represent dynamic systems and reversible dynamic systems, respectively. This observation not only unifies these diverse categories under one notion of variable sets but also justifies the notation that we employ for them.

One can use the Hom functor to map any small category \mathcal{C} to $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$. More precisely, define $y : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$ by $y_A = \text{Hom}(-, A)$ on objects and $y_f :$

$\text{Hom}(-, A) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(-, B)$ as defined in Example 3.3.7 on morphisms. It is easy to check that y is actually a functor. This functor plays a crucial role in category theory and is known as the *Yoneda embedding*. It is known that y is a full and faithful functor. Therefore, one can always pretend that any small category is actually a category of variable sets.

Philosophical Comment 3.3.10. One of the prominent foundational paradigms in mathematics is Brouwerian intuitionism. Among many other things, the paradigm believes that mathematics is a mental narrative constructed by a creative subject for herself. Like any narrative, this mathematical story evolves over time as new constructions are added and new properties are proved. In this context, truth in mathematics is viewed as temporal and dynamic, which can be effectively represented by our variable sets in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$, where \mathcal{C} is a suitable category that captures the progression of time. There are many valid formalizations of this notion of time. For instance, the simplest formalization that comes to mind is the set of all natural numbers and its usual order encoding the instances and the arrow of time. However, in this example, we focus on Brouwer’s own understanding of time:

This perception of a move of time may be described as the falling apart of a life moment into two distinct things, one of which gives way to the other, but is retained by memory. If the twofold thus born is divested of all quality, it passes into the empty form of the common substratum of all twofolds. And it is this common substratum, this empty form, which is the basic intuition of mathematics [15].

To formalize this notion of time, we use $[n] = \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$, for $n \geq 0$, as the objects to represent the n th moment of time and, for any $n \leq m$, we define the morphisms from $[n]$ to $[m]$ as a function $f : [m] \rightarrow [n]$, where $f(i) = i$, for any $i < n$. The equation $f(i) = j$ represents the creation process of moments by encoding the fact that the moment i has been created from the moment j . Therefore, the condition $f(i) = i$ just says that when we are at the n th moment, the moment $i < n$ is fixed throughout the creation process, and only the moments greater than or equal to n are newly created. As it is expected, the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$ leads to an interesting intuitionistic dynamic version of sets. What is surprising, though, is the fact that some of these variable growing sets are in some sense *completed*, and the category of these completed sets satisfies all classical axioms of set theory except the axiom of choice. Hence, it can serve as a model to prove the unprovability of the axiom of choice from ZF. The details are, of course, beyond the scope of this chapter. For more, see [57].

4 Some Universal Constructions

Category theory is renowned for its *relative approach*, in which the properties of an entity are defined by its relationships with other entities rather than by its internal components. For example, when we work with sets in a categorical

context, we define the properties of a given set based on the morphisms (functions) that connect it to other sets, rather than inspecting the elements within the set itself.

As the relative approach completely ignores the internal structure of the entities, it is hardly clear whether it is actually capable of defining any non-trivial property. For instance, consider the task of defining the singleton set $\{0\}$ in \mathbf{Set} . An analysis reveals that such a task is impossible as any two isomorphic objects in a category exhibit indistinguishable relative behavior. Therefore, a definition for $\{0\}$ would also apply to $\{1\}$ which is impossible. The first lesson from this observation is that any purely relative definition overlooks the differences between isomorphic objects. If we choose to pursue a relative perspective, we must accept this limitation. With that observation, let us change the task from defining the set $\{0\}$ to defining “being a singleton”. Fortunately, we can see that this time, the definition is possible. A set A is a singleton iff for any set B , there exists exactly one map from B to A . To transform this modest observation to a general method of producing relative definitions, we must notice that our above definition of singletons is based on the informal intuition that singletons are the “*greatest*” objects with a certain property, i.e., the property of having a map from any object into them. Using this vague form of being greatest is not accidental. It is clear that if we must define everything relatively, then the only things we can define are the best objects satisfying a relative behavior with respect to some of the others. This being the best can take one of two forms: either it can be the least object or the greatest object with respect to some property. Such definitions are referred to as defining by a *universal property*, and this section is dedicated to exploring these definitions.

4.1 Cartesian Structure

As we have already seen, singleton sets are defined by the property of having exactly one map from any arbitrary source into them. This is a crucial notion that is useful in many categories, so let us give it a name.

Definition 4.1.1. (*Terminal objects*) An object A is called *terminal* if for any object B , there exists a *unique* map from B to A . This unique map is denoted by $!_B : B \rightarrow A$ and if B is clear from the context, just by $!$.

Example 4.1.2. In \mathbf{FinSet} and \mathbf{Set} , an object is terminal iff it is a singleton. As we only care about the cardinality of the set and not its element, we usually denote these terminal objects by a common name $\{*\}$. In a poset (P, \leq) , a terminal object is by definition an element $a \in P$ such that for any $b \in P$, we have $b \leq a$. Hence, a terminal object is the greatest element of the poset if it exists. In $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, a terminal object is a pair in the form $(\{*\}, id_{\{*\}})$. The same also holds for the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$, where a terminal object is a constant functor $\Delta_{\{*\}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$. In \mathbf{NJ} , the proposition \top is a terminal object. The reason is that first, there is always a derivation from A to \top , for any proposition A . Second, for a fixed formula A , as we identified any two such derivations by

the η -equivalence relation, the map from A to \top is also unique. The same claim also holds for **NN** and **NM**.

Example 4.1.3. (*Non-existence of terminal objects*) Terminal objects do not necessarily exist. For instance, a poset without a greatest element such as (\mathbb{N}, \leq) or a non-trivial monoid does not have a terminal object. As another example, the category of sets with at least two elements does not have a terminal object.


Remark 4.1.4. Define the order \leq on the objects of \mathcal{C} by setting $B \leq A$ if there is a morphism $f : B \rightarrow A$. In this sense, a terminal object A can be intuitively thought of as the “greatest” object in the category, as there is a map from any object B into A . However, we must use “greatest” with caution, as being the greatest in this order is not sufficient to be a terminal object. There is an additional condition requiring the uniqueness of morphisms from B to A , which is not captured by our *informal* order-theoretic description.

Remark 4.1.5. A category can have many terminal objects. For instance, all singletons in **Set** are terminal. However, up to an isomorphism, there is at most one terminal object. To prove this, let A and B be two terminal objects. Then, by the universal property of both A and B , there are maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow A$. Now, consider the maps $fg : B \rightarrow B$ and $gf : A \rightarrow A$. By the uniqueness condition for both A and B , we have $fg = id_B$ and $gf = id_A$. Hence, $f : A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism. Now, as there is at most one terminal object up to an isomorphism and our relative approach sees everything up to isomorphisms, it is safe to denote all terminal objects by one reserved name, i.e., 1 , and call it *the* terminal object.

Philosophical Comment 4.1.6. (*Terminal objects as the trivial truth*) Reading any category as a proof system, a terminal object is a *trivially true proposition*, i.e., a proposition with a unique deduction from any given assumption. One may argue that although the intuition behind the uniqueness condition is clear for the singletons in **Set**, the same claim for \top is a bit artificial and this is even evident in **NJ**, where we must use the apparently artificial η -equivalence to ensure this condition. To defend our interpretation, let us emphasize that the logical constant \top is present in the language to formalize the *trivial* truth. Whatever it means, the trivial truth must be provable as it is true and have exactly one proof as it is trivial. Note that if we forget about the triviality part, then there is no need for \top in the language as there are many other provable statements like $p \rightarrow p$ playing the same role as \top does. In fact, in proof-irrelevant approaches, all provable statements are considered equivalent, while this should not hold in a proof-sensitive approach. For instance, the formula $p \rightarrow p$ and \top must be considered as different formulas, because there are many deductions of p from p and hence many proofs of $p \rightarrow p$ while \top has only one proof.

The second universal construction we are interested in is the binary product. Before going any further, it is useful to pause and consider cartesian products in **Set**, and to try to define them in a relative fashion without referring to their internal structure.

Definition 4.1.7. (*Binary products*) Let A and B be two objects in a category \mathcal{C} . An object C together with two morphisms $p_0 : C \rightarrow A$ and $p_1 : C \rightarrow B$ is called a *binary product* of A and B if for any object D in \mathcal{C} and any morphisms $f : D \rightarrow A$ and $g : D \rightarrow B$, there exists a *unique* map $h : D \rightarrow C$ such that:



The maps p_0 and p_1 are called the *projections* of the binary product. The unique map h is denoted by $\langle f, g \rangle$. Note that $p_0 \circ \langle f, g \rangle = f$ and $p_1 \circ \langle f, g \rangle = g$. As we will mostly work with binary products in this chapter, whenever we say a product, unless specified otherwise, we always mean a binary product.

Remark 4.1.8. The uniqueness condition in Definition 4.1.7 can be equivalently phrased as the identity $\langle p_0h, p_1h \rangle = h$, for any $h : D \rightarrow C$. To show the equivalence, it is clear that having the identity, we can reach the uniqueness, because if $p_0h = p_0h' = f$ and $p_1h = p_1h' = g$, then $h = \langle p_0h, p_1h \rangle = \langle p_0h', p_1h' \rangle = h'$. Conversely, if we have the uniqueness condition, set $h' = \langle p_0h, p_1h \rangle$. As $p_0h' = p_0h = f$ and $p_1h' = p_1h = g$, then by uniqueness, we have $h = h'$. Writing universal conditions as equalities is useful in practice. However, it is also conceptually important as it helps to construct the free categories with that universal structure, by first producing all possible required objects and maps freely and then making the quotient over the equalities to ensure that they have the properties they should.


Remark 4.1.9. There is a high-level definition for binary products that is conceptually more elegant but computationally harder to work with. Here is the definition. A binary product of A and B is an object C together with an isomorphism between the functors $\text{Hom}(-, C) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and $\text{Hom}(-, A) \times \text{Hom}(-, B) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ in the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$. We do not prove the equivalence between the two definitions here. However, it is a good exercise in order to become fluent in the categorical language.

Remark 4.1.10. Consider all diagrams of the shape:

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

where A and B are fixed and we change D and the maps $f : D \rightarrow A$ and $g : D \rightarrow B$. Using maps between the middle objects, there is a natural order on these diagrams. In the following picture, we say that the lower diagram is

greater than the upper one:



if there is $h : D_0 \rightarrow D_1$ making the whole diagram commutative. In this sense, the universal definition of binary product roughly states that the diagram

$$A \xleftarrow{p_0} C \xrightarrow{p_1} B$$

is the “greatest” among all the diagrams with the mentioned shape. Again, we put the “greatest” in quotation, as being the greatest in the above order is not enough to be a product due to the missing uniqueness condition.

Example 4.1.11. In **FinSet** and **Set**, the usual cartesian product $A \times B$ together with its projections $p_0 : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $p_1 : A \times B \rightarrow B$, is a binary product of the sets A and B . In a poset (P, \leq) , a product of $a, b \in P$ is by definition the greatest lower bound of the subset $\{a, b\}$ i.e., an element c such that $c \leq a$ and $c \leq b$ and for any $d \in P$, if $d \leq a$ and $d \leq b$, then $d \leq c$. The product in a poset is usually called *meet*. For the typical poset (P, \subseteq) , where P is a set of subsets of a set X , if P is closed under intersection, then the product (meet) is the intersection itself. In **Set^N**, a product of (A, σ_A) and (B, σ_B) is the dynamic system $(A \times B, \sigma_A \times \sigma_B)$ together with the evident projections, where $[\sigma_A \times \sigma_B](a, b) = (\sigma_A(a), \sigma_B(b))$. Note that the projections respect the dynamisms and hence they live in **Set^N**. A similar situation happens in **Set^Z**. More generally, in **Set^C**, a product of two functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is the functor $H : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, together with the maps $p_0 : H \rightarrow F$ and $p_1 : H \rightarrow G$ such that H maps the object A to $F(A) \times G(A)$ and the morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ to the function $H(f) : F(A) \times G(A) \rightarrow F(B) \times G(B)$, sending (x, y) to $(F(f)(x), G(f)(y))$. The projection $p_0 : H \rightarrow F$ is defined by setting $(p_0)_A : F(A) \times G(A) \rightarrow F(A)$ as the usual projection. The map $p_1 : H \rightarrow G$ is defined similarly. It is not hard to see that H is actually a functor, p_0 and p_1 are actually maps in **Set^C** and the data is actually a product.

Example 4.1.12. In **NJ**, the product of A and B is the conjunction $A \wedge B$ together with the following two derivations as $p_0 : A \wedge B \rightarrow A$ and $p_1 : A \wedge B \rightarrow B$:

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \wedge E_1 \quad \frac{A \wedge B}{B} \wedge E_2$$

For any two derivations D and D' , take $\langle D, D' \rangle$ as the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{D}{A} \quad \frac{D'}{B}}{A \wedge B} \wedge I$$

To prove $p_0(\langle D, D' \rangle) = D$, note that the left hand side of the equality is the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{D \quad D'}{A \quad B} \wedge I}{\frac{A \wedge B}{A} \wedge E_1}$$

which is β -equivalent to D . As we consider the derivations up to β -equivalence, we have $p_0(\langle D, D' \rangle) = D$. The proof for the other identity, i.e., $p_1(\langle D, D' \rangle) = D'$ is similar. For the uniqueness, by Remark 4.1.8, it is enough to prove $\langle p_0 D, p_1 D \rangle = D$, for any derivation D of $A \wedge B$. Notice that the left hand side of the equality is:

$$\frac{\frac{D}{A \wedge B} \wedge E_1 \quad \frac{D}{A \wedge B} \wedge E_2}{\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \wedge I}$$

which is η -equivalent to D . Therefore, $\langle p_0 D, p_1 D \rangle = D$. A similar construction is in place for the categories **NN** and **NM**. Note that conjunction, its rules, and their $\beta\eta$ -equivalences form the minimal machinery required to make conjunction into the product in **NJ**. The only intuitively non-trivial aspect is the $\beta\eta$ -equivalences, which might be seen as artificial conditions imposed on derivations to ensure the categorical interpretation works. However, in Philosophical Comment 4.1.14, we argue that these equivalences are also natural conditions to assume.


Example 4.1.13. (*Non-existence of binary products*) Consider the poset (P, \subseteq) of all infinite subsets of \mathbb{N} . Then, the product (meet) of the set of even numbers and the set of odd numbers does not exist, as there is no infinite set below both of them, let alone the greatest of such lower bounds. For another example, consider a non-trivial group seen as a category. Then, the product of the category's only object $*$ with itself does not exist. Because, if it does, it must be $*$. Let us assume that $p_0, p_1 \in G$ are the projections of the product. Then, for any $g, h \in G$, there is $i \in G$ such that $p_0 i = g$ and $p_1 i = h$. Therefore, $p_1 p_0^{-1} g = h$, for any $g, h \in G$, which is impossible. Just put $h = p_1 p_0^{-1}$ and $g \neq e$.

Philosophical Comment 4.1.14. (*Product as the conjunction*) Reading any category as a proof system, we can interpret a product of two propositions as their conjunction. However, looking deeply into the definition, one may also object that although the diagram commutativity and the uniqueness conditions for the cartesian product of sets is natural, the proof-theoretical counterpart, i.e., the β - and η -equivalences are not and hence the identification of the conjunction with the product may seem to be too demanding. To justify the choice, note that by Remark 4.1.9, a product of A and B is just an object C in \mathcal{C} together with an isomorphism between the functors $\text{Hom}(-, C)$ and $\text{Hom}(-, A) \times \text{Hom}(-, B)$ in the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$. This just says that the deductions of $A \wedge B$ from D is in one-to-one and *uniform* correspondence with the pairs of deductions of A


and B from D . This, of course, can be considered as a natural formalization for the conjunction operator. The projections, the diagram commutation and the uniqueness conditions, however, are inessential details to present this universal definition in a low level language of maps.

Lemma 4.1.15. *The product is unique up to a canonical isomorphism, i.e., for any two products (C, p_0, p_1) and (D, q_0, q_1) of A and B , the canonical map $i : C \rightarrow D$ induced by the universality of the product is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let (C, p_0, p_1) and (D, q_0, q_1) be both products of the two objects A and B . Therefore, there are maps $i : C \rightarrow D$ and $j : D \rightarrow C$ such that the diagram:



commutes. Therefore, the map $ji : C \rightarrow C$ makes the following diagram commute:



By the universality of the product (C, p_0, p_1) , this map must be unique. As $id_C : C \rightarrow C$ does exactly the same thing, $ji = id_C$. Similarly, one can show that $ij = id_D$. Therefore, $i : C \rightarrow D$ is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 4.1.16. Here are two remarks. First, note that the isomorphism $i : C \rightarrow D$ in Lemma 4.1.15 is not just an isomorphism between C and D . It also transforms the projections to each other, i.e., $q_0i = p_0$ and $q_1i = p_1$. This is what we should expect because a product is not just an object but the tuple of an object and two projections, and the isomorphism between the products must also interact with these projections. Secondly, using Lemma 4.1.15, we are allowed to denote a product of A and B and their projections with a reserved name $A \times B$ and $p_0^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $p_1^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow B$. When there is no risk of confusion, we simply denote $p_0^{A,B}$ and $p_1^{A,B}$ by p_0 and p_1 .

Definition 4.1.17. A category is called *cartesian* if it has a terminal object and all binary products.

Example 4.1.18. All categories **FinSet**, **Set**, **Top**, **Set^C**, **NN**, **NM** and **NJ** are cartesian. A cartesian poset is usually called a *bounded meet-semilattice*.

Usually, universal constructions are functorial. Let us explain the phenomenon by an example. Assume that the product of A and B and the product of C and D exist. Now, assume that we are given two maps $f : A \rightarrow C$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$. We intend to come up with a *canonical map* $f \times g : A \times B \rightarrow C \times D$. For that purpose, first note that $p_0^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $p_1^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow B$. Thus, $fp_0^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow C$ and $gp_1^{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow D$. Therefore, $\langle fp_0^{A,B}, gp_1^{A,B} \rangle : A \times B \rightarrow C \times D$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{p_0^{A,B}} & A \times B & \xrightarrow{p_1^{A,B}} & B \\
 \downarrow f & \swarrow fp_0^{A,B} & \downarrow f \times g & \searrow gp_1^{A,B} & \downarrow g \\
 C & \xleftarrow{p_0^{C,D}} & C \times D & \xrightarrow{p_1^{C,D}} & D
 \end{array}$$

One can then define $f \times g : A \times B \rightarrow C \times D$ as $\langle fp_0^{A,B}, gp_1^{A,B} \rangle$. Using this definition, one can show that the assignment $(-) \times (-) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ mapping the pair (A, B) to $A \times B$ and $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ to $f \times g : A \times B \rightarrow C \times D$ is a functor. We call this functor a *binary product* functor. Note that for each pair of objects, there are different choices for their binary product and hence there may be different product functors on a given category. However, as all those different choices are isomorphic, one can see that there is at most one binary product functor, up to an isomorphism. Using this observation and by a slight abuse of language, we denote all binary product functors with one reserved notation $(-) \times (-) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and call it *the* binary product functor.

Using the universal property of the terminal object and the products, it is easy to prove the following list of isomorphisms:

Theorem 4.1.19. *Let \mathcal{C} be a cartesian category. Then:*

- $A \times 1 \cong A$, via the map $p_0 : A \times 1 \rightarrow A$.
- $A \times B \cong B \times A$, via the map $\langle p_1, p_0 \rangle : A \times B \rightarrow B \times A$.
- $(A \times B) \times C \cong A \times (B \times C)$, via the canonical map $\langle r_0q_0, \langle r_1q_0, q_1 \rangle \rangle : (A \times B) \times C \rightarrow A \times (B \times C)$, where $q_i = p_i^{(A \times B), C}$ and $r_i = p_i^{A, B}$.

Proof. We only prove the first claim and leave the rest to the reader. Consider the map $\langle id_A, ! \rangle : A \rightarrow A \times 1$. We claim that this map is the converse of p_0 , i.e., $p_0 \langle id_A, ! \rangle = id_A$ and $\langle id_A, ! \rangle p_0 = id_{A \times 1}$. The first equality is clear. For the second, it is enough to show that both $\langle id_A, ! \rangle p_0$ and $id_{A \times 1}$ make the following

diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xleftarrow{p_0} & A \times 1 & \xrightarrow{p_1} & 1 \\
 & \searrow^{p_0} & \uparrow^{\langle id_A, ! \rangle p_0} & & \nearrow_{p_1 = !} \\
 & & A \times 1 & &
 \end{array}$$

which is trivially true. Therefore, by the uniqueness condition in the definition of the product, we have $\langle id_A, ! \rangle p_0 = id_{A \times 1}$. \square

Using binary products, it is possible to define the product of any finite family A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n of objects and denote it by $A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ or $\prod_{i=0}^n A_i$. Of course, we have to specify the way we split the product into binary products and by definition, we always start from the left, i.e., $\prod_{i=0}^n A_i = (\dots((A_0 \times A_1) \times A_2) \times \dots) \times A_n$. For the projections of this product, for any $0 \leq j \leq n$, there is a canonical combination of binary projections that goes from $\prod_{i=0}^n A_i$ to A_j . We denote this map by p_j . Moreover, for any families of maps $\{f_i : C \rightarrow A_i\}_{i=0}^n$, there is a canonical map from C to $\prod_{i=0}^n A_i$ that we denote by $\langle f_i \rangle_{i=0}^n$. Notice that using Theorem 4.1.19, it is clear that the way we split the product into binary products and the order of them is not important in the end.

4.2 Cocartesian Structure

The cartesian structure explained in the previous subsection has a dual that is also significant in categorical proof theory.

Definition 4.2.1. (*Initial objects*) An object A is called *initial* if for any object B , there exists a unique map from A to B . This unique map is denoted by $!_B : A \rightarrow B$ and if B is clear from the context, just by $!$. Similar to terminal objects, there is at most one initial object up to an isomorphism. Therefore, we can denote all initial objects with a reserved name 0 and call it *the* initial object.


Example 4.2.2. In **FinSet** and **Set**, the initial object is the empty set \emptyset . In a poset (P, \leq) , the initial object is by definition an element $a \in P$ such that for any $b \in P$, we have $a \leq b$. Hence, the initial object is the least element of the poset. In $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbf{N}}$ and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbf{Z}}$, the initial object is the pair $(\emptyset, id_{\emptyset})$. More generally, in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$, the initial object is the constant functor $\Delta_{\emptyset} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, mapping every object to the empty set and any morphism of \mathcal{C} to the identity function over \emptyset . In **NJ**, the proposition \perp is an initial object. The reasoning is similar to that of terminality of \top presented in Example 4.1.2. Notice the role of the η -equivalence relation on derivations to ensure the uniqueness condition.

Philosophical Comment 4.2.3. (*Initial objects as the trivializing inconsistency*) Reading any category as a proof system, we can interpret the initial

object as the trivializing inconsistency, i.e., the proposition \perp whose assumption makes all propositions deductible and all such deductions equivalent. Note that this type of definition is different from what we had for \top and conjunction, as here, we identify a proposition by what and how it can prove the other propositions rather than by the form of its deductions. Trying to define \perp in the latter way, one may argue that we must define \perp as a proposition with no proof and then, as a derived property, show that such a proposition proves any other proposition in a trivial way. To see why, note that a deduction is a way to transform the proofs of the assumption to the proofs of the conclusion, and as \perp has no proofs, there is only one unique way to map this empty set to the set of proofs of any other proposition. We will come back to this discussion when we reach the BHK interpretation in Section 5.

Example 4.2.4. (*Non-existence of initial objects*) For an easier example, consider the poset (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) . This poset has no least element and hence no initial object. For another, note that any non-trivial monoid seen as a category does not have an initial object. Moreover, the category of non-empty sets with functions as its morphisms does not have an initial object.

Definition 4.2.5. (*Binary coproducts*) Let A and B be two objects. An object C together with two morphisms $i_0 : A \rightarrow C$ and $i_1 : B \rightarrow C$ is called a *coproduct* of A and B if for any object D and any morphisms $f : A \rightarrow D$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$, there exists a unique map $h : C \rightarrow D$ such that:



The maps i_0 and i_1 are called the *injections* of the coproduct. The unique h is denoted by (f, g) . Similar to what we had for the other universal constructions, the coproduct of A and B is unique up to (a canonical) isomorphism and hence we can denote it and their injections with reserved names $A + B$ and $i_0^{A,B} : A \rightarrow A + B$ and $i_1^{A,B} : B \rightarrow A + B$, respectively. When there is no risk of confusion, we simply denote $i_0^{A,B}$ and $i_1^{A,B}$ by i_0 and i_1 . Finally, as we will mostly work with binary coproducts in this chapter, whenever we say a coproduct, unless specified otherwise, we always mean a binary coproduct.

Remark 4.2.6. The uniqueness condition above can be equivalently phrased as the identity $(hi_0, hi_1) = h$, for any $h : C \rightarrow D$. The proof is similar to that of the product case.

Remark 4.2.7. Similar to products, there is also a high-level definition for coproducts. A coproduct of A and B is an object C together with an isomorphism

between the functors $\text{Hom}(C, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and $\text{Hom}(A, -) \times \text{Hom}(B, -) : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ in the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$. We will not prove the equivalence between the two definitions.

Remark 4.2.8. Notice that the universal definition of the binary coproduct roughly states that the diagram

$$A \xrightarrow{i_0} C \xleftarrow{i_1} B$$

is the “least” between all such diagrams with fixed end nodes A and B .

Example 4.2.9. In \mathbf{FinSet} and \mathbf{Set} , the coproduct of A and B is the disjoint union $A + B = \{(0, a) \mid a \in A\} \cup \{(1, b) \mid b \in B\}$ together with the injections $i_0 : A \rightarrow A + B$ and $i_1 : B \rightarrow A + B$, defined by $i_0(a) = (0, a)$ and $i_1(b) = (1, b)$. In a poset (P, \leq) , the coproduct of $a, b \in P$ is by definition the least upper bound of the subset $\{a, b\}$ i.e., an element c such that $a \leq c$ and $b \leq c$ and for any $d \in P$, if $a \leq d$ and $b \leq d$, then $c \leq d$. Coproducts in posets are usually called *joins*. For the typical poset (P, \subseteq) , where P is a set of subsets of a set X , if P is closed under binary union, the coproduct (join) is the union, itself. In $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the coproduct of (A, σ_A) and (B, σ_B) is $(A + B, \sigma_{A+B})$, together with the usual injections, where $[\sigma_{A+B}](0, a) = (0, \sigma_A(a))$ and $[\sigma_{A+B}](1, b) = (1, \sigma_B(b))$. Note that the injections respect the dynamism. More generally, a coproduct of two objects $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ and $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the functor $H : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ mapping the object A to $H(A) = F(A) + G(A)$ and the map $f : A \rightarrow B$ to the function $H(f) : F(A) + G(A) \rightarrow F(B) + G(B)$ defined by $H(f)(0, x) = (0, F(f)(x))$ and $H(f)(1, y) = (1, G(f)(y))$. The injections $i_0 : F \rightarrow H$ and $i_1 : G \rightarrow H$ are defined by $(i_0)_A : F(A) \rightarrow F(A) + G(A)$ and $(i_1)_A : G(A) \rightarrow F(A) + G(A)$ as the usual injections. It is easy to prove that $H : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a functor, both i_0 and i_1 are natural transformations and the data is actually a coproduct.

Example 4.2.10. In \mathbf{NJ} , the coproduct of A and B is the disjunction $A \vee B$ together with the two derivations:

$$\frac{A}{A \vee B} \vee I_1 \qquad \frac{B}{A \vee B} \vee I_2$$

as the injections. For any two derivations D and D' , define the map (D, D') as the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{A}{A \vee B} \quad \frac{[A] \quad D}{C}}{C} \quad \frac{[B] \quad D'}{C}}{C} \vee E$$

To prove $(D, D')i_0 = D$, note that the left hand side is the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{A}{A \vee B} \quad \frac{[A] \quad D}{C}}{C} \quad \frac{[B] \quad D'}{C}}{C} \vee E$$

which is β -equivalent to D . As we consider the derivations up to β -equivalence, we have $(D, D')i_0 = D$. The proof for the other identity, i.e., $(D, D')i_1 = D'$ is similar. For the uniqueness, by Remark 4.2.6, it is enough to prove $(Di_0, Di_1) = D$, for any derivation D with the assumption $A \vee B$. Notice that the left hand side is:

$$\frac{\frac{[A]^1}{A \vee B} \vee I_1 \quad \frac{[B]^2}{A \vee B} \vee I_2}{\frac{A \vee B \quad \begin{array}{c} D \\ C \end{array}}{C} \vee E}$$

which is η -equivalent to D .

Philosophical Comment 4.2.11. (*Coproduct as the disjunction*) Reading any category as a proof system, we can interpret the coproduct of two propositions as their disjunction. However, looking deeply into the definition, one may also object that although the diagram commutativity and the uniqueness conditions for the disjoint union of sets is natural, the proof-theoretical counterpart, i.e., the β - and η -equivalences are not and hence the identification of the disjunction with the coproduct may seem to be too demanding. To justify the choice, note that by Remark 4.2.7, a coproduct of A and B is just an object C in \mathcal{C} together with an isomorphism between the functors $\text{Hom}(C, -)$ and $\text{Hom}(A, -) \times \text{Hom}(B, -)$ in the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$. This just says that the deductions of D from the assumption $A + B$ is in one-to-one and *uniform* correspondence with the pairs of deductions of D from A and B . This, of course, can be considered as a natural formalization for the disjunction operator. The projections, the diagram commutation and the uniqueness conditions, however, are inessential details to present this universal definition in a low level language of maps. Note that this type of definition is again based on what and how a proposition can prove the other propositions rather than by the form of its deductions. Trying to define the disjunction in the latter way, one may argue that we must define $A \vee B$ as a proposition whose proofs are either the proofs of A or the proofs of B and we know which one is the case. Then again, as a derived property, we can show that the deductions of D from $A \vee B$ is in one-to-one correspondence with the pairs of the deductions of A and B from D . The reason simply is that to transform the proofs of $A \vee B$ to the proofs of D , as a proof of $A \vee B$ is either a proof of A or a proof of B and we know which case is happening, it is necessary and sufficient to transform the proofs of A and the proofs of B into the proofs of D . We will come back to this discussion when we reach the BHK interpretation in Section 5.

Definition 4.2.12. A category is called *cocartesian* if it has the initial object and all the binary coproducts.

Example 4.2.13. All categories \mathbf{FinSet} , \mathbf{Set} , \mathbf{Top} , $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$, and \mathbf{NJ} are cocartesian. A cocartesian poset is usually called a *bounded join-semilattice*.

Example 4.2.14. (*Non-existence of binary coproducts*) Consider the poset (P, \subseteq) of all subsets of \mathbb{N} whose complement is infinite. Then, the coproduct (join) of the set E of even numbers and O of odd numbers does not exist,

as the only subset above both of them is \mathbb{N} whose complement is empty and as such finite. For another example, consider a non-trivial group considered as a category. Similar to the product case, it is easy to prove that the coproduct of $*$ with itself does not exist in this category.

Similar to what we had for the product, the coproduct can also rise to a functor. Assume that both the coproduct of A and B and the coproduct of C and D exist. Now, assume that we are given two morphisms $f : A \rightarrow C$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$. We intend to come up with a *canonical map* $f + g : A + B \rightarrow C + D$. For that purpose, first note that $i_0^{C,D} : C \rightarrow C + D$ and $i_1^{C,D} : D \rightarrow C + D$. Thus, $i_0^{C,D} f : A \rightarrow C + D$ and $i_1^{C,D} g : B \rightarrow C + D$. Therefore, $(i_0^{C,D} f, i_1^{C,D} g) : A + B \rightarrow C + D$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{i_0^{A,B}} & A + B & \xleftarrow{i_1^{A,B}} & B \\
 \downarrow f & \searrow i_0^{C,D} f & \vdots f+g & \swarrow i_1^{C,D} g & \downarrow g \\
 C & \xrightarrow{i_0^{C,D}} & C + D & \xleftarrow{i_1^{C,D}} & D
 \end{array}$$

One can then define $f + g : A + B \rightarrow C + D$ as $(i_0^{C,D} f, i_1^{C,D} g)$. It is easy to see that this definition makes the assignment $(-)+(-) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ mapping the pair (A, B) to $A + B$ and the morphism $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ to $f + g : A + B \rightarrow C + D$ a functor. This functor is called a *coproduct functor*. Again, as all coproduct functors are isomorphic, we use one reserved notation $(-)+(-) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for all of them and call it *the* coproduct functor.

Moreover, similar to products, we can define the coproduct of any finite family A_0, \dots, A_n of objects and denote it by $A_0 + \dots + A_n$ or $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i$. Using the injections, one can come up with a canonical map $i_j : A_j \rightarrow \sum_{i=0}^n A_i$, for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover, for any family $\{f_i : A_i \rightarrow C\}_{i=0}^n$ of maps, there is a canonical map from $\sum_{i=0}^n A_i$ to C that we denote by $(f_i)_{i=0}^n$.

4.3 Exponential Objects

The third universal construction we are interested in is the exponential. Exponentials provide the machinery to internalize the structure of the category within itself.

Definition 4.3.1. (*Exponential object*) Let \mathcal{C} be a cartesian category and A and B be two objects. An object C together with a morphism $ev : C \times A \rightarrow B$ is called an *exponential object* if for any $f : D \times A \rightarrow B$, there exists a unique $g : D \rightarrow C$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 D \times A & & \\
 \downarrow g \times id_A & \searrow f & \\
 C \times A & \xrightarrow{ev} & B
 \end{array}$$

Again, it is easy to see that exponentials are unique up to a canonical isomorphism. Hence, we can safely refer to them as *the* exponential object of B by A and denote it and its evaluation map by the reserved names $[A, B]$ (or sometimes B^A) and $ev^{A,B} : [A, B] \times A \rightarrow B$, respectively. Moreover, for any $f : C \times A \rightarrow B$, we denote its unique g by $\lambda_A^{B,C} f : C \rightarrow [A, B]$. If there is no risk of confusion, we drop the superscripts in $ev^{A,B}$ and $\lambda_A^{B,C} f$ and write ev and $\lambda_A f$, respectively. Note that the above diagram's commutativity is simply the equality $ev(\lambda_A f \times id_A) = f$.

Remark 4.3.2. The uniqueness condition in Definition 4.3.1 can be equivalently phrased as the identity $\lambda_A ev(g \times id_A) = g$, for any $g : C \rightarrow [A, B]$.

Remark 4.3.3. Consider all diagrams of the shape:

$$D \times A \xrightarrow{f} B$$

where A and B are fixed and we change D and the map $f : D \times A \rightarrow B$. Using maps between D 's, these diagrams have a natural order. In the following picture, we say that the lower diagram is greater than the upper one:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_0 \times A & \xrightarrow{f_0} & B \\ \downarrow g \times id_A & & \uparrow f_1 \\ D_1 \times A & \xrightarrow{f_1} & B \end{array}$$

if there is $g : D_0 \rightarrow D_1$ making the whole diagram commutative. In this sense, the universal definition of the exponential object roughly states that the diagram

$$C \times A \xrightarrow{ev} B$$

is the “greatest” among all the diagrams with similar shapes. Note that the uniqueness condition is again missing in this informal discussion.

Remark 4.3.4. Similar to other universal constructions, there is a high-level formalization for the exponential object. An exponential object is an object C together with an isomorphism between the functors $\text{Hom}(-, C)$ and $\text{Hom}(- \times A, B)$ in the category $\mathbf{Set}^{C^{op}}$. We do not prove the equivalence between the two definitions. However, one special instance of the isomorphism in the second definition, i.e., the one between $\text{Hom}(1 \times A, B)$ or equivalently $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ and $\text{Hom}(1, [A, B])$ is worth explaining. Here is the description of the isomorphism. For any $f : A \rightarrow B$, using $p_1 : 1 \times A \rightarrow A$, we have the map $f p_1 : 1 \times A \rightarrow B$. By the universal property of the exponential $[A, B]$, we have the map $\lambda_A(f p_1) :$

$1 \rightarrow [A, B]$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 \times A & \xrightarrow{p_1} & A \\
 \lambda_A(f p_1) \times id_A \downarrow & \searrow f p_1 & \downarrow f \\
 [A, B] \times A & \xrightarrow{ev} & B
 \end{array}$$

Conversely, having a map $g : 1 \rightarrow [A, B]$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 \times A & \xleftarrow{\langle !, id_A \rangle} & A \\
 g \times id_A \downarrow & & \\
 [A, B] \times A & \xrightarrow{ev} & B
 \end{array}$$

as a map from A to B . It is easy to see that these two operations are the converse to each other. For any $f : A \rightarrow B$, we denote $\lambda_A(f p_1)$ by λf and for any $g : 1 \rightarrow [A, B]$ and $a : X \rightarrow A$, we denote the map $ev(g \times id_A) \langle !, id_A \rangle a$, by $g \cdot a : X \rightarrow B$. It is easy to see that $(\lambda f) \cdot a = f \circ a$ and $\lambda(g \cdot id_A) = g$. Therefore, we can read λ as the usual lambda operator and \cdot as the application operation.

Example 4.3.5. In the categories **FinSet** and **Set**, the exponential $[A, B]$ is the set B^A consisting of all the functions from A to B with the morphism $ev : B^A \times A \rightarrow B$ defined by $ev(f, a) = f(a)$. Note that for any map $f : C \times A \rightarrow B$, the map $\lambda_A f : C \rightarrow B^A$ is defined by $(\lambda_A f)(c)(a) = f(c, a)$. In the poset (P, \leq) , the exponential is by definition the greatest element c such that $c \wedge a \leq b$, i.e., an element c such that $c \wedge a \leq b$ and for any $d \in P$ if $d \wedge a \leq b$ then $d \leq c$. Exponential objects in posets are called *Heyting implications* and denoted by \rightarrow . In the poset $(\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}, \subseteq)$, the exponential $U \rightarrow V$ is $\{x \in P \mid \forall y \geq x (y \in U \rightarrow y \in V)\}$. For the poset $\mathcal{O}(X)$, where X is a topological space, the exponential $U \rightarrow V$ is $int(U^c \cup V)$, where int is the interior operation.

Example 4.3.6. In $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the exponential object $[(A, \sigma_A), (B, \sigma_B)]$ is the dynamical system (C, σ_C) where C is the set of all functions from A to B and $\sigma_C(f) = \sigma_B f \sigma_A^{-1}$. The evaluation map $ev : (C, \sigma_C) \times (A, \sigma_A) \rightarrow (B, \sigma_B)$ is just the usual set-theoretical evaluation map. Notice that ev respects the dynamism as $ev(\sigma_C(f), \sigma_A(x)) = \sigma_C(f)(\sigma_A(x)) = \sigma_B f \sigma_A^{-1}(\sigma_A(x)) = \sigma_B(f(x)) = \sigma_B(ev(f, x))$. For any equivariant map $f : (D, \sigma_D) \times (A, \sigma_A) \rightarrow (B, \sigma_B)$, the map $\lambda_A f : (D, \sigma_D) \rightarrow [(A, \sigma_A), (B, \sigma_B)]$ is defined by $(\lambda_A f)(d)(a) = f(d, a)$ and it is equivariant. The reason is that for any $d \in D$ and any $a \in A$, we have $(\lambda_A f)(\sigma_D(d))(a) = f(\sigma_D(d), a)$, by definition. Moreover, as f is equivariant, we have

$$f(\sigma_D(d), a) = \sigma_B(f(d, \sigma_A^{-1}(a))) = \sigma_B[(\lambda_A f)(d)(\sigma_A^{-1}(a))].$$

Therefore, $(\lambda_A f)(\sigma_D(d)) = \sigma_B((\lambda_A f)(d)) \sigma_A^{-1}$.

Example 4.3.7. Let \mathcal{C} be a small category. Then, in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$, the exponential object $[E, F]$ is the functor mapping the object A to the set $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{set}^{\mathcal{C}}}(y^A \times E, F)$. The evaluation map is the natural transformation $ev : [E, F] \times E \rightarrow F$ defined by $ev_A : [E, F](A) \times E(A) \rightarrow F(A)$, mapping the pair (α, x) to $\alpha_A(id_A, x)$, for any $\alpha : y^A \times E \rightarrow F$ and $x \in E(A)$. It is an interesting exercise to set \mathcal{C} as $\mathbf{1}$ or $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$, compute the exponential object described here and show that it is exactly what was described in Example 4.3.5 and Example 4.3.6.

Example 4.3.8. In \mathbf{Top} , not all exponential objects exist. For instance, there is no topological space and no evaluation map that can act as $[\mathbb{Q}, I]$, where \mathbb{Q} is the subspace of rational numbers in \mathbb{R} and $I = [0, 1]$ is the unit interval [14]. In fact, for any topological space X , a necessary and sufficient condition for X is known that guarantees the existence of the exponential $[X, Y]$ for *all* spaces Y . This condition is called *core-compactness*. To define this notion, let $U, V \subseteq X$ be two open subsets of X . The open V is called *way below* U , denoted by $V \ll U$, if any open cover of U has a finite subcover for V . A space X is called *core-compact* if for every open neighborhood U of a point $x \in X$, there exists an open neighborhood V of x with $V \ll U$. If the space X is Hausdorff, it is core-compact iff it is locally compact. If X is core-compact, then the space $[X, Y]$ is simply the set of all continuous functions from X to Y with the topology with the subbasis

$$O_{U,V} = \{f \in [X, Y] \mid U \ll f^{-1}(V)\},$$

for any opens $U \subseteq X$ and $V \subseteq Y$. The evaluation map is the usual set-theoretical evaluation map. If both X and Y are Hausdorff, then this topology is just the usual compact-open topology that has the subbasis

$$O'_{K,V} = \{f \in [X, Y] \mid f[K] \subseteq V\},$$

for any compact $K \subseteq X$ and any open $V \subseteq Y$. For instance, as the discrete space \mathbb{N} is locally compact and Hausdorff, the exponential $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ exists and it is just the set of *all* functions over \mathbb{N} together with the compact-open topology which is nothing but the usual product topology. Another example that we will use later is the exponential $[\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N}]$ that also exists, as $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a compact and Hausdorff space and its topology is the compact-open topology.

Example 4.3.9. In \mathbf{NJ} , the exponential $[A, B]$ is the implication $A \rightarrow B$ together with the derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge A}{A} \wedge_{E_2} \quad \frac{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge A}{A \rightarrow B} \wedge_{E_1}}{B} \rightarrow E$$

as the evaluation map. For any derivation D for B from $C \wedge A$, define $\lambda_A D$ as:

$$\frac{\frac{C \quad [A]}{C \wedge A} \wedge_I \quad D}{\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B} \rightarrow I}$$

To show that $ev(\lambda_A D \times id_A) = D$, note that the right-hand side is:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{C \wedge A}{C}}{\lambda_A D} \quad \frac{C \wedge A}{A}}{A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{C \wedge A}{A}}{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge A} \quad \frac{}{ev} \quad B$$

Substituting $\lambda_A D$ and ev in this derivation, we have:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{C \wedge A}{C} \quad [A]}{C \wedge A} \quad \frac{D}{B}}{A \rightarrow B} \rightarrow I \quad \frac{C \wedge A}{A} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{C \wedge A}{C} \quad [A]}{C \wedge A} \quad \frac{D}{B}}{A \rightarrow B} \rightarrow I \quad \frac{C \wedge A}{A}}{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge A} \quad \frac{A}{A} \quad \frac{(A \rightarrow B) \wedge A}{A \rightarrow B} \quad \frac{}{B}$$

which is $\beta\eta$ -equivalent to D . The proof of the uniqueness part is similar.

Philosophical Comment 4.3.10. (*Exponentials as the implication*) Reading any category as a proof system, we can interpret the exponential as the implication. To justify, note that the exponential $[A, B]$ is just an object together with a natural isomorphism between $\text{Hom}(- \times A, B)$ and $\text{Hom}(-, [A, B])$. This just says that the deduction of B from $D \wedge A$ are in one-to-one and uniform correspondence with the deductions of $A \rightarrow B$ from D , i.e., proving $A \rightarrow B$ is just proving B with the addition of A to the assumptions.

Definition 4.3.11. A cartesian category where all exponentials exist is called a *cartesian closed category* (CCC, for short). A CCC which has all the binary coproducts is called an *almost bicartesian closed category* (ABC, for short), and if it also has the initial object, a *bicartesian closed category* (BCC, for short). A BCC (resp. an ABC) that is also a poset is called a *Heyting algebra* (resp. an *almost Heyting algebra*). By the BC-structure, we mean the terminal and initial objects and the product, coproduct and exponential of a BCC. This is an informal notion, putting a name on the structure that makes a category a BCC. The CC- and AB-structures are defined accordingly.

Example 4.3.12. All categories **FinSet**, **Set**, **Set^C**, and **NJ** are BCC's. The categories **NN** and **NM** are CCC and ABC, respectively.

Philosophical Comment 4.3.13. A BCC can be read as a proof system over the language $\mathcal{L}_p = \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \top, \perp\}$. Similarly, an ABC (resp. a CCC) is a proof system over the fragment $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp\} = \{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \top\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\vee, \perp\} = \{\wedge, \rightarrow, \top\}$). With this interpretation, Heyting algebras are trivialized proof systems over \mathcal{L}_p where all deductions are collapsed to one deductibility order. The

same also holds for the poset ABC and the poset CCC. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that reading connectives as universal constructions naturally leads to intuitionistic proof systems. For classical proof systems, see Section 6.

Example 4.3.14. (*Non-existence of exponential objects*) Consider the set P consisting of all finite subsets of \mathbb{N} together with the whole set \mathbb{N} . Note that the poset (P, \subseteq) is cartesian with the terminal object \mathbb{N} and the intersection as the product. We claim that the exponential $W = \{0\} \rightarrow \{1\}$ in the poset (P, \subseteq) does not exist. If it does, it must have the property $S \cap \{0\} \subseteq \{1\}$ iff $S \subseteq W$, for any $S \in P$. As $S \cap \{0\} \subseteq \{1\}$ holds for any $S \subseteq \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$, we must have $\mathbb{N} - \{0\} \subseteq W$. Therefore, W is not finite and hence $W = \mathbb{N}$. But then as $\mathbb{N} \subseteq W = \mathbb{N}$, we must have $\mathbb{N} \cap \{0\} \subseteq \{1\}$ which is impossible.

Example 4.3.15. Let \mathcal{C} be a non-preorder category with the initial and terminal objects and $0 \cong 1$. Then, \mathcal{C} cannot have all the exponentials because if it can, then we must have

$$\text{Hom}(A, B) \cong \text{Hom}(1 \times A, B) \cong \text{Hom}(1, [A, B]) \cong \text{Hom}(0, [A, B]).$$

for any objects A and B . As 0 is the initial object, the rightmost set has exactly one element. Hence, $\text{Hom}(A, B)$ must also be a singleton. This contradicts the assumption that \mathcal{C} is not a preordered set. As a consequence, many algebraic categories, like the category of all groups and homomorphisms, do not have all exponential objects.

Example 4.3.16. Let X be a fixed infinite set. Define \mathcal{C} as the category of sets in the form X^k for some $k \geq 0$ with the usual functions as the morphisms. This category is cartesian with the terminal object X^0 and the usual set-theoretical product as the product. We claim that the exponential $[X, X]$ does not exist in \mathcal{C} . Because if it does, it must be in the form X^k , for some $k \geq 0$. Therefore, $\text{Hom}(X^0, [X, X]) = \text{Hom}(X^0, X^k)$ must be in one to one correspondence with $\text{Hom}(X^0 \times X, X) \cong \text{Hom}(X, X)$. However, the cardinality of the former equals the cardinality of X , while the cardinality of the latter is strictly greater than the cardinality of X . This phenomenon that there are more functions over an infinite set than the cardinality of the set itself is blocking the desirable construction of a cartesian closed category of *sets* with a non-terminal object X such that $[X, X] \cong X$. Such a situation can be useful to interpret lambda calculus where each element of the domain X can also be read as a function on X at the same time. Having such a dual nature is a usual phenomenon in computability theory where numbers are both the inputs and the codes of the algorithms. Such a CCC (using ordered/topological structures and not pure sets) was later discovered by Dana Scott [45].

Similar to what we had for the product and coproduct, the exponential can also rise to a functor. Assume that both the exponentials $[A, B]$ and $[C, D]$ exist. Now, assume that we are given $f : C \rightarrow A$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$. We intend to come up with a *canonical map* $[f, g] : [A, B] \rightarrow [C, D]$. For that purpose, first note that

$id_{[A,B]} \times f : [A, B] \times C \rightarrow [A, B] \times A$. Composing with $ev^{A,B} : [A, B] \times A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow D$, we will have the map $h : [A, B] \times C \rightarrow D$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [A, B] \times C & \xrightarrow{id_{[A,B]} \times f} & [A, B] \times A \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow ev^{A,B} \\ D & \xleftarrow{g} & B \end{array}$$

One can then define $[f, g] : [A, B] \rightarrow [C, D]$ as $\lambda_C h$. Now, define the assignment $[-, -] : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ by mapping the pair (A, B) to $[A, B]$ and $(f, g) : (A, B) \rightarrow (C, D)$ to $[f, g] : [A, B] \rightarrow [C, D]$. This assignment is a functor called the *exponentiation functor*.

4.4 Structure-preserving Functors

So far, we have introduced terminal and initial objects, binary products and coproducts, and exponentials as proof-sensitive versions of logical constants. We also claimed that any BCC can be interpreted as a proof system over the language \mathcal{L}_p . The next natural step is to compare these proof systems using the natural machinery of functors. We expect these functors to preserve the logical constants of the systems. In this subsection, we will introduce these structure-preserving functors and then see some examples.

Definition 4.4.1. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two BCC's. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is said to preserve:

- the terminal (initial) object, if $F(A)$ is a terminal (initial) object in \mathcal{D} , for any terminal (initial) object in \mathcal{C} .
- the product, if the diagram

$$F(A) \xleftarrow{F(p_0)} F(C) \xrightarrow{F(p_1)} F(B)$$

is a product of $F(A)$ and $F(B)$ in \mathcal{D} , for any product

$$A \xleftarrow{p_0} C \xrightarrow{p_1} B$$

in the category \mathcal{C} .

- the coproduct, if the diagram

$$F(A) \xrightarrow{F(i_0)} F(C) \xleftarrow{F(i_1)} F(B)$$

is a coproduct of $F(A)$ and $F(B)$ in \mathcal{D} , for any coproduct

$$A \xrightarrow{i_0} C \xleftarrow{i_1} B$$

in the category \mathcal{C} .

A product-preserving functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ preserves the exponentials, if the object $F(C)$ together with the evaluation map

$$F(C \times A) \xrightarrow{F(ev)} F(B)$$

is an exponential in \mathcal{D} , for any exponential

$$C \times A \xrightarrow{ev} B$$

in the category \mathcal{C} . Note that as F preserves the product, $F(C \times A)$ is actually a product of $F(C)$ and $F(A)$.

Remark 4.4.2. Fixing a BC-structure for \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} , one can define the preservation equivalently in the following way. We say that F preserves:

- the terminal object iff the canonical map $! : F(1_{\mathcal{C}}) \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{D}}$ is an isomorphism.
- the initial object iff the canonical map $! : 0_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow F(0_{\mathcal{D}})$ is an isomorphism.
- the product iff the canonical map $\langle F(p_0), F(p_1) \rangle : F(A \times B) \rightarrow F(A) \times F(B)$ is an isomorphism.
- the coproduct iff the canonical map $(F(i_0), F(i_1)) : F(A) + F(B) \rightarrow F(A + B)$ is an isomorphism.
- the exponential iff the canonical map $\lambda_{F(A)}(F(ev) \circ g) : F([A, B]) \rightarrow [F(A), F(B)]$ is an isomorphism, where g is the inverse of the canonical map $\langle F(p_0), F(p_1) \rangle : F([A, B] \times A) \rightarrow F([A, B]) \times F(A)$

Note that the second definition of preservation demands the canonical morphisms (i.e., the ones induced by the universality of the structure) to be an isomorphism. As we will see later, this is not equivalent to simply having an isomorphism (except for the initial and terminal objects). Even if we have a natural isomorphism, it is still different from having the canonical map as an isomorphism. By these weaker versions, what we really do is preserving the object of the structure (product, coproduct, exponential), while we must also preserve its involved maps (projections, injections, evaluation) as they are also a part of the structure.

Definition 4.4.3. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two BCC's. A functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is called a *BC-functor* if it preserves the BC-structure. The AB- and CC-functors are defined similarly, demanding the preservation of the structures available in the ABC's and CCC's, respectively.

Example 4.4.4. The inclusion functor $i : \mathbf{FinSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, mapping the finite sets and the functions between them to themselves is a BC-functor. The reason is that the construction of the BC-structure on finite sets is exactly the same as the one on all sets.

Example 4.4.5. The forgetful functor $U : \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ mapping (A, σ_A) to A and equivariant maps to themselves is a BC-functor. To see why, it is enough to go back and check the construction of the BC-structure in the two categories. The only non-trivial thing to mention is that for the set of the exponential object $[(A, \sigma_A), (B, \sigma_B)]$, we used the set B^A of *all* functions from A to B and not just the equivariant functions. This is consistent with our claim that U preserves all exponentials.

Example 4.4.6. Let X and Y be two topological spaces and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be an *open map*, i.e., a continuous map, where $f[U]$ is open in Y , for any open $U \subseteq X$. Then, the functor $f^{-1} : \mathcal{O}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is a BC-functor. It is clear that it preserves all finite meets and finite joins, simply because the inverse image function always preserves finite intersections and finite unions. For the exponentiation, first notice that $f[W \cap f^{-1}(U)] = f[W] \cap U$, for any subsets $W \subseteq X$ and $U \subseteq Y$. Then, consider the following series of equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} W \subseteq f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow_X f^{-1}(V) \quad \text{iff} \quad W \cap f^{-1}(U) \subseteq f^{-1}(V) \quad \text{iff} \\ f[W \cap f^{-1}(U)] \subseteq V \quad \text{iff} \quad f[W] \cap U \subseteq V. \end{aligned}$$

As f is an open map, $f[W]$ is open, for any open $W \in \mathcal{O}(X)$. Hence, $f[W] \cap U \subseteq V$ is equivalent to $f[W] \subseteq U \rightarrow_Y V$ which is also equivalent to $W \subseteq f^{-1}(U \rightarrow_Y V)$. Therefore, as W is an arbitrary open subset of X , we reach $f^{-1}(U \rightarrow_Y V) = f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow_X f^{-1}(V)$.

Example 4.4.7. Let (P, \leq_P) and (Q, \leq_Q) be two posets and $f : (P, \leq_P) \rightarrow (Q, \leq_Q)$ be a *p-morphism*, i.e., an order-preserving map such that for any $x \in P$ and $y \in Q$, if $f(x) \leq_Q y$, then there exists $z \in P$ such that $z \geq_P x$ and $f(z) = y$. Then, the functor $f^{-1} : U(Q, \leq_Q) \rightarrow U(P, \leq_P)$ is a BC-functor. To prove, it is enough to show that putting the upset topologies on P and Q makes the map $f : P \rightarrow Q$ an open map. Let $U \subseteq P$ be an upset. Then, to show that $f[U]$ is also an upset, assume that $y \in f[U]$ and $y \leq_Q w$. Therefore, there is $x \in U$ such that $y = f(x)$. Hence, by the property of the function f , there exists $z \in P$ such that $z \geq_P x$ and $w = f(z)$. As U is an upset and $x \in U$, we have $z \in U$. Hence, $w \in f[U]$. Therefore, $f[U]$ is an upset, which means that f is an open map.

Example 4.4.8. Let \mathcal{C} be a BCC. Then, the forgetful functor $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$ is a BC-functor. A similar claim holds for the ABC's and CCC's.

Example 4.4.9. Let \mathcal{C} be a small CCC. Then, the functor $y : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$ is a CC-functor. We only mention the main points in this example and leave the rest to the reader. For the terminal object, it is enough to note that $y(1) = \text{Hom}(-, 1)$ is actually the constant functor $\Delta_{\{*\}}$ which is the terminal object in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$. For the product, note that the canonical map $y(A \times B) \rightarrow y(A) \times y(B)$ is the map $\text{Hom}(-, A \times B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(-, A) \times \text{Hom}(-, B)$ induced by a composition with projections. It is not hard to see that this map is actually an isomorphism. For the exponential, the canonical map $y([A, B]) \rightarrow [y(A), y(B)]$ is the map

$\text{Hom}(-, [A, B]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(y_- \times y_A, y_B)$ induced by combining the evaluation and the Yoneda functor. Using the Yoneda embedding, it is enough to show that the canonical map $\text{Hom}(-, [A, B]) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(- \times A, B)$ induced by the evaluation map is an isomorphism. The latter is mentioned in Remark 4.3.4.

Example 4.4.10. (*Non-preservation of terminal objects and products*) Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC and X be a set with at least two elements. Then, the constant functor $\Delta_X : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is not a CC-functor. It does not preserve the terminal object as otherwise, X must have been a singleton. It does not preserve the product as otherwise, the canonical map $\Delta_X(A \times B) \rightarrow \Delta_X(A) \times \Delta_X(B)$ must be an isomorphism. Computing this map, we can see that it is actually the function $X \rightarrow X \times X$ mapping x to (x, x) . However, as X has more than one element, the map $x \mapsto (x, x)$ cannot be surjective. Notice that if X is infinite, the objects $\Delta_X(A \times B)$ and $\Delta_X(A) \times \Delta_X(B)$, i.e., X and $X \times X$ are isomorphic in \mathbf{Set} . This isomorphism also makes the functors $\Delta_X(- \times -) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\Delta_X(-) \times \Delta_X(-) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ isomorphic. However, none of these facts imply that Δ_X is preserving the product. As we emphasized before, to preserve the product, it is important to have the *canonical morphism* as an isomorphism.

Example 4.4.11. (*Non-preservation of exponentials*) Let X and Y be two topological spaces. Then, the inverse image of a continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is not necessarily a CC-functor as it may not preserve the exponentials. For instance, take the continuous map $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(x) = x^2$. Let $U = (-\infty, 0)$ and note that $U \rightarrow \emptyset = \text{int}[0, +\infty) = (0, +\infty)$. Then, $f^{-1}(U \rightarrow \emptyset) = f^{-1}((0, +\infty)) = \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$. However, $f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \rightarrow \emptyset = \mathbb{R}$ and hence $f^{-1}(U \rightarrow \emptyset) \neq f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow f^{-1}(\emptyset)$. Notice that $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not an open map, as $f[\mathbb{R}] = [0, +\infty)$ is not open.

Example 4.4.12. (*Non-preservation of initial objects and coproducts*) Let \mathcal{C} be a small cocartesian category. Then, the functor $y : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$ does not preserve the initial object or *any* of the coproducts in \mathcal{C} . For the initial object, note that $y_0(\mathcal{C}) = \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, 0)$ and this set is not empty for $\mathcal{C} = 0$. Therefore, y_0 cannot be the initial object of $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$. Similarly, for the coproducts, notice that $y_{A+B}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, A+B)$ which is not isomorphic to $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, A) + \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, B)$ for $\mathcal{C} = 0$. Because the first set has exactly one element while the second has exactly two elements. Therefore, y_{A+B} and $y_A + y_B$ are not isomorphic as objects of $\mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$.

Remark 4.4.13. Note that in the previous example, we seriously used the existence of the initial object to prove that $y : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{cop}}$ does not preserve any existing coproducts. It is actually possible to prove it even without assuming that \mathcal{C} is cocartesian.

4.5 Free Structured Categories

In the previous subsections, we identified the discourse of BCC's and BC-functors as a natural categorical framework for formalizing proof systems over

\mathcal{L}_p and their interpretations. With this framework established, one might take a conceptual leap to seek a universal property that redefines the syntactical BCC \mathbf{NJ} in a relative manner, thereby providing a definition for syntax in a syntax-free way.

Theorem 4.5.1. *The category \mathbf{NJ} is the free BCC generated by the infinite set $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$ of objects, i.e., for any BCC \mathcal{C} and any assignment f of the objects of \mathcal{C} to the atoms $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$, there is a unique (up to isomorphism) BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ extending f , i.e., $F(p_i) = f(p_i)$, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The same also holds for \mathbf{NM} and \mathbf{NN} , as the free ABC and CCC generated by the set of objects $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$, respectively.*

Proof. We only explain the case \mathbf{NJ} . The rest are similar. First, let us start with an informal explanation of why we expect \mathbf{NJ} to be the free BCC generated by the set $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$. The reason is simple. Reading category-theoretically, one can see that the propositions in the language \mathcal{L}_p and the rules of \mathbf{NJ} are designed to define a BC-structure on \mathbf{NJ} in a minimal manner. For instance, the connective \wedge defines the product object $A \wedge B$ of the objects A and B . The rules $(E\wedge_1)$ and $(E\wedge_2)$ act as the projection maps for the product $A \wedge B$, and $(I\wedge)$ corresponds to the operation $\langle -, - \rangle$ on the maps, which is required for the products. Similarly, there is a correspondence between the disjunction and its rules with coproducts, the implication and its rules with exponentiation, \top and its axiom with the terminal object, and \perp and its axiom with the initial object. Of course, there are some issues with the commutativity and the uniqueness conditions in the universal definition of the BC-structure. These are resolved with the minimal equalities that $\beta\eta$ -equivalences put on the derivations. Note that these equivalences are nothing but what one needs to ensure the commutativity and the uniqueness conditions that the BC-structure of \mathbf{NJ} demands. Therefore, we naturally expect \mathbf{NJ} to be the “least” possible BCC generated by the set $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$ of objects.

To formally prove the freeness, let f be an assignment of the objects of \mathcal{C} to the atoms in $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$. Our task is defining the BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and proving its uniqueness up to an isomorphism. We will explain the main ingredients of the proof and leave the rest to the reader. First, fix a BC-structure on \mathcal{C} , i.e., fix an initial and a terminal object and for any two objects, fix a product, a coproduct and an exponential for them. We will define the assignment F on propositions and derivations in an inductive way. For propositions, set $F(p_i) = f(p_i)$, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $F(\top) = 1$, $F(\perp) = 0$, $F(A \wedge B) = F(A) \times F(B)$, $F(A \vee B) = F(A) + F(B)$ and $F(A \rightarrow B) = [F(A), F(B)]$.

For derivations, for any finite set of assumptions in the form $[A]^i$, define $F(\Gamma)$ as $\prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} F(\gamma)$, using the order on Γ induced by the superscripts in $[A]^i$'s. If $\Gamma = \emptyset$, define $F(\Gamma) = 1$. Then, for any derivation D of A with the set of assumptions Γ , we want to assign a map $F(D) : F(\Gamma) \rightarrow F(A)$. As the derivation D is a tree constructed from the rules of \mathbf{NJ} , it is enough to define $F(D)$ recursively on the sub-derivations of D . If D is a one-node tree proving $[A]^i$, define $F(D)$ as the projection on the i th component of $F(\Gamma)$. For the other rules, use Table 2.

Rules	Interpretations
$\frac{}{\top} (\top)$	$!_{F(\Gamma)}$
$\frac{D}{\perp} (\perp)$	$!_A \circ F(D)$
$\frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B}} (I \wedge)$	$\langle F(D_1), F(D_2) \rangle$
$\frac{D}{\frac{A \wedge B}{A}} (E \wedge_1) \quad , \quad \frac{D}{\frac{A \wedge B}{B}} (E \wedge_2)$	$p_0 \circ F(D) \quad , \quad p_1 \circ F(D)$
$\frac{D}{\frac{A}{A \vee B}} (I \vee_1) \quad , \quad \frac{D}{\frac{B}{A \vee B}} (I \vee_2)$	$i_0 \circ F(D) \quad , \quad i_1 \circ F(D)$
$\frac{D \quad \frac{[A]^i \quad [B]^j}{\frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{C}} (E \vee_{i,j})}{\frac{A \vee B}{C}} (E \vee)$	$ev \langle I \langle \lambda_i F(D_1), \lambda_j F(D_2) \rangle F(D) \rangle$
$\frac{[A]^i \quad D}{\frac{B}{A \rightarrow B}} (I \rightarrow_i)$	$\lambda_i F(D)$
$\frac{D_1 \quad D_2}{\frac{A \quad A \rightarrow B}{B}} (E \rightarrow)$	$ev \circ \langle F(D_2), F(D_1) \rangle$

Table 2: Inductive definition of $F(D)$

To read the table, we need the following notational conventions. First, for the map $F(D) : F(\Gamma \cup [A]^i) \rightarrow F(B)$, we can use the commutativity of the product to transform $F(\Gamma \cup [A]^i)$ to $F(\Gamma) \times F(A)$, and then using λ_A , construct a map from $F(\Gamma)$ to $[F(A), F(B)]$. We call this map $\lambda_i F(D)$. Second, notice that in any BCC, there is a canonical map $I : [X, Z] \times [Y, Z] \rightarrow [X + Y, Z]$. We use this map to interpret the rule $(E \vee)$.

The definition of $F(\mathbf{D})$ does not respect the renaming of superscripts as any such renaming may change the order of $F(\gamma)$'s in the product $F(\Gamma) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} F(\gamma)$. However, as we will finally restrict ourselves to the derivations with one assumption, the map F becomes well-defined at the end. The definition of $F(\mathbf{D})$ respects the $\beta\eta$ -equivalences on \mathbf{D} . This holds due to the universal properties of the BC-structure on \mathcal{C} . We leave its detailed proof to the reader. Then, to get a functor, one must restrict F to the maps in \mathbf{NJ} , i.e., to the derivations with one assumption. It is easy to see that this restriction is a functor as F is defined on a one-node tree with one assumption as the identity map and we defined F by composing the values of F on sub-derivations. The functor F respects the BC-structure by design. For instance, we defined $F(A \wedge B) = F(A) \times F(B)$, and the projections in \mathbf{NJ} , i.e., the rules $(E\wedge_1)$ and $(E\wedge_2)$ are mapped to the projections of \mathcal{C} . As F clearly extends f , we constructed the BC-functor we sought.

To prove the uniqueness, note that every proposition is constructed from the atoms and $\{\top, \perp\}$ using $\{\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ in a unique way, and any derivation is constructed from the rules. If F is to be a BC-functor, it must preserve the BC-structure, and hence the definition of F is essentially forced upon us. For instance, we must define $F(A \wedge B)$ as the product $F(A) \times F(B)$, and the application of F on the derivation:

$$\frac{A \wedge B}{A} (E\wedge_1)$$

must be the projection $p_0 : F(A) \times F(B) \rightarrow F(A)$. Therefore, the only choice we have is the choice of the BC-structure on \mathcal{C} which is unique up to isomorphism. Hence, F must be unique up to an isomorphism. \square

Theorem 4.5.1 characterizes the BCC \mathbf{NJ} as the “least” BCC containing the given set $\{p_0, p_1, \dots\}$ of objects. This characterization, like those for products, coproducts, and other universal constructions, is a relative one based on universality and does not rely on the internal structure of the category \mathbf{NJ} . The method of constructing \mathbf{NJ} is not crucial; there may be alternative syntactical methods to construct the same category, which can be seen as different *presentations* of the same mathematical entity. In this sense, the definition of \mathbf{NJ} provided by Theorem 4.5.1 serves as a conceptual characterization and offers insight into how to define syntax in a *presentation-free* manner.

5 BHK Interpretation and Variable Sets

In the previous section, we introduced some universal constructions to interpret the logical constants in the propositional language. For this purpose, we employed categorical language, where propositions are treated as objects and *deductions* as morphisms. This framework effectively formalized the expected behavior of logical constants. However, some anomalies emerged, such as defining the constants \perp and \vee by their behavior as assumptions, based on how they prove other propositions rather than how they are proved themselves. One could

argue that these anomalies result from our choice of deduction as the primitive notion, while the primitive notion should actually be the *proof*, i.e., a deduction with no assumption. Once proofs are specified, a deduction of B from A can always be defined as a *construction* that maps proofs of A to proofs of B . But if proofs are taken as primitives, how do we define the logical connectives? The well-known Brouwer-Heyting-Kolmogorov (BHK) interpretation attempts to answer this question. It defines the proofs of a proposition recursively as follows:

- there is a canonical proof for \top ,
- there is no proof for \perp ,
- a proof of $A \wedge B$ is a pair of a proof of A and a proof of B ,
- a proof of $A \vee B$ is either a proof of A or a proof of B ,
- a proof of $A \rightarrow B$ is a *construction* that transforms any proof of A to a proof of B .

The BHK interpretation is clearly based on a notion of *construction*, as the implication clause clearly demonstrates. Even for the other clauses, we must specify a world of constructions from which the clauses select the ones considered as proofs. To formalize this notion of construction, a natural approach is to employ a category with sufficient structure as the world of constructions. Here, we interpret the objects as types and the morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ as a construction of type B based on a given input of type A .

There are many such categories, ranging from categories of recursive functions or continuous maps to the usual category of sets. In this section, we restrict ourselves to the classical category of sets to simplify the exposition. However, in Section 9 and Section 10, we will explore some alternative constructions to illustrate their usefulness and interesting properties. These alternative constructions are typically referred to as the *realizability* interpretation.

Fixing constructions, we also need to incorporate the notion of *time*, an important factor that is often ignored in the usual presentation of the BHK interpretation. To understand the role of time, consider the way a constructive mathematician rejects the axiom of the excluded middle. For her, $A \vee \neg A$ is not acceptable as a *general law* because it asserts that for any proposition A , there is either a proof of A or a proof that A leads to a contradiction. This is not true in her view, as there are propositions that are potentially provable but have not been proved *so far*, making them neither provable nor disprovable at this point in time.

However, in the static and timeless picture that the BHK interpretation presents, without any epistemological change, either A is provable and we have its proof, or we do not have any proof because it is impossible to have one. In the latter case, since there is no proof for A , one can claim that any proof of A leads to a proof of the contradiction, which provides a proof for $A \rightarrow \perp = \neg A$ by the BHK definition of the proofs of implication. Therefore, the BHK interpretation,

with classical sets and functions as its world of constructions, validates the axiom of the excluded middle if we ignore the temporal aspect. Recalling that time is the seed of *Kripke semantics* for constructive theories, it is insightful to consider what Goodman interestingly highlighted:

Recursive realizability emphasizes the active aspect of constructive mathematics. However, Kleene's notion has the weakness that it disregards that aspect of constructive mathematics which concern epistemological change. Precisely that aspect of constructive mathematics which Kleene's notion neglects is emphasized by Kripke's semantics for intuitionistic logic. However, Kripke's notion makes it appear that the constructive mathematician is a passive observer of a structure which gradually reveals itself. What is lacking is the emphasis on the mathematician as active which Kleene's notion provides [31].

Using the temporal structure, the informal BHK interpretation can be updated as follows:

- there is *always* a canonical proof for \top ,
- there is *never* a proof for \perp ,
- a proof of $A \wedge B$ *at some point* is a pair of a proof of A and a proof of B *at the same point*,
- a proof of $A \vee B$ *at some point* is either a proof of A or a proof of B *at the same point*,
- a proof of $A \rightarrow B$ *at some point* is a construction that transforms any proof of A *at any point in the future* to a proof of B *at that point*.

There is another necessary update to the BHK interpretation concerning the clauses for \perp and \vee . We will explain the latter, as the former is similar. In the traditional form of the BHK interpretation, a proof of $A \vee B$ at some point is either a proof of A or a proof of B at that same point. However, this definition can be too stringent for some practices. For instance, if we are generating a sequence of zeros and ones one bit at a time, at stage n , we know that the next bit a_{n+1} is either zero or one. Yet, we do not have a proof at that moment to determine which it will be.

This observation suggests weakening the clause for disjunction in the BHK interpretation to state that a proof of $A \vee B$ at time n is a construction that will eventually become a proof of A or B as time progresses, regardless of how it progresses. To formalize this concept, we need a notion called *coverage* or *Grothendieck topology*, which defines how future possibilities can cover the present moment. This chapter will not delve into this concept, as it extends far beyond the scope of our already extensive survey. However, you can explore a basic version of it in the renowned *Beth semantics* for intuitionistic logic [86, 87].

Using the two ingredients of construction and time, and setting aside the role of coverages, we will provide a formalization for a weaker form of the BHK interpretation in the following two subsections.

5.1 Provability via the BHK interpretation

Let us start with the simpler task of formalizing the BHK interpretation considered as the inductive definition of the provability relation rather than the actual proofs. As we saw before, this means restricting our structures from categories to posets, where all the morphisms are collapsed into an order relation.

First, let $\mathcal{T} = (T, \leq)$ be a poset encoding the time structure. Note that time is not linear, as each point in time may branch into different possible futures. Ignoring explicit proofs and focusing solely on provability, a proposition is represented by an order-preserving map from \mathcal{T} to $\mathbf{2}$, indicating whether the proposition is provable at each point in time. It is order-preserving because if a proposition is provable at some point $w \in T$, it remains provable as time progresses. Therefore, the set of all propositions is $\mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{T}}$. For the deductibility order between propositions, we define $A \leq B$ if and only if $A(w) \leq B(w)$ for every $w \in T$. This means that A proves B if the provability of A at any point in time implies the provability of B at that point.

For any proposition A and any point $w \in T$, we write $w \Vdash A$ to denote $A(w) = 1$, meaning that A is provable at w . Now, following the BHK interpretation and substituting proofs with provability, we define the provability of complex propositions as follows:

- $w \not\Vdash \perp$, meaning that \perp is never provable.
- $w \Vdash \top$, meaning that \top is always provable.
- $w \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $w \Vdash A$ and $w \Vdash B$, meaning that $A \wedge B$ is provable at some point iff both A and B are provable at that point. This is the shadow of the definition of the proofs of a conjunction as the pairs of the proofs of the conjuncts.
- $w \Vdash A \vee B$ iff either $w \Vdash A$ or $w \Vdash B$, meaning that $A \vee B$ is provable at some point iff either A or B is provable at that point. This is the shadow of the definition of the proofs of a disjunction as the proofs of either of the disjuncts.
- $w \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff for any $u \geq w$ if $u \Vdash A$ then $u \Vdash B$, meaning that $A \rightarrow B$ is provable at some point iff at any point in the future, when A becomes provable, B also becomes provable at that point. This is the shadow of the definition of the proofs of an implication as a construction transforming a proof of A to a proof of B . When we have such a construction at w , we can apply it at all points in the future to any future proof of A to get a proof of B .

It is straightforward to verify that the operations $\{\perp, \top, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ on the poset $\mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{T}}$ align with its BC-structure. For instance, for disjunction, we have $A \vee B \leq C$ if and only if $A \leq C$ and $B \leq C$, for any propositions A , B , and C . Given this BC-structure, we can conclude that the BHK interpretation yields a poset proof system, specifically a Heyting algebra, as discussed in the previous section.

Two points are worth noting here. First, the BHK interpretation defines provability rather than deductibility. Deductibility is simply the natural order on $\mathbf{2}^{\mathcal{T}}$ induced by the temporal structure of \mathcal{T} . This approach allows for a clearer definition of \perp and \vee , as it directly addresses their provability rather than their role as assumptions for proving other propositions. Second, the BHK interpretation concretely formalizes poset proof systems, with propositions represented as order-preserving functions rather than abstract elements in a Heyting algebra.

Given these observations, one might wonder if the poset proof system we introduced earlier is more general than what the BHK interpretation provides. Fortunately, this is not the case:

Theorem 5.1.1. (*Kripke representation for Heyting algebras [86]*) *Let \mathcal{H} be a Heyting algebra. Then, the canonical map $e : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{[\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{2}]}$ defined by $e(a)(f) = f(a)$ is a full and faithful BC-functor, where $[\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{2}]$ is the poset of all BC-functors from \mathcal{H} to $\mathbf{2}$ with the pointwise order.*

Therefore, any poset proof system can be viewed as a subsystem of the proof system derived from the BHK interpretation. In essence, the BHK interpretation offers a *concrete representation* for all poset proof systems.

5.2 Proofs via the BHK interpretation

Having investigated the easier case of provability, we are now ready to focus on the original BHK interpretation. The first point is generalizing the structure of time from a poset to a small category \mathcal{T} . The idea is that not only the results of the growth of time are important, but also we care about *how* this expansion happens. Therefore, in the categorical formalization of time, the objects of \mathcal{T} are the points on the timeline, while its morphisms, such as $f : w \rightarrow u$, explain how w grows to u .

Now, having the category \mathcal{T} to formalize the temporal structure, a proposition is simply an assignment of sets to the objects of \mathcal{T} , specifying the proofs of the proposition at each point w , together with an assignment of functions to the maps of \mathcal{T} , specifying how proofs change through time. The natural way to formalize such data is by variable sets over \mathcal{T} , i.e., the functors from \mathcal{T} to **Set**. Therefore, we assume that **Set** ^{\mathcal{T}} is the category of propositions. Note that a deduction of the proposition B from the proposition A in this category is defined as a natural transformation that is simply a way to map the proofs of A to the proofs of B at each point w of \mathcal{T} in a uniform and coherent way. This is compatible with our previous discussion of defining deductions as constructions that transform proofs and not as a primitive notion.

For any proposition A , write $w, x \Vdash A$ to denote $x \in A(w)$, meaning that x is a proof of A at the point w . Then, the BHK interpretation simply states:

- there is no x such that $w, x \Vdash \perp$,
- $w, * \Vdash \top$, where $*$ is the unique x for which $w, x \Vdash \top$,
- $w, \langle x, y \rangle \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $w, x \Vdash A$ and $w, y \Vdash B$,
- $w, \langle i, x \rangle \Vdash A \vee B$ iff either $i = 0$ and $w, x \Vdash A$ or $i = 1$ and $w, x \Vdash B$,
- $w, \{\alpha_u\}_{u \in \mathcal{T}} \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff for any expansion $f : w \rightarrow u$ and any x such that $u, x \Vdash A$, we have $u, \alpha_u(f, x) \Vdash B$.

In the last part, the sequence $\{\alpha_u\}_{u \in \mathcal{T}}$ must be coherent. To explain, note that for any map $g : u \rightarrow v$, there are two natural candidates to map the pair of $f : w \rightarrow u$ and x as a proof of A at u to a proof of B at v . One is using α_u to provide a proof of B at u and then apply $B(g)$ to reach a proof of B at v . The other is first changing (f, x) to $(gf, A(g)(x))$ and then apply α_v . The coherency simply says that these two ways are equal:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}(w, u) \times A(u) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_u} & B(u) \\
\downarrow (g \circ -) \times A(g) & & \downarrow B(g) \\
\text{Hom}(w, v) \times A(v) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_v} & B(v)
\end{array}$$

In other words, we are simply saying that the assignment $\{\alpha_u : \text{Hom}(w, u) \times A(u) \rightarrow B(u)\}_{u \in \mathcal{T}}$ is a natural transformation.

The astute reader will soon realize that these clauses cannot fully define complex propositions such as $A \wedge B$, $A \vee B$, and $A \rightarrow B$, since any proposition is represented as a functor from \mathcal{T} into **Set**, and what we've defined so far only covers the object part of the functor. However, there is a canonical method to extend this assignment to maps of \mathcal{T} , thereby obtaining a functor for each complex proposition. By doing so, it becomes clear that the operations $\{\perp, \top, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow\}$ correspond precisely to the BC-structure of the category **Set** ^{\mathcal{T}} . Therefore, it follows that the BHK interpretation yields a proof system in the sense described in the previous sections, specifically a BCC.

Again, there are a few key points to consider. First, the BHK interpretation focuses on defining proofs rather than deductions. This approach resolves the peculiarities associated with \perp and \vee , as they are now characterized by their proofs rather than by their deductive capacities. Second, it's important to emphasize that in this framework, propositions and deductions are represented concretely as variable sets and natural transformations, respectively, rather than as abstract objects and morphisms in a general BCC.

One might wonder whether there is any advantage to using this abstract setting, or if an abstract BCC can be represented by a category of variable sets. To address this, note that if we shift from BCCs to CCCs, such a representation becomes feasible. Specifically, the Yoneda embedding provides a CC-functor that maps the category \mathcal{C} into **Set** ^{\mathcal{C}^{op}} in a faithful and full manner. Leveraging

a significant representation theorem from topos theory [40], we can even opt for a temporal structure that is a poset, providing a robust connection between abstract and concrete settings.

Theorem 5.2.1. (*Kripke representation for small CCC's*) *Let \mathcal{C} be a small CCC. Then, there exist a poset (P, \leq) and a full and faithful CC-functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{(P, \leq)}$.*

Now, let us return to the general setting of BCCs. Contrary to what one might expect, it is not always possible to embed a BCC into a BCC of the form $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{T}}$ via a full and faithful BC-functor. In fact, some BCCs cannot be mapped by any BC-functor into categories of variable sets.

The reason for this limitation is straightforward. In the category $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{T}}$, the object $1 + 1$ is not isomorphic to 1 because $1 + 1$ has one element at each $w \in \mathcal{T}$, while 1 always has a single element. However, in certain BCCs, such as Heyting algebras, we have $1 \cong 1 + 1$, and this property is preserved by any BC-functor, whether or not it is full or faithful. Philosophically, this distinction highlights that the BHK interpretation imposes a specific structure that ensures the proofs of A and B within $A \vee B$ are disjoint. In contrast, arbitrary BCCs allow for a more flexible integration of proofs.

Remark 5.2.2. If the reader is familiar with Grothendieck toposes, which incorporate the coverage structures we omitted, they might suspect that using sheaves instead of presheaves could address this issue in the BHK interpretation. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The issue persists because, even in non-trivial Grothendieck toposes, we still have $1 + 1 \not\cong 1$.

As it may be clear now, the issue with the representation claim lies in the cocartesian structure of a BCC. To provide stronger evidence, we demonstrate that some cocartesian categories cannot be mapped into a category of variable sets via a weakly-full functor that preserves the cocartesian structure. To prove this, we define the property $(*)$ in a cocartesian category as follows: For any diagram of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \longrightarrow & A \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow i_0 \\ B & \xrightarrow{i_1} & A + B \end{array}$$

where i_0 and i_1 are the injections, there is a map in $\text{Hom}(C, 0)$. Note that the property $(*)$ is somehow stating that the coproduct is disjoint.

Lemma 5.2.3. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two cocartesian categories such that there is a weakly-full functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ preserving the initial object and the binary coproducts. Then, if \mathcal{D} has the property $(*)$, then so does \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. Let the following diagram commute in \mathcal{C} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & \longrightarrow & A \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow i_0 \\
 B & \xrightarrow{i_1} & A + B
 \end{array}$$

Then, applying the functor F and using the fact that F preserves the coproducts, we can use (*) to have a map in $\text{Hom}(F(C), 0)$. Since $F(0)$ is an initial object, there is a map in $\text{Hom}(F(C), F(0))$. As F is weakly-full, there is a map in $\text{Hom}(C, 0)$. \square

Now, observe that for any category of variable sets (and all Grothendieck toposes), the property (*) holds, as $A + B$ is the pointwise *disjoint* union of sets. However, (*) does not hold for non-trivial cocartesian posets. For example, consider a poset with $a \neq 0$. In such a poset, we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 a & \leq & a \\
 \wedge & & \wedge \\
 a & \leq & a \vee a = a
 \end{array}$$

However, since $a \not\leq 0$, if such posets could be mapped via a weakly-full functor that preserves the cocartesian structure into a category of the form $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{T}}$, then $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{T}}$, having the property (*), would force the poset to also possess this property. This leads to a contradiction. It is crucial to note that the weakly-fullness condition cannot be omitted. Without this condition, any cocartesian category \mathcal{C} could be trivially mapped into the initial object 0 of a category of variable sets using the constant functor Δ_0 . While this functor is cocartesian, it is not necessarily weakly-full.

6 Classical Deductions

We have examined how BCC's offer a categorical formalization of intuitionistic proof systems and explored their interconnections, including the syntactical systems as free categories and the BHK interpretation as a source of a special family of proof systems. Given this comprehensive framework for intuitionistic proofs, it is natural to seek a comparable formalization for classical proof systems. Unfortunately, the situation is less satisfactory. To proceed, we begin with a useful lemma:

Lemma 6.0.1. *In a BCC, all maps in $\text{Hom}(A, 0)$ are isomorphisms, for any object A . As a consequence, there is at most one map in $\text{Hom}(B, -C)$, for any objects B and C .*

Proof. First, observe that $0 \times A$ is an initial object. To prove, note that $\text{Hom}(0 \times A, B) \cong \text{Hom}(0, B^A)$ and as 0 is initial, there is exactly one map in $\text{Hom}(0, B^A)$ which also means there is exactly one map from $0 \times A$ to B , for any arbitrary object B . Hence, $0 \times A$ is initial. Now, let $f : A \rightarrow 0$ be a map. We claim that the map $! : 0 \rightarrow A$ is the inverse of $f : A \rightarrow 0$. As 0 is initial, it is clear that $f! = id_0$. Therefore, we have to show that $!f = id_A$. For that purpose, consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{\langle f, id_A \rangle} & 0 \times A & \xrightarrow{p_1} & A \\
 id_A \downarrow & & \downarrow p_0 & & \downarrow id_A \\
 A & \xrightarrow{f} & 0 & \xrightarrow{!} & A
 \end{array}$$

The left square trivially commutes. The right square commutes as $0 \times A$ is an initial object. Therefore, the whole rectangular commutes. As the upper row is id_A , the lower row must also be id_A . Therefore, $!f = id_A$ and hence $f : A \rightarrow 0$ is an isomorphism. For the second part, first notice that there is at most one map in $\text{Hom}(A, 0)$, for any object A . The reason is that if $\text{Hom}(A, 0)$ is non-empty, by the first part, $A \cong 0$ which implies the initiality of A . Hence, $\text{Hom}(A, 0)$ must be a singleton. Using this fact, as $\text{Hom}(B, \neg C) \cong \text{Hom}(B \times C, 0)$, it is trivial that $\text{Hom}(B, \neg C)$ has at most one element. \square

Philosophical Comment 6.0.2. Reading proof theoretically, Lemma 6.0.1 simply states that the negation of a formula has at most one proof because any such proof is just a deduction of \perp from the formula itself. This result is quite counter-intuitive for some logicians, as there are apparently some negative formulas with different proofs in mathematics. For these logicians, what Lemma 6.0.1 actually implies is that identifying \perp with the initial object is too demanding and must be relaxed. There are many ways to solve this issue. For instance, one can identify \perp as a *weak initial object*, i.e., an object that has a (not necessarily unique) map to any other object. As another way, one can simply move to the setting of minimal logic, omitting \perp completely from the language. For other logicians, the uniqueness of the proofs of the negative propositions is not only intuitive and justifiable but also has some explanatory power. For these logicians, all proofs of a negative formula are equivalent because the proofs of the negative statements carry no information other than their mere truth or provability. This is a known intuition in constructive mathematics that negative formulas behave more like classical propositions where only truth plays a role and not the actual proofs. One can even say that Lemma 6.0.1 actually provides a formal proof for this intuition.

Now, it is time to return to our task of providing a categorical formalization for classical proof systems. There are different interpretations of how classicality must be captured in the categorical setting. In the most obvious approach,

one can argue that classical proofs, whatever they are, generalize intuitionistic proofs. Therefore, the category of classical deductions must at least be a BCC. To incorporate the essence of classical proofs, we have the following four proposals:

- **Logical equivalence:** There is a map from $\neg\neg A$ to A , for any object A .
- **Isomorphism:** $A \cong \neg\neg A$, for any object A .
- **Natural Isomorphism:** $A \cong \neg\neg A$, natural in A , i.e., there is a natural transformation $\alpha : id_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \neg\neg(-)$ such that $\alpha_A : A \rightarrow \neg\neg A$ is an isomorphism, for any object A .
- **Canonical Isomorphism:** The canonical map $\lambda_{\neg A} ev\langle p_1, p_0 \rangle$ from A to $\neg\neg A$ is an isomorphism.

Using Lemma 6.0.1, there is at most one map in $\text{Hom}(A, \neg\neg A)$. Thus, the last three options are all equivalent. However, the weakest form is different from the others. It only ensures the existence of a deduction of A from $\neg\neg A$ for any proposition A . This cannot fully capture the essence of classical proofs, as classical mathematicians typically believe that the propositions A and $\neg\neg A$ are *identical*, not merely logically equivalent. Therefore, we are led to define a category of classical proofs as a BCC where $A \cong \neg\neg A$, for any object A .

Theorem 6.0.3. (Joyal) *A BCC in which $A \cong \neg\neg A$, for any object A is a preordered set.*

Proof. By lemma 6.0.1, there is at most one map in $\text{Hom}(A, \neg\neg B)$. As $B \cong \neg\neg B$, there is at most one map in $\text{Hom}(A, B)$, for any two objects A and B . Hence, the category is a preordered set. \square

Similar to how we interpreted negations, Theorem 6.0.3 can be read in two distinct ways. The first interpretation suggests that there are no non-trivial classical deductions, reflecting the idea that classical mathematics is grounded in truth or, equivalently, in deductibility where deductions have no substantive role beyond their mere existence. In this view, classical proofs are seen as fundamentally trivial or non-informative. Conversely, the second interpretation offers a different perspective: while classical proofs may not be as informative as constructive proofs, they still contain some amount of information and are not trivially unique. Thus, Theorem 6.0.3 demonstrates that the combination of the BC-structure and the isomorphism between A and $\neg\neg A$ might be too restrictive. Consequently, alternative formalizations are needed to capture classical proof systems.

There are primarily two approaches to developing such alternatives. The first approach maintains the CC-structure but relaxes the cocartesian structure. The second approach acknowledges the importance of preserving the symmetry between conjunctive and disjunctive operations by weakening both cartesian and cocartesian structures while ensuring they remain dual to each other. We will briefly outline these two methods.

The first approach involves generalizing the well-known negative translation of classical logic into intuitionistic logic. This translation helps to identify classical deductions within the realm of intuitionistic logic and aims to axiomatize the structure of these deductions universally. To start, we need to present this generalization of the negative translation. Recall that a *boolean algebra* is a Heyting algebra \mathcal{H} where $a = \neg\neg a$ for any $a \in \mathcal{H}$. Then:

Theorem 6.0.4. *Let \mathcal{H} be an almost Heyting algebra and $r \in \mathcal{H}$ be an arbitrary element. Then, the subset $\mathcal{H}_r = \{x \rightarrow r \mid x \in \mathcal{H}\}$ of \mathcal{H} together with the order of \mathcal{H} is a boolean algebra.*

Proof. First, note that the following data actually describes the BC-structure of \mathcal{H}_r :

- $0_r = (1 \rightarrow r) = r$ and $1_r = (0 \rightarrow r) = 1$,
- $(x \rightarrow r) \wedge_r (y \rightarrow r) = (x \vee y \rightarrow r)$,
- $(x \rightarrow r) \rightarrow_r (y \rightarrow r) = ((x \rightarrow r) \wedge y) \rightarrow r$,
- $(x \rightarrow r) \vee_r (y \rightarrow r) = (x \wedge y \rightarrow r)$.

To prove that it is boolean, note that $\neg_r(x \rightarrow r) = (x \rightarrow r) \rightarrow r$ and hence $\neg_r\neg_r(x \rightarrow r) = [((x \rightarrow r) \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow r$. It is easy to prove that the latter is actually $x \rightarrow r$. Therefore, $\neg_r\neg_r(x \rightarrow r) = (x \rightarrow r)$. \square

One can lift the above technique from the posetal ABC's, i.e., the almost Heyting algebras to all ABC's [35, 76]. Let \mathcal{C} be an ABC and R be an arbitrary object such that the canonical map $\lambda_{R^A} \text{ev}\langle p_1, p_0 \rangle : A \rightarrow R^{R^A}$ is monic, i.e., for any two maps $f, g : X \rightarrow A$, if $\lambda_{R^A} \text{ev}\langle p_1, p_0 \rangle f = \lambda_{R^A} \text{ev}\langle p_1, p_0 \rangle g$, then $f = g$. Consider the category \mathcal{C}_R consisting of all the objects of the form R^A in \mathcal{C} as its objects and *all* maps between these objects as its morphisms. The first observation is that the category \mathcal{C}_R is actually a CCC. Its terminal object is simply $1_{\mathcal{C}}^R$, which is also a terminal object in \mathcal{C} . For the product of R^A and R^B , first consider the maps:

$$R^{A+B} \times A \xrightarrow{id_{R^{A+B}} \times i_0} R^{A+B} \times (A+B) \xrightarrow{ev} R$$

$$R^{A+B} \times B \xrightarrow{id_{R^{A+B}} \times i_1} R^{A+B} \times (A+B) \xrightarrow{ev} R$$

Then, it is enough to set R^{A+B} as the product together with $\lambda_A \text{ev}(id_{R^{A+B}} \times i_0) : R^{A+B} \rightarrow R^A$ and $\lambda_B \text{ev}(id_{R^{A+B}} \times i_1) : R^{A+B} \rightarrow R^B$ as the projections. For the exponentiation of R^A and R^B , first consider the map:

$$R^{R^A \times B} \times R^A \times B \xrightarrow{ev} R$$

Then, it is enough to set $R^{R^A \times B}$ as the exponential object together with the evaluation map $\lambda_B ev : R^{R^A \times B} \times R^A \rightarrow R^B$. This completes the presentation of the CC-structure of the category \mathcal{C}_R .

For the cocartesian structure, unlike the posetal case, the object R is not necessarily the initial object of \mathcal{C}_R . For instance, set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ and $R = \{0, 1\}$. Then, \mathcal{C}_R is the category of all powersets together with all the functions between them. It is easy to see that $\{0, 1\}$ is not an initial object in \mathcal{C}_R . In fact, this category has no initial object. For the coproducts, the situation is worse. Our candidate for the coproduct, i.e., the operation mapping R^A and R^B to $R^{A \times B}$ is defined on the objects. However, there is no natural way to extend this assignment to the morphisms and gain a functor on $\mathcal{C}_R \times \mathcal{C}_R$. In fact, it is possible to prove that this operation on the objects gives rise to a functor iff the category \mathcal{C}_R is a preordered set [76]. Having said that, it is still possible to sacrifice the cocartesian structure and interpret \perp and the disjunction as R and the operation $(R^A, R^B) \mapsto R^{A \times B}$, respectively. Of course, the lack of the functorial behavior of the latter blocks our disjunction to operate on the deductions properly. Finally, for the classicality, one can see that \mathcal{C}_R is classical in the sense of the logical equivalence we had above, i.e., there is a map $f : \neg\neg A \rightarrow A$, for any object A . In fact, a stronger property holds, i.e., the map $f : \neg\neg A \rightarrow A$ is the left inverse of the canonical map $\lambda_{\neg A} ev \langle p_1, p_0 \rangle$. One can axiomatize \mathcal{C}_R 's with their explained structures as the classical proof systems [76]. Those categories are called *control categories*.

The second alternative is based on the idea of taking the negation as a primitive structure of the classical proof systems. To axiomatize such a negation, one can simply add a functor $\neg : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{op}$ satisfying $id_{\mathcal{C}} \cong \neg\neg$ to the structure. For the conjunctive and disjunctive structures, we first need two binary functors satisfying some basic properties. For instance, they must be symmetric and associative with the units \top and \perp , respectively. Roughly speaking, what we need is a categorical version of the usual structure of a commutative monoid where one can make the product of the objects and the maps in a coherent way. This is called a *symmetric monoidal structure*. For instance, both the cartesian and cocartesian structures are symmetric monoidal.

Having two symmetric monoidal structures for conjunction and disjunction, however, is not enough to capture the classical deductions. We also need two other ingredients. First, we must assume that the negation operator maps the conjunctive structure to the disjunctive structure and vice versa. Secondly, we need some maps to simulate the provability of $A \rightarrow A \wedge A$ and $A \wedge B \rightarrow A$ in our system. For them, we need two natural transformations satisfying some coherency properties. For more on this alternative approach, see [82, 5, 30].

7 Categories as Semantics

In the previous sections, we introduced BCC's (resp. ABC's and CCC's) as the proof systems for the language \mathcal{L}_p (resp. $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_p - \{\perp, \vee\}$).³ One can visualize the class of all BCC's and the BC-functors between them as the *models* for the abstract proofs. The free BCC, i.e., the category \mathbf{NJ} , is living high above and captures the pure notion of proof, where no unnecessary structure is present. Then, below \mathbf{NJ} , we have other BCC's, the shadows of the free BCC. As much as we go down in the picture, the BCC's become more concrete and hence easier to work with. Finally, on the ground level, we have the Heyting algebras, where all the deductions are collapsed to one map encoding the mere *deductibility*. One can use this picture as some sort of semantics for the deductions, where the free BCC plays the role of the *syntax*, all the others are the models of that syntax and the BC-functors from \mathbf{NJ} into a BCC \mathcal{C} are the *interpretations* of the syntax inside the model \mathcal{C} .

To see how such a semantical setting works, first, let us recall the three problems we explained in Section 1:

- *The existence problem:* given two propositions A and B , if there is a map from A to B in \mathbf{NJ} .
- *The equivalence problem:* given two maps $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbf{NJ} , if they are equal in \mathbf{NJ} . Note that the problem is not just the pure equality of two syntactical entities as the equality of the derivations in \mathbf{NJ} is considered up to the $\beta\eta$ -equivalence.
- *The identity problem:* given two propositions A and B , if there is an isomorphism between them in \mathbf{NJ} .

For any of these problems, if the answer is positive—i.e., if there exists a deduction or the deductions are equal or the propositions are identical—we must provide the evidence in the free BCC. However, for the negative claims, when there is no deduction, the deductions are unequal, or the propositions are non-identical, as any positive claim is inherited from the free category to all its shadows, it is enough to prove the claim for a shadow category, where hopefully its concrete nature makes the computation easier. Here, we use some examples to show how BCC's can be used to prove such negative claims.

Example 7.0.1. (*The existence problem*) We want to show that the proposition $p \vee \neg p$ is not provable, i.e., there is no map in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(\top, p \vee \neg p)$. For the sake of contradiction, assume $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(\top, p \vee \neg p) \neq \emptyset$. Then, for any BCC \mathcal{C} and any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, there must be a map in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, F(p) + 0^{F(p)})$. To reach a contradiction, it is enough to find suitable BCC and BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, F(p) + 0^{F(p)})$ is empty. We provide two instances of such a suitable choice. First, as we only care about the existence of maps, one

³In the following discussion, we will only focus on the full language and the BCC's. However, everything we say also holds for the two fragments.

may aim for the lowest possible level of the BCC's, i.e., the Heyting algebras. For instance, take \mathcal{C} as the Heyting algebra $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R})$ and set $f(p) = (0, \infty)$. Then, by the freeness of \mathbf{NJ} , there is a BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $F(p) = f(p)$. Now, note that $0^{F(p)} = (-\infty, 0)$ and hence $F(p) + 0^{F(p)} = \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$. Therefore, there is no map in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, F(p) + 0^{F(p)})$ as $\mathbb{R} \not\subseteq \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$.

As another instance and to have a more BHK-style argument, let $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and set $f(p) = (\{0, 1\}, \sigma)$, where $\sigma(0) = 1$ and $\sigma(1) = 0$. Again, f gives rise to a BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Note that $0^{F(p)}$ is empty, as there is no function from $\{0, 1\}$ to \emptyset . Now, if there is a map in $\text{Hom}(1, F(p) + 0^{F(p)})$, as $1 = (\{*\}, id_{\{*\}})$, there is an invariant element in $F(p) + 0^{F(p)}$. As $0^{F(p)}$ is empty, there must be an invariant element in $\{0, 1\}$ which is impossible.

Example 7.0.2. (*The equivalence problem*) We prove that the following two derivations:

$$D_1 : \frac{p \wedge p}{p} \wedge E_1 \qquad D_2 : \frac{p \wedge p}{p} \wedge E_2$$

are not equal in \mathbf{NJ} . Assume $D_1 = D_2$. Then, for any BCC \mathcal{C} and any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the maps $F(D_1)$ and $F(D_2)$ must be equal. Therefore, to prove the inequality, it is again enough to find suitable BCC and BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $F(D_1) \neq F(D_2)$ in \mathcal{C} . Notice that for this problem, we cannot use the preordered sets, as any two morphisms there are equal. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ and $f(p) = \{0, 1\}$. Then, the resulting BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ maps D_1 and D_2 to the projections $p_0 : \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $p_1 : \{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, respectively. These two functions are not equal in \mathbf{Set} . Therefore, D_1 and D_2 cannot be equal in \mathbf{NJ} .

Example 7.0.3. (*The identity problem*) We show that the propositions p and $p \wedge p$ are not identical in \mathbf{NJ} . Assume $p \wedge p \cong p$. Then, for any BCC \mathcal{C} and any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, the objects $F(p)$ and $F(p) \times F(p)$ must be isomorphic in \mathcal{C} . Therefore, to prove the claim, it is again enough to find suitable BCC and BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $F(p) \not\cong F(p) \times F(p)$. Again, we cannot use preordered sets here, as for them, the logical equivalence and the propositional identity are the same and p and $p \wedge p$ are logically equivalent. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ and $f(p) = \{0, 1\}$. Then, the resulting BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ maps $p \wedge p$ and p to $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$, respectively and $\{0, 1\} \times \{0, 1\}$ and $\{0, 1\}$ are clearly not isomorphic in \mathbf{Set} .

These examples demonstrate how BCC's are useful in providing counter-models for negative claims. However, even for positive claims, sometimes working with the shadow of the syntax can be helpful, as it might be easier to handle compared to the pure syntax. To be more precise, for any of the three mentioned problems, it is clear that if the positive claim (the existence of deductions, the equivalence of derivations, or the existence of isomorphisms) holds for all BCC's, it also holds for \mathbf{NJ} , simply because \mathbf{NJ} is itself a BCC. This completeness-style result is not as informative as one might expect. To make it more informative, one may want to restrict the family of all BCC's to a complete subfamily such

that working within that family is considerably easier than dealing with the raw syntax. This is the task of the following subsections, which will address the three problems discussed above.

7.1 The Existence Problem

For the existence problem, let us first define the suitable notion of completeness for a family of BCC's.

Definition 7.1.1. A family \mathfrak{F} of BCC's is called *existence-complete* for \mathbf{NJ} if for any two propositions A and B satisfying $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(A, B) = \emptyset$, there exists $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and a BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(F(A), F(B)) = \emptyset$. A BCC is called *existence-complete* for \mathbf{NJ} , if it is existence-complete as a singleton family. For \mathbf{NM} and \mathbf{NN} , a similar definition is in place, replacing the BC-structure by AB- or CC-structures, respectively.

Philosophical Comment 7.1.2. Reading any BCC \mathcal{C} a proof system and any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ as an interpretation of the pure deductions by the deductions living in \mathcal{C} , the existence-completeness simply states that if B is not intuitionistically deducible from A , then there is an interpretation F into a BCC in \mathfrak{F} , where $F(A)$ does not prove $F(B)$.

Remark 7.1.3. There is a stronger version of the existence-completeness of \mathcal{C} for \mathbf{NJ} that simply demands the existence of a weakly-full BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. This is stronger as it is the uniform version of the existence-completeness, where one BC-functor F works for all the formulas A and B .

As the existence problem is just about the existence of morphisms, it is reasonable to think that \mathcal{C} and $\text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$ have the same behavior in this respect. The next corollary provides a proof for this intuition.

Lemma 7.1.4. (i) *The existence of a weakly-full BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is equivalent to the existence of a weakly-full BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$.*

(ii) *The existence-completeness of a family \mathfrak{F} of BCC's for \mathbf{NJ} is equivalent to that of the family $\{\text{Po}(\mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{F}\}$.*

A similar claim also holds for \mathbf{NM} and \mathbf{NN} .

Proof. For (i), recall from Example 3.2.18 and Example 4.4.8 that the poset reflection of a BCC is a Heyting algebra and the canonical forgetful map $\pi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$ is a full and hence weakly-full BC-functor. As the composition of weakly-full functors is weakly-full, one direction of (i) is clear. For the other direction, let $G : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})$ be a weakly-full BC-functor. Then, as π is surjective on the objects, it is possible to find the objects $h(p_i)$ in \mathcal{C} such that $\pi h(p_i) = G(p_i)$. Then, by the freeness of \mathbf{NJ} , Theorem 4.5.1, there is a BC-functor $H : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $H(p_i) = h(p_i)$ and hence $\pi H(p_i) = G(p_i)$. We

claim that $\pi H \cong G$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \mathcal{C} \\
 & \nearrow H & \downarrow \pi \\
 \mathbf{NJ} & \xrightarrow{G} & \text{Po}(\mathcal{C})
 \end{array}$$

The reason simply is that $\pi H(p_i) = G(p_i)$, for any $i \geq 0$ and hence by the universality of the freeness of \mathbf{NJ} , the two functor πH and G must be isomorphic. Using this fact, it is easy to show that H is weakly-full, because if $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(A, B) = \emptyset$, then $\text{Hom}_{\text{Po}(\mathcal{C})}(G(A), G(B)) = \emptyset$, as G is weakly-full. As $G(A) \cong \pi H(A)$ and $G(B) \cong \pi H(B)$, we have $\text{Hom}_{\text{Po}(\mathcal{C})}(\pi H(A), \pi H(B)) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(H(A), H(B)) = \emptyset$ which completes the proof of weakly-fullness of H . The proof for (ii) is similar. \square

The immediate consequence of Lemma 7.1.4 is the existence-completeness of one Heyting algebra for \mathbf{NJ} :

Theorem 7.1.5. (Algebraic Completeness) *The Heyting algebra $\text{Po}(\mathbf{NJ})$ and hence the family of all Heyting algebras are existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} .*

Proof. As the identity functor $id : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{NJ}$ is weakly-full, by Lemma 7.1.4, we can prove the claim. \square

To push the completeness further, one may want to restrict the family of Heyting algebra to Heyting algebras of some specific form. The first immediate restriction is to Heyting algebras in the form $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$, where (P, \leq) is a poset. To prove, it is enough to use Theorem 5.1.1 to embed the Heyting algebra \mathcal{H} into $\mathbf{2}^{[\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{2}]}$, where $[\mathcal{H}, \mathbf{2}]$ is the poset of all BC-functors from \mathcal{H} to $\mathbf{2}$:

Theorem 7.1.6. (Kripke Completeness)

- (i) *There is a poset (P, \leq) (i.e., $[\text{Po}(\mathbf{NJ}), \mathbf{2}]$) and a weakly-full BC-functor $\mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$. Therefore, the poset $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$ and consequently the family of all Alexandrov spaces is existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} .*
- (ii) *Let $FinTree$ be the family of all Heyting algebras in the form $\mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$, where (T, \leq) is a finite rooted tree. Then, $FinTree$ is existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} .*

Proof. The proof of (i) is explained above. For (ii), a technique called *filtration* is required to show that for given formulas A and B , finite posets and then finite rooted trees are sufficient for the existence-completeness. We will not explain the details here. The reader must consult [16]. \square

Using finite rooted trees, one can strengthen the existence-completeness even further. Recall that a space X is called *metrizable* if there is a metric on X inducing its topology. It is called *dense-in-itself* if $Cl(X - \{x\}) = X$, for any $x \in X$. The spaces \mathbb{Q} , \mathbb{R} and $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, where $\{0, 1\}$ is the discrete space with two elements are all dense-in-themselves.

Theorem 7.1.7. (McKinsey-Tarski [62, 70]) *Let X be a dense-in-itself metrizable space. Then, $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is existence-complete for **NJ**.*

Proof. To prove, it is enough to show that for any finite rooted tree (T, \leq) , there is a weakly-full BC-functor from $\mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$ into $\mathcal{O}(X)$. For that purpose and using Example 4.4.6, it is enough to provide an open surjection $f : X \rightarrow T$, where T is equipped with the upset topology. Note that the surjectivity of f implies that $f^{-1} : \mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is weakly-full. This is not an easy task and one can find its proof in [9]. \square

Corollary 7.1.8. *Each of the Heyting algebras $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{Q})$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$ are existence-complete for **NJ**.*

Of course, any existence-complete family for **NJ** can also be used as an existence-complete family for **NM** and **NN**. The reason is the well-known conservativity of **NJ** over **NM** and **NN**. However, there are also some interesting existence-completeness results specific to the fragments. We present one of these results as we will need it in the next subsection.

Theorem 7.1.9. ([33]) *There is a weakly-full AB-functor from **NM** to $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$, where $|$ is the divisibility order on \mathbb{N} . Therefore, $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$ is existence-complete for **NM**.*

Proof. The first part of the proof is similar to what we explained for Heyting algebras. First, notice that $\text{Po}(\mathbf{NM})$ is an almost Heyting algebra and it is enough to provide a weakly-full AB-functor from $\text{Po}(\mathbf{NM})$ to $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$. For that purpose, we first embed $\text{Po}(\mathbf{NM})$ into $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$, where (P, \leq) is the poset $[\text{Po}(\mathbf{NM}), \mathbf{2}]$ of all AB-functors ordered by the pointwise order. One crucial point here is that the poset (P, \leq) has a terminal object, which simply is the constant map 1. Notice that this map is an AB-functor but not a BC-functor, as it does not preserve the initial element 0. Having this terminal element is the main reason to deviate from **NJ** and Heyting algebras. Then, there is a technical step changing (P, \leq) into a countable poset again with a terminal element [33]. Finally, to provide a weakly-full AB-functor from $\mathbf{2}^{(P, \leq)}$ to $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$, using Example 4.4.7, it is enough to provide a surjective p-morphism from $(\mathbb{N}, |)$ to (P, \leq) . This is the main part of the proof and can be found in [33]. \square

Note that the poset $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$ or even more generally, the poset $\mathbf{2}^{(Q, \leq)}$, where (Q, \leq) is a poset with the top element t is not existence-complete for **NJ**. The reason is that the formula $\neg p \vee \neg \neg p$ is not provable in intuitionistic logic, i.e., there is no map in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(\top, \neg p \vee \neg \neg p)$, while for any order-preserving map $f : (Q, \leq) \rightarrow \mathbf{2}$ in $\mathbf{2}^{(Q, \leq)}$, we have $\neg f \vee \neg \neg f = 1$. The reason for the latter is that either $\neg f = 0$ or $\neg f = 1$. To prove, assume $(\neg f)(q) = 1$ and $(\neg f)(r) = 0$, for some $q, r \in Q$. Then, as $q \leq t$, we have $(\neg f)(t) = 1$. However, $(\neg f)(r) = 0$ means that there is $s \geq r$ such that $f(s) = 1$. Hence, $f(t) = 1$ which is impossible as $(\neg f)(t) = 1$.

7.1.1 BHK Existence-completeness

One interesting family whose existence-completeness is worth investigating is the family of categories of the form \mathbf{Set}^C . The reason for this interest is their role in formalizing the BHK interpretation. For that purpose, and thanks to Lemma 7.1.4, it is enough to compute the poset reflection of \mathbf{Set}^C and check if a family of these posets is existence-complete or not. To start, it is natural to consider the canonical choice among all categories of variable sets, i.e., the category of sets itself. However, this category is not existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} as it captures the whole classical logic.

Theorem 7.1.10. $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}) \cong \mathbf{2}$. *Therefore, for any two propositions A and B , $\text{CPC} \vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}(F(A), F(B)) \neq \emptyset$, for any weakly-full BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.*

Proof. First, note that in the preorder reflection of \mathbf{Set} , all non-empty sets are equivalent to each other as there is a function between any two non-empty sets. As the empty set has a function into any set and there is no function from a non-empty set into the empty set, the poset reflection will be the poset $\mathbf{2}$, where 0 represents the class of the empty set and 1 is the class of all non-empty sets. The second part is an easy consequence of the first part. \square

The first non-trivial family to investigate is the family of variable sets over trees.

Theorem 7.1.11. *For any tree (T, \leq) , we have $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^{(T, \leq)}) \cong \mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$. Therefore, the family of BCC's in the form $\mathbf{Set}^{(T, \leq)}$, where (T, \leq) is a finite rooted tree is existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} .*

Proof. First, for any object E of $\mathbf{Set}^{(T, \leq)}$, define $C(E) = \{u \in T \mid E(u) \neq \emptyset\}$ as a subset of T . It is easy to see that $C(E)$ is actually an upset and hence lives in $\mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$. Moreover, it is clear that if there is a map $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$, then $C(E) \subseteq C(F)$. Therefore, C induces an order-preserving map from $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^{(T, \leq)})$ to $\mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$. We claim that this map is an isomorphism. First, it is clear that it is surjective, as for any upset U of (T, \leq) , it is enough to define $E_U(u) = \{*\}$ if $u \in U$ and otherwise $E_U(u) = \emptyset$ and define $E(i_{uv})$ as the only possible map from $E_U(u)$ to $E_U(v)$, where $i_{uv} : u \rightarrow v$ is the unique map in the poset (T, \leq) from u to v . This map exists, as if $u \leq v$, either $u \notin U$ which implies $E_U(u) = \emptyset$ or $u \in U$ which implies $v \in U$ and hence $E_U(u) = E_U(v) = \{*\}$. It is also easy to check that $E_U : (T, \leq) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a functor and $C(E) = U$.

Secondly, $C : \text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^{(T, \leq)}) \rightarrow \mathbf{2}^{(T, \leq)}$ is an order-embedding. To prove, assume that $C([E]) \subseteq C([F])$. We must construct a map $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$. As $C([E]) \subseteq C([F])$, either $F(u)$ is non-empty or $E(u) = F(u) = \emptyset$, for any $u \in T$. Define $M \subseteq T$ as the set of all minimal elements in T such that $F(u) \neq \emptyset$. For any $m \in M$, choose one $y_m \in F(m)$ in an arbitrary fashion. We can extend the assignment y to all u 's for which $F(u) \neq \emptyset$, because for such u , there is a unique $m_u \in M$ such that $m_u \leq u$. The reason simply is that the segment below u is well-ordered and hence has the least element in M . Define y_u as $F(i_{m_u u})(y_{m_u})$.

It is easy to see that if $u \leq v$ and $F(u)$ and $F(v)$ are non-empty, then $m_u = m_v$ and $F(i_{uv})(y_u) = y_v$. Now, define $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$ in the following way. For any $u \in T$, if $F(u) = \emptyset$, then $E(u) = \emptyset$, and hence we can define $\alpha_u : E(u) \rightarrow F(u)$ as the unique function over the empty set. If $F(u) \neq \emptyset$, then define α_u as the constant function, mapping everything to y_u . Checking that $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$ is a natural transformation is straightforward. \square

The next simple case whose poset reflection is easy to compute is the category \mathbf{Set}^G , where G is a group.

Theorem 7.1.12. *Let G be a group and $\text{Sub}(G)$ be the preordered set of its subgroups with the ordering $K \leq H$ defined by the existence of a $g \in G$ such that $g^{-1}Kg \subseteq H$. Then, $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G) = \mathbf{2}^{\text{Sub}(G)^{op}}$.*

Proof. To any object E in \mathbf{Set}^G , assign a subset of $\text{Sub}(G)$ by $\delta(E) = \{H \leq G \mid \exists x \in E(*) \forall h \in H, E(h)(x) = x\}$. Notice that $\delta(E)$ is downward-closed, because if $g^{-1}Kg \subseteq H$ and $H \in \delta(E)$, then there exists $x \in E(*)$ such that $E(h)(x) = x$, for any $h \in H$. Therefore, $E(g^{-1}kg)(x) = x$, for any $k \in K$ which implies that $E(k)(E(g)(x)) = E(g)(x)$. Hence, $K \in \delta(E)$. Now, we show that if there is a natural transformation $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$, then $\delta(E) \subseteq \delta(F)$. Assume that $H \in \delta(E)$. Hence, there exists $x \in E(*)$ such that $E(h)(x) = x$, for any $h \in H$. As α is a natural transformation, we have $F(h)(\alpha_*(x)) = \alpha_*(E(h)(x)) = \alpha_*(x)$. Therefore, $H \in \delta(F)$ and hence $\delta(E) \subseteq \delta(F)$. Using this observation, it is clear that δ induces a map from $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G)$ to $\mathbf{2}^{\text{Sub}(G)^{op}}$. We claim that this map is an isomorphism.

To prove that it is an order-embedding, assume that $\delta(E) \subseteq \delta(F)$. We must construct a natural transformation $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$. Define the relation \sim on the set $E(*)$ by $x \sim y$, if there is $g \in G$ such that $E(g)(x) = y$. It is easy to use the fact that G is a group and E is a functor to prove that the relation \sim is an equivalence relation. Take the partition of $E(*)$ into the equivalence classes of \sim . To define $\alpha_* : E(*) \rightarrow F(*)$, we define α_* on any equivalence class, separately. Take a class O and pick an arbitrary element $x_O \in O$. Define $S_{x_O} = \{g \in G \mid E(g)(x_O) = x_O\}$. It is clear that $S_{x_O} \in \delta(E)$ and hence in $\delta(F)$. Therefore, there exists $y \in F(*)$ such that for any $g \in S_{x_O}$, we have $F(g)(y) = y$. This means that if $E(g)(x_O) = x_O$ then $F(g)(y) = y$, for any $g \in G$. Define $\alpha_*(x_O) = y$ and for any $z \in O$, if $z = E(g)(x_O)$, for some $g \in G$, define $\alpha_*(z) = F(g)(y)$. Note that the definition of $\alpha_*(z)$ is independent of the choice of g , because if $E(g)(x_O) = E(h)(x_O) = z$, then $E(g^{-1}h)(x_O) = x_O$ and hence $F(g^{-1}h)(y) = y$ which implies $F(g)(y) = F(h)(y)$. This completes the definition of α_* on O , but as O is an arbitrary class, we have a function $\alpha_* : E(*) \rightarrow F(*)$. To show that $\alpha : E \rightarrow F$ is a natural transformation, one must prove $F(g)(\alpha_*(z)) = \alpha_*(E(g)(z))$, for any $g \in G$ and any $z \in E(*)$. Assume that $z \in O$, for some class O and $z = E(h)(x_O)$. Notice that $E(g)(z) = E(g)E(h)(x_O) = E(gh)(x_O)$. Then, by definition, $\alpha_*(z) = F(h)(x_O)$. Hence, $F(g)(\alpha_*(z)) = F(g)(F(h)(x_O)) = F(gh)(x_O)$. The last is equal to $\alpha_*(E(g)(z))$, because $E(g)(z) = E(gh)(x_O)$ and $E(g)(z)$ belongs to the class O .

Finally, we have to show that δ is surjective. For any downward-closed set $I \subseteq \text{Sub}(G)$, define $E_I(*) = \Sigma_{H \in I} G/H$ and $E(g)(H, [r]_H) = (H, [gr]_H)$. Then, it is easy to see that $E_I : G \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is actually a functor. Moreover, we have $\delta(E_I) = I$. The reason is that for any subgroup K , we have $K \in \delta(E_I)$ iff there is $H \in I$ and $r \in G$ such that for any $k \in K$, we have $[r]_H = [kr]_H$. This is simply equivalent to the existence of $H \in I$ such that $K \leq H$. As I is down-ward closed, the last is equivalent to $K \in I$. \square

Remark 7.1.13. Notice that if the group G is abelian, then the preorder \leq in Theorem 7.1.12 becomes the usual inclusion.

Corollary 7.1.14. ([33]) $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}) \cong \mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$, where $|$ is the divisibility relation.

Proof. For $G = (\mathbb{Z}, +)$, the poset $\text{Sub}(G)$ is just $(\mathbb{N}, |)^{op}$, as the subgroups of G are of the form $n\mathbb{Z}$ and $m\mathbb{Z} \subseteq n\mathbb{Z}$ iff $n | m$. \square

Now, having $\text{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G)$ computed, we can combine it with Theorem 7.1.9 to prove some existence-completeness results for \mathbf{NM} . For that purpose, we must connect $\text{Sub}(G)^{op}$ to $(\mathbb{N}, |)$. Let G be a group. An element $x \in G$ is called of an *infinite non-commutative order* if x^m is not in the subgroup generated by $\{g^{-1}x^n g \mid g \in G\}$, for any $n > m \geq 0$. If G is abelian, then x is of infinite non-commutative order iff $x^n \neq e$, for any $n > 0$.

Lemma 7.1.15. *If G has an element of an infinite non-commutative order, then there exists a surjective p -morphism $f : \text{Sub}(G)^{op} \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}, |)$.*

Proof. Let x be an element of an infinite non-commutative order. For any subgroup H , if there is a positive number n such that $\{g^{-1}x^n g \mid g \in G\} \subseteq H$, define $f(H)$ as the least of such n 's and if there is no n with that property, define $f(H) = 0$. It is easy to prove that for any such n , we have $f(H) | n$. We first show that f is order-preserving. Let $H \leq K$. If $f(H) = 0$, we have $f(K) | f(H)$. Therefore, w.l.o.g., we can assume that $f(H) \neq 0$. As $H \leq K$, there is some $g \in G$ such that $g^{-1}Hg \subseteq K$. We claim that $r^{-1}x^{f(H)}r \in K$, for any $r \in G$. To prove, set $s = rg^{-1}$. Then, $r^{-1}x^{f(H)}r = g^{-1}s^{-1}x^{f(H)}sg$. By definition of $f(H)$, we have $s^{-1}x^{f(H)}s \in H$. Therefore, $r^{-1}x^{f(H)}r \in K$. As $r \in G$ is arbitrary, we have $f(K) | f(H)$. To prove that f is surjective, for any $n \geq 0$, define H_n as the subgroup generated by $\{g^{-1}x^n g \mid g \in G\}$. Then, as x is of an infinite non-commutative order, then $f(H_n) = n$. Finally, to prove that f is a p -morphism, assume that $f(H) | m$, for some number $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider H_m . As $f(H_m) = m$, it is enough to prove that $H_m \leq H$. For any $g \in G$, as $g^{-1}x^{f(H)}g \in H$ and $f(H) | m$, we also have $g^{-1}x^m g \in H$, for any $g \in G$. Therefore, $H_m \subseteq H$ and hence $H_m \leq H$. \square

Theorem 7.1.16. *Let G be a group that has an element of an infinite non-commutative order. Then, there exists a weakly-full AB-functor $F : \mathbf{NM} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^G$. Therefore, \mathbf{Set}^G is existence-complete for \mathbf{NM} .*

Proof. By Lemma 7.1.4, it is enough to prove the existence of a weakly-full AB-functor from \mathbf{NM} to $\mathbf{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G)$. By Theorem 7.1.12, we know that $\mathbf{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G)$ is $\mathbf{2}^{Sub(G)^{op}}$ and by Lemma 7.1.15, there is a surjective p-morphism from $Sub(G)^{op}$ to $(\mathbb{N}, |)$ which implies the existence of a weakly-full AB-functor from $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$ to $\mathbf{2}^{Sub(G)^{op}}$. Therefore, it is just enough to find a weakly-full AB-functor from \mathbf{NM} to $\mathbf{2}^{(\mathbb{N}, |)}$ which is provided by Theorem 7.1.9. \square

Remark 7.1.17. One may wonder if we can extend Theorem 7.1.16 to cover the whole \mathbf{NJ} . The answer is negative. As we observed before, a poset in the form $\mathbf{2}^{(Q, \leq)}$ where (Q, \leq) has a top element cannot be existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} . As $\mathbf{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^G)$ is $\mathbf{2}^{Sub(G)^{op}}$ and $Sub(G)^{op}$ has the trivial subgroup $\{e\}$ as its top element, we cannot expect \mathbf{Set}^G to be existence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} .

Corollary 7.1.18. (*Läuchli realizability for MPC [49, 33]*) *There exists a weakly-full AB-functor $F : \mathbf{NM} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is existence-complete for \mathbf{NM} .*

Remark 7.1.19. Läuchli realizability [49] was the first BHK style complete semantics for minimal logic. It is also possible to extend it to intuitionistic logic using a trick to interpret \perp [33]. The modern categorical version we present here is developed and elegantly presented in [33].

So far, we have computed the poset reflection of some categories of the form $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$. Let us conclude this subsection by a remark that such computation is not always an easy task. For instance, there are small categories \mathcal{C} such that the poset reflection of $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is not even a set. To see such a situation, let X and Y be two sets and $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ be two functions:

$$X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xrightarrow{g} \end{array} Y$$

Then, define the category $\mathcal{C}_{f,g:X \rightarrow Y}$ in the following manner. For the objects, use the elements in the disjoint union $X + Y = \{(0, x) \mid x \in X\} \cup \{(1, y) \mid y \in Y\}$ of X and Y and for the maps, define $\mathbf{Mor}(\mathcal{C}_{f,g:X \rightarrow Y})$ as the union of the set of identity maps and the set

$$\{f_x : (0, x) \rightarrow (1, y) \mid f(x) = y\} \cup \{g_x : (0, x) \rightarrow (1, y) \mid g(x) = y\}$$

where for any pair (x, y) if $f(x) = y$ (resp. $g(x) = y$), there is a map $f_x : (0, x) \rightarrow (1, y)$ (resp. $g_x : (0, x) \rightarrow (1, y)$). As no non-trivial composition is possible with our maps, we define the composition in a trivial way. In [51], Lawvere claimed that there are sets X and Y and maps $f, g : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\mathbf{Po}(\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}_{f,g:X \rightarrow Y}})$ is not even a set, see [63].

7.2 The Equivalence Problem

For the equivalence problem, we only focus on one BCC rather than a family of BCC's. Here is the formal definition of the completeness of a BCC.

Definition 7.2.1. A BCC \mathcal{C} is called *equivalence-complete* for \mathbf{NJ} , when for any two maps $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbf{NJ} , if $F(f) = F(g)$, for any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, then $f = g$. For \mathbf{NM} and \mathbf{NN} , a similar definition is in place, replacing the BC-structure by the AB- or CC-structures, respectively.

Remark 7.2.2. There is also a stronger version of the equivalence-completeness of \mathcal{C} for \mathbf{NJ} that simply demands the existence of a faithful BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. In fact, it is a uniform version of the equivalence-completeness, as we have just one BC-functor working for all formulas A and B .

7.2.1 Equivalence-completeness for \mathbf{NN}

Historically, the equivalence problem started with and still focused on the \mathbf{NN} case and the CC-structure. The reason is the close connection this setting has with the simply typed lambda calculus as a very basic programming language. The first two important equivalence-completeness results are the following:

Theorem 7.2.3. ([90]) *Any CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that maps the atoms of \mathcal{L}_p to infinite sets is faithful. Therefore, \mathbf{Set} is equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} .*

Theorem 7.2.4. ([80]) *\mathbf{FinSet} is equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} .*

The equivalence-completeness of \mathbf{FinSet} is crucial as it helps to prove the decidability of the equivalence problem for \mathbf{NN} .

Corollary 7.2.5. ([80]) *The equivalence problem for \mathbf{NN} is decidable.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that the equivalence problem and its complement are both recursively enumerable. It is recursively enumerable as if two proofs are equal, *there exists* a sequence of basic $\beta\eta$ -equalities transforming one to the other. For the complement, if two proofs are not equal, then by Theorem 7.2.4, *there is* an assignment of finite sets to the atoms in the proofs such that the resulting functions are not equal. \square

It is worth mentioning that the two versions of the equivalence-completeness are not equivalent. For instance, although \mathbf{FinSet} is equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} , there is no faithful CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$. As explained in [79], the reason is the existence of infinitely many maps in $\mathbf{Hom}_{\mathbf{NN}}((p \rightarrow p) \wedge p, p)$ encoding the natural numbers. To explain, for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the derivation D_n of p from $(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p$, inductively by:

$$D_0: \frac{(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p}{p} \wedge_2 E \qquad D_{n+1}: \frac{\frac{(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p}{p \rightarrow p} \wedge_1 E \qquad \frac{(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p}{p} \wedge_2 E}{p} \rightarrow E$$

These proofs form an infinite family $\{D_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of distinct derivations. To see why, it is enough to show that a CC-functor maps them to different maps. Using the freeness of \mathbf{NN} , define $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ by mapping p to the set \mathbb{N} . Then, F maps D_n to the function $f_n : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $f_n(\alpha, m) = \alpha^n(m)$, where

α^n means iterating α for n many times. Substituting α as the successor function s and setting $m = 0$, it is clear that $f_n(s, 0) = n$, which implies that all f_n 's are distinct.

In the rest of this subsection, we will present a necessary and sufficient condition for a CCC to be equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} in any of the two mentioned senses. First, for the weaker version, it is clear that if \mathcal{C} is a preordered set, then it cannot be complete for \mathbf{NN} , as there are at least two non-equal projection morphisms in $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(p \wedge p, p)$, as discussed in Example 7.0.2. The good news is that this necessary condition is actually sufficient.

Theorem 7.2.6. (Simpson [79]) *For any CCC \mathcal{C} , it is equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} iff it is not a preordered set.*

Philosophical Comment 7.2.7. By Theorem 7.2.6, if \mathcal{C} is not equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NN} , then it must be a preordered set. Reading any CCC as a proof system, it simply means that if two non-equivalent derivations in \mathbf{NN} are considered as equal in \mathcal{C} , then the whole notion of deduction in \mathcal{C} collapses to the mere deductibility. In other words, it is impossible to add more equalities than what is governed by the $\beta\eta$ -equivalences if we want to keep the notion of deductibility non-trivial. In this sense, the deduction equivalence of \mathbf{NN} is optimal [27].

For the other version of the equivalence-completeness for \mathbf{NN} , let us first explain a necessary condition [79]. A map $f : A \rightarrow A$ in a CCC \mathcal{C} is called of an *infinite order* if $f^m \neq f^n$, for any $m \neq n$, where f^k means the result of k many compositions of f with itself. We show that the existence of a map $f : A \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} with an infinite order is a necessary condition, if we want a faithful functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. To see why, it is enough to find a map in \mathbf{NN} with an infinite order. For that purpose, consider the following derivation D from $[(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p] \rightarrow p$ to itself:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{[(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p]_1}{p \rightarrow p} \quad \frac{\frac{[(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p]_1}{p} \quad \frac{[(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p]_1}{p \rightarrow p}}{p}}{(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p}}{[(p \rightarrow p) \wedge p] \rightarrow p} \rightarrow I_1$$

This derivation is of an infinite order in \mathbf{NN} . To see why, it is enough to find a CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ such that $F(D^m) \neq F(D^n)$, for any $m \neq n$. For that purpose, use the freeness of \mathbf{NN} and find a CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ such that $F(p) = \mathbb{N}$. Then, one can see that $F(D)$ is the function $G : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$ defined by $G(\alpha) = \lambda f k. \alpha(f, f(k))$. Computing G^n , we see that $G^n(\alpha) = \lambda f k. \alpha(f, f^n(k))$ and hence $G^n(p_1) = \lambda f k. f^n(k)$. Therefore, $G^n(p_1)$'s are distinct functions, for different n 's which means that $G^n \neq G^m$, if $m \neq n$.

The following theorem shows that this necessary condition is actually sufficient:

Theorem 7.2.8. (Simpson [79]) For any CCC \mathcal{C} , there exists a faithful CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ iff \mathcal{C} contains an endomorphism of an infinite order.

7.2.2 Equivalence-completeness for **NJ**

The structure of the proofs in **NJ** is usually more complex than what is present in **NN**. The reason simply is the rather complex behavior of the disjunction elimination rule. However, recently, the **NJ** counterpart of Theorem 7.2.4 was also proved:

Theorem 7.2.9. (Scherer [72, 71]) **FinSet** is equivalence-complete for **NJ**.

Corollary 7.2.10. The equivalence problem for **NJ** is decidable.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 7.2.5. □

Our final task in this subsection is to generalize Theorem 7.2.9 from **FinSet** to any non-preorder BCC. The basic idea behind the following line of argument is attributed to Alex Simpson [77]. First, notice that using the argument we gave for **NN**, it is clear that if a BCC is equivalence-complete for **NJ**, then it cannot be a preordered set. For sufficiency, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 7.2.11. Let \mathcal{C} be a BCC. For any objects A, B and C , if $i_0 : A \rightarrow A+B$ and $i_1 : B \rightarrow A+B$ are the injections, then:

- (i) i_0 is monic, i.e., for any maps $f, g : C \rightarrow A$ if $i_0 f = i_0 g : C \rightarrow A+B$, then $f = g$.
- (ii) i_1 is monic, i.e., for any maps $f, g : C \rightarrow B$ if $i_1 f = i_1 g : C \rightarrow A+B$, then $f = g$.
- (iii) If \mathcal{C} is not a preordered set, then for any maps $f : 1 \rightarrow A$ and $g : 1 \rightarrow B$, the maps $i_0 f, i_1 g : 1 \rightarrow A+B$ are distinct.

Proof. For (i), consider the map $i_0 \times id_A : A \times A \rightarrow (A+B) \times A$. First, we intend to define a map $j : (A+B) \times A \rightarrow A \times A$ such that $j \circ (i_0 \times id_A) = id_{A \times A}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \times A & \xrightarrow{i_0 \times id_A} & (A+B) \times A \\
 & \searrow id_{A \times A} & \downarrow j \\
 & & A \times A
 \end{array}$$

For that purpose, define j' as the following canonical map:

$$j' = (\lambda_A id_{A \times A}, \lambda_A \langle p_1, p_1 \rangle) : A+B \rightarrow [A, A \times A]$$

and set $j = \text{ev}\langle j' \times \text{id}_A \rangle : (A + B) \times A \rightarrow A \times A$. It is easy to see that $j \circ (i_0 \times \text{id}_A) = \text{id}_{A \times A}$. Now, let $f, g : C \rightarrow A$ satisfy $i_0 f = i_0 g$. Then,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 C & \xrightarrow{\langle f, f \rangle} & A \times A & \xrightarrow{i_0 \times \text{id}_A} & (A + B) \times A \\
 & \xrightarrow{\langle g, f \rangle} & & & \downarrow j \\
 & & & \searrow \text{id}_{A \times A} & A \times A
 \end{array}$$

the two maps of the first row are equal. Hence, $\langle f, f \rangle = \langle g, f \rangle$ which implies $f = g$. The proof for (ii) is similar to (i).

For (iii), assume $i_0 f = i_1 g : 1 \rightarrow A + B$, for some $f : 1 \rightarrow A$ and $g : 1 \rightarrow B$. As \mathcal{C} is not a preordered set, there are distinct morphisms $k, l : E \rightarrow F$ in \mathcal{C} . Therefore, the two maps $\lambda_E k, \lambda_E l : 1 \rightarrow [E, F]$ are distinct. Now, consider the maps $\lambda_E k! : A \rightarrow [E, F]$ and $\lambda_E l! : B \rightarrow [E, F]$ and note that $\lambda_E k! f = \lambda_E k$ and $\lambda_E l! g = \lambda_E l$. Using the universal property for the coproduct $A + B$, we have a map $h : A + B \rightarrow [E, F]$ such that $h \circ i_0 = \lambda_E k!$ and $h \circ i_1 = \lambda_E l!$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & [E, F] & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & & & \lambda_E k! & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & & & h & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & & & \lambda_E l! & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & & & \lambda_E l & & \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \\
 1 & \xrightarrow{f} & A & \xrightarrow{i_0} & A + B & \xleftarrow{i_1} & B \xleftarrow{g} 1
 \end{array}$$

As $i_0 f = i_1 g$, we have $\lambda_E k = h i_0 f = h i_1 g = \lambda_E l$ which is a contradiction. \square

Corollary 7.2.12. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-preorder BCC. Then, the maps $i_j : 1 \rightarrow \sum_{j=0}^n 1$ are distinct for different j 's.*

Proof. The proof is by an induction on n . For $n = 1$, by part (iii) of Lemma 7.2.11, we have $i_0 \neq i_1$. To prove the claim for $n + 1$, if $i_j = i_k$, for some $j, k \leq n$, we can use part (ii) of Lemma 7.2.11 to reduce the claim to the induction hypothesis. If $j \leq n$ and $k = n + 1$, we can use part (iii) of Lemma 7.2.11 to reach a contradiction. \square

Lemma 7.2.13. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-preorder BCC. Then, there is a faithful BC-functor $F : \mathbf{FinSet} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. For any finite set A , define $F(A)$ as $\sum_{a \in A} 1$ and for any function $f : A \rightarrow B$ define $F(f) : \sum_{a \in A} 1 \rightarrow \sum_{b \in B} 1$ by the canonical map $(i_{f(a)})_{a \in A}$. It is easy to prove that F is a BC-functor. For faithfulness, assume that $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ are two maps such that $F(f) = F(g)$. Then, using the definition of $F(f)$ and $F(g)$, we have $i_{f(a)} = i_{g(a)} : 1 \rightarrow \sum_{b \in B} 1$, for any $a \in A$. As \mathcal{C} is not a preordered set, by Corollary 7.2.12, we have $f(a) = g(a)$ and as $a \in A$ is arbitrary, $f = g$. \square

Corollary 7.2.14. *A BCC \mathcal{C} is equivalence-complete for \mathbf{NJ} iff it is not a preordered set.*

Proof. One direction is explained before. For the other, if $f \neq g : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbf{NJ} , by Theorem 7.2.9, there is a BC-functor $G : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$ such that $G(f) \neq G(g)$. Combined with the BC-functor $F : \mathbf{FinSet} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ of Lemma 7.2.13, we reach the BC-functor $FG : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and as F is faithful, we have $FG(f) \neq FG(g)$. This completes the proof of the equivalence-completeness of \mathcal{C} for \mathbf{NJ} . \square

Philosophical Comment 7.2.15. Similar to Philosophical Note 7.2.7, Corollary 7.2.14 implies that it is impossible to add more equalities than what is governed by the $\beta\eta$ -equivalences to the \mathbf{NJ} , if we want to keep the deductibility non-trivial. In this sense, the deduction equivalence of \mathbf{NJ} is optimal.

7.3 The Identity Problem

In this subsection, we will focus on the last problem among the three we introduced in Section 1, i.e., the propositional identity problem. To identify all the pairs of isomorphic propositions in a given fragment, we have two approaches to follow. Either we ask syntactically for some basic isomorphisms from which all the other isomorphisms can be derived or we can go for a semantical approach of having a concrete complete category \mathcal{C} such that two propositions are isomorphic iff all of their images in \mathcal{C} are isomorphic. We will explain both of these approaches later. But, first, we need a diversion into the arithmetical world.

7.3.1 Tarski's High School Algebra Problem

Consider the first-order language $\{\times, +, (-)^{(-)}, 1\}$ for arithmetic and the equations in Table 3. All these equations clearly hold in the *standard model*, i.e., the

$1 \times x = x$	$x \times y = y \times x$	$x \times (y \times z) = (x \times y) \times z$
$x^1 = x$	$x^{(y \times z)} = (x^y)^z$	$1^x = 1$
$(x \times y)^z = x^z \times y^z$	$x + y = y + x$	$x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z$
$x \times (y + z) = x \times y + x \times z$	$x^{(y+z)} = x^y \times x^z$	

Table 3: High School Identities

set of natural numbers equipped with the usual addition, multiplication, and exponentiation functions and the number 1 as its designated constant. In [22], Tarski asked if the equalities in Table 3 axiomatize all equalities in the language $\{\times, +, (-)^{(-)}, 1\}$ that hold over the set of positive natural numbers and conjectured that the answer is positive. For some fragments of the language, we know that this is really the case. For instance, for the fragment $\{1, \times, (-)^{(-)}\}$, the $+$ -free equations in Table 3 axiomatize all the valid equations over the fragment. However, later Wilkie [91] proved that for the full language, the answer

is negative. Consider the following equation called Wilkie's equation:

$$(A^x + B^x)^y \times (C^y + D^y)^x = (A^y + B^y)^x \times (C^x + D^x)^y,$$

where $A = 1 + x$, $B = 1 + x + x^2$, $C = 1 + x^3$ and $D = 1 + x^2 + x^4$. Wilkie's equation is valid in the standard model. To see why, it is enough to note that we have the identity $AD = BC$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} A^{xy}[(A^x + B^x)^y \times (C^y + D^y)^x] &= (A^x + B^x)^y \times ((AC)^y + (AD)^y)^x = \\ (A^x + B^x)^y \times ((AC)^y + (BC)^y)^x &= C^{xy}[(A^x + B^x)^y \times (A^y + B^y)^x]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A^{xy}[(A^y + B^y)^x \times (C^x + D^x)^y] &= (A^y + B^y)^x \times ((AC)^x + (AD)^x)^y = \\ (A^y + B^y)^x \times ((AC)^x + (BC)^x)^y &= C^{xy}[(A^y + B^y)^x \times (A^x + B^x)^y]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$A^{xy}[(A^x + B^x)^y \times (C^y + D^y)^x] = A^{xy}[(A^y + B^y)^x \times (C^x + D^x)^y].$$

As A is always positive, we reach the equality we wanted to prove by canceling out the term A^{xy} . Notice that in all the steps of this proof except the canceling out part, we only used the high school algebra identities in Table 3. Using a complex proof-theoretic argument, Wilkie [91] showed that this equation is not provable by the axioms in Table 3. Later Gurevič [32] provided a finite counter-model to reprove this unprovability. He also showed that the theory of all valid equalities is not finitely axiomatizable. More precisely, he considered the equation:

$$(A^x + B_n^x)^{2^x} \times (C_n^{2^x} + D_n^{2^x})^x = (A^{2^x} + B_n^{2^x})^x \times (C_n^x + D_n^x)^{2^x},$$

where $A = 1 + x$, $B_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x^i$, $C_n = 1 + x^n$ and $D_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x^{2^i}$ and $n \geq 3$ is an odd number. Using the fact that $AD_n = B_n C_n$, one can see that the equation is valid in the standard model. Then, Gurevič showed that for any finite set of axioms, there exists an odd $n \geq 3$ such that the corresponding equation is not provable from the axioms. Although the theory of all valid equations is not finitely axiomatizable, it is known that it is decidable [58, 32].

7.3.2 The Propositional Identity

In this subsection, we will address the propositional identity problem for the systems **NN**, **NM** and **NJ**. For **NN**, using the positive solution for Tarski's high school algebra problem for the $+$ -free fragment, one can prove:

Theorem 7.3.1. *The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \cong B$ is provable from the theory $Th_{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow}$ presented in Table 4.

(ii) $A \cong B$ as two objects in \mathbf{NN} .

(iii) $F(A) \cong F(B)$, for any CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$.

Proof. Proving (ii) from (i) is a consequence of the fact that all the isomorphisms in Table 4 hold in any CCC including \mathbf{NN} . Proving (iii) from (ii) is also easy, as functors respect isomorphisms. To prove (i) from (iii), first rewrite the formulas A and B as terms t_A and t_B in the language $\{\times, (-)^{(-)}, 1\}$ replacing \top, \wedge and \rightarrow with $1, \times$ and $(-)^{(-)}$, respectively. Now, as the relation \cong over \mathbf{FinSet} is just the equality between the cardinals of the finite sets, (iii) implies the validity of $t_A = t_B$ in the standard model. Hence, $t_A = t_B$ is provable from the $+$ -free high school algebra identities that are nothing but the axioms of $Th_{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow}$ in disguise. \square

$\top \wedge A \cong A$	$A \wedge B \cong B \wedge A$
$A \wedge (B \wedge C) \cong (A \wedge B) \wedge C$	$\top \rightarrow A \cong A$
$(A \wedge B) \rightarrow C \cong (A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C))$	$A \rightarrow \top \cong \top$
$A \rightarrow (B \wedge C) \cong (A \rightarrow B) \wedge (A \rightarrow C)$	

Table 4: $Th_{\top, \wedge, \rightarrow}$

Corollary 7.3.2. *The propositional identity problem in \mathbf{NN} is decidable.*

Proof. Using Theorem 7.3.1, $A \cong B$ holds in \mathbf{NN} iff it is provable from a finitely axiomatizable theory. Hence, the relation \cong is recursively enumerable. Moreover, The theorem also proves that $A \not\cong B$ iff there exists a CC-functor $F : \mathbf{NN} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$ such that $F(A) \not\cong F(B)$. As any CC-functor is essentially a numeral assignment to the atoms in A and B and $F(A) \not\cong F(B)$ is just an inequality between natural numbers, we see that $\not\cong$ is also recursively enumerable. Therefore, \cong is decidable. \square

For \mathbf{NM} , the propositional identities is not finitely axiomatizable as shown in [28]. Actually, all Gurevič's equations are also propositional identities, and hence, we can use the non-finite-axiomatizability of the valid equations in that language to prove the non-finite-axiomatizability of the propositional identities in \mathbf{NM} . For \mathbf{NJ} , in [21], it is proved that the equational theory for the arithmetical language $\{\times, +, (-)^{(-)}, 0, 1\}$ is not finitely-axiomatizable, using again Gurevič's equations. Hence, the propositional identities in \mathbf{NJ} is not finitely axiomatizable. Moreover, as observed in [28], for \mathbf{NJ} , the equivalence between (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 7.3.1 breaks down. To see why, it is enough to consider the propositions $\neg p \vee \neg\neg p$ and \top . Any of their interpretations in \mathbf{FinSet} are isomorphic as both sides have one element. However, they are not even intuitionistically equivalent. Having that said, for negative propositions:

Theorem 7.3.3. ([28]) *The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\text{IPC} \vdash \neg A \leftrightarrow \neg B$.

(ii) $\neg A \cong \neg B$ as two objects in **NJ**.

(iii) $F(\neg A) \cong F(\neg B)$, for any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$.

Corollary 7.3.4. *The following are equivalent:*

(i) $A \cong 0$ as two objects in **NJ**.

(ii) $F(A) \cong 0$, for any BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinSet}$.

To the best of our knowledge, the decidability of the propositional identity problem for **NM** and **NJ** is still open. For a survey on the results and the applications of the propositional identity problem, see [20, 19].

8 Higher-order Theories

In the previous sections, we used categorical machinery to formalize a proof system over the *propositional language* as a structured category. While these investigations are intriguing, one must acknowledge that mathematics extends far beyond this restrictive language to form propositions about various *types* of entities, such as natural numbers, real numbers, points, lines, and more. It also addresses higher-order entities constructed from these *basic* entities. For example, we may consider functions on natural numbers, functions on those functions, and so forth. To formalize this richer language, we need to extend the propositional language with *types* over which quantifiers operate and to include *higher types* that encompass functions between these types. In this section, we will discuss these higher-order languages in general and introduce a specific language for discussing natural numbers.

Let $\{T_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of primitive symbols. We define the set of all *types* inductively as follows: each T_i is a type, for any $i \in I$, and for any two types σ and τ , the expressions $\sigma \times \tau$ and $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ are also types. The basic types represent the fundamental sets of entities we work with, while the operations $\sigma \times \tau$ and $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ formalize the cartesian product of σ and τ , and the set of all functions from σ to τ , respectively.

Next, we need to introduce *terms* as names for entities within the types. First, consider a family of function symbols $\{f_j^\tau(x_1^{\sigma_1}, x_2^{\sigma_2}, \dots, x_{n_j}^{\sigma_{n_j}})\}_{j \in J}$, where $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{n_j}$, and τ are types. The function symbol f_j^τ is intended to formalize a basic function of arity n_j , with inputs of types $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{n_j}$ and output of type τ . Now consider:

- Infinitely many variables in the form x^σ , for any type σ .
- The function symbol $\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(x^\sigma, y^\tau)$, for any types σ and τ . The intended meaning of $\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(x^\sigma, y^\tau)$ is the pair of x^σ and y^τ .
- The function symbols $\mathbf{p}_0^\sigma(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$ and $\mathbf{p}_1^\tau(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$, for any types σ and τ . The intended meaning of $\mathbf{p}_0^\sigma(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$ and $\mathbf{p}_1^\tau(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$ are the projections on the first and second components, respectively.

Now, define *terms* inductively by:

- any variable of type σ is a term of type σ ,
- for any function symbol $f^\tau(x_1^{\sigma_1}, x_2^{\sigma_2}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$, (including $\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(x^\sigma, y^\tau)$, $\mathbf{p}_0^\sigma(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$ and $\mathbf{p}_1^\tau(x^{\sigma \times \tau})$), if $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^n$ are terms of types $\{\sigma_k\}_{k=1}^n$, then $f^\tau(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ is a term of type τ ,
- $\lambda x^\sigma.t(x^\sigma)$ is a term of type $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$, for any types σ and τ and any term $t(x^\sigma)$ of type τ ,
- ts is a term of type τ , for any terms t and s of types $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ and σ , respectively.

The intended meaning of $\lambda x^\sigma.t(x^\sigma)$ is a function that maps x^σ to $t(x^\sigma)$ and sr means the application of the function s on the input r .

Finally, consider a family of predicate symbols $\{P_k(x_1^{\sigma_1}, x_2^{\sigma_2}, \dots, x_{n_k}^{\sigma_{n_k}})\}_{k \in K}$. Then, define *formulas* inductively in the following way:

- \top and \perp are formulas,
- $t_1 =_\sigma t_2$ is a formula, if both t_1 and t_2 are terms of type σ ,
- $P(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ is a formula, if $\{t_r\}_{r=1}^n$ are terms of types $\{\sigma_r\}_{r=1}^n$, for any predicate symbol $P(x_1^{\sigma_1}, x_2^{\sigma_2}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$,
- if A and B are formulas, $A \wedge B$, $A \vee B$, $A \rightarrow B$ are formulas,
- if $A(x^\sigma)$ is a formula, then $\forall x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)$ and $\exists x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)$ are formulas.

As it is clear from the definition, to specify a higher-order language \mathcal{L} , it is enough to specify its basic types and its families of function and predicate symbols. We denoted these three families by $B(\mathcal{L})$, $F(\mathcal{L})$ and $P(\mathcal{L})$, respectively. We also denote the set of all types of \mathcal{L} by $T(\mathcal{L})$.

Define the logic IQC^ω over the language \mathcal{L} as the theory consisting of the usual axioms of multi-sorted first-order logic with equality plus the following defining axioms:

- $\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(\mathbf{p}_0^\sigma(x^{\sigma \times \tau}), \mathbf{p}_1^\tau(x^{\sigma \times \tau})) =_{\sigma \times \tau} x^{\sigma \times \tau}$, $\mathbf{p}_0^\sigma(\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(x^\sigma, y^\tau)) =_\sigma x^\sigma$, and $\mathbf{p}_1^\tau(\mathbf{p}^{\sigma \times \tau}(x^\sigma, y^\tau)) =_\tau y^\tau$,
- $(\lambda x^\sigma.t(x^\sigma))y^\sigma =_\tau t(y^\sigma)$, where $t(x^\sigma)$ is of type τ and $t(y^\sigma)$ is the substitution of y^σ in $t(x^\sigma)$ for x^σ .

There are two non-logical axioms of interest in this chapter. The first is the axiom $\lambda y^\sigma.(x^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \cdot y^\sigma) = x^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}$ or equivalently the *axiom of extensionality*

$$\text{EXT} : \quad \forall f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} g^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} [\forall x^\sigma (fx =_\tau gx) \rightarrow (f =_{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} g)],$$

stating that a function is uniquely determined by its action. The second is the *axiom of choice*

$$\text{AC} : \quad \forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y) \rightarrow \exists f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \forall x^\sigma A(x, fx),$$

stating that if for any x of type σ , there is a y of type τ satisfying $A(x, y)$, one can find a function f of type $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ to choose such a y of type τ , for any x of type σ .

Remark 8.0.1. Here are some remarks. First, when it is clear from the context, we omit the types, including in x^σ , function and predicate symbols, and $=_\sigma$. Second, if we eliminate the type constructors \times and \rightarrow , the function symbols \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{p}_0 , \mathbf{p}_1 , and the term constructors λ and application, along with their corresponding equalities, the result is multi-sorted first-order logic, denoted by IQC. Third, sometimes the zero type 0 and the sum type $+$ are added to represent the empty set and disjoint union, respectively. However, we will not include these in this chapter to keep the presentation simpler. Fourth, the language can be restricted to its fragments, as we did for the propositional language. One fragment of interest is the one without \perp and \vee , as it simplifies the treatment of arithmetic as we will see later.

There is a canonical classical interpretation of higher-order languages. It is enough to assign a non-empty set to any basic type in $B(\mathcal{L})$ and interpret the type σ by the set M^σ recursively defined by $M^{\sigma \times \tau} = M^\sigma \times M^\tau$ and $M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} = [M^\sigma, M^\tau]$, where \times and $[-, -]$ are the cartesian product and the exponentiation in **Set**. Then, we must assign functions to the function symbols in $F(\mathcal{L})$ respecting the types and extend the interpretation to all terms by composition. Note that the function symbols \mathbf{p} , \mathbf{p}_0 and \mathbf{p}_1 must be interpreted as the pairing functions and the projections, respectively, $\lambda x^\sigma. t(x)$ must be read as a function mapping $a \in M^\sigma$ to $t(a) \in M^\tau$, where τ is the type of $t(x)$ and t_s must be read as the usual application function. Finally, we must assign relations to the predicate symbols in $P(\mathcal{L})$ respecting the types. It is easy to see that $\text{IQC}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$ is valid under any such interpretation.

For a constructive interpretation of a higher-order theory, we offer an informal interpretation here, which will be formalized later in Section 9. We start with an informal concept of construction. To interpret types in a higher-order language, we change the category of sets in the classical interpretation to the category of *constructed sets*, i.e., sets where all elements are constructed with *constructed functions* serving as the morphisms. For interpreting formulas, we need to extend the BHK interpretation from Section 5 to include equality and quantifiers. This extension can take various forms, and we outline the one that we plan to formalize later:

- a proof of $t = s$ is a verification that t and s are equal,
- a proof of $\forall x^\sigma A(x)$ is a construction that transforms any construction of a to a proof of $A(a)$, for any a of type σ ,
- a proof of $\exists x^\sigma A(x)$ is a pair of a construction of an element a of the type σ and a proof of $A(a)$.

Even at this informal level, we can verify the provability of some axioms. It is straightforward to see that every theorem of IQC^ω is provable through this

BHK interpretation. The axiom EXT has a proof under the BHK interpretation because if we have a proof of $\forall x^\sigma (fx = gx)$, then we reach a proof of $fx = gx$ for any x of type σ , which implies $f = g$, thereby establishing its provability. For the axiom of choice, we need to make an additional assumption. Let us assume that each element in σ has a unique construction. Then, if we have a construction for $\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y)$, it provides an element b of type τ along with its construction for any construction of any element a of type σ . Since constructions for the elements of type σ are unique, we can ignore the dependence on the construction of a . This effectively gives us a function $f : \sigma \rightarrow \tau$ by mapping a 's to b 's. Note that the function f is induced by a construction and hence must be interpreted as a constructed function.

8.1 Constructive Theories of Arithmetic

In this subsection, we will introduce some theories of constructive arithmetic. Let us start with the simpler first-order case. Fix the language $\mathcal{L}_{\text{HA}} = \{0, S, +, \cdot\}$ and assume that the language does not have the connectives \vee and \perp . This is no restriction on the theory as it is known that the propositions $S(0) = 0$ and $\exists z[(z = 0 \rightarrow A) \wedge (z \neq 0 \rightarrow B)]$ can play the role of \perp and $A \vee B$, respectively [86]. Define *Heyting (resp. Peano) arithmetic*, denoted by HA (resp. PA) as the intuitionistic (resp. classical) logic with the equality extended by the axioms:

- $\forall x(S(x) \neq 0)$,
- $\forall xy(S(x) = S(y) \rightarrow x = y)$,
- $\forall x(x + 0 = x)$,
- $\forall xy(x + S(y) = S(x + y))$,
- $\forall x(x \cdot 0 = 0)$,
- $\forall xy(x \cdot S(y) = x \cdot y + x)$,
- $A(0) \wedge \forall x(A(x) \rightarrow A(S(x))) \rightarrow \forall xA(x)$, for any formula $A(x)$.

It is clear that the set of natural numbers with the canonical interpretation of the language \mathcal{L}_{HA} is a model of PA. This model is called the *standard model* and will be denoted by \mathfrak{N} . Here are some basic facts about the theories HA and PA. First, defining the relation $x \leq y$ as $\exists z(x + z = y)$, it is possible to prove the usual properties of the ordering in HA such as its totality and the fact that the operations $+$ and \cdot respect the ordering. Any quantifier in the form $\forall x(x \leq t \rightarrow A(x))$ and $\exists x(x \leq t \wedge A(x))$, for some term t is called a *bounded quantifier* and will be abbreviated by $\forall x \leq t A(x)$ and $\exists x \leq t A(x)$, respectively. A formula is called *bounded* if all of its quantifiers can be replaced by a bounded quantifier up to provability in HA. Any bounded formula $A(\bar{x})$ is decidable in HA, i.e., $\text{HA} \vdash \forall \bar{x}(A(\bar{x}) \vee \neg A(\bar{x}))$. The theory PA is conservative over HA for formulas in the form $\forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y} A(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, where $A(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is bounded.⁴ A

⁴This means that $\text{PA} \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y} A(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ implies $\text{HA} \vdash \forall \bar{x} \exists \bar{y} A(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$, if $A(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is bounded.

formula is called \exists -free if it has no occurrence of an existential quantifier. It is easy to see that any bounded formula is equivalent to an \exists -free formula in HA. To prove, it is just enough to change any $\exists x \leq t A(x)$ to $\neg \forall x \leq t \neg A(x)$. These two formulas are equivalent as bounded formulas are decidable in HA. It is possible to formalize some basic recursion theory in HA. More precisely, there is a \exists -free formula $T(e, x, w, y)$ such that in the standard model it means that the Turing machine with the code e halts on the input x with the computation w and the output y .

For the higher-order version of Heyting arithmetic, denoted by HA^ω , use the higher-order language with the basic type N , the function symbols $\{0, S(x^N)\}$ of type N , the function symbols $\mathbf{R}^\sigma(x^\sigma, y^{N \times \sigma \rightarrow \sigma}, z^N)$, for any type σ and add no predicate symbol other than equality. Define HA^ω as IQC^ω plus the following axioms:

- $\mathbf{R}^\sigma(x, y, 0) = x$ and $\mathbf{R}^\sigma(x, y, S(z)) = y\mathbf{p}(z, \mathbf{R}^\sigma(x, y, z))$,
- $S(0) \neq 0$ and $S(x) = S(y) \rightarrow x = y$,
- $A(0) \wedge \forall x^N (A(x) \rightarrow A(S(x))) \rightarrow \forall x^N A(x)$, for any formula $A(x)$ in the extended language.

We also define the extension HA_2^ω of HA^ω that we use in a restricted way later. First, add a new basic type 2, two constants 0_2 and 1_2 of type 2 and for any type σ , a function symbol $c^\sigma(x^\sigma, y^\sigma, z^2)$. The intended meaning of 2 is the set $\{0, 1\}$ and $c^\sigma(x^\sigma, y^\sigma, z^2)$ is the function that reads the elements x^σ and y^σ from σ and z^2 from $\{0, 1\}$ and returns x^σ if $z = 0$ and y^σ if $z = 1$. Extend the theory HA^ω by the equations $c^\sigma(x, y, 0_2) = x$, $c^\sigma(x, y, 1_2) = y$ and $c^\sigma(w0_2, w1_2, z) = wz$, for any w of type $2 \rightarrow \sigma$. The resulting theory is denoted by HA_2^ω . Notice that the induction axiom operates over the whole new language including the formulas with terms of type 2.

It is clear that HA can be interpreted inside HA^ω , reading any variable x as a variable of the type N , interpreting 0 and S as the corresponding constants and defining the addition and multiplication by the function symbol \mathbf{R} using the usual recursive definitions. For more on the definition and the basic properties of the defined arithmetical theories, see [87].

Similar to HA, the theories HA^ω and HA_2^ω have a canonical classical interpretation that we also call the *standard model* and denote by \mathfrak{N} . To define the model, it is enough to map the basic type N to the set of natural numbers \mathbb{N} and read terms 0 and $S(x^N)$ as the zero element and the successor function on \mathbb{N} . For \mathbf{R} , we must use the canonical function defined by the recursive definition the axioms for \mathbf{R} suggests. Later in Section 10, we will provide a more constructive interpretation using the BHK interpretation.

8.2 Non-classical Axioms and Consistency

We began this chapter with a brief history of Hilbert's program and its consistency problems, which motivated the formal and precise investigation of the

concept of proof. This investigation ultimately led to the development of categorical proof theory, providing concrete and distinct models for proof systems, as demonstrated in the previous sections. To close the circle, it would be interesting to apply categorical proof theory to prove the consistency of mathematical theories in general, and arithmetical theories in particular.

For the usual arithmetical theories such as HA and PA, one might argue that since mathematics is no longer in crisis, the urgency of addressing consistency problems has diminished. Today, we consider the standard model to be both secure and intuitively acceptable, making it reasonable to assert the consistency of arithmetic based on the existence of this model. However, the philosophical and mathematical discourse surrounding consistency problems is more nuanced than this straightforward objection suggests, although the objection does hold some validity. To address the objection, it is important to note that proving consistency in the intuitive manner described above is essentially verifying the soundness of the theory with respect to our classical image. Constructive mathematics, however, encompasses various alternative theories that describe alternative worlds inconsistent with our classical understanding. Thus, proving consistency is not merely a philosophical endeavor but involves establishing the plausibility of such hypothetical worlds, where classical intuition may not be as effective as we assume. To illustrate this, we provide two examples of alternative worlds within constructive mathematics.

The primary claim of constructive mathematics is that all mathematical entities are constructions. Within this framework, a challenge arises when dealing with infinitary objects, such as functions over natural numbers or infinite sequences of zeros and ones, which exceed the finite and bounded capacity of human construction. There are numerous approaches to handling these objects, with two extreme ends of the spectrum: the *law-like* and *lawless* approaches.

In the law-like approach, all infinitary objects are required to be law-like, meaning that despite their infinitary nature, they are generated by a finite set of rules or laws. The natural candidate for such a finite law is an algorithm. Consequently, this interpretation of constructive mathematics confines itself to the computable world, where everything, including functions on numbers, must be computable. This variant of constructive mathematics is known as *Russian constructivism*. A typical axiom in Russian constructivism is the *Church-Turing thesis*.

$$\text{CT} : \quad \forall f^{N \rightarrow N} \exists e^N \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(e, x, w, y) \wedge (fx = y)],$$

stating that *all total functions on natural numbers are computable*. More precisely, it asserts that for any function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there exists a Turing machine with the code e that computes f , meaning that for any input x , there is a computation w of e on x producing the output $y = f(x)$. Now, regarding our consistency problem, we might ask whether $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{CT}$ is consistent. The answer is unclear because, in the usual classical framework, some functions, such as the characteristic function for the halting predicate, are uncomputable. Therefore, the theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{CT}$ is inconsistent with our classical understanding of the world.

At the opposite end of the spectrum is the assumption that all infinite objects are *lawless*. For example, when considering functions over natural numbers, we may work with any function whose values are chosen in a lawless manner, one after another, over time. At any given moment, we can only comprehend a finite number of values in our finite minds, yet we can still discuss potentially infinite sequences of numbers constructed in this lawless fashion. One might argue that even if we include these mathematical objects in our constructive mathematics, we cannot derive any conclusions about them due to their lawless and hence completely unpredictable nature. Brouwer’s insightful idea was that if all functions are lawless, the only meaningful statements we can make about them must involve only finitely many values of the function. For instance, stating that the first element of a lawless sequence α is five is meaningful, whereas claiming that all its elements are zero is not. In this framework, we can accommodate lawless sequences if we restrict ourselves to discussing the *continuous* properties of the functions where continuity ensures that the property is actually about a finite part of the input. This type of continuity is a defining characteristic of what is commonly referred to as *Brouwerian constructivism*. A typical axiom in this form of constructivism is the *continuity principle*⁵:

$$\text{WC-N} : \quad \forall f^{N^N \rightarrow N} \forall \alpha^{N \rightarrow N} \exists x^N \forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} (\alpha =_x \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta),$$

where $\alpha =_x \beta$ abbreviates $\forall y^N (y < x \rightarrow \alpha y = \beta y)$, stating that the *value of a total numeral function at α depends only on finitely many values of α* . The x bounding the cardinality of these values is called the *continuity module*. Similar to what we encountered with CT, this axiom is also inconsistent with our usual classical image. It asserts that all total functions $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ are continuous. However, using the axiom of the excluded middle, we can observe that the characteristic function of the singleton $\{\alpha_0\}$, where α_0 is the constant zero function, is total but not continuous. In other words, the value of $f(\alpha)$ depends on all values of $\alpha(n)$, not just a finite number of them. Therefore, we face a consistency question again, this time about the theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{WC-N}$. For more on non-classical constructive theories, see [86, 87].

One natural strategy for proving such consistency claims is providing a model—an alternative world where the anti-classical axioms hold. To construct these models, we use categories of constructed sets, interpreting constructions in a way that aligns with the consistency problem at hand. We then apply the BHK interpretation to validate the theory and demonstrate its consistency. Consider, for instance, the case of $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{CT}$. Here, we naturally expect to interpret the informal notion of construction as an algorithm or a computable function. The category of constructed sets then provides a *computable world*, where everything, including all functions on natural numbers, is computable. This setup is precisely what we need to support the Church-Turing thesis, and by leveraging this observation, we aim to show that the BHK interpretation validates CT.

⁵This axiom is formally called the *weak continuity principle for numbers*. Hence, the abbreviation WC-N.

However, under the BHK interpretation, the axiom

$$\text{CT} : \quad \forall f^{N \rightarrow N} \exists e^N \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(e, x, w, y) \wedge (fx = y)],$$

asserts more than just “all total functions over natural numbers are computable.” It also requires that the process of finding the code e for a function f from its construction \mathbf{f} be computable. Later, we will explain how to weaken CT to align with what we originally intended. For now, let us examine the implications of working with this current version.

As we saw above, we have two options for interpreting constructions: either as an algorithm or as a computable function, and the choice significantly impacts the validation of CT. If we interpret \mathbf{f} as a computable function, i.e., as f itself, then the requirement to recursively find a code for it becomes impossible, as we will explain later. On the other hand, if we interpret \mathbf{f} as an algorithm for f , then CT simply asserts that if we have an algorithm \mathbf{f} for f , we can find a code e for f in a computable manner. This is straightforward, as e can simply be set as the algorithm \mathbf{f} itself.

Let us now investigate the axiom

$$\text{WC-N} : \quad \forall f^{N^N \rightarrow N} \forall \alpha^{N \rightarrow N} \exists x^N \forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} (\alpha =_x \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta).$$

from the same lens. Here, we must interpret construction as a continuous entity to get a *continuous world*. Similar to CT, the axiom not only asserts that $f(\alpha)$ depends on x many initial values of α , but also demands the continuity of the process of determining x based on the constructions of f and α . When the constructions of f and α are read as the functions themselves, this requirement becomes impossible again. However, there exists a notion of an “algorithm” that operates on infinitary data. By interpreting the constructions of f and α as such algorithms, one can validate the axiom, as it is possible to determine x from the algorithms [85].

In general, there are essentially two ways to interpret a construction: *intensionally* or *extensionally*. The intensional approach treats constructions as *instructions* to be executed, while the extensional approach views them as *functions in the traditional sense*. For example, in the above examples, the intensional interpretation considers a construction as an *algorithm*, whereas the extensional interpretation views it as a computable or continuous *function*.

In this chapter, we adopt the *extensional* approach. A key point about this approach is that it typically tends to validate the axioms EXT and AC. As mentioned in the last paragraph prior to Subsection 8.1, the validity of EXT is straightforward. Regarding AC, the extensional interpretation usually treats a function as its own construction, implying that constructions are generally unique. This uniqueness leads to the validation of AC. In contrast, under the intensional approach, a function can correspond to many different algorithms, which influences the validation of the axiom of choice.

In the following theorem, we will show that CT and WC-N are inconsistent with EXT and AC. Consequently, we demonstrate what we previously promised:

that the extensional BHK interpretation cannot validate the axioms CT and WC–N.

Theorem 8.2.1. *The theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$ is inconsistent with either of the axioms CT or WC–N.*

Proof. We argue informally inside the theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$. For CT, use AC on CT to get a functional $F : N^N \rightarrow N$ that maps a total function $f : N \rightarrow N$ to one of its codes. We claim that $f = g$ iff $F(f) = F(g)$. One direction is clear. For the other, if $F(f) = F(g)$, as $F(f)$ is the code for f , we have $fx = F(f) \cdot x = F(g) \cdot x = gx$, where $e \cdot x$ is the output of applying the machine with the code e on the input x . Note that the predicate $e \cdot x = y$ is definable in arithmetic by the definition $\exists w^N T(e, x, w, y)$. Therefore, $fx = gx$, for any x of type N and thus $f = g$, by EXT. Now, using the equivalence between $f = g$ and $F(f) = F(g)$ and the decidability of the equality over the type N in HA^ω , we have the decidability of the equality over N^N , i.e.,

$$\forall f^{N \rightarrow N} g^{N \rightarrow N} [(f = g) \vee \neg(f = g)]. \quad (*)$$

Set x as a parameter and define f as the map that reads w and outputs the truth value of the predicate $T(x, x, w, 1)$ and g as the constant zero function. This is possible as T is decidable and hence f is total. Note that $f = g$ iff $\forall w^N \neg T(x, x, w, 1)$. Therefore, by $(*)$, we have

$$\forall x^N (\forall w^N \neg T(x, x, w, 1) \vee \neg \forall w^N \neg T(x, x, w, 1)).$$

Using this decidability, we can define a total characteristic function $h : N \rightarrow N$ that reads x and outputs 1 if $\forall w^N \neg T(x, x, w, 1)$, and 0 if $\neg \forall w^N \neg T(x, x, w, 1)$. By CT, there is a code for the function h . Call it e . Then, either $e \cdot e = 1$ or $e \cdot e = 0$. In the first case, we have $e \cdot e = 1$ which means that $\exists w^N T(e, e, w, 1)$. However, we are in the first case. Hence, we must have $\forall w^N \neg T(e, e, w, 1)$ which is impossible. If $e \cdot e = 0$, then as the value of $e \cdot e$ is unique, it is not 1 and hence it is easy to prove that $\forall w^N \neg T(e, e, w, 1)$. However, we are in the second case. Hence, $\neg \forall w^N \neg T(e, e, w, 1)$ which is again a contradiction.

For WC–N, we will reproduce the proof provided in [36], only altering the type-theoretic language to our arithmetical language. Since functions on natural numbers and sequences of natural numbers are essentially the same entities, we will use them interchangeably to simplify our presentation. Let $0^n k^\omega$ denote the sequence of n many zeros followed by infinitely many k 's, for any k and n of type N . Then, notice that $0^n k^\omega =_n 0^\omega$ and $0^n k^\omega =_{(n+1)} k$. By applying AC on WC–N, we have a functional F such that for any $f^{N^N \rightarrow N}$, $\alpha^{N \rightarrow N}$ and $\beta^{N \rightarrow N}$ if $\alpha =_{F(f, \alpha)} \beta$ then $f\alpha = f\beta$. By substituting $\alpha = 0^\omega$, we have

$$\forall f^{N^N \rightarrow N} \forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} [0^\omega =_{M(f)} \beta \rightarrow f0^\omega = f\beta], \quad (**)$$

where $M(f) = F(f, 0^\omega)$. Let $m = M(\lambda \gamma. 0)$ and define $f^{N^N \rightarrow N}$ by $f\beta = M(\lambda \gamma. \beta(\gamma m))$. Note that $0^\omega(\gamma m) = 0$, for the variable $\gamma^{N \rightarrow N}$. Hence, by

EXT, we have $\lambda\gamma.0^\omega(\gamma m) = \lambda\gamma.0$. Thus, by definition, we have $f(0^\omega) = M(\lambda\gamma.0^\omega(\gamma m)) = M(\lambda\gamma.0) = m$. Therefore, by (**), we have

$$\forall\beta^{N \rightarrow N}[0^\omega =_{M(f)} \beta \rightarrow m = f\beta]. \quad (\dagger)$$

On the other hand, for any $\beta^{N \rightarrow N}$, we can define $g_\beta = \lambda\gamma.\beta(\gamma m)$. Note that $M(g_\beta) = f(\beta)$, by the definition of f . Moreover, notice that $g_\beta 0^\omega = \beta(0)$ and $g_\beta(\gamma) = \beta(\gamma m)$. Applying (**) on g_β , we have

$$\forall\gamma^{N \rightarrow N}[0^\omega =_{f\beta} \gamma \rightarrow \beta 0 = \beta(\gamma m)]. \quad (\dagger\dagger)$$

Substituting $\beta = 0^{M(f)+1}1^\omega$ in (\dagger) and using the fact that $0^\omega =_{M(f)} \beta$, we have $f(\beta) = m$. Using the same $\beta = 0^{M(f)+1}1^\omega$ in $(\dagger\dagger)$ and the equality $f(\beta) = m$, we have

$$\forall\gamma^{N \rightarrow N}[0^\omega =_m \gamma \rightarrow \beta 0 = \beta(\gamma m)].$$

Substituting $\gamma = 0^m(M(f)+1)^\omega$, we have $0^\omega =_m \gamma$. Hence, $0 = \beta 0 = \beta(\gamma m) = \beta(M(f)+1) = 1$ which is a contradiction. \square

As a concluding part of this subsection, we will explain how to weaken the axioms CT and WC–N to reflect our original intent. Our approach is to modify the existential quantifiers to require only the *mere* existence of the code and the continuity module, rather than their constructibility via a recursive or continuous process. In this revised formulation, CT aligns with our original understanding, stating that for any computable function f , there exists a code e for f , with no requirement for the process of finding this code to be computable. Similarly, WC–N would assert that for any function f and any α , there exists an x such that the value of $f(\alpha)$ depends only on the first x values of α , and the process of finding x need not be continuous.

To achieve this, we need a method to *collapse* proofs of a proposition into a single proof, preserving only the fact of provability while discarding additional details. This process is known as *propositional truncation* [1, 69]. However, for simplicity, we will use a similar mechanism adapted to the specific BHK interpretation employed in this chapter.

First, note that if we formalize the BHK interpretation in a set-like manner without any temporal structure, it becomes apparent that for any sentence A , if there is no proof of A , then *any* construction can serve as a proof of $\neg A$, since there is no proof of A to transform into a proof of \perp . Consequently, if A does have a proof, then $\neg A$ cannot have a proof and hence *any* construction serves as a proof of $\neg\neg A$, and if A is not provable, then $\neg A$ is provable implying that $\neg\neg A$ has *no* proof. Thus, a proof of $\neg\neg A$ conveys no information beyond the mere provability of A , meaning that $\neg\neg$ can function as a collapsing mechanism. Using this collapsing machine, the weaker versions of the axioms CT and WC–N can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CT}_{\neg\neg} : \quad & \forall f^{N \rightarrow N} \neg\neg \exists e^N \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(e, x, w, y) \wedge (fx = y)], \\ \text{WC-N}_{\neg\neg} : \quad & \forall f^{N \rightarrow N} \forall \alpha^{N \rightarrow N} \neg\neg \exists x^N \forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} (\alpha =_x \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta). \end{aligned}$$

where the existence of the code or the continuity module x is asserted, but the requirement for finding them in a recursive or continuous manner is relaxed. Note that even these weakened versions remain in contradiction with our classical image, as double negation has no impact in classical mathematics. In Section 10, we will formalize the arguments provided here to construct models for the theories $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{CT}_{\neg\neg}$ and $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{WC-N}_{\neg\neg}$, thereby demonstrating their consistency.

8.3 Information Extraction

There is also another application of categorical proof theory that is relevant not only to the alternative theories discussed in the previous subsection but also to conventional theories compatible with our classical perspective. To illustrate this, consider a simple question: Does a proof of a proposition contain more information than just its mere truth? The answer appears to be affirmative. For example, in the context of HA , knowing a proof of a proposition of the form $\forall x \exists y A(x, y)$ tells us that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A(n, m)$ holds in the standard model. However, the proof might contain additional information. Specifically, it may be possible to *extract* an algorithm from the proof that, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, computes an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A(n, m)$.

The traditional black-and-white approach to proofs often overlooks the possibility of intermediate solutions. It either retains all proofs with their syntactical complexities intact or shifts to a semantic view, discarding the entire structure of a proof in favor of greater flexibility. The trade-off is that this approach loses all information contained within the proof, leaving only the bare truth of its conclusion. While ignoring the proof structure can be useful in some contexts, it may be overly simplistic in others. Therefore, we may need to find a middle ground that balances flexibility with the retention of useful information. Specifically, developing *models of proofs* that preserve certain aspects of the proof structure while allowing for some flexibility could offer a more nuanced approach. This way, we can maintain essential information while adapting the proofs for practical use.

This is precisely where categorical proof theory, and specifically the BHK interpretation, becomes highly valuable. For instance, a BHK proof of the sentence $\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y)$ is a construction that maps any construction of any element a of type σ to a pair consisting of a construction of an element b of type τ and a proof of $A(a, b)$. Thus, if the elements in types σ and τ are constructions for themselves, having a BHK proof for the sentence $\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y)$ enables us to find a method to compute b from a . Note that the notion of construction is not predetermined; it can be tailored to suit specific needs. For example, if we choose to interpret constructions as computable functions, then for $\sigma = \tau = N$, a BHK proof of $\forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)$ yields a recursive function that takes a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and computes a natural number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A(n, m)$ holds. Similarly, if we choose to interpret constructions as continuous functions, then for $\sigma = N \rightarrow N$ and $\tau = N$, a BHK proof of $\forall x^{N \rightarrow N} \exists y^N A(x, y)$ provides a continuous function that, given a function $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, computes a natural

number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A(\alpha, m)$ holds. We will revisit these applications in Section 10.

9 Realizability

In the previous sections, we explained the categorical formalization of propositional deductive systems. The natural next step is to extend the formalization to the higher-order setting. However, this task is far more demanding than what we covered for the propositional case, and thus it goes beyond what we can include in this chapter.⁶ To provide a taste of this, though, we will present a special yet powerful enough setting called *realizability*, based on the BHK interpretation we discussed earlier.

Choosing this special setting has its own benefits. First, it provides the categorical presentation of one of the most powerful techniques in proof theory of the same name. Second, our setting uses less structure, which translates to gaining more insights into the theories. For instance, we will show that any computable function provably total in HA and PA is representable in any CCC with enough structure. In this section, we establish the general setting for an arbitrary higher-order language, and in Section 10, we will apply the machinery to arithmetical theories.

9.1 Propositional Realizability

To formalize the higher-order BHK interpretation, we follow the format explained in Section 5 and extended in Section 8. However, this time, we relax the temporal structure and change our notion of construction from set functions to maps in a BCC. First, let us start with the propositional language again.

Notation 9.1.1. In the realizability parts of this chapter, namely the present section and Section 10, we use Typewriter font (as in $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$) for objects and maps in our BCC to distinguish them from set-theoretical objects and functions.

Definition 9.1.2. Let \mathcal{C} be a BCC. By a \mathcal{C} -*interpretation* \mathfrak{J} for the propositional language, we mean an assignment that maps each atom p in the language to a pair $(|p|, R_p)$, where $|p|$ is an object in \mathcal{C} and $R_p \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, |p|)$ is a set.

By recursion, we extend \mathfrak{J} to assign an object $|A|$ to any proposition A in the following way:

- $|\top| = 1, |\perp| = 0,$
- $|A \wedge B| = |A| \times |B|, |A \vee B| = |A| + |B|, |A \rightarrow B| = [|A|, |B|].$

Then, inductively define the relation $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ between the map $\mathbf{r} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, |A|)$ and the proposition A in the following way:

- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash p$ if $\mathbf{r} \in R_p$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |p|,$

⁶To see how such generalized settings work, see [64, 34, 39].

- $!_1 \Vdash \top$ for the unique map $!_1 : 1 \rightarrow 1$,
- $\mathbf{r} \not\Vdash \perp$ for any map $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow 0$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{r} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A| \times |B|$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \vee B$ iff there exists $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{i}_0 \mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A$ or there exists $\mathbf{t} : 1 \rightarrow |B|$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{t} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A| + |B|$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff for any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$, if $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A$ then $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{s} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow [|A|, |B|]$.

For any *finite* set Γ of formulas, define $|\Gamma|$ as $\prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\gamma|$. We use an arbitrary order on the formulas in Γ , and since the product is commutative up to an isomorphism, the chosen order is actually immaterial. Then, by $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{J}} A$, we mean the existence of a map $\mathbf{r} : |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{s} \Vdash A$, for any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |\Gamma|$ satisfying $\mathbf{s} \Vdash \bigwedge \Gamma$. This \mathbf{r} is called a *realizer* for $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{J}} A$. When Γ is empty, $|\Gamma| = 1$, by definition and $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ is called a realizer for A . When the \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{J} is clear from the context, we drop the subscript \mathfrak{J} in $\Vdash_{\mathfrak{J}}$. Finally, by $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$, we mean $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{J}} A$, for any \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{J} .

Remark 9.1.3. Notice that $\mathbf{r} : |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$ realizes $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{J}} A$ iff for any sequence $\{\mathbf{s}_{\gamma} : 1 \rightarrow |\gamma|\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ of maps such that $\mathbf{s}_{\gamma} \Vdash \gamma$, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \mathbf{s}_{\gamma} \rangle_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \Vdash A$. This presentation is easier to work with in practice.

Example 9.1.4. For any \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{J} , the identity map $\text{id}_{|A|} : |A| \rightarrow |A|$ realizes $A \Vdash A$ because if $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ then $\text{id}_{|A|} \circ \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} \Vdash A$. The unique map $!_{|A|} : 0 \rightarrow |A|$ realizes $\perp \Vdash A$. To prove that, we have to show that for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow 0$, if $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \perp$ then $!_{|A|} \circ \mathbf{r} \Vdash A$. However, $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \perp$ is impossible, by definition. The unique map $!_{|A|} : |A| \rightarrow 1$ realizes $A \Vdash \top$ because if $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ then $!_{|A|} \circ \mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow 1$. As 1 is terminal, we have $!_{|A|} \circ \mathbf{r} = !_1$ and as $!_1 \Vdash \top$, we reach $!_{|A|} \circ \mathbf{r} \Vdash \top$.

Example 9.1.5. The map $\mathbf{p}_0 : |A| \times |B| \rightarrow |A|$ realizes $\{A, B\} \Vdash A$. Let $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A| \times |B| = |A| \times |B|$. Then, $\mathbf{p}_0 \circ \mathbf{r} \Vdash A$, by definition. Similarly, one can show that $\mathbf{i}_1 : |B| \rightarrow |A| + |B|$ realizes $B \Vdash A \vee B$.

Example 9.1.6. If $C \Vdash A$ and $C \Vdash B$ then $C \Vdash A \wedge B$. Let $\mathbf{r} : |C| \rightarrow |A|$ and $\mathbf{s} : |C| \rightarrow |B|$ be the realizers, respectively. Then, $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle : |C| \rightarrow |A| \times |B|$ realizes $C \Vdash A \wedge B$. To prove that, let $\mathbf{u} : 1 \rightarrow |C|$ realize C . Then, by definition, $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash A$ and $\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash B$. As $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} = \langle \mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{u} \rangle$, we reach $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash A \wedge B$, by definition.

Example 9.1.7. If $A \Vdash C$ and $B \Vdash C$ then $A \vee B \Vdash C$. Let $\mathbf{r} : |A| \rightarrow |C|$ and $\mathbf{s} : |B| \rightarrow |C|$ be the realizers, respectively. Then, $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle : |A| + |B| \rightarrow |C|$ realizes $A \vee B \Vdash C$. To prove that, let $\mathbf{u} : 1 \rightarrow |A| + |B|$ realize $A \vee B$. Then, by definition, either there is $\mathbf{v} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{i}_0 \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{v} \Vdash A$ or there is $\mathbf{w} : 1 \rightarrow |B|$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{w} \Vdash B$. In the former case, we have $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} = \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{i}_0 \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{v} \Vdash C$ and in the latter case $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} = \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle \circ \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{w} \Vdash C$.

Example 9.1.8. If $C \Vdash A$ and $C \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ then $C \Vdash B$. Let $\mathbf{r} : |C| \rightarrow |A|$ and $\mathbf{s} : |C| \rightarrow [|A|, |B|]$ be the realizers, respectively. Then, the map $\mathbf{ev}\langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{r} \rangle : |C| \rightarrow |B|$ realizes $C \Vdash B$. To prove that, let $\mathbf{u} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |C|$ be a map such that $\mathbf{u} \Vdash C$. Then, $\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ and $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash A$. Hence, $(\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{u}) \Vdash B$. As $\mathbf{ev}\langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{u}) \cdot (\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{u})$, we reach $\mathbf{ev}\langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \circ \mathbf{u} \Vdash B$.

Example 9.1.9. If $\{C, A\} \Vdash B$ then $C \Vdash A \rightarrow B$. Let $\mathbf{r} : |C| \times |A| \rightarrow |B|$ be a realizer for $\{C, A\} \Vdash B$. We claim that the map $\lambda_{|A|}\mathbf{r} : |C| \rightarrow [|A|, |B|]$ realizes $C \Vdash A \rightarrow B$. To show that, let $\mathbf{s} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |C|$ be a map such that $\mathbf{s} \Vdash C$. We have to show that $(\lambda_{|A|}\mathbf{r}) \circ \mathbf{s} \Vdash A \rightarrow B$. For that purpose, let $\mathbf{t} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |A|$ be a map such that $\mathbf{t} \Vdash A$. Then, as $((\lambda_{|A|}\mathbf{r}) \circ \mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{t} = \mathbf{r} \circ \langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \rangle$ and we know that $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t} \rangle \Vdash B$, the proof is complete.

As might already be clear from the provided examples, our goal is to transform proofs in IPC into realizers, i.e., maps in \mathcal{C} . This transformation allows us to import the proofs into \mathcal{C} and leverage the structure of \mathcal{C} to gain insights about proofs.

Theorem 9.1.10. (*Soundness-completeness*) For any set $\Gamma \cup \{A\}$ of formulas, $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{IPC}} A$ iff $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A$ for any BCC \mathcal{C} .

Proof. For soundness, it is enough to use an induction on the length of the proof of $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{IPC}} A$. Some cases are checked in the above examples. The rest is left to the reader. For completeness, set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{NJ}$ and $\mathfrak{I}(p) = (p, \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{NJ}}(\top, p))$. Then, as $\Gamma \Vdash_{\mathfrak{I}} A$, it has a realizer map $\mathbf{r} : |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$ in \mathbf{NJ} . Hence, there is a derivation of A from Γ in \mathbf{NJ} which implies $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{IPC}} A$. \square

9.2 \mathcal{C} -sets and Higher-order Realizability

So far, we have covered our alternative formalization for the propositional BHK interpretation. To extend this formalization to higher-order languages, we need a notion of sets whose elements are constructed by maps in \mathcal{C} . The following provides such a notion.

Definition 9.2.1. Let \mathcal{C} be a BCC. By a \mathcal{C} -set, we mean a tuple in the form $S = (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S)$, where $|S|$ is an object in \mathcal{C} , $\|S\|$ is a set and $\Vdash_S \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{1}, |S|) \times \|S\|$ is a binary relation such that for any $x \in \|S\|$, there exists $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S|$ such that $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$. A \mathcal{C} -set map $f : (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S) \rightarrow (|T|, \|T\|, \Vdash_T)$ is a function $f : \|S\| \rightarrow \|T\|$ induced (or realized) by a map $\mathbf{f} : |S| \rightarrow |T|$ in \mathcal{C} , i.e., if $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$ then $\mathbf{f}\mathbf{x} \Vdash_T f(x)$, for any $x \in \|S\|$ and any $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S|$. It is easy to see that \mathcal{C} -sets together with \mathcal{C} -set maps form a category, denoted by $\mathcal{C}\text{-Set}$.⁷

Philosophical Comment 9.2.2. Interpreting \mathcal{C} as the world of constructions, a \mathcal{C} -set can be viewed as a *constructed set*. More precisely, the \mathcal{C} -set $S = (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S)$ consists of the set $\|S\|$ equipped with a type $|S|$ of constructions

⁷Following the usual convention in the literature, \mathcal{C} -sets must be called assemblies over \mathcal{C} . We use the term \mathcal{C} -set because it better aligns with the intuition that it is a set whose elements are constructed via the maps in \mathcal{C} .

and a relation $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$ indicating that $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S|$ is a construction of x . The surjectivity condition ensures that every element has a construction. Similarly, a \mathcal{C} -set map is a function induced by changing constructions via compositions with maps within \mathcal{C} .

The category $\mathcal{C}\text{-Set}$ is a BCC. We only present the BC-structure without the proof that it really is the BC-structure. For more details, see [13, 12, 2, 3]. The terminal object of $\mathcal{C}\text{-Set}$ is the \mathcal{C} -set $\mathbf{1} = (\mathbf{1}, \{*\}, \Vdash_{\mathbf{1}})$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the terminal object of \mathcal{C} and $\Vdash_{\mathbf{1}}$ is defined by $id_{\mathbf{1}} \Vdash_{\mathbf{1}} *$. The initial object of $\mathcal{C}\text{-Set}$ is the \mathcal{C} -set $\mathbf{0} = (\mathbf{0}, \emptyset, \Vdash_{\mathbf{0}})$, where $\mathbf{0}$ is the initial object of \mathcal{C} and $\Vdash_{\mathbf{0}}$ is the empty relation.

For products, coproducts and exponentials, let $S = (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S)$ and $T = (|T|, \|T\|, \Vdash_T)$ be two \mathcal{C} -sets. Then, for the product of S and T , consider the tuple $S \times T = (|S| \times |T|, \|S\| \times \|T\|, \Vdash_{S \times T})$, where $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_{S \times T} x$ iff $p_0 \mathbf{x} \Vdash_S p_0(x)$ and $p_1 \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T p_1(x)$, for any $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S| \times |T|$ and any $x \in \|S\| \times \|T\|$. It is easy to see that $S \times T$ is a \mathcal{C} -set. Moreover, it is clear that the set projection functions are induced by the projection maps in \mathcal{C} and hence they are \mathcal{C} -set maps. The data of $S \times T$, together with the projections is the binary product of S and T . For the coproduct of S and T , consider the tuple $S + T = (|S| + |T|, \|S\| + \|T\|, \Vdash_{S+T})$, where $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_{S+T} x$ iff there are $\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S|$ and $y \in \|S\|$ such that $\mathbf{x} = i_0 \mathbf{y}$, $x = (0, y)$ and $\mathbf{y} \Vdash_S y$ or there are $\mathbf{z} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |T|$ and $z \in \|T\|$ such that $\mathbf{x} = i_1 \mathbf{z}$, $x = (1, z)$ and $\mathbf{z} \Vdash_T z$. It is easy to see that $S + T$ is a \mathcal{C} -set. Moreover, the set injection functions are induced by the injection maps in \mathcal{C} . Therefore, we can consider them as \mathcal{C} -set maps. The data of $S + T$ together with the injections is the binary coproduct of S and T . Finally, for the exponential $[S, T]$, consider the tuple

$$[S, T] = (||S||, |T|, \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}\text{-Set}}(S, T), \Vdash_{[S, T]}),$$

where $\mathbf{f} \Vdash_{[S, T]} f$ iff $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$ implies $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T f(x)$, for any $\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |S|$ and any $x \in \|S\|$. It is easy to see that $[S, T]$ is a \mathcal{C} -set. Moreover, the usual evaluation map is induced by the evaluation map in \mathcal{C} . Therefore, we can consider it as a \mathcal{C} -set map. The data of $[S, T]$ together with the evaluation map is the exponentiation of T by S .

With a suitable notion of constructed sets in place, we can now extend the BHK interpretation to higher-order languages.

Definition 9.2.3. Let \mathcal{L} be a higher-order language and \mathcal{C} be a BCC. By a \mathcal{C} -interpretation of \mathcal{L} , we mean a tuple

$$\mathfrak{I} = (\{M^\sigma\}_{\sigma \in T(\mathcal{L})}, \{f^\mathfrak{I}\}_{f \in F(\mathcal{L})}, \{P^\mathfrak{I}\}_{P \in P(\mathcal{L})}),$$

where M^σ is a \mathcal{C} -set such that $\|M^\sigma\| \neq \emptyset$ and $M^{\sigma \times \tau} = M^\sigma \times M^\tau$ and $M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} = [M^\sigma, M^\tau]$, for any types σ and τ , $f^\mathfrak{I} : M^{\sigma_1} \times \cdots \times M^{\sigma_n} \rightarrow M^\tau$ is a \mathcal{C} -set map, for any n -ary function symbol $f(x_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$ of type τ and $P^\mathfrak{I} = (|P|, R_P)$, where $|P|$ is an object in \mathcal{C} and $R_P \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{1}, |P|) \times \|M^{\sigma_1}\| \times \cdots \times \|M^{\sigma_n}\|$ is a relation, for any n -ary predicate symbol $P(x_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$.

The \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{I} assigns a \mathcal{C} -set map to any function symbol of the language. We can extend the assignment to all terms of the language. However,

let us first extend the language \mathcal{L} by adding a constant of type σ , for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. This is a usual technique to have a name for any element in the domain. For simplicity, we denote this constant by a itself and call the extended language $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$. Now, we interpret any $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$ -term $t(\bar{x}) = t(x^{\sigma_1}, \dots, x^{\sigma_n})$ of type τ as a \mathcal{C} -set map $t(\bar{x})^{\mathfrak{J}} : M^{\sigma_1} \times \dots \times M^{\sigma_n} \rightarrow M^\tau$ using the interpretation of the function symbols and composition. For the new constants, we interpret the constant $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ as the map $1 \rightarrow M^\sigma$ that picks a from $\|M^\sigma\|$. The next step is extending the \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{J} to all *sentences* in the language $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$. First, assign an object in \mathcal{C} to any $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$ -*formula* in the following way:

- $|\top| = 1, |\perp| = 0, |t = s| = 1, |P(t_1, \dots, t_n)| = |P|,$
- $|A \wedge B| = |A| \times |B|, |A \vee B| = |A| + |B|, |A \rightarrow B| = [|A|, |B|],$
- $|\forall x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)| = [|M^\sigma|, |A(x^\sigma)|], |\exists x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)| = |M^\sigma| \times |A(x^\sigma)|.$

Remark 9.2.4. Note that for any formula $A(\bar{x})$ and any two families of terms \bar{t} and \bar{s} of the appropriate types, we have $|A(\bar{t})| = |A(\bar{s})|$. This demonstrates a restriction in our approach, highlighting that our object-assignment is essentially propositional and does not account for the dependency of the formulas on the variables. To emphasize this fact, we use the fixed name $|A|$ to denote $|A(\bar{t})|$, regardless of the family of terms \bar{t} .

Define the relation $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ between the map $\mathbf{r} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, |A|)$ and the $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{J})$ -*sentence* A in the following way:

- $!_1 \Vdash \top$, for the unique map $!_1 : 1 \rightarrow 1$,
- $\mathbf{r} \not\Vdash \perp$, for any map $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow 0$,
- $!_1 \Vdash t = s$ iff $t^{\mathfrak{J}} = s^{\mathfrak{J}}$, for the unique map $!_1 : 1 \rightarrow 1$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash P(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ iff $(\mathbf{r}, t_1^{\mathfrak{J}}, \dots, t_n^{\mathfrak{J}}) \in R_P$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |P|$, where the \mathcal{C} -set map $t_i^{\mathfrak{J}} : 1 \rightarrow M^{\sigma_i}$ is interpreted as an element in $\|M^{\sigma_i}\|$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \wedge B$ iff $\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{r} \Vdash A$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{r} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A| \times |B|$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \vee B$ iff there exists $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{i}_0 \mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A$ or there exists $\mathbf{t} : 1 \rightarrow |B|$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{t}$ and $\mathbf{t} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |A| + |B|$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A \rightarrow B$ iff for any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$, if $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A$ then $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{s} \Vdash B$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow [|A|, |B|]$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \forall x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)$ iff for any $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$, if $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$ then $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a} \Vdash A(a)$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow [|M^\sigma|, |A|]$,
- $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \exists x^\sigma A(x^\sigma)$ iff there is $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{r} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{r} \Vdash A(a)$, for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma| \times |A|$.

Let \bar{x} be a *finite* set of variables of types $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$. For any finite set of formulas $\Gamma(\bar{x})$, define $|\Gamma|$ as $\prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\gamma|$. We use an arbitrary order on the formulas in Γ , and since the product is commutative up to an isomorphism, the chosen order is actually immaterial. Then, by $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A(\bar{x})$, we mean the existence of a map $\mathbf{r} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n, \mathbf{s} \rangle \Vdash A(\bar{a})$, for any $\{\mathbf{a}_i : 1 \rightarrow |M^{\sigma_i}|\}_{i=1}^n$, any $\{a_i \in \|M^{\sigma_i}\|\}_{i=1}^n$ and any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |\Gamma|$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i \Vdash_{M^{\sigma_i}} a_i$, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\mathbf{s} \Vdash \bigwedge \Gamma(\bar{a})$. This \mathbf{r} is called a *realizer* for $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A(\bar{x})$. When $\Gamma(\bar{x})$ is empty, \mathbf{r} is called a realizer for $A(\bar{x})$. Again, we used an arbitrary order on the variables in \bar{x} which is immaterial. For an infinite set $\Gamma(\bar{x})$, by $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A(\bar{x})$, we mean the existence of a finite set $\Delta(\bar{x}) \subseteq \Gamma(\bar{x})$ such that $\Delta(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A(\bar{x})$. When the \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathcal{J} is clear from the context, we drop the subscript \mathcal{J} in $\Vdash_{\mathcal{J}}$. Finally, by $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A(\bar{x})$, we mean $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A(\bar{x})$, for any \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathcal{J} .

Remark 9.2.5. The definition of $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash A(\bar{x})$ can be somewhat ambiguous since it is not immediately clear which variables are considered free in the formulas in $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \cup A(\bar{x})$. Naturally, we would choose \bar{x} to be the set of all free variables in $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \cup A(\bar{x})$. However, there are cases where other variables need to be treated as free. For instance, in the formula $A(x) \wedge B(y)$, the set of free variables is $\{x, y\}$. However, the definition of realizability for this formula requires us to consider $A(x)$ with free variables $\{x, y\}$ rather than just $\{x\}$. Fortunately, extending the set of free variables does not impact realizability. This is because $\|M^\tau\| \neq \emptyset$ for any type τ , which implies that there is always a map $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\tau|$. Thus, using \mathbf{a} , the existence of a realizer $\mathbf{r} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$ is equivalent to the existence of a realizer $\mathbf{s} : |M^\tau| \times |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |\Gamma| \rightarrow |A|$, when the variable of type τ is a dummy in $A(\bar{x})$.

Example 9.2.6. It is straightforward to verify that the examples of propositional realizability we previously discussed extend to the case where variables are present. For instance, the following examples hold: $[A(\bar{x}) \Vdash A(\bar{x})]$, $[\perp \Vdash A(\bar{x})]$, $[A(\bar{x}) \Vdash \top]$, $[\{A(\bar{x}), B(\bar{x})\} \Vdash A(\bar{x})]$, and $[B(\bar{x}) \Vdash A(\bar{x}) \vee B(\bar{x})]$.

Example 9.2.7. Let $\mathbf{p} : |M^\sigma| \times |M^\sigma| \times 1 \times |A| \rightarrow |A|$ be the projection map on the last component. Then \mathbf{p} realizes $(x^\sigma = y^\sigma), A(x^\sigma) \Vdash A(y^\sigma)$. The reason is that for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$, any $a, b \in \|M^\sigma\|$, any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow 1$ and any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$, if $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$, $\mathbf{b} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} b$, $\mathbf{r} \Vdash a = b$ and $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A(a)$, we must have $\mathbf{r} =!_1$ and hence $a = b$, by definition. Therefore, $\mathbf{p} \circ \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \rangle = \mathbf{s} \Vdash A(b)$.

Example 9.2.8. Let $t(\bar{x}) = t(x_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$ be an $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{J})$ -term of type τ . The interpretation of $t(\bar{x})$ is the \mathcal{C} -set map $t^{\mathcal{J}} : M^{\sigma_1} \times \dots \times M^{\sigma_n} \rightarrow M^\tau$ and as it is a \mathcal{C} -set map, it is induced by a map $\mathbf{t} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \rightarrow |M^\tau|$ in \mathcal{C} . Then, for any $\{\mathbf{a}_i : 1 \rightarrow |M^{\sigma_i}|\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{a_i \in \|M^{\sigma_i}\|\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i \Vdash_{M^{\sigma_i}} a_i$, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, it is easy to see that $\mathbf{t} \langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n \Vdash_{M^\tau} t^{\mathcal{J}}(\bar{a})$. This claim holds for any such \mathbf{t} .

Example 9.2.9. Let $t(\bar{x}) = t(x_1^{\sigma_1}, \dots, x_n^{\sigma_n})$ be an $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{J})$ -term of type τ . We claim that $A(t(\bar{x}), \bar{x}) \Vdash \exists y^\tau A(y, \bar{x})$. Using the previous example, let $\mathbf{t} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \rightarrow |M^\tau|$ be a map inducing $t^{\mathcal{J}}$. Now, define the map $\mathbf{r} = \langle \mathbf{t}\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \rangle :$

$|M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |A| \rightarrow |M^\tau| \times |A|$, where \mathbf{p} is the projection on $|M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}|$ and \mathbf{q} is the projection on $|A|$. Then, \mathbf{r} realizes $A(t(\bar{x}), \bar{x}) \Vdash \exists y^\tau A(y, \bar{x})$. To prove that, let $\{\mathbf{a}_i : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |M^{\sigma_i}|\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{a_i \in \|M^{\sigma_i}\|\}_{i=1}^n$, and $\mathbf{s} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |A|$ such that $\mathbf{a}_i \Vdash_{M^{\sigma_i}} a_i$, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A(t(\bar{a}), \bar{a})$. As $\mathbf{t}\langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n \Vdash_{M^\tau} t^\mathcal{J}(\bar{a})$, we reach $\langle \mathbf{t}\langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n, \mathbf{s} \rangle \Vdash \exists y^\tau A(y, \bar{a})$. As $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n, \mathbf{s} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{t}\langle \mathbf{a}_i \rangle_{i=1}^n, \mathbf{s} \rangle$, the proof is complete.

Example 9.2.10. If $A(\bar{x}) \Vdash B(\bar{x}, y)$ and $A(\bar{x})$ has no free variable y , then $A(\bar{x}) \Vdash \forall y^\tau B(\bar{x}, y)$. Let $\mathbf{r} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |M^\tau| \times |A| \rightarrow |B|$ be the realizer for $A(\bar{x}) \Vdash B(\bar{x}, y)$. Using the commutativity of the product, we can transform \mathbf{r} to the map $\mathbf{s} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |A| \times |M^\tau| \rightarrow |B|$. Then, the map $\lambda_{|M^\tau|} \mathbf{s} : |M^{\sigma_1}| \times \dots \times |M^{\sigma_n}| \times |A| \rightarrow [|M^\tau|, |B|]$ realizes $A(\bar{x}) \Vdash \forall y^\tau B(\bar{x}, y)$. The proof follows a similar method to the one used for implications, as detailed in Example 9.1.9.

Theorem 9.2.11. (*Soundness*) For any set $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \cup \{A(\bar{x})\}$ of formulas, if $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \vdash_{\text{IQC}\omega + \text{EXT}} A(\bar{x})$ then $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \Vdash_{\mathcal{C}} A(\bar{x})$, for any BCC \mathcal{C} .

Proof. The proof is by induction on the length of the proof of $\Gamma(\bar{x}) \vdash_{\text{IQC}\omega + \text{EXT}} A(\bar{x})$. We have already realized the propositional rules as shown in Theorem 9.1.10. For the quantifier rules, as well as the axioms for equality and EXT, some specific instances have been addressed in the examples above. The remaining cases are left as an exercise for the reader. \square

Since our notion of realizability is a *special case* of the semantics for higher-order languages, we do not anticipate completeness. The following example illustrates a concrete counterexample.

Example 9.2.12. (*Incompleteness of realizability*) For any sentence A , any formula $B(x^\sigma)$ and any \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathcal{J} , we show that $(A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)) \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} \exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))$. Notice that $(A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)) \not\vdash_{\mathcal{J}} \exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))$ in intuitionistic logic. This provides a counterexample to the completeness of our realizability notion. To prove the realizability part, note that $|A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)| = [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|]$ and $|\exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))| = |M^\sigma| \times [|A|, |B|]$. There are two cases to consider. Either $\Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A$ or $\not\vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A$. In the first case, let $\mathbf{r} \Vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A$. Then, define

$$\mathbf{F}_0 = [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \xrightarrow{\langle \text{id}, \text{ro!} \rangle} [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \times |A| \xrightarrow{\text{p}_0 \circ \text{ev}} |M^\sigma|$$

$$\mathbf{F}_1 = [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \times |A| \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \langle \text{ro!} \rangle} [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \times |A| \xrightarrow{\text{p}_1 \circ \text{ev}} |B|$$

We claim that $\mathbf{F} = \langle \mathbf{F}_0, \lambda_{|A|} \mathbf{F}_1 \rangle$ realizes $(A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)) \Vdash \exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))$. Let $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)$. Then, $\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r} \Vdash \exists x^\sigma B(x)$ which implies the existence of $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ such that $\text{p}_0(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$ and $\text{p}_1(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \Vdash B(a)$. Now, we have to show that $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s} \Vdash \exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))$. First, notice that $\text{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{F}_0 \circ \mathbf{s} = \text{p}_0(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. Second, we want to show that $\text{p}_1(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s}) \Vdash A \rightarrow B(a)$. Let $\mathbf{t} \Vdash A$. Then, $\text{p}_1(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s}) \cdot \mathbf{t} = \text{p}_1(\mathbf{s} \cdot \mathbf{r}) \Vdash B(a)$ which completes the proof.

In the second case, we assume $\not\vdash_{\mathcal{J}} A$. As $\|M^\sigma\| \neq \emptyset$, we can pick a map $\mathbf{a} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and an element $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ such that $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. Define $\mathbf{F}_0 = \mathbf{a} \circ ! :$

$[|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and $\mathbf{F}_1 = \mathbf{p}_1 \circ \mathbf{ev} : [|A|, |M^\sigma| \times |B|] \times |A| \rightarrow |B|$. We claim that $\mathbf{F} = \langle \mathbf{F}_0, \lambda_{|A|} \mathbf{F}_1 \rangle$ realizes $(A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)) \Vdash \exists x^\sigma (A \rightarrow B(x))$. Let $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A \rightarrow \exists x^\sigma B(x)$. First, notice that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{F}_0 \circ \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. Second, we have $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{s}) \Vdash A \rightarrow B(a)$ as there is no $\mathbf{t} \Vdash A$.

9.3 Projective \mathcal{C} -sets and the Axiom of Choice

In this subsection, we investigate the situations where the axiom of choice is realizable. To do this, we first need to introduce projective \mathcal{C} -sets.

Definition 9.3.1. A \mathcal{C} -set $S = (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S)$ is called *projective* if $\mathbf{x}_0 \Vdash_S x$ and $\mathbf{x}_1 \Vdash_S x$ implies $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_1$, for any $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1 : 1 \rightarrow |S|$ and any $x \in \|S\|$.

Theorem 9.3.2. Let \mathcal{J} be a \mathcal{C} -interpretation that maps the type σ to a projective \mathcal{C} -set. Then, the sentence $\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y) \rightarrow \exists f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \forall x^\sigma A(x, fx)$ is realizable.

Proof. Note that $|\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y)| = [|M^\sigma|, |M^\tau| \times |A|]$ and $|\exists f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \forall x^\sigma A(x, fx)| = |M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}| \times [|M^\sigma|, |A|]$. Consider the maps \mathbf{F}_0 and \mathbf{F}_1 defined as below:

$$\mathbf{F}_0 = [|M^\sigma|, |M^\tau| \times |A|] \times |M^\sigma| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{ev}} |M^\tau| \times |A| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_0} |M^\tau|$$

$$\mathbf{F}_1 = [|M^\sigma|, |M^\tau| \times |A|] \times |M^\sigma| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{ev}} |M^\tau| \times |A| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_1} |A|$$

We claim that the map

$$\mathbf{F} = \langle \lambda_{|M^\sigma|} \mathbf{F}_0, \lambda_{|M^\sigma|} \mathbf{F}_1 \rangle : [|M^\sigma|, |M^\tau| \times |A|] \rightarrow |M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}| \times [|M^\sigma|, |A|]$$

realizes

$$\forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y) \Vdash \exists f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \forall x^\sigma A(x, fx).$$

Let $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \forall x^\sigma \exists y^\tau A(x, y)$. As M^σ is projective, for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$, there is a unique $\mathbf{a}_0 : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ such that $\mathbf{a}_0 \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. Hence, we have $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0 \Vdash \exists y^\tau A(a, y)$ which implies the existence of $b \in \|M^\tau\|$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0) \Vdash_{M^\tau} b$ and $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0) \Vdash A(a, b)$. For any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$, choose such a $b \in \|M^\tau\|$ and define $g : \|M^\sigma\| \rightarrow \|M^\tau\|$ by setting $g(a) = b$. We claim that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r}) \Vdash_{[M^\sigma, M^\tau]} g$. For the proof, let $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. By the projectivity of M^σ , we have $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_0$. As $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{a} = ((\lambda_{|M^\sigma|} \mathbf{F}_0) \circ \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{F}_0 \circ \langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{a}_0 \rangle = \mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0)$ and $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{a}_0) \Vdash_{M^\tau} b = g(a)$, we reach $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\tau} g(a)$. Hence, $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r}) \Vdash_{[M^\sigma, M^\tau]} g$. Similarly, we can prove that $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r}) \Vdash \forall x^\sigma A(x, gx)$. Therefore, $\mathbf{F} \circ \mathbf{r} \Vdash \exists f^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau} \forall x^\sigma A(x, fx)$. \square

Unfortunately, the exponentiation of projective \mathcal{C} -sets is not necessarily projective. Therefore, even if the \mathcal{C} -interpretation maps all basic types to projective \mathcal{C} -sets, this does not guarantee that all M^σ 's are projective. However, in certain special cases, we can ensure that all M^σ are projective, which in turn implies that the axiom of choice is realizable. To explain this, we need two definitions.

Definition 9.3.3. A category \mathcal{C} with a terminal object 1 is called *well-pointed* if, for any two maps $f, g : A \rightarrow B$, having $f \circ h = g \circ h$ for any $h : 1 \rightarrow A$ implies $f = g$.

Example 9.3.4. The categories **Set** and **Top** are well-pointed while **Set**² is not. For the latter claim, consider the inclusion function $i : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ as an object in **Set**² and the map $\alpha : i \rightarrow i$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{0, 1\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \{0, 1\} \\ \uparrow i & & \uparrow i \\ \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} & \{0\} \end{array}$$

defined by $\alpha_0 = id_{\{0\}}$ and α_1 as the constant zero function. It is easy to see that the only map from the terminal object $1 = \{*\} \rightarrow \{*\}$ to i is:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{*\} & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & \{0, 1\} \\ \uparrow id_{\{*\}} & & \uparrow i \\ \{*\} & \xrightarrow{\beta_0} & \{0\} \end{array}$$

where $\beta_0(*) = \beta_1(*) = 0$. As $\alpha \circ \beta = id_i \circ \beta$ and $\alpha \neq id_i$, the category **Set**² is not well-pointed.

Remark 9.3.5. Let \mathcal{C} be a well-pointed CCC and $f, g : 1 \rightarrow [A, B]$ be two maps. Then, having $f \cdot h = g \cdot h$, for any $h : 1 \rightarrow A$, implies $f = g$. To prove this claim, as any map $k : 1 \rightarrow [A, B]$ is in the form $\lambda_A k'$, for some $k' : A \rightarrow B$, it is enough to pick $f', g' : A \rightarrow B$ such that $f = \lambda_A f'$ and $g = \lambda_A g'$ and show that $f' = g'$. Now, let $h : 1 \rightarrow A$. Then, $f \cdot h = (\lambda_A f') \cdot h = f' \circ h$. Similarly, $g \cdot h = g' \circ h$. As $f \cdot h = g \cdot h$, we have $f' \circ h = g' \circ h$, for any $h : 1 \rightarrow A$. As \mathcal{C} is well-pointed, $f' = g'$ which implies $f = g$.

Definition 9.3.6. A \mathcal{C} -set $S = (|S|, \|S\|, \Vdash_S)$ is called *total* if for any $\mathbf{x} : 1 \rightarrow |S|$ there is $x \in \|S\|$ such that $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$.

Lemma 9.3.7. Let S and T be \mathcal{C} -sets. Then:

- (i) If S and T are projective (resp. total), then $S \times T$ is also projective (resp. total).
- (ii) If \mathcal{C} is well-pointed, S is total and T is projective, $[S, T]$ is projective.
- (iii) If S is projective and T is total, $[S, T]$ is total.

Proof. (i) is easy to prove. For (ii), let $\mathbf{f} \Vdash_{[S, T]} h$, $\mathbf{g} \Vdash_{[S, T]} h$, and $\mathbf{x} : 1 \rightarrow |S|$ be an arbitrary map. As S is total, there is an element $x \in \|S\|$ such that $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$. Hence, we have $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T h(x)$ and $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T h(x)$. As T is projective, we have $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x}$. As $\mathbf{x} : 1 \rightarrow |S|$ is arbitrary and \mathcal{C} is well-pointed, we have $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g}$, by Remark 9.3.5. For (iii), let $\mathbf{f} : 1 \rightarrow [|S|, |T|]$. We define a function

$f : \|S\| \rightarrow \|T\|$ such that $\mathbf{f} \Vdash_{[S,T]} f$. As S is projective, for any $x \in \|S\|$, there is a unique $\mathbf{x} : 1 \rightarrow |S|$ such that $\mathbf{x} \Vdash_S x$. Hence, $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} : 1 \rightarrow |T|$. As T is total, there is an element $y \in \|T\|$ such that $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T y$. Choose such a y and define $f(x) = y$. To prove $\mathbf{f} \Vdash_{[S,T]} f$, let $\mathbf{z} \Vdash_S x$. As S is projective, $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}$. Then, by definition, $f(x)$ is chosen such that $\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{x} \Vdash_T f(x)$. \square

Using Lemma 9.3.7, if \mathcal{C} is well-pointed and the \mathcal{C} -interpretation \mathfrak{J} maps all basic types to total projective \mathcal{C} -sets, then \mathfrak{J} maps all types to total projective \mathcal{C} -sets. Consequently, the axiom of choice is realizable for any such \mathcal{C} -interpretation. We will use this fact later in Section 10.

10 Realizability for Arithmetical Theories

In this section, we intend to apply the realizability machinery to the arithmetical theories introduced in Section 8. To achieve this, we need two additional components. First, we must introduce two new BCC's to capture the worlds of computable and continuous constructions that we informally presented in Section 8. Second, we need a categorical way of representing the set of natural numbers using a categorical gadget called the *natural numbers object*. These two components will be covered in Subsections 10.1 and 10.2, respectively. Then, in Subsection 10.3, we will use the previously introduced BCC's to prove some arithmetical consistencies and to extract information from the arithmetical proofs.

10.1 A Recursive and a Continuous World

In this subsection, we will introduce two categories to formalize the previously mentioned computable and continuous worlds. For the latter, the canonical candidate is the category **Top**. However, **Top** does not have all the exponentials, making it somewhat cumbersome to work with. To achieve a BCC with a continuous nature similar to that of **Top**, we need to extend topological spaces by incorporating their own local equality relations.

Definition 10.1.1. An *equilogical space* is a pair (X, \sim_X) , where X is a topological space and \sim_X is an equivalence relation on X . One can read the equilogical space (X, \sim_X) as a proposition whose finitary proofs are stored in X and considered up to the equivalence \sim_X . An *equilogical map* $f : (X, \sim_X) \rightarrow (Y, \sim_Y)$ is a continuous function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ preserving the equivalence relation, i.e., if $x \sim_X y$ then $f(x) \sim_Y f(y)$, for any $x, y \in X$. Two equilogical maps $f, g : (X, \sim_X) \rightarrow (Y, \sim_Y)$ are considered equivalent, denoted by $f \sim g$, if $f(x) \sim_Y g(x)$, for any $x \in X$. The relation \sim on the equilogical maps from (X, \sim_X) to (Y, \sim_Y) is an equivalence relation, respecting the composition of functions, i.e., if $f_1 \sim f_2$ and $g_1 \sim g_2$, then $f_1 \circ g_1 \sim f_2 \circ g_2$, for any $f_1, f_2 : (Y, \sim_Y) \rightarrow (Z, \sim_Z)$ and $g_1, g_2 : (X, \sim_X) \rightarrow (Y, \sim_Y)$. The collection of equilogical spaces and equilogical maps (up to the equivalence) with the evident composition and identity constitutes a category, denoted by **Equ**.

Philosophical Comment 10.1.2. An equilogical space should be understood as a constructive space, where both the set of elements and their equality are primitive notions. In constructive mathematics, every mathematical entity is a mental construction, and thus, there is no universal notion of equality applicable everywhere. One must define the corresponding equality locally for each constructed entity. Consequently, an equilogical map is simply a constructive continuous function that preserves the local identities as expected. The equivalence between equilogical maps serves as an *extensionality* criterion, ensuring that a map is uniquely determined by its values.

The category **Equ** is a BCC. The terminal and the initial objects are $(\{*\}, =_{\{*\}})$ and $(\emptyset, =_{\emptyset})$, respectively. The product of (X, \sim_X) and (Y, \sim_Y) is the pair $(X \times Y, \sim_{X \times Y})$, equipped with the usual projections, where $X \times Y$ is the cartesian product with the product topology, and $(x_1, y_1) \sim_{X \times Y} (x_2, y_2)$ iff $x_1 \sim_X x_2$ and $y_1 \sim_Y y_2$. Note that the projection maps are continuous and respect the equivalence relation, thus they live in **Equ**. The coproduct of (X, \sim_X) and (Y, \sim_Y) is $(X + Y, \sim_{X+Y})$, equipped with the usual injections, where $X + Y$ is the disjoint union of X and Y with its canonical topology and $(0, x_1) \sim_{X+Y} (0, x_2)$ iff $x_1 \sim_X x_2$ and $(1, y_1) \sim_{X+Y} (1, y_2)$ iff $y_1 \sim_Y y_2$. Note that the injections are continuous and respect the equivalence relation, thus they live in **Equ**.

For the exponential objects in **Equ**, their detailed construction is unfortunately beyond the scope of this chapter and the interested reader can refer to [4, 2] for more information. The only property of the construction we need here is the fact that the exponentials in **Top** (if they exist) remain intact by moving to **Equ**. More precisely, define the functor $Eq : \mathbf{Top} \rightarrow \mathbf{Equ}$ mapping the space X to the equilogical space $(X, =_X)$ and the function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to the class of itself in **Equ**. Then, if the exponential $[X, Y]$ with the usual set-theoretical evaluation map exists in **Top**, then the exponential $[(X, =_X), (Y, =_Y)]$ is just $([X, Y], =_{[X, Y]})$ with the same evaluation map. For instance, the exponential $[(\mathbb{N}, =), (\mathbb{N}, =)]$ in **Equ** is just $(\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, =)$ with the usual evaluation map.

The second category formalizes the computable world and is defined similarly to **Equ**. However, in this category, spaces and continuous functions are replaced with subsets of \mathbb{N} and computable functions, respectively.

Example 10.1.3. Consider the collection of pairs (A, \sim_A) , where A is a subset (not necessarily decidable or computably enumerable) of \mathbb{N} and \sim_A is an equivalence relation on A . An *equivariant map* $f : (A, \sim_A) \rightarrow (B, \sim_B)$ is a *partial* computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that maps the elements of A to the elements of B while preserving the equivalence relation. Two equivariant maps are considered equivalent if they induce the same function on the equivalence classes. We can interpret the pair (A, \sim_A) as representing the set of all *finitary proofs* of a proposition ϕ_A assigned to A , with \sim_A capturing the equivalence between these proofs. Thus, an equivariant map is viewed as an *algorithmic* procedure that transforms proofs of ϕ_A into proofs of ϕ_B , respecting the equivalences among

these proofs. The collection of all pairs (A, \sim_A) as the objects and equivariant maps (up to the equivalence) as the morphisms together with the evident composition and identity constitutes a category, denoted by **Rec**.

The category **Rec** is a BCC. Similar to **Equ**, its terminal and initial objects are $(\{*\}, =_{\{*\}})$ and $(\emptyset, =_{\emptyset})$, respectively. The products and coproducts are defined similar to **Equ**. However, as in **Rec**, we restrict ourselves to the subsets of \mathbb{N} , we need to encode the cartesian product and the disjoint union of two subsets of \mathbb{N} by another subset. More precisely, in **Rec**, the product of (A, \sim_A) and (B, \sim_B) is the pair (C, \sim_C) , together with the maps $p_0 : C \rightarrow A$ and $p_1 : C \rightarrow B$, where $C = \{2^a(2b+1) \mid a \in A, b \in B\}$, $2^a(2b+1) \sim_C 2^c(2d+1)$ iff $a \sim_A c$ and $b \sim_B d$, and p_0 and p_1 are defined by $p_0(2^n(2m+1)) = n$ and $p_1(2^n(2m+1)) = m$. Notice that both p_0 and p_1 are computable functions and hence live in **Rec**. Similarly, for the coproduct of (A, \sim_A) and (B, \sim_B) , we use (C, \sim_C) , together with the maps $i_0 : A \rightarrow C$ and $i_1 : B \rightarrow C$, where

$$C = \{2^a(2b+1) \mid (a=0 \text{ and } b \in A) \text{ or } (a=1 \text{ and } b \in B)\},$$

$2^a(2b+1) \sim_C 2^c(2d+1)$ if $(a=c=0 \text{ and } b \sim_A d)$ or $(a=c=1 \text{ and } b \sim_B d)$ and i_0 and i_1 are defined by $i_0(n) = 2^0(2n+1) = 2n+1$ and $i_1(n) = 2(2n+1)$. Notice that both i_0 and i_1 are computable functions and hence live in **Rec**.

For the exponential object $[(A, \sim_A), (B, \sim_B)]$, we use (C, \sim_C) , together with the map $ev : C \times A \rightarrow B$, where

$$C = \{e \in \mathbb{N} \mid \forall n \in A (e \cdot n \in B) \ \& \ \forall mn \in A (m \sim_A n \rightarrow e \cdot m \sim_B e \cdot n)\},$$

$e \sim_C f$ iff $e \cdot n \sim_B f \cdot n$, for any $n \in A$ and $ev(2^e(2a+1)) = e \cdot a$, where $e \cdot a$ is the output of a universal machine applying the code e of a Turing machine to the input a . Recall that for any partial computable map $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, by the S_{mn} -theorem, if e is one of the codes for the function $(m, n) \mapsto f((2^m(2n+1)))$, we have $S(e, m) \cdot n = f((2^m(2n+1)))$, for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, for any class $[f] : (D, \sim_D) \times (A, \sim_A) \rightarrow (B, \sim_B)$, it is enough to define $\lambda_A[f] : (D, \sim_D) \rightarrow (C, \sim_C)$ as the class of the computable function $d \mapsto S(e, d)$. One can verify that this map is well-defined, equivariant, and meets the required property in the definition of the exponential object. Moreover, it is unique with respect to this property.

10.2 Natural Numbers Object

In this subsection, we will introduce a categorical version of the set of natural numbers and represent numbers and numeral functions, i.e., the multi-variable functions over the natural numbers, by this categorical gadget.

Definition 10.2.1. (*Natural numbers object*) Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC. A *natural numbers object* (an NNO, for short) in \mathcal{C} is an object N together with maps $Z : 1 \rightarrow N$ and $s : N \rightarrow N$ such that for any object A and any maps $a : 1 \rightarrow A$

and $f : A \rightarrow A$, there exists a unique map $g : N \rightarrow A$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N & \xrightarrow{s} & N \\
 & \searrow a & \downarrow g & & \downarrow g \\
 & & A & \xrightarrow{f} & A
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that any two natural numbers objects in a category are canonically isomorphic. For any maps $a : 1 \rightarrow A$ and $f : A \rightarrow A$, we denote the unique g by $R(f, a)$. Therefore, we have $R(f, a) \circ Z = a$ and $R(f, a) \circ s = f \circ R(f, a)$. Intuitively, the map $R(f, a) : N \rightarrow A$ is the map defined by iterating f over the initial values a and the equations are just the description of this recursive definition.

Remark 10.2.2. Despite what we had for products, coproducts and exponentials, it is not clear how to rewrite the uniqueness condition for an NNO as an equality. This can be problematic in constructing the free CCC with an NNO. We will come back to this point later.

Remark 10.2.3. Notice that the universal definition of the natural numbers object roughly states that the diagram

$$1 \xrightarrow{Z} N \xrightarrow{s} N$$

is the “least” between all such diagrams with the fixed node 1.

Example 10.2.4. In **Set**, the set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers together with the morphism $Z : \{*\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ mapping $*$ to 0 and $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ mapping any number to its successor is an NNO. In a CCC poset (P, \leq) , the NNO is the terminal 1 with the canonical map $! : 1 \rightarrow 1$ as both Z and s . In both $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, the pair $(\mathbb{N}, id_{\mathbb{N}})$ together with the same maps as before is an NNO. Note that both the maps Z and s preserve the identity and hence are equivariant. Moreover, note that for any $a : (\{*\}, id_{\{*\}}) \rightarrow (A, \sigma_A)$ and $f : (A, \sigma_A) \rightarrow (A, \sigma_A)$, it is easy to see that $\sigma_A(f^n(a(*))) = f^n(a(*))$. Therefore, the map $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$ defined by $g(n) = f^n(a(*))$ is actually a map from the dynamic system $(\mathbb{N}, id_{\mathbb{N}})$ to the dynamic system (A, σ_A) . It is clear that this g is the unique $R(f, a)$ we are looking for. More generally, the constant functor $\Delta_{\mathbb{N}} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ together with Δ_Z and Δ_s is an NNO in $\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{C}}$. In **Equ**, the pair $(\mathbb{N}, =_{\mathbb{N}})$ along with the set functions Z and s is an NNO, where \mathbb{N} is the discrete space of natural numbers. Note that both Z and s are continuous and equivariant as they preserve the equivalence relation. Moreover, for any $[x] : (\{*\}, =_{\{*\}}) \rightarrow (X, \sim_X)$ and $[f] : (X, \sim_X) \rightarrow (X, \sim_X)$, it is easy to see that the class of the map $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ defined by $g(n) = f^n(a(*))$ is independent of the choice of f and a . The map g is clearly a continuous equivariant map from $(\mathbb{N}, =_{\mathbb{N}})$ to (X, \sim_X) . It is clear that the class of g is the unique $R(f, a)$ we are looking for. The same

construction applies to **Rec**, with the important point being that the class of all computable functions is closed under primitive recursion, allowing the definition of g from a and f .

For clarity in presenting some arguments, it is useful to consider the category **FinOrd**, which consists of natural numbers as objects and functions between finite sets as morphisms. Specifically, an object in **FinOrd** is a natural number $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and a morphism from m to n is a function from the set $\{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ to the set $\{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. The identity and composition of morphisms are defined in the standard way. The category **FinOrd** is a BCC, with the terminal object being 1, the initial object being 0, and the product, coproduct, and exponential operations corresponding to the usual operations on natural numbers. Essentially, **FinOrd** provides a simpler version of the category **FinSet**, where we work with the cardinalities of finite sets rather than the sets themselves. In fact, by choosing an arbitrary bijection $\alpha_A : A \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \text{Card}(A) - 1\}$ for any finite set A , we can define a functor $\text{Card} : \mathbf{FinSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinOrd}$. This functor maps a finite set A to its cardinality $\text{Card}(A)$ and a function $f : A \rightarrow B$ to the function $\alpha_B \circ f \circ \alpha_A^{-1} : \{0, 1, \dots, \text{Card}(A) - 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \text{Card}(B) - 1\}$. The functor Card is a BC-functor.

Example 10.2.5. (*Non-existence of the NNO*) The category **FinOrd** has no NNO. For the sake of contradiction, let the number n together with the maps $Z : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ and $s : \{0, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ be an NNO. Then, as $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ is finite, there are distinct natural numbers $p < q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s^p Z = s^q Z$. Now, consider the number $q+1$ as an object in **FinOrd** and the maps $a : \{0\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, q\}$ picking the element 0 in $\{0, \dots, q\}$ and $f : \{0, \dots, q\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, q\}$ defined as the successor function, except that for q , we define $f(q) = 0$. Then, as (n, Z, s) is an NNO, there is a map $g : n \rightarrow q+1$ such that $gs^k Z(0) = k$, for any natural number $k \leq q$. Therefore, as $gs^p Z = gs^q Z$, we have $p = q$ which is impossible. Note that we only used the existence of the map $R(f, a)$ to reach a contradiction and not its uniqueness.

Example 10.2.6. Let \mathcal{C} be a BCC such that there is a BC-functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinOrd}$. We claim that \mathcal{C} has no NNO. First, note that F is surjective on objects, because F maps $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1$ in \mathcal{C} to n in **FinOrd**. Moreover, F is a full functor as for any map $f : \{0, \dots, m-1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ in **FinOrd**, there is a map $g : \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} 1 \rightarrow \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} 1$ in \mathcal{C} that uses the injections to mimic the behavior of f and hence $F(g) = f$. Using these two facts, it is easy to see that if (N, Z, s) is an NNO in \mathcal{C} , then $(F(N), F(Z), F(s))$ in **FinOrd** has all the properties of an NNO except probably its uniqueness. However, the existence of such data is impossible as observed in Example 10.2.5. Therefore, \mathcal{C} has no NNO. One can use this observation to prove that the categories **FinSet** and **NJ** have no NNO. For the former, use the BC-functor $\text{Card} : \mathbf{FinSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinOrd}$. For the latter, by mapping the atoms p_i to some numbers, we can use Theorem 4.5.1 to find a BC-functor $F : \mathbf{NJ} \rightarrow \mathbf{FinOrd}$.

In any CCC equipped with an NNO (N, Z, s) , there is a standard way to represent natural numbers and *some* of numeral functions. For the former, the

natural number n is represented by the map $\bar{n} = s^n \circ Z : 1 \rightarrow N$, iterating the successor map for n many times. For the latter, we have:

Definition 10.2.7. Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC with the NNO (N, Z, s) . A numeral function $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is called *representable* in \mathcal{C} if there is a map $F : N^k \rightarrow N$ in \mathcal{C} such that for any $(n_1, \dots, n_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{\langle \bar{n}_1, \dots, \bar{n}_k \rangle} & N^k \\
 \downarrow \overline{f(n_1, \dots, n_k)} & & \searrow F \\
 & & N
 \end{array}$$

Example 10.2.8. Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC with the NNO (N, Z, s) . It is clear that the function $c_0 : \mathbb{N}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ mapping its one and only input to zero is representable by the map $Z : 1 \rightarrow N$. Similarly, the successor function is representable by the map $s : N \rightarrow N$. The projection function $I_i^k : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ mapping a k -tuple to its i -th argument is representable by the projection map $p_i : \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} N \rightarrow N$. For a less trivial example, consider the map $f : N \rightarrow N$ as $f = R(s \circ s, Z)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N \\
 & \searrow Z & \downarrow f \\
 & & N
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 N & \xrightarrow{s} & N \\
 \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
 N & \xrightarrow{s \circ s} & N
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N & \xrightarrow{s^n} & N \\
 & \searrow Z & \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
 & & N & \xrightarrow{s^{2n}} & N
 \end{array}$$

Therefore, the map $f : N \rightarrow N$ represents the numeral function $d : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by $d(n) = 2n$.

Example 10.2.9. In **Set**, **Set** ^{\mathcal{C}} , and **Equ**, all numeral functions are representable. In **Rec**, however, the representable functions are the total computable functions.

In **Set**, we often use the inductive nature of \mathbb{N} to define new functions from the existing ones by what is called *primitive recursion*. More precisely, given functions $g : X \rightarrow A$ and $h : \mathbb{N} \times X \times A \rightarrow A$, for some sets X and A , we can use recursion on n to define a function $f : \mathbb{N} \times X \rightarrow A$ satisfying $f(0, x) = g(x)$

and $f(n+1, x) = h(n, x, f(n, x))$. A similar situation occurs for any NNO in any CCC. Here, the inductive nature of \mathbb{N} is mimicked by the universality of the NNO.

Lemma 10.2.10. (*Primitive recursion*) *Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC with the NNO (N, Z, s) . Then, for any map $g : X \rightarrow A$ and any $h : N \times X \times A \rightarrow A$, there exists a unique $f : N \times X \rightarrow A$ such that:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \xrightarrow{\langle Z!, id_X \rangle} & N \times X \\
 & \searrow g & \downarrow f \\
 & & A
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 N \times X & \xrightarrow{s \times id_X} & N \times X \\
 \downarrow \langle id_{N \times X}, f \rangle & & \downarrow f \\
 N \times X \times A & \xrightarrow{h} & A
 \end{array}$$

Proof. Define $G : 1 \rightarrow (N \times A^X)$ as $\langle Z, \lambda_X g \rangle$ and $H' : N \times A^X \times X \rightarrow A$ as $h \langle p_0, p_2, ev \langle p_1, p_2 \rangle \rangle$ and set $H : (N \times A^X) \rightarrow (N \times A^X)$ as $\langle sp_0, \lambda_X H' \rangle$. By the universality of the NNO, there exists a unique $F : N \rightarrow N \times A^X$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N \\
 & \searrow G & \downarrow F \\
 & & N \times A^X
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 N & \xrightarrow{s} & N \\
 \downarrow F & & \downarrow F \\
 N \times A^X & \xrightarrow{H} & N \times A^X
 \end{array}$$

Define $f : N \times X \rightarrow A$ by $ev \langle p_1^{N, A^X} F p_0^{N, X}, p_1^{N, X} \rangle$. It is easy to see that this f satisfies the claimed property and it is unique in that property. \square

Remark 10.2.11. Note that in the above proof, we used exponentiation to manage the parameter object X . If the category is cartesian but not cartesian closed, one must modify the definition of the NNO to a stronger form, known as a *parametrized* NNO, which directly incorporates the parameter X into the definition.

Theorem 10.2.12. *All primitive recursive functions are representable in any CCC with an NNO.*

Proof. As observed in Example 10.2.8, all basic functions are clearly representable. It is also easy to see that the composition of representable functions is representable. For primitive recursion, it is sufficient to use Lemma 10.2.10. \square

It is clear that in a poset CCC, all numbers are represented with the map $! : 1 \rightarrow 1$. This situation is annoying as we expect to represent numbers in an injective way. The next lemma shows that this poset case is actually the only problematic case.

Lemma 10.2.13. *Let \mathcal{C} be a non-preorder CCC with an NNO. If $\bar{m} = \bar{n}$, then $m = n$, for any $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let $pd : N \rightarrow N$ be a representation for the predecessor function in \mathcal{C} and assume $\bar{m} = \bar{n}$, for some $m > n$. By composing pd with \bar{m} and \bar{n} for n many times, we have $\overline{m-n} = \bar{0}$. Therefore, it is enough to prove that $\bar{k} \neq \bar{0}$, for any $k \neq 0$. Let $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ be two different maps between two objects in \mathcal{C} . Define $h : N \rightarrow [A, B]$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N & \xrightarrow{s} & N \\
 & \searrow \lambda f & \downarrow h & & \downarrow h \\
 & & [A, B] & \xrightarrow{(\lambda g) \circ !} & [A, B]
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that $h \circ \bar{0} = \lambda f$ while $h \circ \bar{k} = \lambda g$, for any $k > 0$. Therefore, if $\bar{k} = \bar{0}$, by composition with h , we reach $\lambda f = \lambda g$ which implies $f = g$. This is a contradiction. \square

In a similar way to what we had for **NJ**, it is also possible to come up with the “least” CCC with an NNO, where every object is constructed from N and 1 by using product and exponentiation, and any morphism is constructed from the very basic morphisms such as $!$, p_0 , p_1 , ev , Z , s , and the operations $\langle -, - \rangle$, λ , and R . To state a formal version of this claim, we need the following definition:

Definition 10.2.14. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two CCC’s and $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be a CC-functor. We say that F *preserves the NNO*, if for any NNO

$$1 \xrightarrow{Z} N \xrightarrow{s} N$$

in \mathcal{C} , the diagram

$$F(1) \xrightarrow{F(Z)} F(N) \xrightarrow{F(s)} F(N)$$

is an NNO in \mathcal{D} .

Theorem 10.2.15. (*Free CCC with an NNO*) *There exists a free CCC with an NNO, i.e., a CCC \mathcal{C} with an NNO such that for any CCC \mathcal{D} with an NNO, there is a unique (up to isomorphism) CC-functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, preserving the NNO. We denote this CCC by Λ_N .*

Proof. As the conditions of being an NNO go beyond simple equalities, we cannot apply the usual method of generating all required objects and maps and then using a quotient to form the equivalence relation generated by the equalities. To address this, we should weaken the notion of an NNO to something representable by equalities, construct the free CCC with that weak NNO, and then demonstrate that the weak NNO is actually an NNO in that category. For more details on this strategy, see [44]. \square

Remark 10.2.16. The category Λ_N is not a preorder. To prove this, we assume otherwise. Thus, the two maps $Z : 1 \rightarrow N$ and $sZ : 1 \rightarrow N$ must be equal. Use the freeness of Λ_N to get a CC-functor $F : \Lambda_N \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ preserving the NNO. Hence, $F(N) \cong \mathbb{N}$. As $Z = sZ$ in Λ_N , we have $F(Z) = F(s)F(Z) : \{*\} \rightarrow F(N)$, which implies $0 = 1$ in \mathbb{N} , leading to a contradiction. Hence, Λ_N is not a preorder.

Definition 10.2.17. A numerical function is called a *primitive recursive functional* if it is representable in Λ_N .

It is reasonable to claim that the numerical primitive recursive functionals are exactly the functions that are representable in *all* CCC's with an NNO, simply because Λ_N is the “smallest” of such categories. This claim can be proved using the following lemma:

Lemma 10.2.18. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two CCC's with an NNO and $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a CC-functor preserving the NNO. Then, if the map $F : N_{\mathcal{C}}^k \rightarrow N_{\mathcal{C}}$ in \mathcal{C} represents the function $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, then $G(F) : N_{\mathcal{D}}^k \rightarrow N_{\mathcal{D}}$ in \mathcal{D} also represents f .*

Proof. As F represents f , for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $F \circ \bar{n}_{\mathcal{C}} = \overline{f(n)}_{\mathcal{C}}$. As G is a CC-functor respecting the NNO, we have $G(\bar{n}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \bar{n}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Therefore, by applying G on $F \circ \bar{n}_{\mathcal{C}} = \overline{f(n)}_{\mathcal{C}}$, we get $G(F) \circ \bar{n}_{\mathcal{D}} = \overline{f(n)}_{\mathcal{D}}$. \square

Corollary 10.2.19. *A numerical function is a primitive recursive functional iff it is representable in all CCC's with an NNO.*

Proof. One direction is clear as Λ_N is itself a CCC with an NNO. For the other direction, let \mathcal{C} be a CCC with an NNO. Define G as the unique CC-functor from Λ_N to \mathcal{C} that preserves the NNO. By Lemma 10.2.18, it follows that if a function is representable in Λ_N , it is also representable in \mathcal{C} . \square

In the remainder of this subsection, we aim to evaluate the computational power of numerical primitive recursive functionals. To begin, we demonstrate that all such functionals are computable.

Theorem 10.2.20. *All numerical primitive recursive functionals are recursive.*

Proof. Let $f : \mathbb{N}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a primitive recursive functional. Then, by Corollary 10.2.19, f is representable in **Rec**. Hence, it is recursive, by Example 10.2.9. \square

Remark 10.2.21. Having established Theorem 10.2.20, one might assume that all total recursive functions are representable in Λ_N . However, this is not the case. The reason is tied to the well-known informal argument that no formal system can capture all total recursive functions. For a formal proof, see [45].

We have shown that all primitive recursive functions are representable in any CCC with an NNO. Consequently, these functions are all primitive recursive functionals. However, the power of Λ_N extends well beyond that of primitive

recursion. This is because Λ_N supports primitive recursion not only on numerical functions but also on functionals. For example, consider the Ackermann function $A(m, n)$, defined by $A(0, n) = n + 1$ and $A(m + 1, n) = A_m^{n+1}(1)$, where A_m is just the function $A(m, -) : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. This function is *not* primitive recursive. However, it is a primitive recursive functional as one can use a higher-order recursion on m to define A_m using the equations $A_0 = s$ and $A_{m+1} = \lambda n. A_m^{n+1}(1)$.

To formally prove the representability of the Ackermann function in Λ_N , we first consider the function $iter : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that maps (n, f) to $f^{n+1}(1)$. Using the recursive definition of $iter$, which is given by the equations $iter(0, f) = f(1)$ and $iter(n+1, f) = f(iter(n, f))$, and applying Lemma 10.2.10, we can construct a map $i : N \times N^N \rightarrow N$ in Λ_N that simulates the behavior of $iter$. More precisely, set $X = N^N$ and $A = N$ in Lemma 10.2.10 and define $g : N^N \rightarrow N$ by $ev\langle id_{N^N}, \bar{1}o! \rangle$ and $h : N \times N^N \times N \rightarrow N$ by $ev\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle$. By Lemma 10.2.10, there is a map $i : N \times N^N \rightarrow N$ such that:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 N^N & \xrightarrow{\langle Zo!, id_{N^N} \rangle} & N \times N^N \\
 \searrow ev\langle id_{N^N}, \bar{1}o! \rangle & & \downarrow i \\
 & & N
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 N \times N^N & \xrightarrow{s \times id_{N^N}} & N \times N^N \\
 \downarrow \langle id_{N \times N^N}, i \rangle & & \downarrow i \\
 N \times N^N \times N & \xrightarrow{ev\langle p_1, p_2 \rangle} & N
 \end{array}$$

Now, define $F : N \rightarrow N^N$ as a map induced by the universality of the NNO:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 1 & \xrightarrow{Z} & N & \xrightarrow{s} & N \\
 \searrow \lambda_N s & & \downarrow F & & \downarrow F \\
 & & N^N & \xrightarrow{\lambda_N (io(p_1 \times p_0))} & N^N
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that $F : N \rightarrow N^N$ mimics the definition of A_- . Therefore, the map $ev\langle F, id_N \rangle : N \times N \rightarrow N$ represents the Ackermann function in Λ_N .

10.3 Realizability

From the introduction of Subsection 8.1, recall that the language of arithmetic does not include the connectives \vee and \perp . Therefore, it suffices to work with CCC's rather than BCC's for its interpretation. Furthermore, since we aim to realize arithmetical proofs, it is natural to assume that the CCC has an NNO. Thus, in this subsection, we assume that \mathcal{C} is a CCC equipped with the NNO $(\mathbb{N}, Z, \mathbf{s})$. For any such \mathcal{C} , there is a canonical \mathcal{C} -interpretation called the *standard \mathcal{C} -interpretation* that captures the intended meaning of the arithmetical proofs. Formally, by the *standard \mathcal{C} -interpretation* \mathfrak{S} of the language of \mathbf{HA}^ω , we mean a \mathcal{C} -interpretation that maps:

- the basic type N to the \mathcal{C} -set $N = (\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}, \Vdash_N)$, where $\mathbf{n} \Vdash_N n$, for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ in which $\mathbf{n} : 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the representation of the natural number n ,
- the function symbol 0 to the \mathcal{C} -set map $0^\mathfrak{S} : 1 \rightarrow N$ picking the element $0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that this map is realized by $\mathbf{Z} : 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- the function symbol $S(x^N)$ of type N to the \mathcal{C} -set map $S^\mathfrak{S} : N \rightarrow N$ defined by $S^\mathfrak{S}(n) = n + 1$. Note that this map is realized by $\mathbf{s} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- the function symbol $\mathbf{R}^\sigma(x^\sigma, y^{N \times \sigma \rightarrow \sigma}, z^N)$ of type σ to the \mathcal{C} -set map $(\mathbf{R}^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S} : M^\sigma \times [N \times M^\sigma, M^\sigma] \times N \rightarrow M^\sigma$ defined recursively by

$$(\mathbf{R}^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}(a, f, 0) = a \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{R}^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}(a, f, n + 1) = f(n, (\mathbf{R}^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}(a, f, n)).$$

Using Lemma 10.2.10, it is easy to see that this map is realized by a map in \mathcal{C} constructed via a primitive recursion.

If the basic type 2 is also present in the language and the coproduct $2 = 1 + 1$ exists in \mathcal{C} , the standard \mathcal{C} -interpretation must map:

- the type 2 to the \mathcal{C} -set $(2, \{0, 1\}, \Vdash_2)$, where $\mathbf{i}_0 \Vdash_2 0$ and $\mathbf{i}_1 \Vdash_2 1$,
- the constants 0_2 and 1_2 of type 2 to the \mathcal{C} -set maps $0_2^\mathfrak{S} : 1 \rightarrow 2$ and $1_2^\mathfrak{S} : 1 \rightarrow 2$ picking the elements 0 and 1 in $\{0, 1\}$, respectively. Note that these functions are realized by the maps $\mathbf{i}_0 : 1 \rightarrow 2$ and $\mathbf{i}_1 : 1 \rightarrow 2$, respectively,
- the function symbol $c^\sigma(x^\sigma, y^\sigma, z^2)$ to the \mathcal{C} -set map $(c^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S} : M^\sigma \times M^\sigma \times 2 \rightarrow M^\sigma$ defined by $(c^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}(a, b, 0) = a$ and $(c^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}(a, b, 1) = b$. It is easy to see that the function $(c^\sigma)^\mathfrak{S}$ is realized by a map in \mathcal{C} .

In the rest of this subsection, we will use only the standard \mathcal{C} -interpretation for realizability. Thus, we will omit the subscript \mathfrak{S} in $\Vdash_\mathfrak{S}$ everywhere. Additionally, by a sentence, we always mean an $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{S})$ -sentence.

Remark 10.3.1. Here are some remarks. First, as the language does not have the connective \perp , one can use induction to prove that for any sentence A , the set $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(1, |A|)$ is non-empty. Second, for any \exists -free sentence, i.e., a sentence A with no existential quantifiers, the object $|A|$ is always a terminal object. Therefore, there is only one map in $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(1, |A|)$. Third, as we interpreted \perp as $S(0) =_N 0$ and $|S(0) =_N 0| = 1$, we have $|\neg B| = |B \rightarrow \perp| = [|B|, 1] \cong 1$. Therefore, for any negative sentence A , we also have $|A| \cong 1$. One can read this property as an incarnation of the usual intuition that these sentences have no computational content because such sentences can have at most one realizer, encoding whether they are provable or not.

Example 10.3.2. (*Realizability for negative formulas*) For any formula $A(x^\sigma)$, we have $\Vdash \neg A(x^\sigma)$ iff $\not\Vdash A(a)$, for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. For the forward direction, let $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \neg A(x^\sigma)$ and $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. There is $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ such that $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$.

Hence, $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash \neg A(a)$. If $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A(a)$, we reach $(\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathbf{s} \Vdash S(0) = 0$ which implies $S(0) = 0$. Hence, $\not\Vdash A(a)$. For the backward direction, assume $\not\Vdash A(a)$, for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. Consider $! : |M^\sigma| \rightarrow |\neg A| \cong 1$. We claim that $! \Vdash \neg A(x^\sigma)$. To prove that, we have to show that for any $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$, any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ and any $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$, if $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A(a)$ then $(! \circ \mathbf{a}) \cdot \mathbf{s} \Vdash S(0) =_N 0$. As there is no $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ satisfying $\mathbf{s} \Vdash A(a)$, we get $! \Vdash \neg A(x^\sigma)$ which complete the proof. A similar thing is true for $\Vdash A(\bar{x})$ for a set \bar{x} of variables. Especially, if A is a *sentence*, then $\Vdash \neg A$ iff $\not\Vdash A$.

Remark 10.3.3. (*Double negation as a collapsing operator*) Using Example 10.3.2, one can see that $\Vdash \neg\neg A(x^\sigma)$ iff $\Vdash A(a)$, for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. A similar thing is true for $\Vdash \neg\neg A(\bar{x})$ for a set \bar{x} of variables. Notice the difference between $\Vdash \neg\neg A(x^\sigma)$ and $\Vdash A(x^\sigma)$. In the latter, one must come up with a map $\mathbf{r} : |M^\sigma| \rightarrow |A|$ such that for any $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$ satisfying $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$, we have $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash A(a)$. This simply means the existence of a *uniform* way to find a realizer for $A(a)$ for $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$. In this sense, one can say that $\Vdash \neg\neg A(x^\sigma)$ is actually the non-uniform version of $\Vdash A(x^\sigma)$, where we only care about the existence of the realizer and not its uniform construction. This non-uniformity is exactly what we get from the double negation operator. We discussed this role of double negation before when we talked about the axioms CT and WC–N in Section 8.

Example 10.3.4. (*Realizability for disjunctive formulas*) $\Vdash A(x^\sigma) \vee B(x^\sigma)$ iff there are maps $\mathbf{r} : |M^\sigma| \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{s} : |M^\sigma| \rightarrow |A|$ and $\mathbf{t} : |M^\sigma| \rightarrow |B|$ such that for any $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$, if $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$, either $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} = 0$ and $\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash A(a)$ or $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} = n$, for some $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{t} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash B(a)$. We only prove the forward direction and leave the rest to the reader. To prove it, substitute the formula $A(x^\sigma) \vee B(x^\sigma)$ with its definition $\exists y^N [(y = 0 \rightarrow A(x^\sigma)) \wedge (y \neq 0 \rightarrow B(x^\sigma))]$ and let \mathbf{u} be its realizer. Therefore, for any $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ and any $a \in \|M^\sigma\|$, if $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash_N n$ and $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash [(n = 0 \rightarrow A(a)) \wedge (n \neq 0 \rightarrow B(a))]$. There are two cases. Either $n = 0$ or $n \neq 0$. In the first case, as $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash_N n$, we have $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) = 0$. Moreover, $\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash (n = 0 \rightarrow A(a))$. As $n = 0$, we have $! \Vdash n = 0$. Hence, $\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \cdot ! \Vdash A(a)$. In the second case, as $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash_N n$ and $n \neq 0$, we have $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) = n$, for some $n \geq 1$. Moreover, $\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \Vdash (n \neq 0 \rightarrow B(a))$. As $n \neq 0$, we have $\not\Vdash n = 0$ which implies $! \Vdash n \neq 0$, by Example 10.3.2. Hence, $\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a}) \cdot ! \Vdash B(a)$. Now, define $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{s} = \text{ev}(\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{u}, !)$ and $\mathbf{t} = \text{ev}(\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{u}, !)$. Then, as $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a})$, $\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a})) \cdot !$, and $\mathbf{t} \circ \mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{a})) \cdot !$, it is clear that either $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} = 0$ and $\mathbf{s} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash A(a)$ or $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{a} = n$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{t} \circ \mathbf{a} \Vdash B(a)$. A similar thing is true for $\Vdash A(\bar{x}) \vee B(\bar{x})$ for a set \bar{x} of variables.

Example 10.3.5. (*Incompleteness of realizability*) For any *sentence* A , the intuitionistically invalid sentence $A \vee \neg A$ is realizable. To prove, note that there are two cases to consider. Either $\Vdash A$ or $\not\Vdash A$. In the first case, define $\mathbf{r} = 0$ and set $\mathbf{s} : 1 \rightarrow |A|$ as one of the realizers of A . In the second case, set $\mathbf{r} = 1$ and $\mathbf{t} = ! : 1 \rightarrow |\neg A| \cong 1$. By Example 10.3.2, as $\not\Vdash A$, we have $\mathbf{t} \Vdash \neg A$. Finally, by Example 10.3.4, we have $\Vdash A \vee \neg A$.

So far, we have investigated the behavior of realizability for negative and disjunctive formulas. In the next lemma, we connect the realizability to the validity in the standard model \mathfrak{N} . First, we need a definition. In the language of arithmetic, a type is called a *0-type* if it is only constructed from the basic type N using \times but not \rightarrow . It is called a *1-type*, if it is either a 0-type or it is in the form $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$, for two 0-types σ and τ . A formula is called a *0-formula* (resp. *1-formula*) if all terms in it (including variables, constants and function symbols) are of 0-types (resp. 1-types). A formula is called *standard* if $\|M^\sigma\| = \mathfrak{N}^\sigma$, for any type σ occurring in A as the type of a term in it. For instance, any 0-formula is a standard formula. To have another example, as the exponentiation $[K, L]$ exists in **Top**, for any finite powers K and L of \mathbb{N} , the exponentiation of $[(K, =), (L, =)]$ in **Equ** is $([K, L], =)$. Additionally, as K is discrete, all functions from K to L are continuous. Hence, if $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$, for any 1-type σ , we have $\|M^\sigma\| = \mathfrak{N}^\sigma$. Therefore, all 1-formulas are standard, when $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$.

Remark 10.3.6. Note that for $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$ and any 1-types σ and τ , any $f \in \|M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}\|$ is actually a continuous function $f : \mathfrak{N}^\sigma \rightarrow \mathfrak{N}^\tau$ realized by itself as a map in **Equ**. Therefore, we can write $f \Vdash_{M^{\sigma \rightarrow \tau}} f$.

Lemma 10.3.7. (*Realizability vs truth*) *Let A be an \exists -free standard sentence. Then, $\Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{N} \models A$. Especially, for any \exists -free 0-sentence A , we have $\Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{N} \models A$.*

Proof. First, recall from Remark 10.3.1 that for any \exists -free sentence A , there is only one map in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(1, |A|)$ that we denote by θ_A . Therefore, we have to show that $\theta_A \Vdash A$ iff $\mathfrak{N} \models A$. The proof is by induction on A . For the atomic formulas, the claim holds by definition and the fact that for any type in A we have $\|M^\sigma\| = \mathfrak{N}^\sigma$. The conjunction case is easy. For the implication $A = B \rightarrow C$, if $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \Vdash B \rightarrow C$ and $\mathfrak{N} \models B$, then by the induction hypothesis, $\theta_B \Vdash B$. Therefore, by definition, $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \cdot \theta_B \Vdash C$. As there is just one map in $\text{Hom}(1, |C|)$, we have $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \cdot \theta_B = \theta_C$. Hence, $\theta_C \Vdash C$. Again, by the induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{N} \models C$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{N} \models B \rightarrow C$. For the other direction, assume $\mathfrak{N} \models B \rightarrow C$. To prove $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \Vdash B \rightarrow C$, we must show that $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \cdot \mathbf{r} \Vdash C$, for any $\mathbf{r} \Vdash B$. Since, there is only one map in $\text{Hom}(1, |B|)$, we have $\mathbf{r} = \theta_B$. Since $\theta_B \Vdash B$, by the induction hypothesis $\mathfrak{N} \models B$. As $\mathfrak{N} \models B \rightarrow C$, we have $\mathfrak{N} \models C$. By the induction hypothesis, $\theta_C \Vdash C$. As there is only one map in $\text{Hom}(1, |C|)$, we have $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \cdot \mathbf{r} = \theta_C$. Hence, $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \cdot \mathbf{r} = \theta_C \Vdash C$. Therefore, $\theta_{B \rightarrow C} \Vdash B \rightarrow C$. For the universal quantifier $A = \forall x^\sigma B(x)$, if $\theta_{\forall x^\sigma B(x)} \Vdash \forall x^\sigma B(x)$, then for any $a \in \|M^\sigma\| = \mathfrak{N}^\sigma$, pick $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow |M^\sigma|$ such that $\mathbf{a} \Vdash_{M^\sigma} a$. Then, $\theta_{\forall x^\sigma B(x)} \cdot \mathbf{a} \Vdash B(a)$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{N} \models B(a)$, for any $a \in \mathfrak{N}^\sigma$. Hence, $\mathfrak{N} \models \forall x^\sigma B(x)$. Conversely, if $\mathfrak{N} \models \forall x^\sigma B(x)$ then $\mathfrak{N} \models B(a)$, for any $a \in \mathfrak{N}^\sigma = \|M^\sigma\|$. By the induction hypothesis $\theta_{B(a)} \Vdash B(a)$. Now, similar to the argument for the implication, we have $\theta_{\forall x^\sigma B(x)} \Vdash \forall x^\sigma B(x)$. For the second part, note that if A is a 0-sentence, all types σ occurring in A are in the form $N \times N \times \dots \times N$. Hence, $\|M^\sigma\| = \mathbb{N}^k$. \square

Example 10.3.8. (*Non-classicality of realizability*) We saw that $A \vee \neg A$ is

always realizable, for any sentence A . In this example, we show that $A(x) \vee \neg A(x)$ is *not* necessarily realizable if $A(x)$ is a formula with free variables. For instance, let $A(x) = \forall w^N y^N \neg T(x^N, x^N, w^N, y^N)$ stating that if the code x of a Turing machine applies to x itself, the computation does not halt. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Rec}$. We claim that $\not\Vdash A(x) \vee \neg A(x)$. To see why, assume $\Vdash A(x) \vee \neg A(x)$. By Example 10.3.4, there is a map $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ in \mathbf{Rec} such that for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, either $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{n} = 0$ and $\Vdash A(n)$ or $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{n} = \mathbf{m}$, for some $m \geq 1$ and $\Vdash \neg A(n)$. As both $A(n)$ and $\neg A(n)$ are \exists -free 0-sentences, by Lemma 10.3.7, realizability coincides with the truth. Therefore, as $\mathbf{m} \neq 0$, for any $m \geq 1$, deciding $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{n} = 0$ also decides the truth of $A(n)$ which is the halting problem for the input n . As $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a map in \mathbf{Rec} , it is a total computable function. Hence, $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{n} = 0$ is a decidable predicate for the input n . This implies that the halting problem is also decidable which is a contradiction. Hence, $\not\Vdash A(x) \vee \neg A(x)$.

Example 10.3.9. (*Undecidability of equality*) Let x and y be two variables of type $N \rightarrow N$. We show that $(x = y) \vee (x \neq y)$ is not necessarily realizable. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$ and assume $\Vdash (x = y) \vee (x \neq y)$. Then, by Example 10.3.4, there is a map $\mathbf{r} : [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}] \times [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ in \mathbf{Equ} such that for any functions $\alpha, \beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, if we also read them as maps in \mathbf{Equ} realizing themselves, either $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 0$ and $\Vdash \alpha = \beta$ or $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \mathbf{m}$, for some $m \geq 1$ and $\Vdash \alpha \neq \beta$. As both $\alpha = \beta$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ are \exists -free 1-sentences, by Lemma 10.3.7, realizability coincides with the truth. Therefore, as $\mathbf{m} \neq 0$, for any $m \geq 1$, deciding $\mathbf{r} \circ \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = 0$ also decides the equality $\alpha = \beta$. However, $\mathbf{r} : [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}] \times [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a map in \mathbf{Equ} . Hence, it is a continuous function and as $\{0\}$ is open in the discrete topology of \mathbb{N} , the subset $\Delta = \{(\alpha, \alpha) \mid \alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}\}$ must be open in $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Let 0^ω be the constant zero function on \mathbb{N} . As Δ is open, there is a basic open neighbourhood $U = \prod_{i=0}^{\omega} U_i \subseteq \Delta$ around $(0^\omega, 0^\omega)$. As $U_i = \mathbb{N}$ except for finitely many i 's, U always intersects with $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} - \Delta$ which is a contradiction. Therefore, Δ is not open and hence $\not\Vdash (x = y) \vee (x \neq y)$.

So far, we have seen some examples of (un)realizability of arithmetical formulas. Next theorem shows that any provable sentence in $\mathbf{HA}^\omega + \mathbf{EXT}$ is realizable. To extend the same claim to cover the axiom of choice, we need the following definition:

Definition 10.3.10. The NNO $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{s})$ in a CCC is called *total* if for any map $\mathbf{a} : 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there is a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{n}$.

For instance, the NNO in the categories \mathbf{Set} , \mathbf{Rec} and \mathbf{Equ} is total.

Theorem 10.3.11. *Let \mathcal{C} be a CCC with an NNO. If $\mathbf{HA}^\omega + \mathbf{EXT} \vdash A$, then $\Vdash A$. If 2 exists in \mathcal{C} , the same also holds for $\mathbf{HA}_2^\omega + \mathbf{EXT}$. If \mathcal{C} is also well-pointed non-preorder category with the total NNO, we have a similar claim for $\mathbf{HA}^\omega + \mathbf{EXT} + \mathbf{AC}$. If M^2 is also total, we have the same for $\mathbf{HA}_2^\omega + \mathbf{EXT} + \mathbf{AC}$.*

Proof. Using Theorem 9.2.11, the logical part is realizable. The only thing to prove is the realizability of the non-logical axioms of the theories. The realizability of the defining axioms for the function symbol \mathbf{R}^σ is easy to check. For

$S(0) \neq 0$ and $\forall x^N(S(x) = S(y) \rightarrow (x = y))$, as they are 0-sentences, their truth implies their realizability, by Lemma 10.3.7. For the induction

$$A(0) \wedge \forall x^N(A(x) \rightarrow A(Sx)) \rightarrow \forall x^N A(x),$$

set $X = |A| \times [N, [|A|, |A|]]$. It is enough to find a map $\mathbf{f} : N \times X \rightarrow |A|$ such that for any $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow X$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A(0) \wedge \forall x^N(A(x) \rightarrow A(Sx))$, then $\mathbf{f} \circ \langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \Vdash A(n)$. Consider $\mathbf{p}_0 : X \rightarrow |A|$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 : X \rightarrow [N, [|A|, |A|]]$ as the projection maps and $\mathbf{e} : N \times [N, [|A|, |A|]] \times |A| \rightarrow |A|$ as the canonical evaluation map. Then, define $\mathbf{h} : N \times X \times |A| \rightarrow |A|$ as:

$$N \times X \times |A| \xrightarrow{\text{id}_N \times \mathbf{p}_1 \times \text{id}_{|A|}} N \times [N, [|A|, |A|]] \times |A| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{e}} |A|$$

Using Lemma 10.2.10, there is a map $\mathbf{f} : N \times X \rightarrow |A|$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\langle \mathbf{z}_0!, \text{id}_X \rangle} & N \times X \\ & \searrow \mathbf{p}_0 & \downarrow \mathbf{f} \\ & & |A| \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} N \times X & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s} \times \text{id}_X} & N \times X \\ & \downarrow \langle \text{id}_N \times \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f} \rangle & \downarrow \mathbf{f} \\ N \times X \times |A| & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{h}} & |A| \end{array}$$

We claim that this \mathbf{f} works. First, for any map $\mathbf{r} : 1 \rightarrow X$ and any number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, note that $\mathbf{f} \circ \langle 0, \mathbf{r} \rangle = \mathbf{p}_0 \mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{f} \circ \langle \mathbf{n} + 1, \mathbf{r} \rangle = (\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r})$. Now, if $\mathbf{r} \Vdash A(0) \wedge \forall x(A(x) \rightarrow A(Sx))$, then by induction on natural numbers, it is easy to see that $\mathbf{f} \circ \langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r} \rangle \Vdash A(n)$, for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For the second part, as the NNO is total, the \mathcal{C} -set N is total. As \mathcal{C} is not a preordered set, the \mathcal{C} -set N is projective, by Lemma 10.2.13. Now, as \mathcal{C} is well-pointed, the standard \mathcal{C} -interpretation maps all types to projective total \mathcal{C} -sets, by Lemma 9.3.7. Hence, by Theorem 9.3.2, the axiom of choice is realized. The case involving the type 2 is easy. In the second case, it is enough to use an argument similar to the proof of part (iii) of Lemma 7.2.11 to show that M^2 is projective. The rest is similar to the previous case. \square

Using Theorem 10.3.11, one can easily establish some consistency and unprovability statements. First, we show that the negation of some classical tautologies are consistent with $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$.

Corollary 10.3.12. *There are 0-formulas $A(x)$ and $B(x)$ such that $\neg \forall x^N(A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$ and $\neg[\forall x^N \neg \neg B(x) \rightarrow \neg \forall x^N B(x)]$ are consistent with $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$.*

Proof. Set $A(x) = \forall w^N y^N \neg T(x, x, w, y)$ and $B(x) = (A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$. As **Rec** is a well-pointed non-preorder category with the total NNO, we have the soundness of $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$. Moreover, in Example 10.3.8, we showed that $\forall x^N(A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$ is not realizable for the standard **Rec**-interpretation. Hence, by Example 10.3.2, we reach $\Vdash \neg \forall x^N(A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$. For the other part, we claim that $\not\Vdash \forall x^N \neg \neg B(x) \rightarrow \neg \forall x^N B(x)$. Assume otherwise. Then,

as $\forall x^N \neg\neg B(x)$ is an intuitionistic tautology, we have $\Vdash \forall x^N \neg\neg B(x)$. Therefore, we must have $\Vdash \neg\neg \forall x^N B(x)$ which is equivalent to $\Vdash \forall x^N B(x)$. However, we showed that $\not\Vdash \forall x^N (A(x) \vee \neg A(x))$. \square

The next consistency statement is the consistency of Church-Turing thesis:

Corollary 10.3.13. *The theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{CT}_{\neg\neg}$ is consistent.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Rec}$. As \mathbf{Rec} is a well-pointed non-preorder category with the total NNO, using Theorem 10.3.11, it is enough to show that

$$\text{CT}_{\neg\neg} : \quad \forall f^{N \rightarrow N} \neg\neg \exists e^N \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(e, x, w, y) \wedge (fx = y)],$$

is realizable. For that purpose, first notice that the elements in $\| [N, N] \|$ are just total recursive functions. Now, using Remark 10.3.3, it is enough to show that for any total recursive function $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the statement

$$\exists e^N \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(e, x, w, y) \wedge (gx = y)],$$

is realizable. As g is computable, it has a code $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is easy to show that $\Vdash \forall x^N \exists w^N \exists y^N [T(m, x, w, y) \wedge (gx = y)]$. \square

Remark 10.3.14. As explained before, to prove the consistency of the anti-classical theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{CT}_{\neg\neg}$, one cannot use the usual classical image. However, as observed in Corollary 10.3.13, one can take an alternative world, i.e., the computable world \mathbf{Rec} and interpret arithmetical proofs in that world. In fact, the possibility of realizing Church-Turing thesis was quite expected in such a world as every “function” in that world is computable. One can go even further to say that the theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{CT}_{\neg\neg}$ with its Church-Turing thesis is actually a device to describe such computable worlds.

To have a similar consistency result for $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{WC} - \mathbf{N}_{\neg\neg}$, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 10.3.15. (i) *There exists a function $M : [\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N}] \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that reads continuous functions $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and returns a number $M(f, \alpha)$ such that for any $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, if $\alpha =_{M(f, \alpha)} \beta$, then $f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$.*

(ii) *There exists a continuous function $M : [2^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N}] \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ that reads a continuous function $f : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and returns a number $M(f)$ such that for any $\alpha, \beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow 2$, if $\alpha =_{M(f)} \beta$, then $f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$.*

Proof. First, recall from Example 4.3.8 that the function space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ as a topological space is the same as the product space \mathbb{N}^ω . Therefore, we work with the latter as it is easier to work with. For (i), for any f and α , as f is continuous, $f^{-1}(\{f(\alpha)\})$ must be open. Hence, $\alpha \in f^{-1}(\{f(\alpha)\})$ has a neighbourhood in the form $\{\alpha_0\} \times \cdots \times \{\alpha_{n-1}\} \times \mathbb{N}^\omega$ around α in $f^{-1}(\{f(\alpha)\})$, where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is the i -th argument of α . Therefore, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$, if $\alpha =_n \beta$, we have $f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$. Define $M(f, \alpha)$ as the least such number n . By definition, it is clear that $M(f, \alpha)$ has the required property.

For (ii), for any finite string $w = w_0w_1\dots w_n$ of zeros and ones, define $K_w = \{w_0\} \times \dots \times \{w_n\} \times \{0,1\}^\omega$ as a subset of $2^\mathbb{N}$ and notice that it is both open and compact. Now, as the first step, we prove that for any $f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, there is at least one $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\alpha, \beta \in 2^\mathbb{N}$, if $\alpha =_m \beta$, then $f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$. Note that $2^\mathbb{N}$ is a compact space and as f is continuous, $I = f[2^\mathbb{N}]$ is a compact subspace of the discrete space \mathbb{N} . Hence, it is finite. Moreover, as $\{k\}$ is both open and closed, then so is $f^{-1}(k)$, for any $k \in I$. Therefore, $f^{-1}(k)$ is compact. As it is open, it is a union of opens in the form K_w , for some finite strings w . By compactness, we can assume that the number of w 's is finite. Hence, $f^{-1}(k) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_k} K_{w_{k,i}}$. Pick m as the maximum of the lengths of all $w_{k,i}$'s, for all $k \in I$ and $i \leq n_k$. Therefore, it is clear that if $\alpha =_m \beta$, then $\alpha \in K_{w_{k,i}}$ iff $\beta \in K_{w_{k,i}}$ which implies $\alpha \in f^{-1}(k)$ iff $\beta \in f^{-1}(k)$ and hence $f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$. This completes the proof of claim. Now, define $M(f)$ as the least such number m . By definition, it is clear that $M(f)$ has the claimed property. The only thing to prove is the continuity of M . As $M(f)$ is the least possible number with the property

$$\forall \alpha \beta \in 2^\mathbb{N} [\alpha =_m \beta \rightarrow f(\alpha) = f(\beta)],$$

it is easy to see that $M^{-1}(m)$ is the set of $f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that f is constant over K_w , for all $w \in \{0,1\}^m$ but there are distinct $\alpha, \beta \in 2^\mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha =_{m-1} \beta$, while $f(\alpha) \neq f(\beta)$. Therefore, one can represent $M^{-1}(m)$ as the intersection of

$$\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{w \in \{0,1\}^m} \{f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid f[K_w] = \{n\}\}$$

and

$$\bigcup_{w \in \{0,1\}^{m-1}} \bigcup_{\alpha \neq \beta \in K_w} \bigcup_{n \neq n' \in \mathbb{N}} [\{f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid f(\alpha) = n\} \cap \{f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid f(\beta) = n'\}].$$

Note that the topology of $[2^\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}]$ is the usual compact-open topology, as observed in Example 4.3.8. Therefore, using the continuity of the evaluation function and the compactness of K_w , it is easy to prove that $M^{-1}(m)$ is open. Hence, M is continuous. \square

Corollary 10.3.16. *The theory $\text{HA}_2^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC}$ is consistent with the axioms $\text{WC-N}_{\neg, \rightarrow}$ and UWC-N , where*

$$\text{UWC-N} : \quad \forall f^{2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} \exists x^{\mathbb{N}} \forall \alpha^{\mathbb{N} \rightarrow 2} \beta^{\mathbb{N} \rightarrow 2} (\alpha =_x \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta),$$

is the uniform continuity principle, stating that for any map $f : 2^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the value of f only depends on finitely many of the values of its input.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$. Note that \mathcal{C} is a non-preorder well-pointed category and its NNO is total. Moreover, M^2 is total. Therefore, it is enough to show that both $\text{WC-N}_{\neg, \rightarrow}$ and UWC-N are realizable. For $\text{WC-N}_{\neg, \rightarrow}$, using Remark 10.3.3, it is enough to show that for any continuous functions $f : \mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and any function

$\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, the statement $\exists x^N \forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} [\alpha =_x \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta]$ is realizable. Using Lemma 10.3.15, we know that $M(f, \alpha)$ provides the witness for x . The sentence $\forall \beta^{N \rightarrow N} [\alpha =_{M(f, \alpha)} \beta \rightarrow f\alpha = f\beta]$ is a true \exists -free 1-sentence. Hence, its truth implies its realizability. For (ii), it is enough to use the function M introduced in Lemma 10.3.15 for $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. Note that M is continuous. \square

Remark 10.3.17. Similar to the case of Church-Turing thesis, to prove the consistency of the anti-classical theory $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} + \text{WC} - \mathbb{N}_{\rightarrow}$, we can interpret arithmetical proofs in an alternative world, i.e., the continuous world **Equ**. Again, the interpretation was quite expected and one can say that the theory with its continuity principle is actually a device to describe such continuous worlds.

In the rest of this subsection, we use the realizability machinery to extract some computational information from the arithmetical proofs. First, recall the notion of representable functions defined in Definition 10.2.7. Then, we have:

Theorem 10.3.18. (*Function extraction*) *Let $A(x, y)$ be an \exists -free 0-formula and $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} \vdash \forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)$. Then, for any non-preorder CCC \mathcal{C} with an NNO, there exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ representable in \mathcal{C} such that $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x^N A(x, f(x))$. The same also holds for HA and if $A(x, y)$ is bounded, for PA.*

Proof. For the first part, notice that $|\forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)| = [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} \times |A|]$. Therefore, by Theorem 10.3.11, there is a map $\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow [\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} \times |A|]$ such that $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)$. Therefore, for any natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as $\mathbf{n} \Vdash n$, we have $\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n} \Vdash \exists y^N A(n, y)$ which means that there is a natural number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \Vdash_N m$ and $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n}) \Vdash A(n, m)$. As $A(n, m)$ is an \exists -free 0-sentence, by Lemma 10.3.7, we have $\mathfrak{R} \models A(n, m)$. As \mathcal{C} is non-preorder, the number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is uniquely determined by $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{n})$. Define the function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $f(n) = m$. It is clear that $A(n, f(n))$ holds in the standard model, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The only thing to note is that the function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is representable by the map $\mathbf{p}_0 \circ (\mathbf{r} \cdot \text{id}_{\mathbb{N}})$. For the second part, it is enough to embed HA into HA^ω and note that any formula in the language of HA is translated into a 0-formula as its terms are all of type N . For PA, use the conservativity of PA over HA for the formulas in the form $\forall x \exists y A(x, y)$, where A is bounded and the fact that any bounded formula is equivalent to an \exists -free formula in HA. \square

Corollary 10.3.19. *If $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} \vdash \forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)$, for an \exists -free 0-formula $A(x, y)$, then there exists a recursive function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x^N A(x, f(x))$. The same also holds for HA.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Rec}$ in Theorem 10.3.18 and recall that only recursive functions are representable in **Rec**. \square

To find the strongest possible application of Theorem 10.3.18, we must work with the “least” possible CCC with an NNO, i.e., the free category Λ_N .

Corollary 10.3.20. *If $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} \vdash \forall x^N \exists y^N A(x, y)$, for an \exists -free 0-formula, then there exists a primitive recursive functional $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{R} \models \forall x^N A(x, f(x))$. The same also holds for HA and if $A(x, y)$ is bounded, for PA.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{C} = \Lambda_N$ in Theorem 10.3.18. By Remark 10.2.16, Λ_N is not a preorder. Therefore, it is enough to recall that the numeral primitive recursive functionals are by definition the functions representable in the category Λ_N . \square

Finally, we can apply the extraction technique to the higher functionals:

Corollary 10.3.21. *If $\text{HA}^\omega + \text{EXT} + \text{AC} \vdash \forall x^{N \rightarrow N} \exists y^N A(x, y)$, for an \exists -free 1-formula $A(x, y)$, then there exists a continuous function $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{N} \models A(\alpha, f(\alpha))$, for any function $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. As **Equ** is a well-pointed non-preorder with the total NNO, in Theorem 10.3.11, set $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Equ}$. Notice that $|\forall x^{N \rightarrow N} \exists y^N A(x, y)| = [\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N} \times |A|]$. Therefore, there is a map $\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow [\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbb{N} \times |A|]$ such that $\mathbf{r} \Vdash \forall x^{N \rightarrow N} \exists y^N A(x, y)$. By definition, for any function $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we have $\mathbf{r} \cdot \alpha \Vdash \exists y^N A(\alpha, y)$ which means that there is a natural number $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \alpha) \Vdash_N m$ and $\mathbf{p}_1(\mathbf{r} \cdot \alpha) \Vdash A(\alpha, m)$. As **Equ** is not a preordered set, the value of m is uniquely determined by $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \alpha)$. Define $f : \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $f(\alpha) = m$. Note that f is a continuous map, as it is realized by $\mathbf{p}_0(\mathbf{r} \cdot \alpha)$ living in **Equ**. As $A(\alpha, f(\alpha))$ is an \exists -free 1-formula and hence standard, by Lemma 10.3.7, we have $\mathfrak{N} \models A(\alpha, f(\alpha))$, for any function $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. \square

References

- [1] Steven Awodey and Andrej Bauer. Propositions as [types]. *J. Logic Comput.*, 14(4):447–471, 2004.
- [2] Andrej Bauer. *The realizability approach to computable analysis and topology*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2000. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Carnegie Mellon University.
- [3] Andrej Bauer. Realizability as the connection between computable and constructive mathematics. In *Proceedings of CCA*, 2005.
- [4] Andrej Bauer, Lars Birkedal, and Dana S. Scott. Equilogical spaces. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 315(1):35–59, 2004.
- [5] Gianluigi Bellin, Martin Hyland, Edmund Robinson, and Christian Urban. Categorical proof theory of classical propositional calculus. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 364(2):146–165, 2006.
- [6] J. Bénabou. Logique catégorique, a series of lectures presented at the séminaire de mathématiques supérieur, montreal, 1974.
- [7] Nick Benton, Gavin Bierman, Valeria de Paiva, and Martin Hyland. Linear λ -calculus and categorical models revisited. In *Computer science logic (San Miniato, 1992)*, volume 702 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 61–84. Springer, Berlin, 1993.

- [8] Nick Benton, Gavin Bierman, Valeria de Paiva, and Martin Hyland. A term calculus for intuitionistic linear logic. In *Typed lambda calculi and applications (Utrecht, 1993)*, volume 664 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 75–90. Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [9] G. Bezhanishvili, N. Bezhanishvili, J. Lucero-Bryan, and J. van Mill. A new proof of the McKinsey-Tarski theorem. *Studia Logica*, 106(6):1291–1311, 2018.
- [10] G. M Bierman. *On intuitionistic linear logic*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory, 1994.
- [11] Gavin M Bierman. What is a categorical model of intuitionistic linear logic? In *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications: Second International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, TLCA'95 Edinburgh, United Kingdom, April 10–12, 1995 Proceedings 2*, pages 78–93. Springer, 1995.
- [12] Lars Birkedal. *Developing Theories of Types and Computability via Realizability*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA, 1999.
- [13] Lars Birkedal. A general notion of realizability. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 8(2):266–282, 2002.
- [14] Francis Borceux. *Handbook of categorical algebra. 2*, volume 51 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [15] L. E. J. Brouwer. *Brouwer's Cambridge lectures on intuitionism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1981.
- [16] Alexander Chagrov and Michael Zakharyashev. *Modal logic*, volume 35 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1997.
- [17] Roy L. Crole. *Categories for types*. Cambridge Mathematical Textbooks. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [18] V. C. V. de Paiva. The Dialectica categories. In *Categories in computer science and logic (Boulder, CO, 1987)*, volume 92 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 47–62. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1989.
- [19] Roberto Di Cosmo. *Isomorphisms of types: from λ -calculus to information retrieval and language design*. Progress in Theoretical Computer Science. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1995.
- [20] Roberto Di Cosmo. A short survey of isomorphisms of types. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.*, 15(5):825–838, 2005.

- [21] Roberto Di Cosmo and Thomas Dufour. The equational theory of $\langle \mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \times, \uparrow \rangle$ is decidable, but not finitely axiomatisable. In *Logic for programming, artificial intelligence, and reasoning*, volume 3452 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 240–256. Springer, Berlin, 2005.
- [22] John Doner and Alfred Tarski. An extended arithmetic of ordinal numbers. *Fund. Math.*, 65:95–127, 1969.
- [23] Kosta Došen and Zoran Petrić. *Proof-theoretical coherence*. King’s College Publications, 2004.
- [24] Kosta Došen and Zoran Petrić. The maximality of the typed lambda calculus and of Cartesian closed categories. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)*, 68(82):1–19, 2000.
- [25] Kosta Došen. Identity of proofs based on normalization and generality. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 9(4):477–503, 2003.
- [26] Kosta Došen. A prologue to the theory of deduction. In *The logica yearbook 2010*, pages 65–80. Coll. Publ., London, 2011.
- [27] Kosta Došen and Zoran Petrić. The maximality of the typed lambda calculus and of Cartesian closed categories. *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd) (N.S.)*, 68(82):1–19, 2000.
- [28] Marcelo Fiore, Roberto Di Cosmo, and Vincent Balat. Remarks on isomorphisms in typed lambda calculi with empty and sum types. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 141(1-2):35–50, 2006.
- [29] Harvey Friedman. Equality between functionals. In *Logic Colloquium: Symposium on Logic Held at Boston, 1972–73*, pages 22–37. Springer, 1975.
- [30] Carsten Führmann and David Pym. Order-enriched categorical models of the classical sequent calculus. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 204(1):21–78, 2006.
- [31] Nicolas D. Goodman. Relativized realizability in intuitionistic arithmetic of all finite types. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 43(1):23–44, 1978.
- [32] R. Gurevič. Equational theory of positive numbers with exponentiation. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 94(1):135–141, 1985.
- [33] Victor Harnik and Michael Makkai. Lambek’s categorical proof theory and Läuchli’s abstract realizability. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 57(1):200–230, 1992.
- [34] Martin Hofmann. Syntax and semantics of dependent types. In *Semantics and logics of computation (Cambridge, 1995)*, volume 14 of *Publ. Newton Inst.*, pages 79–130. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [35] Martin Hofmann and Thomas Streicher. Completeness of continuation models for λ_μ -calculus. volume 179, pages 332–355. 2002. LICS’97 (Warsaw).

- [36] Martín Hötzel Escardó and Chuangjie Xu. The inconsistency of a Brouwerian continuity principle with the Curry-Howard interpretation. In *13th International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications*, volume 38 of *LIPICs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages 153–164. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2015.
- [37] William A Howard et al. The formulae-as-types notion of construction. *To HB Curry: essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*, 44:479–490, 1980.
- [38] J. M. E. Hyland. The effective topos. In *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium (Noordwijkerhout, 1981)*, volume 110 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, pages 165–216. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1982.
- [39] Bart Jacobs. *Categorical logic and type theory*, volume 141 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1999.
- [40] A. Joyal and I. Moerdijk. Toposes as homotopy groupoids. *Adv. Math.*, 80(1):22–38, 1990.
- [41] G. M. Kelly and S. Mac Lane. Coherence in closed categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 1(1):97–140, 1971.
- [42] S. C. Kleene. On the interpretation of intuitionistic number theory. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 10:109–124, 1945.
- [43] Anders Kock. *Synthetic differential geometry*, volume 333 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2006.
- [44] J. Lambek. An equational variant of Lawvere’s natural numbers object. volume 154, pages 265–272. 2000. *Category theory and its applications (Montreal, QC, 1997)*.
- [45] J. Lambek and P. J. Scott. *Introduction to higher order categorical logic*, volume 7 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [46] Joachim Lambek. Deductive systems and categories. I. Syntactic calculus and residuated categories. *Math. Systems Theory*, 2:287–318, 1968.
- [47] Joachim Lambek. Deductive systems and categories. II. Standard constructions and closed categories. In *Category Theory, Homology Theory and their Applications, I (Battelle Institute Conference, Seattle, Wash., 1968, Vol. One)*, pages 76–122. Springer, Berlin, 1969.
- [48] Joachim Lambek. Deductive systems and categories. III. Cartesian closed categories, intuitionist propositional calculus, and combinatory logic. In *Toposes, algebraic geometry and logic (Conf., Dalhousie Univ., Halifax,*

- N.S.*, 1971), Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 274, pages 57–82. Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [49] H. Läuchli. An abstract notion of realizability for which intuitionistic predicate calculus is complete. In *Intuitionism and Proof Theory (Proc. Conf., Buffalo, N.Y., 1968)*, pages 227–234. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1970.
 - [50] F. William Lawvere. Equality in hyperdoctrines and comprehension schema as an adjoint functor. In *Applications of Categorical Algebra (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XVII, New York, 1968)*, volume XVII of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 1–14. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1970.
 - [51] F. William Lawvere. Adjoints in and among bicategories. In *Logic and algebra (Pontignano, 1994)*, volume 180 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 181–189. Dekker, New York, 1996.
 - [52] F. William Lawvere. Functorial semantics of algebraic theories and some algebraic problems in the context of functorial semantics of algebraic theories. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, (5):1–121, 2004.
 - [53] F. William Lawvere. Adjointness in foundations. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, (16):1–16, 2006.
 - [54] Saunders Mac Lane. Natural associativity and commutativity. *Rice Univ. Stud.*, 49(4):28–46, 1963.
 - [55] Saunders Mac Lane. Why commutative diagrams coincide with equivalent proofs. In *Algebraists' homage: papers in ring theory and related topics (New Haven, Conn., 1981)*, volume 13 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 387–401. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1982.
 - [56] Saunders Mac Lane. Despite physicists, proof is essential in mathematics. volume 111, pages 147–154. 1997.
 - [57] Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. A first introduction to topos theory, Corrected reprint of the 1992 edition.
 - [58] Angus Macintyre. The laws of exponentiation. In *Model theory and arithmetic (Paris, 1979–1980)*, volume 890 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 185–197. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1981.
 - [59] M. Makkai. The fibrational formulation of intuitionistic predicate logic I: completeness according to Gödel, Kripke, and Läuchli. I. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 34(3):334–377, 1993.
 - [60] M. Makkai. The fibrational formulation of intuitionistic predicate logic I: completeness according to Gödel, Kripke, and Läuchli. II. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 34(4):471–498, 1993.

- [61] Per Martin-Löf and Giovanni Sambin. *Intuitionistic type theory*, volume 9. Bibliopolis Naples, 1984.
- [62] J. C. C. McKinsey and Alfred Tarski. The algebra of topology. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 45:141–191, 1944.
- [63] Matias Menni. *Exact completions and toposes*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2000.
- [64] Erik Palmgren. A categorical version of the Brouwer-Heyting-Kolmogorov interpretation. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.*, 14(1):57–72, 2004.
- [65] G. D. Plotkin. Lambda-definability and logical relations. Technical Report SAIRM- 4, School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Edinburgh, 1973.
- [66] Gordon D. Plotkin. Lambda-definability in the full type hierarchy. In *To H. B. Curry: essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*, pages 363–373. Academic Press, London-New York, 1980.
- [67] Dag Prawitz. Ideas and results in proof theory. In *Proceedings of the Second Scandinavian Logic Symposium (Univ. Oslo, Oslo, 1970)*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 63, pages 235–307. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1971.
- [68] Dag Prawitz. On the idea of a general proof theory. *Synthese*, 27:63–77, 1974.
- [69] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy type theory—univalent foundations of mathematics*. The Univalent Foundations Program, Princeton, NJ; Institute for Advanced Study (IAS), Princeton, NJ, 2013.
- [70] Helena Rasiowa and Roman Sikorski. *The mathematics of metamathematics*. Monografie Matematyczne, Tom 41. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warsaw, 1963.
- [71] Gabriel Scherer. *Which types have a unique inhabitant?* PhD thesis, Université Paris-Diderot, 2016.
- [72] Gabriel Scherer. Deciding equivalence with sums and the empty type. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 52(1):374–386, 2017.
- [73] R. A. G Seely. *Hyperdoctrines and natural deduction*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1977.
- [74] R. A. G. Seely. Linear logic, *-autonomous categories and cofree coalgebras. In *Categories in computer science and logic (Boulder, CO, 1987)*, volume 92 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 371–382. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1989.
- [75] Robert A. G. Seely. Hyperdoctrines, natural deduction and the Beck condition. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.*, 29(6):505–542, 1983.

- [76] Peter Selinger. Control categories and duality: on the categorical semantics of the lambda-mu calculus. *Math. Structures Comput. Sci.*, 11(2):207–260, 2001.
- [77] Alex Simpson. TLCA list of problems, Problem 15, 1995.
- [78] Alex Simpson. Measure, randomness and sublocales. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 163(11):1642–1659, 2012.
- [79] Alex K. Simpson. Categorical completeness results for the simply-typed lambda-calculus. In *Typed lambda calculi and applications (Edinburgh, 1995)*, volume 902 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 414–427. Springer, Berlin, 1995.
- [80] S. V. Solov'ev. The category of finite sets and Cartesian closed categories. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 105:174–194, 200, 1981.
- [81] Morten Heine Sørensen and Pawel Urzyczyn. *Lectures on the Curry-Howard isomorphism*. Elsevier, 2006.
- [82] Lutz Straßburger. *Towards a theory of proofs of classical logic*. PhD thesis, Université Paris-Diderot-Paris VII, 2011.
- [83] M. E. Szabo. *Algebra of proofs*, volume 88 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978.
- [84] Paul Taylor. *Practical foundations of mathematics*, volume 59. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [85] A. S. Troelstra. Realizability. In *Handbook of proof theory*, volume 137 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, pages 407–473. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.
- [86] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen. *Constructivism in mathematics. Vol. I*, volume 121 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988.
- [87] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen. *Constructivism in mathematics. Vol. II*, volume 123 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988.
- [88] Jaap van Oosten. *Realizability: an introduction to its categorical side*, volume 152 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2008.
- [89] Walter P. van Stigt. *Brouwer's intuitionism*, volume 2 of *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990.

- [90] Djordje Čubrić. Embedding of a free Cartesian-closed category into the category of sets. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 126(1-3):121–147, 1998.
- [91] Alex J. Wilkie. On exponentiation—a solution to Tarski’s high school algebra problem. In *Connections between model theory and algebraic and analytic geometry*, volume 6 of *Quad. Mat.*, pages 107–129. Dept. Math., Seconda Univ. Napoli, Caserta, 2000.