Topoi with enough points

Ivan Di Liberti

Logic Colloquium 24
June 2024, Gothenburg.

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

1. Logical aspects of duality theory,

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

1. Logical aspects of duality theory,
2. Classifying topoi,

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

1. Logical aspects of duality theory,
2. Classifying topoi,
3. Topoi with enough points

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

1. Logical aspects of duality theory,
2. Classifying topoi,
3. Topoi with enough points (new stuff),

This talk is based on a joint work with *Morgan Rogers*.

- **Topoi with enough points**, ArXiv:2403.15338.

Plan

1. Logical aspects of duality theory,
2. Classifying topoi,
3. Topoi with enough points (new stuff),

Boolean algebras

Boolean algebras

Boole introduced boolean algebras in 1847,

Boolean algebras

Boole introduced boolean algebras in 1847, starting a program that nowadays we may call *algebraization of logic*.

Boolean algebras

Boole introduced boolean algebras in 1847, starting a program that nowadays we may call *algebraization of logic*.

$$\mathbb{B} = (B, \top, \bot, \neg, \vee, \wedge).$$

Boolean algebras

Boole introduced boolean algebras in 1847, starting a program that nowadays we may call *algebraization of logic*.

$$\mathbb{B} = (B, \top, \bot, \neg, \vee, \wedge).$$

Motto:

Boolean algebras

Boole introduced boolean algebras in 1847, starting a program that nowadays we may call *algebraization of logic*.

$$\mathbb{B} = (B, \top, \bot, \neg, \vee, \wedge).$$

Motto:propositional first order theories $\equiv$ Boolean algebras

Models vs homomorphisms

Models vs homomorphisms

Models of a propositional theory (boolean algebras) are assignments of truth values to its formulas,

Models vs homomorphisms

Models of a propositional theory (boolean algebras) are assignments of truth values to its formulas, and can be understood as homomorphisms into $\mathbb{T} = \{0 < 1\}$.

$$M : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{T}$$

Models vs homomorphisms

Models of a propositional theory (boolean algebras) are assignments of truth values to its formulas, and can be understood as homomorphisms into $\mathbb{T} = \{0 < 1\}$.

$$M : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{T}$$

$$\phi \mapsto [\phi]$$

Models vs homomorphisms

Models of a propositional theory (boolean algebras) are assignments of truth values to its formulas, and can be understood as homomorphisms into $\mathbb{T} = \{0 < 1\}$.

$$M : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{T}$$

$$\phi \mapsto [\phi]$$

Completeness theorem

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Yes, we can.

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically.

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?
Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically. (Completeness theorem.)

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically. (Completeness theorem.)

Stone duality

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically. (Completeness theorem.)

Stone duality

There is a dual adjunction between boolean algebras (theories) and stone spaces

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?

Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically. (Completeness theorem.)

Stone duality

There is a dual adjunction between boolean algebras (theories) and stone spaces (sets of models *equipped with a topology*).

Completeness theorem

Question: can we recover a boolean algebra (a propositional theory) from its models?
Yes, we can. Provability can indeed be tested semantically. (Completeness theorem.)

Stone duality

There is a dual adjunction between boolean algebras (theories) and stone spaces (sets of models *equipped with a topology*).

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathsf{Bool}^{\mathsf{op}} \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathsf{Mod}"] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\top"] & & \mathsf{Stone} \arrow[ll, bend left, "\mathsf{Sp}"] \end{tikzcd}$$

Stone-type dualities

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models)

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models) .
- One of the aims is to reconstruct the theory from its models (completeness theorem)

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models) .
- One of the aims is to reconstruct the theory from its models (completeness theorem) .
- Boolean algebras are the posets of propositional first order logic.

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models) .
- One of the aims is to reconstruct the theory from its models (completeness theorem) .
- Boolean algebras are the posets of propositional first order logic.

Isbell duality

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models) .
- One of the aims is to reconstruct the theory from its models (completeness theorem) .
- Boolean algebras are the posets of propositional first order logic.

Isbell duality

There is a very general duality in which every other embeds,

Stone-type dualities

- Stone-type dualities is a cluster of theorems that relates classes of posets (propositional logics) to classes of spaces (their models) .
- One of the aims is to reconstruct the theory from its models (completeness theorem) .
- Boolean algebras are the posets of propositional first order logic.

Isbell duality

There is a very general duality in which every other embeds, the duality between frames and topological spaces.

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathsf{Frm}^{op} \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathsf{pt}"] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\top"] & & \mathsf{Top} \arrow[ll, bend left, "\mathsf{O}"] \end{tikzcd}$$

Frames

Frames

A frame is a complete lattice where the *infinitary distributivity rule* holds,

$$(\bigvee x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee (x_i \wedge y).$$

A frame homomorphism is a morphism f preserving suprema ($\bigvee$) and finite meets ($\wedge$).

Frames

A frame is a complete lattice where the *infinitary distributivity rule* holds,

$$(\bigvee x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee (x_i \wedge y).$$

A frame homomorphism is a morphism f preserving suprema ($\bigvee$) and finite meets ($\wedge$).

Topologies are frames

Frames

A frame is a complete lattice where the *infinitary distributivity rule* holds,

$$(\bigvee x_i) \wedge y = \bigvee (x_i \wedge y).$$

A frame homomorphism is a morphism f preserving suprema ($\bigvee$) and finite meets ($\wedge$).

Topologies are frames

The canonical example of frame is a topology. When (X, τ) is a topological space, τ is a frame.

$$\mathrm{O} : \mathrm{Top} \to \mathrm{Frm}^{\mathrm{op}}$$

Models or Formal points

Models or Formal points

For $\mathcal{L}$ a frame we can study its models, as we did for boolean algebras,

$$M : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{T}$$

Models or Formal points

For $\mathcal{L}$ a frame we can study its models, as we did for boolean algebras,

$$M : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{T}$$

this will be a frame homomorphism into truth values.

Models or Formal points

For $\mathcal{L}$ a frame we can study its models, as we did for boolean algebras,

$$M : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{T}$$

this will be a frame homomorphism into truth values. The set of models can be topologised, providing a dual adjunction.

Models or Formal points

For $\mathcal{L}$ a frame we can study its models, as we did for boolean algebras,

$$M : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{T}$$

this will be a frame homomorphism into truth values. The set of models can be topologised, providing a dual adjunction.

Isbell duality

Models or Formal points

For $\mathcal{L}$ a frame we can study its models, as we did for boolean algebras,

$$M : \mathcal{L} \to \mathbb{T}$$

this will be a frame homomorphism into truth values. The set of models can be topologised, providing a dual adjunction.

Isbell duality

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathsf{Frm}^{\mathsf{op}} \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathsf{pt}"] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\top"] & & \mathsf{Top} \arrow[ll, bend left, "\mathsf{O}"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Frames and logic

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models?

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models? **Not always** this adjunction is too general to hope for such a result. But...

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models? **Not always** this adjunction is too general to hope for such a result. But...

Definition: frames with enough points

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models? **Not always** this adjunction is too general to hope for such a result. But...

Definition: frames with enough points

A frame has enough points when given two (different) formulas in it $\phi < \psi$ there exists a model M such that $M(\phi) = 0$ and $M(\psi) = 1$.

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models? **Not always** this adjunction is too general to hope for such a result. But...

Definition: frames with enough points

A frame has enough points when given two (different) formulas in it $\phi < \psi$ there exists a model M such that $M(\phi) = 0$ and $M(\psi) = 1$.

Thm

Frames and logic

Boolean algebras are to first order logic what frames are to *geometric logic*, a logic of infinitary disjunction, finitary conjunction and infinitary distributivity rule.

Question: Can we recover a frame from its space of models? **Not always** this adjunction is too general to hope for such a result. But...

Definition: frames with enough points

A frame has enough points when given two (different) formulas in it $\phi < \psi$ there exists a model M such that $M(\phi) = 0$ and $M(\psi) = 1$.

Thm

When a frame has enough points, then $\mathsf{Opt}(\mathcal{L}) \cong \mathcal{L}$.

From propositional to first order logic

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

Yes.

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

Yes. The previous picture can be recovered by replacing frames with **topoi**.

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

Yes. The previous picture can be recovered by replacing frames with **topoi**. A topos is a category (as opposed to poset) with all colimits (suprema), finite limits (wedges) and a good interaction between them (infinitary distributivity rule).

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

Yes. The previous picture can be recovered by replacing frames with **topoi**. A topos is a category (as opposed to poset) with all colimits (suprema), finite limits (wedges) and a good interaction between them (infinitary distributivity rule).

DL 2020, a Stone-type duality

From propositional to first order logic

Posets are perfect to handle *propositional* logic.

Question: What algebraic gadget can we use to handle *first order logic*?

Question: Can we recover a Stone-type duality for first order logic?

Classifying topoi

Yes. The previous picture can be recovered by replacing frames with **topoi**. A topos is a category (as opposed to poset) with all colimits (suprema), finite limits (wedges) and a good interaction between them (infinitary distributivity rule).

DL 2020, a Stone-type duality

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathsf{Topoi} \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathsf{pt}"] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\top"] & & \mathsf{BIon} \arrow[ll, bend left, "\mathsf{O}"] \end{tikzcd}$$

Definition: topoi with enough points

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Coherent topoi have enough points.

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Coherent topoi have enough points.

Makkai and Reyes (1980s), Fourman-Grayson completeness theorem

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Coherent topoi have enough points.

Makkai and Reyes (1980s), Fourman-Grayson completeness theorem

Separable topoi have enough points.

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Coherent topoi have enough points.

Makkai and Reyes (1980s), Fourman-Grayson completeness theorem

Separable topoi have enough points.

Question: Are these the same theorem?

Definition: topoi with enough points

A topos $\mathcal{E}$ has enough points when given a proper subobject $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ there exists a model $M : \mathcal{E} \to \mathsf{Set}$ such that $M(f)$ is not an isomorphism.

Deligne (1970s), Godel completeness theorem

Coherent topoi have enough points.

Makkai and Reyes (1980s), Fourman-Grayson completeness theorem

Separable topoi have enough points.

Question: Are these the same theorem?
Question: Can we push to the extreme the technology of Deligne and unify every completeness theorem?

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Yes.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Yes. We generalise the technology of Deligne and offer a general theorem that implies both Deligne's and Makkai-Reyes theorem.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Yes. We generalise the technology of Deligne and offer a general theorem that implies both Deligne's and Makkai-Reyes theorem.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Yes. We generalise the technology of Deligne and offer a general theorem that implies both Deligne's and Makkai-Reyes theorem.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

A closed subtopos of a topos with enough points has enough points.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

Yes. We generalise the technology of Deligne and offer a general theorem that implies both Deligne's and Makkai-Reyes theorem.

Thm. DL and Rogers.

A closed subtopos of a topos with enough points has enough points.