

*Basic Combinatory Objects, Uniform Preorders
and Partial Combinatory Algebras*

Jonas Frey

Category Theory Octoberfest

29 October 2022

Dedicated to the Memory of Pieter Hofstra

Remembering Pieter (CMU Pittsburgh, 2016)



Overview

Two parts:

- Hofstra's Basic Combinatory Objects
- Two variations: DCOs and Uniform Preorders

Pieter Hofstra's Basic Combinatory Objects

Basic Combinatory Objects

In his 2006 paper “All realizability is relative”¹, Pieter Hofstra introduced the notion of *basic combinatory object* (building on jww van Oosten on *ordered PCAs*).

Definition

A **basic combinatory object (BCO)** is a set A equipped with a partial order \leq and a set \mathcal{F}_A of partial endofunctions called ‘computable’, which have down-closed domain, s.t.

1. $\exists i \in \mathcal{F} \forall a \in A. i(a) \leq a$
2. $\forall f, g \in \mathcal{F} \exists h \in \mathcal{F} \forall a \in \text{dom}(g \circ f). h(a) \leq g(f(a))$

BCOs form a locally ordered category **BCO** admitting a full and order-reflecting embedding

$$\text{fam} : \mathbf{BCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$$

into the locally ordered category $\mathbf{IOrd} = [\mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}, \mathbf{Ord}]$ of **Set-indexed preorders**, given by $\text{fam}(A)(J) = (A^J, \leq)$ where

$$\varphi \leq \psi \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \exists f \in \mathcal{F}_A \forall j \in J. f(\varphi(j)) \leq \psi(j)$$

for $\varphi, \psi : J \rightarrow A$.

¹Hofstra, Pieter JW. “All realizability is relative.” *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Vol. 141. No. 2. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Basic Combinatory objects – finite meets

BCOs are closed under products in **lOrd**, thus $\mathbf{fam}(A)$ is an indexed meet-semilattice iff

$$A \rightarrow A \times A \quad \text{and} \quad A \rightarrow 1$$

have right adjoints

$$(- \wedge -) : A \rightarrow A \times A \quad \text{and} \quad \top : A \rightarrow 1$$

in **BCO**. We call such BCOs **cartesian**.

Basic Combinatory objects – existential quantification

- Say that an indexed preorder $P : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$ admits **existential quantification**, if the reindexing maps $f^* : P(I) \rightarrow P(J)$ have left adjoints $\exists_f : P(J) \rightarrow P(I)$ for all $f : J \rightarrow I$, subject to the **Beck–Chevalley condition**.
- Denote by $\exists\text{-}\mathbf{IOrd}$ the subcategory of \mathbf{IOrd} on indexed preorders admitting \exists and indexed monotone maps preserving \exists .
- Pieter Hofstra showed that
 1. the forgetful functor $\exists\text{-}\mathbf{IOrd} \rightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$ is 2-monadic, and
 2. the induced ‘ \exists -completion’ 2-monad $D : \mathbf{IOrd} \rightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$ restricts to \mathbf{BCO} .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{BCO} & \overset{D}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathbf{BCO} \\ \text{fam} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{fam} \\ \mathbf{IOrd} & \xrightarrow{D} & \mathbf{IOrd} \end{array}$$

For a BCO A , the carrier of $D(A)$ is the set of **downsets**.

3. Furthermore, D plays well with finite meets: if \mathcal{H} has finite meets then $D(\mathcal{H})$ has finite meets and moreover it satisfies the **Frobenius condition**.

Examples: BCOs from posets and (O)PCAs

- Every poset can be viewed as BCO where only the identity function is computable, which gives a full embedding

$$\mathbf{Pos} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{BCO}.$$

- Every **PCA** \mathcal{A} can be viewed as a *cartesian* BCO where the ordering is trivial and

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{e \cdot (-) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \mid e \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

- More generally, **filtered ordered PCAs** \mathcal{A} can be viewed as cartesian BCO with

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}} = \{e \cdot (-) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \mid e \in \Phi_{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

- Pieter observed that in both cases the associated **realizability tripos** $\mathbf{rt}(\mathcal{A}) : \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbf{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{rt}(\mathcal{A}) = D(\mathbf{fam}(\mathcal{A})) = \mathbf{fam}(D(\mathcal{A}))$$

- In particular this means that **realizability triposes are freely generated under existential quantification!**
- This is related to the fact that realizability toposes are ex/lex-completions.

Characterizing filtered OPCAs among BCOs

Theorem (Hofstra)

TFAE for a cartesian BCO A :

1. A is (induced by) a filtered OPCA.
2. $\mathbf{fam}(D(A))$ is a tripos.
3. The fibers of $\mathbf{fam}(D(A))$ are Heyting algebras.

Proof.

The implications $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3$ are clear.

For $3 \Rightarrow 1$, the application is informally given by the ‘universal realizer of $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi, \varphi \vdash \psi$ ’. Specifically, let $\iota \in \mathbf{fam}(D(A))(A)$ be the function sending every a to its principal downset, and let $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{F}_A$ be a witness of the inequality

$$(\pi_1(\iota) \Rightarrow \pi_2(\iota)) \wedge \pi_1(\iota) \leq \pi_2(\iota)$$

in $\mathbf{fam}(D(A))(A \times A)$. Then the application operation of the OPCA is given by $\varepsilon \circ \wedge$.

The filter Φ_A is given by the **designated truth values**, i.e. the $a \in A$ that are equivalent to \top in $\mathbf{fam}(A)(1)$.



Two variations : DCOs and uniform preorders

Overview

- Pieter's paper formed the starting point for my PhD thesis in which I gave characterizations of realizability triposes and toposes over PCAs.
- In hindsight, the only missing piece in the BCO-approach is that the image of $\mathbf{BCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$ does not have an easy characterization — if we could characterize (O)PCAs among BCOs and BCOs among indexed preorders then we could characterize (O)PCAs among indexed preorders.
- In the following I introduce a **sub- and a super-category** of \mathbf{BCO} which *do* have simple characterizations in \mathbf{IOrd} , and explain how to adapt Pieter's techniques.

$$\mathbf{DCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{BCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{UOrd} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$$

Discrete combinatory objects

Definition

A **discrete combinatory object (DCO)** is simply a BCO whose partial order structure is trivial. We write $\mathbf{DCO} \subseteq \mathbf{BCO}$ for the full subcategory of DCOs.

Definition

Given an indexed preorder $\mathcal{H} : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$, we call $\delta \in \mathcal{H}(J)$ **discrete**, if it is right orthogonal to all cartesian maps over surjections in the total category $\int \mathcal{H}$ of \mathcal{H} .

Lemma

An indexed preorder $\mathcal{H} : \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$ is equivalent to one of the form $\mathbf{fam}(A)$ for a DCO A , iff it has a discrete generic predicate.

Proof.

Given a discrete predicate $\delta \in \mathcal{A}$, define DCO structure on A by taking as computable those partial functions $f : A \rightarrow A$ satisfying $\iota|_{\text{dom}(f)} \leq f^*(\iota)$ in $\mathcal{H}(\text{dom}(f))$. \square

Characterizing $\mathbf{fam}(\mathcal{A})$

We immediately get the following.

Lemma

An indexed meet-semilattice $\mathcal{H} : \mathbf{Set}^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$ comes from a filtered PCA \mathcal{A} iff it has a discrete generic predicate and $D(\mathcal{H})$ is a tripos. The filter is trivial iff $\mathcal{H}(1) \simeq 1$.

- Filtered PCAs are better known as **inclusions of PCAs**, their realizability toposes are called **relative realizability toposes**.
- To be able to characterize (relative) realizability *triposes*, we have to reconstruct \mathcal{H} from $D(\mathcal{H})$. This is what we do next.

\exists -prime predicates

As motivation consider non-indexed case:

- Given a poset P , the lattice of $D(P)$ of **downsets** in P is the **join-completion**, i.e. the **free sup-lattice** on P .
- The **principal downsets** $\downarrow x = \{y \in P \mid y \leq x\}$ can be characterized as **completely join-prime elements** in $D(P)$ – an element x of a lattice L is called completely join-prime if we have

$$x \leq \bigvee_{j \in J} y_j \quad \Rightarrow \quad \exists j \in J. x \leq y_j$$

for all families $(y_j)_{j \in J}$ of elements.

Proposition

A complete lattice L is a join-completion iff it has **enough** completely join-prime elements, i.e. if every element is a join of completely-join-primes.

In this case L the join-completion of its completely join-prime elements.

- We can do something analogous, with \exists instead of \vee .

\exists -prime predicates

Definition

Given an indexed preorder \mathcal{H} which admits existential quantification, a predicate $\pi \in \mathcal{H}(I)$ is called \exists -**prime** if for all functions $I \xleftarrow{u} J \xleftarrow{v} K$ and predicates $\theta \in \mathcal{H}(K)$ such that $u^*\pi \leq \exists_v \theta$, there exists a section s of v such that $u^*\pi \leq s^*\theta$.

Proposition

An indexed preorder \mathcal{H} is an \exists -completion iff it has enough \exists -prime predicates, i.e. if for every predicate $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(I)$ there exists a function $u : J \rightarrow I$ and an \exists -prime predicate $\pi \in \mathcal{H}(J)$ with $\varphi \cong \exists_u \pi$.

In this case, we have $\mathcal{H} \simeq D(\mathcal{P})$ where $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is the indexed sub-preorder on \exists -prime predicates.

With this we can characterize (relative) realizability triposes!

Characterizing realizability triposes

Theorem

A tripos \mathcal{H} is a relative realizability tripos over an inclusion of PCAs, iff

1. \mathcal{H} has enough \exists -prime predicates, and
2. the indexed sup-preorder $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ on \exists -prime predicates is closed under finite meets and has a discrete generic predicate δ .

- The discreteness condition on δ can be stated in \mathcal{H} rather than \mathcal{P} , which is a slight strengthening.
- We get ordinary (non-relative) realizability if the tripos is **2-valued**, i.e. $\mathcal{H}(1) \simeq \mathbf{Bool}$.

Uniform preorders

Rather than a subcategory, uniform preorders form a **super-category** of **BCO** inside **IOrd**.

$$\mathbf{DCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{BCO} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{UOrd} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$$

Definition

A **uniform preorder** is a set A with a set $\mathcal{R}_A \subseteq P(A \times A)$ of **binary relations** such that:

1. $r \in \mathcal{R}_A, s \subseteq r \implies s \in \mathcal{R}_A$
2. $r, s \in \mathcal{R}_A \implies s \circ r \in \mathcal{R}_A$
3. $\text{id} \in \mathcal{R}_A$

- Uniform preorders form a locally ordered category **UOrd** which admits a full embedding $\text{fam} : \mathbf{UOrd} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$ into indexed preorders, where $\text{fam}(A)(J) = (A^J, \leq)$ with the ordering defined by

$$\varphi \leq \psi \quad :\Leftrightarrow \quad \{(\varphi(j), \psi(j)) \mid j \in J\} \in \mathcal{R}_A$$

for $\varphi, \psi : J \rightarrow A$.

- To transform a BCO A into a uniform preorder, we take the smallest uniform preorder structure containing $\mathcal{F}_A \cup \{\leq\}$.
Ordered structure and computable functions are both subsumed in the relational structure!

Indexed preorders arising from uniform preorders

The characterization of the image of $\mathbf{UOrd} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{IOrd}$ is very easy:

Lemma

An indexed preorder \mathcal{H} can be represented by a uniform preorder iff it has a generic predicate.

Proof.

Given a generic predicate $\iota \in \mathcal{H}(A)$, define a uniform preorder structure on A by $\mathcal{R}_A = \{r \subseteq A \times A \mid p^*\iota \leq q^*\iota\}$ where $p, q : r \rightarrow A$ are the projections. □

Finite meets and existential quantification

- Just as **BCO**, **UOrd** is closed under products in **IOrd** and the \exists -completion monad lifts to $D : \mathbf{UOrd} \rightarrow \mathbf{UOrd}$ (the latter is not true for **DCO**).
- Obvious question: given a cartesian uniform preorder A , when is $D(\mathbf{fam}(A))$ a tripos?

Theorem

For A cartesian, $D(\mathbf{fam}(A))$ is a tripos iff there exists an $@ \in \mathcal{R}_A$ such that for all relations $r \in \mathcal{R}_A$ there exists a **total function** $\tilde{r} \in \mathcal{R}_A$ such that

$$\forall a, b, c \in A. r(a \wedge b, c) \implies @(\tilde{r}(a) \wedge b, c).$$

I call uniform preorders satisfying this condition **relationally complete**. Examples are:

1. Uniform preorders induced by filtered OPCAs are relationally complete
2. For every tripos \mathcal{K} , the associated uniform preorder is relationally complete (since $D(\mathcal{K})$ is also a tripos).

Open question

- **Open Question:** Are there relationally complete uniform preorders that do not come from filtered OPCAs?
- I would think so but I haven't been able to come up with any examples!
- The paper
Liron Cohen, Sofia Abreu Faro, and Ross Tate. "The effects of effects on constructivism." Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 347 (2019): 87-120.
introduces a notion of **relational combinatory algebra**, but that doesn't seem to fit.

Thank you for your attention