

Relating Theories of the λ -Calculus

Dana Scott

Merton College

Oxford

Dedicated to Professor H. B. Curry on the occasion of his 80th Birthday

Mathematical theories arise for many different reasons, sometimes in connection with specific applications and often owing to accidental inspiration. From time to time we ought to ask ourselves concerning our theories where should they have come from; usually the answer will have little to do with the exact historical development. The λ -calculus is, I feel, a case in point. In Scott (1980), in the Kleene Festschrift, I made up a story of where the theory of type-free λ -calculus could have come from. Any number of people who heard my lecture and read the manuscript were cross with me. They said “But it didn’t develop that way! And besides we doubt it ever would have.” But this reaction misses the point of my story. I shall not, however repeat the earlier story here, for the point of the present paper is different. For those people who do not like to discuss philosophy — even Philosophy of Mathematics — my remarks here can be taken as a suggestion of how to group diverse models of λ -calculus rather uniformly under a general scheme. The scheme is by now rather well known and not at all original with me. What I hope can be regarded as a useful contribution is my putting of the ideas in a certain order. As I consider the order to be a natural one, I feel there is a philosophical significance to my activity; but I should not want to force this view on anyone.

1 Theories of Functions

Everyone agrees that λ -calculus is a theory of functions. But we must ask: “What kind of a theory?” And also: “Have we got the best theory?” Personally, I think we should also inquire: “How does it relate to other theories?” I certainly

find many discussions far too silent on this last issue. Well, what other theories are there? Certainly set theory comes to mind at once, and no set theory would be worth its salt if it did not provide a theory of functions. Let us not try to catalogue the various known theories here but look at a theory in the style of Zermelo — and we do not have even to be too specific, since in any case such a theory is very standard. What is “unsatisfactory” about Zermelo’s theory is the limitization-of-size view of sets: any *one* set A is extremely small compared to the size of V , the class or universe of *all* sets. Thus, functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ mapping one set A into another set B tell us very little about operations on all sets, maps on V into V . We therefore have an urge to “improve” our set theory by constructing a class theory. Sets are elements $A \in V$; while classes are sub-collections $B \subseteq V$. As V is (by the usual assumptions) so highly closed under so many operations, we have no difficulty in construing certain classes as maps $F : V \rightarrow V$. For example for all $X \in V$ we could have $F(X) = \{X\}$ or $F(X) = A \times X$ (where A is a fixed set).

The passage from sets to classes is a familiar and useful move in the formalization of the theory: many things can be done generally for classes and then specialized to sets. And having a notation for functions defined on all sets is in many cases a great advantage. But wait. What about operations on classes? What should we say about them? Given any two classes A and B , we can form their union, $A \cup B$. The operation, $\cup : V \times V \rightarrow V$, of union of *sets* does not directly apply to *classes* even though there is a connection. Do we also want a theory of class operations? Do we have to go to hyperclasses (classes of classes)? Is there any end to this expansion?

[*An Aside:* The story of Scott (1980) was meant to suggest one answer — the one known to Plotkin (1972). Namely, we consider only “continuous” class operations. These are objects F such that $F(X)$ is defined for every class $X \subseteq V$ and $F(X)$ is a class, too. Moreover F should satisfy:

1. $X \subseteq Y$ always implies $F(X) \subseteq F(Y)$
2. Whenever $A \subseteq F(X)$ and A is a set, then $A \subseteq F(B)$ for some set $B \subseteq X$.

We do not have time to discuss the justification of the word “continuous” here; suffice it to say that conditions (1) and (2) are not as strict as they at first might seem. Every ordinary map $f : V \rightarrow V$ determines a continuous class operator by the definition:

$$F(X) = \{f(x) \mid x \in X\}.$$

Furthermore, F determines f , for we have: $y = f(x)$ if and only if $\{y\} = F(\{x\})$, for all $x, y \in V$. In a suitable sense, then, nothing has been lost; but what has been gained? The reply is that continuous class operators can be identified with classes. We could write, for instance:

$$F = \{(A, B) \mid A, B \in V \text{ and } A \subseteq F(B)\},$$

where, say:

$$(A, B) = \{\{A\}, \{A, B\}\},$$

More in harmony with Scott (1980) would be: $F = \{(a, B) \mid a, B \in V \text{ and } a \in F(B)\}$.

Either trick reduces operator theory to class theory - in the continuous case. And the same trick could be carried over to other kinds of set theory (e.g. Quine's). What we know is that operator theory gives a model for λ -calculus; it is a quite elementary model, too. Nice as this connection is, it is not the topic of the present paper: we do not want to make λ -calculus depend on set theory, since then we have still to explain where set theory comes from. But the connection should be borne in mind.]

Perhaps set theory brings in too many extraneous issues. V , after all, is a massive object closed under all manner of strange operations. What we are probably seeking is a "purer" view of functions: a theory of functions in themselves, not a theory of functions derived from sets. What, then, is a pure theory of functions? Answer: category theory. General category theory is a very pure theory: it is the milk-and-water theory of functions under composition. This composition operation is associative and possesses neutral elements (compositions of zero terms). That is about all you can say about it except to stress that it is also a rather bland theory of types. Every function f has a (unique) domain and codomain, and we write:

$$f : \text{dom } f \rightarrow \text{cod } f$$

Every possible domain is a codomain (and conversely), because if A is such, then

$$\text{dom } 1_A = A = \text{cod } 1_A$$

where 1_A is the neutral element of type A (If we want to be especially parsimonious in entities, we can even write $1_A = A$, because each of 1_A and A uniquely determines the other.).

The point of distinguishing domains and codomains is that not only do they specify the type of f , but a composition $g \circ f$ is defined if, and only if, $\text{dom } g = \text{cod } f$. And then $\text{dom}(g \circ f) = \text{dom } f$ and $\text{cod}(g \circ f) = \text{cod}(g)$. We usually write this as a “rule of inference”:

$$\frac{f : A \rightarrow B \quad g : B \rightarrow C}{g \circ f : A \rightarrow C}$$

with the understanding that the typing of $f \circ g$ can only be obtained by such an application of the rule. The types, then, are invoked just to type functions, and the only theory involved is that of the “transition” of types under composition.

Sets (and set-theoretical mappings) do of course form a category; category theory is meant to be more general than set theory. We should construe the function entities here as triples of sets (A, f, B) where

$$f \subseteq A \times B \text{ and } \forall x \in A \exists! y \in B \text{ s.t. } (x, y) \in f.$$

The definition of composition is obvious. Sets, in this way, give us only one special example of a category. I beg forgiveness of the reader for boring him. All of this is well known to the moderately awake undergraduate in mathematics. Indeed, that is the point: there is plenty of evidence now that category theory is a natural and useful theory of functions. I do not have to rehearse the examples as they can be found in any number of books (e.g. Mac Lane (1971]). There is a rather important logical point to stress, however important for anyone who has thought about λ -calculus models. Category theory is very extensional. We assume as axioms the equations:

$$1_A \circ f = f \circ 1_B = f$$

and

$$h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f,$$

provided $A = \text{dom } f$ and $B = \text{cod } f$ and the double compositions are defined. These are *functional* equations, and they say that two functions defined in different ways are in fact *identical*. Furthermore, identical things can everywhere replace one another.

This point about extensionality may not seem exciting or important, but the logician should remember that, in certain intensional theories of functions, “obvious” definitions will not provide categories. We shall return to this point later. But is category theory the long-sought answer? No, no, not at all. Category theory *pure* provides nothing explicitly aside from identity functions —

and they occur only if we have some possible domain. We do get compositions if we have the necessary terms. Thus, as it stands, category theory has no existential import. (It was not meant to.) Set theory has "too much" existential import. (It was meant to.) What we seek is the middle way — and an argument that the middle way is natural and general.

There is no need to build up unnecessary suspense: the middle way is the theory of the (so called) cartesian closed categories. Fortunately Lambek has written extensively about the theory, and I can refer the reader to his papers for further details; I also am happy to acknowledge his writings as helping me understand what is going on. If we remark that his paper in this volume is called "From λ -calculus to cartesian closed categories", then we might say that my present paper ought to be called "From cartesian closed categories to λ -calculus." I am trying to find out where λ -calculus should come from, and the fact that the notion of a cartesian closed category (c.c.c.) is a late developing one (Eilenberg & Kelly (1966)), is not relevant to the argument: I shall try to explain in my own words in the next section why we should look to it *first*.

2 A Theory of Types

I say "a theory", because there are many possible theories; indeed pure category theory is one of the theories. Its weakness lies in the fact that we are given no construction principles, no way of making new types from old. From the point of view of logic what should we expect? What more do we want to say beyond relations between types which hold when a mapping statement $f : A \rightarrow B$ obtains.

An immediate question that must come to anyone's mind concerns the *arity* of functions. The usual way of reading a mapping statement is to take it as a statement about *one-place* functions, and the \circ of composition is the composition of one place functions. This seems very restricted.

People have suggested generalizing categories to multi-place functions with concomitant compositions (e.g. the book Szabo (1978)), but it does not seem the neatest solution. Much easier is to assume that the category has cartesian products - and more specifically particular representatives of the product domains are chosen. As a special case we will know what the cartesian power A^n is for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and n -ary functions are then maps $f : A^n \rightarrow B$. Not much of a surprise.

We have to take care, however. In the first place, a given category may not have cartesian products (it fails to have enough types). Even if it does, the

maps allowed may be too restricted - for logical purposes. Take the category of groups and homomorphisms, for example. The required products exist. A map $f : A^2 \rightarrow B$ in this category has to be a group homomorphism, naturally. Suppose two maps $u, v : A \rightarrow B$ were given. Intuitively we think in terms of elements and that we are mapping $x \mapsto u(x)$ and $y \mapsto v(y)$. The pointwise group product of the maps, namely, $x, y \mapsto u(x) \cdot v(y)$ is a very nice map $g : A^2 \rightarrow B$ in the ordinary sense — but unless the group B is abelian, g is not a homomorphism. It is a “logical” map but not an “algebraic” map. Pure category theory applies to many algebraic situations (as everyone knows that is why it is a good theory), but not all categories are “logical” even if they have products. In the example of groups, what was “missing” was the group multiplication $\mu : B^2 \rightarrow B$ as a map in the category. (Inverse is missing as well, since it reverses order.) There is an interesting theory of algebraic theories that address the question of the proper categorical construction of categories of algebras, but I do not think we should invoke that theory here.

The precise description of products is as follows. We assume our category has a special domain $\mathbb{1}$ (the empty product, so $A^0 = B^0 = \mathbb{1}$), and for each domain A a special map $0_A : A \mapsto \mathbb{1}$. (The domain $\mathbb{1}$, intuitively, has just one “element”.) Moreover the rule about maps is that 0_A is unique; that is whenever $f : A \mapsto \mathbb{1}$, then we have the equation

$$f = 0_A.$$

Concerning binary products, we have for any two domains A and B a special choice of a domain $A \times B$ (and so $A^{n+1} = A^n \times A$), and special maps

$$\begin{aligned} p_{AB} : A \times B &\rightarrow A \\ q_{AB} : A \times B &\rightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

But the mere existence of “projections” does not characterize $A \times B$ as a product. We have to assume that there is a chosen pairing operation $\langle f, g \rangle$ on maps such that types are assigned by the rule:

$$\frac{f : C \rightarrow A \quad g : C \rightarrow B}{\langle f, g \rangle : C \rightarrow A \times B}$$

Moreover, provided f and g are as above and $h : C \rightarrow A \times B$ we have to assume

$$\begin{aligned} p_{AB} \circ \langle f, g \rangle &= f \\ q_{AB} \circ \langle f, g \rangle &= g \\ \langle p_{AB} \circ h, q_{AB} \circ h \rangle &= h \end{aligned}$$

that is to say, there is an explicit one-one correspondence between the pairs of maps f, g and the map h into the product. This all now makes $A \times B$ well behaved within the category.

So much for a theory of tuples and multiary maps. But we still want a theory of functions: a category allows us to talk of selected functions, while we would want various equations to have a force relating to arbitrary functions. The answer to this desire is function spaces as explicit domains in the category. Given A and B we want to form $(A \rightarrow B)$ as a domain in its own right; if so, there are many maps that have to be set down to make the function space behave. (And here we must definitely leave the category of groups.)

In the first place there has to be an evaluation map $\varepsilon_{BC} : (B \rightarrow C) \times B \rightarrow C$ with the intuitive interpretation that it is the map $f, x \mapsto f(x)$. In the second place there has to be a map for shifting around variables; more precisely, suppose $h : A \times B \rightarrow C$ is a map with two arguments. In an evaluation $h(x, y)$, we can think of holding x constant and regarding $h(x, y)$ as a function of y . We need a name for this function — and for the correspondence with possible values of x . We write

$$\Lambda_{ABC} h : A \times B \rightarrow C$$

so that the function we were thinking of — given x — was $(\Lambda_{ABC} h)(x)$. But all this function-value notation is not categorical notation; what we have to say is that there is a one one correspondence via Λ between maps $h : A \times B \rightarrow C$ and maps $k : A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)$. This comes down to these two equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \circ \langle (\Lambda h) \circ p, q \rangle &= h, \text{ and} \\ \Lambda(\varepsilon \circ \langle k \circ p, q \rangle) &= k. \end{aligned}$$

(It is necessary to have subscripts here: Λ_{ABC} , p_{AB} , q_{AB} , and ε_{BC} ; but we leave them off when there is no ambiguity.)

The notation is now wholly categorical (and mostly unreadable). Category theorists put the whole thing (that is, the definition of a c.c.c., which is what we have just given) into the language of functors, which has a lot of sense. But if you have never seen any abstract category theory before, it is really rather too abstract. The idea of a c.c.c. as a system of types is, I think, reasonably simple. Each c.c.c. represents a theory of functions. The maps in the category are certain special functions that are used to express the relations between the types (the domains of the category). In order to be able to deal with multiary functions, we assume we can form (and analyze) products. In order to be able to work with transformations of arbitrary functions (“arbitrary” within the

theory), we assume we can form function spaces: this is where “higher” types enter the theory, as in the sequence of domains:

$$A, (A \rightarrow A), ((A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A), (((A \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A), \dots$$

To be able really to view these domains as function spaces, certain operations, ε and \wedge , with characteristic equations have to be laid down. If a c.c.c. is a theory of functions (and we include here higher-type functions), then the theory of c.c.c.’s is the theory of types of the title of this section. It is only one such theory. “Bigger” theories could be obtained by demanding more types: for example we could axiomatize *coproducts* (disjoint sums), \mathcal{O} and $A + B$. We could demand infinite products and co products. We could throw in a type Ω of “propositions” so that higher types like $(A^n \rightarrow \Omega)$ correspond to n -ary predicates. This gets into topos theory (as in Johnstone (1977) or Goldblatt (1979) — just to name two recent texts). But the bigger the theory, the more involved, and full definitions at this point would not help this discussion very much. We could also look for “smaller” theories. Some examples — of a rather highly formal nature — can be found in Szabo (1978) with an indication of the algebraic interest of these other type theories. However, a c.c.c. is rather more “logical” and good as a middle ground; further Lambek has explained the logical interest; there is a perfect correspondence between c.c.c.’s and (extensional) typed λ -calculi. The reader can turn to Lambek’s paper for details and references.

Roughly put, when we formally define the typed A -language (with types in the given c.c.c.), then if τ is a typed λ -expression with free variables of types A^0, A^1, \dots, A^{n-1} we can define the “meaning” of τ as a map

$$\llbracket \tau \rrbracket : A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_{n-1} \rightarrow B$$

where B is the type of τ . For example if u is a variable of type $(B \rightarrow C)$ and v a variable of type B , then

$$\llbracket u(v) \rrbracket : (B \rightarrow C) \times B \rightarrow C,$$

and in fact $\llbracket u(v) \rrbracket = \varepsilon_{BC}$. Also if x is the variable in τ of type A_{n-1} then

$$\llbracket \lambda x. \tau \rrbracket : A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots \times A_{n-2} \rightarrow (A_{n-1} \rightarrow B),$$

and in fact $\llbracket \lambda x. \tau \rrbracket = \wedge \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$. (Warning: for other of the variables that are not the last mentioned, it is not so easy to write down the answer: some permutations of the products have to be introduced.)

The two characteristic equations for ε and \wedge in the axioms for a c.c.c., have very familiar translations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda y. h(x, y))(y') &= h(x, y') \quad \text{and} \\ \lambda y. k(x)(y) &= k(x), \end{aligned}$$

where the type of x is A , the type of y and of y' is B . (That is to say, the $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ -meaning of the two sides of the equation is the same map in the category.) Of course this all has to be defined more rigorously, but I hope I have conveyed the main part of the idea of Lambek's correspondence. A typed λ -calculus (with pairs, products, and function spaces) is just another notation for a c.c.c.

No, we have to be more specific than that. Take a c.c.c. How does it correspond to a theory (of functions)? The domains of the category are the types of the theory, and they are structured by the $\mathbb{1}$, $(A \times B)$, $(A \rightarrow B)$ operations on types. Things like \circ , 0 , p , q , $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, ε , and \wedge stand for logical constants (or operators) — with type subscripts as needed. Maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ of the category stand for the non-logical constants of the theory. The equations $f = g$ between maps are the assertions of the theory. The logical axioms are those special equations common to all c.c.c.'s — the other equations are those that just happen to work out in the category. From this point of view the theory has no free variables: all assertions are written with constant terms. Equations with free variables can be construed as functional equations (by a heavy use of \wedge).

Conversely, a more conventional typed λ -calculus is an equational theory with both the familiar logical axioms as well as with non-logical axioms as desired. The equations can involve free variables. Aside from the usual deduction rules for equality, we must employ the extensionality rule

$$\frac{\tau = \sigma}{\lambda x. \tau = \lambda x. \sigma}$$

A category is formed from the types (which are *given* as closed under $\mathbb{1}$, $(A \times B)$, $(A \rightarrow B)$). The terms all have unambiguous types, and they are divided into equivalence classes by the theory. As the maps of the category we take the equivalence classes $[\lambda x. \tau]$ where the term τ of type B has at most the variable x of type A free, and we write $[\lambda x. \tau] : A \rightarrow B$. Of course

$$\begin{aligned} 1_A &= [\lambda x. x], \text{ and} \\ [\lambda y. \sigma] \circ [\lambda x. \tau] &= [\lambda x. \sigma(\tau/y)] \end{aligned}$$

where τ is substituted for y in σ . We must verify that a category is obtained — using the laws of λ -calculus. And we must see that if we go back again to a λ -calculus from the category we have essentially the same theory.

A c.c.c. (or typed λ -calculus - with non-logical axioms) is a satisfactory (extensional) theory of functions because all we have built into the theory is the idea of the product and the function space. The axioms set down are just those needed to make this structuring explicit. The reason that category theory is a convenient way to formalize this definition is that starting from the especially elementary concept of maps under composition, we can see that we have done nothing more than close up under products and function spaces. λ -calculus, then, becomes mostly a notational device for setting down our functional equations. At least for typed λ -calculus, we can see in this way that it is harmless.

The typed λ -calculus is even more harmless than these last remarks suggested. By the well-known Yoneda embedding, one can prove that an arbitrary (small) category has a full and faithful embedding into a c.c.c. This means that starting with a given category and its maps, there is a precise sense in which it is consistent to close up under products and function spaces. No new maps are added to the given category; no new equations between the given maps are imposed by the adjunction of higher types. One can say even more than this about relative consistency, but the remark is best deferred to Section 4, where references to the proof are provided.

A final remark must be added to this section to clear up a possible confusion between theories and models. Up to this point we have been talking about theories. In many systems of logic models can be described by theories: every model has a “diagram” involving constants for all the “elements” of the model and taking as axioms all statements in the language “true” about the model. It depends on the nature of the logic how hard it is to show that every “consistent” theory has a model.

In the case of a c.c.c., a domain A could be said to have an “element” a if there is a map $\alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$. The question is: *are there enough elements?* Suppose $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ are two maps. If $\alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$, then $f \circ \alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow B$; so in a certain sense maps in the category behave as functions on elements. (This is not an original suggestion but is one well known in category theory.) It is natural to ask whether, if $f \circ \alpha = g \circ \alpha$ for all $\alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$, then $f = g$. If this is true in a c.c.c., then it is said to have “enough” elements or to be concrete. In case it is concrete, domains can be identified with sets, maps with functions, products $A \times B$ in the category with the corresponding cartesian product of the sets (ask:

which $c : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A \times B$?), and function spaces $(A \rightarrow B)$ with spaces of actual functions (because there is a one-one correspondence between maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ and elements $e : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow (A \rightarrow B)$).

For a theory in the form of a c.c.c., to ask whether it has a (non-trivial) model is to ask whether it can be expanded to a concrete c.c.c. by the adjunction of elements (and other maps and additional equations, but no new domains) which is non trivial in the sense of not making all domains isomorphic to $\mathbb{1}$.

An answer — though perhaps a rather formal one — is supplied by the method of adjunction of indeterminates $x : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$ presented in Lambek's paper (this volume). We just have to adjoin infinitely many for each domain, one after the other. Each polynomial involves only finitely many indeterminates. But the results stated by Lambek (esp. Corollary to Theorem 2) show us at once that this expanded category is concrete. The idea is really just like the idea of having “free algebras” for any equational theory. (In λ -calculus an algebraic equation that is regarded as universally quantified, say $x + y = y + x$, is replaced by the functional equation

$$\lambda x \lambda y. x + y = \lambda x \lambda y. y + x.$$

More thoughts on concreteness will be brought out in Section 4.

That is the (easy) passage from theories to (certain) models. But remember, a theory is not a model: the maps in a given c.c.c. are not concrete maps, they are just the definable maps in the language of the theory, and the equations between them are the “theorems” of the theory. It is no surprise that a given theory may not have enough definable elements: we may need to expand the stock of elements in order to have a model. For a c.c.c. we find we can. So far, so good; and this is the (known) story of typed λ -calculus.

3 “Type Free” Domains

In the paper of Lambek, the analogy between typed and type free is illustrated (in the obvious way), but no real connection or relation is established. This we shall now do, and the relationship will be deepened in the next section. In the first place, we shall only consider the λ -calculus (or λK -calculus) and not the $\lambda\eta$ -calculus; the latter can be regarded as a special case. What is needed is a notion of domain appropriate to the interpretation of the “type-free” calculus.

In a category, a retraction between two domains A and B is a pair of maps $i : A \rightarrow B$ and $j : B \rightarrow A$ where $j \circ i = 1_A$. Regard A as the “smaller” domain; it is injected into B , and B is surjectively mapped onto A . The notion shares

qualities, then, of A being both a subspace of B and at the same time a quotient. But the injection and surjection have to be related.

Now, suppose that in a cartesian closed category a domain U satisfies the condition that the function space $(U \rightarrow U)$ is a retract of the domain U itself. (This is always so for $U = \mathbb{1}$, but we seek non-trivial examples.) Let the retraction maps be $i : (U \rightarrow U) \rightarrow U$ and $j : U \rightarrow (U \rightarrow U)$. Then U (as it sits in its category) gives us an interpretation of the type-free calculus, which we now explain. Let the type-free terms be constructed in the usual way from variables x, y, z, \dots by means of application and λ -abstraction. Think of all variables as being of type U and define a translation τ^* from untyped terms to typed terms so that

$$\begin{aligned} x^* &= x, \\ (\tau(\sigma))^* &= j(\tau^*)(\sigma^*), \\ (\lambda x. \tau)^* &= i(\lambda x. \tau^*). \end{aligned}$$

We intend this in such a way that τ^* is always of type U . The type-free theory (determined by the category, the domain U , and by the choice of i and j) has as its assertions exactly those equations $\tau = \sigma$ where $\tau^* = \sigma^*$ in the category. The theory satisfies (α) , (β) -conversion-conversion, all the rules of equality, and the rule ξ : from $\tau = \sigma$ to deduce $\lambda x. \tau = \lambda x. \sigma$. This much is surely obvious to anyone reading Lambek's paper.

What I would like to point out here is the converse: given any type-free theory, there is a c.c.c. and a domain U (with a suitable retraction pair i, j) so that the above interpretation gives exactly the same type-free theory. Consequently, nothing is lost in considering type-free theories just as special parts of typed theories. I do not find this result mentioned by Lambek.

The proof is elementary. Let the domains for the category be the λ -terms A , without free variables, for which we can prove in the theory:

$$A = \lambda x. A(A(x)).$$

The maps $f : A \rightarrow B$ are terms f without free variables for which we can prove

$$f = \lambda x. B(f(A(x))).$$

The equations between maps are the equations we can prove in the theory. [Actually, it might be better to construe maps as triples (A, f, B) , but never mind.] It is not hard to show that this is a category where

$$\begin{aligned} 1_A &= A, \text{ and} \\ f \circ g &= \lambda x. f(g(x)). \end{aligned}$$

[More properly spoken, the maps should be equivalence classes of terms based on the equations of theory, but never mind.] To show this construction gives a c.c.c. we need to define:

$$A \times B = \lambda u \lambda z. z(A(u(\lambda x \lambda y. x)))(B(u(\lambda x \lambda y. y))).$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{AB} &= \lambda u. (A \times B)(u)(\lambda x \lambda y. x), \\ q_{AB} &= \lambda u. (A \times B)(u)(\lambda x \lambda y. y), \end{aligned}$$

and if $f : C \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ then

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \lambda t \lambda z. z(f(t))(g(t)).$$

All of this is based on the familiar pairing functions of λ -calculus.

For function spaces, we define

$$A \rightarrow B = \lambda f. B \circ f \circ A.$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{BC} = \lambda u. C(u(\lambda x \lambda y. x)(B(u(\lambda x \lambda y. y))))).$$

and

$$\wedge_{ABC} h = \lambda x \lambda y. h(\lambda z. z(x)(y)).$$

provided $h : (A \times B) \rightarrow C$.

There are a jolly lot of equations to verify, but the work is all straight-forward conversion. The method of retracts as a c.c.c. has in any case been exposed before with respect to the $P\omega$ model in Scott (1976). Note here, however, we are to verify the required equations in a theory (not a model) making use of nothing but the “logical” axioms of λ -calculus.

It remains to identify the domain U in the constructed category. We define:

$$U = \lambda x. x.$$

Clearly

$$U = \lambda x. U(U(x)) = U \circ U.$$

Note that every A in the category is a retract of U ; indeed, for retractions define $A : A \rightarrow U$ and $A : U \rightarrow A$ and

$$A \circ A = A = 1_A.$$

We thus speak of these A 's also as retractions. We can write:

$$(\mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}) = \lambda x \lambda f. f(x),$$

and it is thus easy to verify now that $(\mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U})$ is a retraction of \mathbb{U} . As \mathbb{U} is in fact the identity function, the reinterpretation via \mathbb{U} of the type-free calculus will obviously translate every term into itself. I just note in writing down the definition of the c.c.c., I forgot to define $\mathbb{1}$ — because it is so dull, I suppose! For this we have to map everything onto a constant:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{1} &= \lambda u \lambda x. x, \text{ and} \\ 0 &= \mathbb{1}\end{aligned}$$

I think the calculations suggested provide an argument that the type-free λ -calculus takes *second* place to typed λ -calculus — foundationally speaking. Type-free domains are *special kinds* of types. As I have said before in other writings, to get $(\mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U})$ inside \mathbb{U} , we have to pass to an *infinite* type. I thought this was made very clear in the so-called D_∞ -construction. The category of *continuous lattices and continuous functions* is a c.c.c.. Starting with any domain D_0 , in that category the sequence of types D_n where $D_{n+1} = (D_n \rightarrow D_n)$ has a certain limit D with D_0 (and all the D 's) as retracts, and with $(D_\infty \rightarrow D_\infty)$ not only a retract but an isomorph of D_∞ . That is one choice of an \mathbb{U} , and I showed many variations are possible for other type-free domains \mathbb{U} in this one category.

We hasten to note that in the c.c.c. of *sets and arbitrary functions*, a non-trivial domain \mathbb{U} with $(\mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U})$ a retract is impossible (by cardinality considerations). This means that not all c.c.c. lead directly to interpretations of the type-free theory. Hence, we must conclude, *the typed theory is the more general one, and the prior one.*

Such a conclusion will not be welcome, however. The type-free theory from our experience seems general enough. Even though we have shown two good ways of relating the two kinds of theories, we would like something more. We do not want just some c.c.c. related to a given type-free theory, but we would like to find a relation that achieved any desired c.c.c., provided we cook up the type-free one properly. This problem is the topic of the next section.

Before we turn to this new relationship, a word about *models* of the type-free calculus would be to the point. There is considerable discussion of the notion of a model in Hindley and Longo (1980) and Barendregt (1980) (where other references are given). We should state how this all fits in with the present view.

When presenting a theory in the usual λ -notation, free variables are permitted as well as full use of the rule (ξ) . But, when thinking of elements

(relative to a theory) only terms (better: equivalence classes of terms) *without free variables* should be considered. As is known from many examples, there may not be enough of them. This can of course be so even if we allow in our language many non-logical constants. What does “enough” mean? Well, if f and g are closed terms, it may be that $f(a) = g(a)$ is provable for all closed a , but $f = g$ is not provable. The fact that this happens for some theories should come as no surprise. (For the explicit examples consult Barendregt (1980).)

The remedy is to adjoin indeterminates (constants without new axioms) until “enough” is reached. (A proof is also found in Barendregt (1980).) As with the typed calculus, every theory has a model which satisfies exactly the same equations as are provable in the theory (one might call it a conservative model). The notion of a λ -model has not struck people as quite satisfactory because the extensionality principle in the “enough” clause is not very algebraic. A suggestion of mine is mentioned in the cited references, but I think it would be useful to recast the idea in the light of the present discussion.

In typed λ -calculus, the categorical formulation is one way of eliminating all use of variables. In type-free λ -calculus, the usual plan is to use the combinators - and the plan leads to awfully long formulae. Let us not try to give a variable free formulation, but talk in terms of first-order models. What is unalgebraic in the model definition is the λ -operator, since a bound variable is of the essence of the use of λ . So let us replace λ by the combinators in the usual way. We take S and K as primitive, and a λ -model is (at least), a structure of the form $\langle U, \cdot(\cdot), S, K \rangle$ with a domain, a binary operation, and two distinguished constants. The problem is: *what are the axioms?* Clearly we want:

$$(*) \quad \begin{cases} K(x)(y) = x, \text{ and} \\ S(u)(v)(x) = u(x)(v(x)), \end{cases}$$

as usual. But these are not sufficient to express extensionality which in λ -notation reads

$$\forall x. \tau = \sigma \rightarrow \lambda x. \tau = \lambda x. \sigma$$

If we convert out the variable x , we are tempted to write:

$$\forall x. f(x) = g(x) \rightarrow f = g.$$

But this is too strong. (It corresponds to $U = (U \rightarrow U)$ rather than the weaker: $(U \rightarrow U)$ is a retract of U .) If we wrote:

$$\forall x. f(x) = g(x) \rightarrow \lambda x. f(x) = \lambda x. g(x),$$

the statement would at least be correct - even if containing the unwanted λ . Well, we just have to define this λ in terms of S and K . Introduce the standard definitions:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= S(K)(K) \\ B &= S(K(S))(K). \end{aligned}$$

Then, with λ -notation

$$\lambda x. f(x) = B(I)(f).$$

So the desired axiom now reads

$$(**) \quad \forall x. f(x) = g(x) \rightarrow B(I)(f) = B(I)(g).$$

We are not quite done, however, We want S and K to correspond to λ -expressions (eventually), so we need an axiom which makes them suitably unique. Now we note intuitively that

$$\lambda x_0. \lambda x_1. \dots \lambda x_{n-1}. f(x_0)f(x_1) \dots f(x_{n-1}) = B^n(I)(f)$$

Thus what we need to say is

$$(***) \quad \begin{cases} S = B(B(B(I)))(S), \text{ and} \\ K = B(B(I))(K) \end{cases}$$

To see that $(*)$, $(**)$, and $(***)$ are adequate, we note first that

$$B(I)(f)(x) = f(x)$$

by $(*)$. From $(**)$ it follows that

$$B(I)(B(I)(f)) = B(I)(f).$$

This means that we can reformulate $(**)$ as:

$$(**_1) f = B(I)(f) \wedge g = B(I)(g) \wedge \forall x. f(x) = g(x) \rightarrow f = g.$$

[This does not seem to be equivalent to $(**)$ unless we have the equation about $B(I)(B(I)(f))$ just noted — the retraction equation.] We now generalize $(**_1)$ to n variables:

$$\begin{aligned} (**_n) \quad f &= B^n(I)(f) \wedge g = B^n(I)(g) \wedge \\ &\quad \forall x_0, x_1, \dots x_{n-1}. f(x_0)f(x_1) \dots f(x_{n-1}) = g(x_0)g(x_1) \dots g(x_{n-1}) \\ &\quad \rightarrow f = g. \end{aligned}$$

If we prove this, then by (***) we see that the original axioms (*) uniquely determine S and K ; further we have the uniqueness required to define $\lambda x. \tau$ for any term (cf. the references cited).

To establish (**_n), we need some lemmas. From (*) and (***) and the definitions, we can easily prove:

$$\begin{aligned} S(u) &= B^2(I)(S(u)) \\ S(u)(v) &= B(I)(S(u)(v)) \\ B(u) &= S(K(u)). \end{aligned}$$

We then We then establish for $n \geq 1$:

$$B(I)(B^n(I)(f)) = B^n(I)(f),$$

because $B^n(I)(f)$ has the form $S(u)(v)$. Suppose then that, e.g.

$$\forall x, y, z. f(x)(y)(z) = g(x)(y)(z).$$

By (**) we find

$$\forall x, y. B(I)f(x)(y) = B(I)g(x)(y).$$

This can be rewritten as

$$\forall x, y. B^2(I)(f(x))(y) = B^2(I)(g(x))(y).$$

But again by (**) we find:

$$\forall x. , B(I)(B^2(I)(f(x))) = B(I)(B^2(I)(g(x))).$$

By the lemma, drop the $B(I)$. Throw on another B , use (**), drop off the $B(I)$, and get:

$$B^3(I)(f) = B^3(I)(g).$$

The method is perfectly general and proves (**_n).

The import of this axiomatization is that $B(I)$ is the retraction of the universe \mathcal{U} onto $(\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U})$ and $B^n(I)$ retracts onto

$$\underbrace{(\mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \dots (\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}) \dots)))}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

We need (***) to show that e.g.:

$$S : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathcal{U} \rightarrow (\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U})).$$

We need $(**_n)$ to show that the maps in these function spaces are uniquely determined by their values. We have just been speaking in terms of models; but the calculations just carried out were formal. The axiomatic question, then, is: what is the relationship between the equational theories and the first-order theories? We shall now see the relation is a close one - even if the logic is allowed to go beyond the first order.

4 A Role for Intuitionistic Logic

The (rather cheap) method of adjoining indeterminates proves that every typed or untyped theory of λ -calculus has an extensional model. This can also be put as a conservative extension result for theories: a λ -theory is an equational theory, and every such equational theory can be expanded to a first-order theory *without* forcing any new equations on us, In the untyped case, the style of first-order theory is that of axioms $(*)$, $(**)$, $(***)$ of the previous section. These are the “logical” axioms (i.e. common to all such theories); the non-logical axioms would be all the equations between closed λ -terms demanded by whatever equational theory we started with — and these special equations could involve special “non-logical” constants.

In the typed case, we would get a many-sorted theory with a sort for each domain in the given category. As we have already pointed out, an untyped theory can always be reformulated as a typed theory by the method of retracts. So we now concentrate on typed theories — that is to say, cartesian closed categories.

But the writing down of *first-order* theories is not all that interesting: we clearly have nice axioms for a theory of functions, but first-order theories do not impress us as being very categorical. Such theories do not really capture the idea of the “arbitrary” function. We began our discussion with set theory, where the intention was that function spaces did really contain “all” functions - they did not just appear as an “algebra” of functions. Leaving aside for the moment the (philosophical) question of whether the desire for the *all* is a rational one, we can ask the (formal) question of whether there is a conservative extension result for *higher-order* theories. Surprisingly, category theorists have known the answer for some time. Now we cannot hope to embed the theory of a typed λ -calculus into a classical higher-order theory with a full comprehension axiom of the form

$$\forall x : A. \exists ! y : B. \varphi(x, y) \rightarrow \exists f : A \rightarrow B \forall x : A. \varphi(x, f(x)).$$

Because in higher-order logic we can prove Cantor's Theorem which implies that the only type U which has a surjective map $j : U \rightarrow (U \rightarrow U)$ is the one-element type. Thus, if a typed theory had such a type (and we know many), then the adding of the standard higher-order axioms (where we construe $(A \rightarrow B)$ as the total function space of all functions) would not at all be conservative, Something else has to be tried, and the answer is higher-order intuitionistic logic.

As we shall now have to consider more than one category, let me call our given c.c.c. the category \mathcal{C} . To fix ideas, the constructions to be carried out will be done in ordinary set theory - with classical logic! The models obtained, however, will only satisfy intuitionistic logic. The obvious lack of harmony can be repaired, but it would take too much explanation here. Moreover, we are also going to assume that the given category \mathcal{C} is a set. This is not much of a restriction, since we were thinking of Casa theory and usually a theory has a limited number of symbols in any case.

Before saying where the intuitionistic logic comes from, let me give the construction. Let \mathcal{S} be the category of all sets and arbitrary functions; we know it is a c.c.c. The construction we need here is the well known one of the functor category $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$ of all contravariant functors from \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{S} with the natural transformations as the maps - full definitions follow. The result is that the functor category is a model for higher order intuitionistic logic, in particular it is a c.c.c.; more over the original category \mathcal{C} has a full and faithful embedding in $\mathcal{S}^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$, and this shows the conservative extension property. So much for the outline of the method, now for the details. Needless to say this represents a very early chapter in topos theory; it should be more widely known,

What is a contravariant functor? It is a mapping $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ that associates to every domain A of \mathcal{C} a set $F(A)$ of \mathcal{S} and to every map $f : B \rightarrow A$ of \mathcal{C} a function $F(f) : F(A) \rightarrow F(B)$ (and note the change of order!) so that:

$$F(1_A) = 1_{F(A)}, \text{ and} \\ F(f \circ g) = F(g) \circ F(f),$$

provided $f : B \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} .

It was one of the major early insights of category theory to see that the functors form a category in themselves. What is needed is a definition of transformation between functors. We call such maps $\nu : F \rightarrow G$ "natural transformations" for reasons explained in category theory books. What is a natural transformation $\nu : F \rightarrow G$? It is an association with every domain A of \mathcal{C} of a function $\nu_A : F(A) \rightarrow G(A)$ so that whenever $f : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} , then the

following diagram commutes in \mathcal{S} :

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

This means $\nu_B \circ F(f) = G(f) \circ \nu_A$. And example will help explain this.

For each C of \mathcal{C} , let $H_C = \{h \mid h : A \rightarrow C\}$ and if $f : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} let $H_C(f)$ be the map taking $h \in H_C(A)$ into $h \circ f \in H_C(B)$. It is easy to show H_C is a (contravariant) functor. It is often called the *representable functor* (corresponding to C), and we shall see that it is very “representative”.

Now let $g : C \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{C} . There is a natural transformation $H_g : H_C \rightarrow H_D$ because, for each $h \in H_C(A)$ we can map it to go $g \circ h \in H_D(A)$, naturally. The composite map for $f : B \rightarrow A$ takes $h \in H_C(A)$ into $g \circ h \circ f \in H_D(B)$, and there are two equal ways to calculate it owing to the associativity of composition (in \mathcal{C}); that is why the necessary diagram commutes.

Not only are the H_C pleasant functors with cooperative natural transformations between them, but the by now classic *Yoneda Lemma* proves for us that the only natural transformations $\nu \in H_C \rightarrow H_D$ are those of the form H_g for some $g : C \rightarrow D$. If we remark that if $k : D \rightarrow E$, then

$$H_k \circ H_g = H_{k \circ g}$$

This shows us that $H : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^{C^{op}}$ is a (*covariant*) functor between these categories. Of course H_C uniquely determines C and H_g determines g , so we conclude from this and the Yoneda Lemma that H is a full and faithful embedding of \mathcal{C} into the functor category (all of this on p.2 of Johnstone (1977)!).

All of this discussion is “abstract nonsense” in the sense that its validity is perfectly general for any category \mathcal{C} . If we assume that \mathcal{C} is a c.c.c., then we can say more. The point is that $\mathcal{S}^{C^{op}}$ is a very powerful category. For example, it is always a c.c.c. even if \mathcal{C} is not. The cartesian closed structure of the functor category is obtained through the following definitions.

Before getting down to details, however, some more vivid terminology might help.

Think of a functor U in $\mathcal{S}^{C^{op}}$, following Lawvere, as a “variable domain”. That is to say, for each $A \in \mathcal{C}$ we have an associated domain (set) $U_A = U(A)$. The maps $f : B \rightarrow A$ in \mathcal{C} give us transitions between “stages” A and “later”

stages B ; and each such transition “restricts” elements in U_A to elements in U_B “along” the map f . To save writing, let us set $a \upharpoonright f = (Uf)(a)$ when the functor U is understood. That U is indeed a functor comes down to these equations:

$$a \upharpoonright 1_A = a \text{ and } (a \upharpoonright f) \upharpoonright g = a \upharpoonright (f \circ g),$$

where $f : B \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} . To define a functor U , then, we just have to give the domains and the restrictions. For example the unit functor $\mathbb{1}$ has $\mathbb{1}_A = 0$, a one-point set, and all restrictions constant $0 \upharpoonright f = 0$. And all natural transformations into $\mathbb{1}$ are constant.

Now suppose U and V are two functors. We define $U \times V$ so that for all $A \in \mathcal{C}$

$$(U \times V)_A = U_A \times V_A$$

Whenever $a \in U_A$ and $b \in V_A$ and $f : B \rightarrow A$ then

$$(a, b) \upharpoonright f = (a \upharpoonright f, b \upharpoonright f)$$

(Note that the restriction symbol above is used in three different senses.) The natural transformations $p : U \times V \rightarrow U$ and $q : U \times V \rightarrow V$ have obvious pointwise definitions (e.g. $P_A = P_{U_A V_A} : U_A \times V_A \rightarrow U_A$) and they clearly commute with restrictions. Similarly if $\mu : W \rightarrow U$ and $\nu : W \rightarrow V$ are given natural transformations then $\langle \mu, \nu \rangle : W \rightarrow U \times V$ is also defined pointwise:

$$\langle \mu, \nu \rangle_A = \langle \mu_A, \nu_A \rangle : W_A \rightarrow U_A \times V_A$$

Again it is obvious that these maps commute with restrictions, so $\langle \mu, \nu \rangle$ is natural. As all of this is pointwise; the verification of such equations as $p \circ \langle \mu, \nu \rangle = \mu$ is easy. Again suppose U and V are given. In defining $(U \rightarrow V)$, we cannot be quite as pointwise. That is, $(U \rightarrow V)_A$ cannot be taken simply as the set of functions $(U_A \rightarrow V_A)$, the function space in sets. The reason, roughly, is that when we have a function at one stage, we also have to know how it restricts at later stages; a simple mapping from U_A into V_A does not give us enough information for that. When $f : B \rightarrow A$, restriction on U_A maps into U_B ; this is the wrong direction for us to be able to pass from an arbitrary function defined on U_A to one defined on U_B . So an element of $(U \rightarrow V)_A$ has to be a whole *family* of functions:

$$\varphi_f : U_B \rightarrow V_B$$

one for each $f : B \rightarrow A$. (Note: A is fixed, f and B are variable.) Moreover, we must assume that all is harmonious with restrictions: $c \upharpoonright g = \varphi_{f \circ g}(b \upharpoonright g)$

whenever $c = \varphi_f(b)$, for $b, c \in U_B$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} . In words, φ_{1_A} is the “present” function; while φ_f is what becomes of it in the “future”, supposing time evolves along f . Now families φ of this kind in $(U \rightarrow V)_A$ have to be restricted. By what we just said, the following is more or less forced upon us:

$$(\varphi \upharpoonright f)_g = \varphi_{f \circ g}$$

where $f : B \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ so that $(\varphi \upharpoonright f)$ is a family in $(U \rightarrow V)_B$.

That defines $(U \rightarrow V)$ as a functor. To have $\mathcal{S}^{c.op}$ be a c.c.c., certain maps ε and \wedge are, alas, still required. The evaluation map $\varepsilon : ((V \rightarrow W) \times V) \rightarrow W$ is fortunately rather clear (as a natural transformation). Suppose $\varphi \in (V \rightarrow W)_A$ and $a \in V_A$. Then

$$\varepsilon_A(\varphi, a) = \varphi_{1_A}(a).$$

So $\varepsilon_A : ((V \rightarrow W)_A \times V_A) \rightarrow W_A$. If $f : B \rightarrow A$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_A(\varphi, a) &= \varphi_{1_A}(a) \upharpoonright f \\ &= \varphi_f(a \upharpoonright f) \\ &= (\varphi \upharpoonright f)_{1_B}(a \upharpoonright f) \\ &= \varepsilon_B(\varphi \upharpoonright f, a \upharpoonright f) \end{aligned}$$

This proves ε is natural.

Next, suppose $\psi : (U \times V) \rightarrow W$ is natural. Define $\wedge\psi : U \rightarrow (V \rightarrow W)$ by

$$(\wedge\psi)_A : U_A \rightarrow (V \rightarrow W)_A$$

where for $a \in U_A$ and $b \in V_B$, and $f : B \rightarrow A$ we have:

$$(\wedge\psi)_A(a)_f(b) = \psi_B(a \upharpoonright f, b).$$

To show $\wedge\psi$ is natural, we must calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} (\wedge\psi)_A(a) \upharpoonright f)_g(c) &= (\wedge\psi)_A(a)_{f \circ g}(c) \\ &= \psi_c(a \upharpoonright f \upharpoonright g, c) \\ &= (\wedge\psi)_B(a \upharpoonright f)_g(c) \end{aligned}$$

for $a \in U_A$, $f : B \rightarrow A$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$, $c \in U_C$. It follows that

$$(\wedge\psi)_A \upharpoonright f = (\wedge\psi)_B(a \upharpoonright f)$$

We have to leave to the reader the verification of the two basic equations of c.c.c.’s involving ε , \wedge , p and q . As there was only one way that the definitions

could be written, the verification is quite mechanical, however. As I said before, the functor category is “powerful”, and indeed it is much more than a c.c.c. For instance, we can define the analogue of the *power set* for arbitrary functors. For any \mathcal{U} , let $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{U})_A$ be the collection of all families S_f indexed by $f : B \rightarrow A$ where $S_f \subseteq \mathcal{U}_B$ and such that $b \upharpoonright g \in S_{f \circ g}$ whenever $b \in S_f$ and $g : C \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} . Restriction is defined by

$$(\mathcal{S} \upharpoonright f)_g = S_{f \circ g}$$

The significance of the power operator will become clear when we speak about higher-order logic.

Having seen why the functor category is a c.c.c., it is good to pause a moment to appreciate the difference between the elements $a \in \mathcal{U}_A$ as sets and the “elements” of \mathcal{U} in the categorical sense. If $\alpha : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is natural it means that $\alpha_A : \mathbb{1}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_A \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $a_A = \alpha_a(0)$, then $a_A \in \mathcal{U}_A$. If $f : B \rightarrow A$, then because α is natural we find:

$$\begin{aligned} a \upharpoonright f &= \alpha_A(0) \upharpoonright f \\ &= \alpha_B(0 \upharpoonright f) \\ &= \alpha_B(0) \\ &= a_B \end{aligned}$$

This is very strong indeed, since usually if $a \in \mathcal{U}_A$ and $f_0, f_1 : B \rightarrow A$, there is no reason why $a \upharpoonright f_0 = a \upharpoonright f_1$. So the number of “elements” of \mathcal{U} will very likely be rather small. (And, even worse, a_A has to be chosen for all A in \mathcal{C} .)

In the special case $\sigma : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}$ we can simplify the choices out of $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{U})_A$ even further. Write $S_A = \sigma_A(0)$, then $S_A \subseteq \mathcal{U}_A$ for all $A \in \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, when $f : B \rightarrow A$, then

$$\begin{aligned} S_B &= \sigma_B(0)_{1_b} \\ &= \sigma_B(0 \upharpoonright f)_{1_B} \\ &= (\sigma_A(0) \upharpoonright f)_{1_B} \\ &= \sigma_A(0)_f \end{aligned}$$

This means that $\sigma_A(0)_f$ is determined from the S_B ’s. And if they are chosen so that

$$b \in S_B \text{ implies } b \upharpoonright g \in S_C$$

whenever $g : C \rightarrow B$, then the σ_A so defined from them provides a natural transformation. Again, we see the elements of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{U}$ are rather special. We can say that elements of a functor provide information about the “global” nature of

the functor; but this is far from determining it, for there can be considerable “local” activity that cannot be sensed globally. For example, the sets U_B can be empty for a long “time”, only becoming non empty in the “future”. The functor U is non trivial, but it has no global elements.

5 Type-Free Domains Revisited

References