

# Cartesian Closed Categories and Lambda Calculus

G  rad Huet\*

INRIA

The purpose of these notes is to propose an equational framework for the formalization, and ultimately the mechanization, of categorical reasoning. This framework is explained by way of example in the axiomatization of cartesian closed categories. The relationship with intuitionistic sequent calculus and lambda calculus is explained.

## 1. The Equational Nature of Category Theory

Category theory reasoning proves equality of arrow compositions, as determined by diagrams. The corresponding equality is given in the model, i.e. in the category under consideration. But the proofs do not appeal to any particular property of the equality relation, such as extensionality. All we assume is that equality is a congruence with respect to the arrow operators.

However we are not dealing with simple homogeneous equational theories, but with typed theories. For instance, every arrow is equipped with its type  $f : A \longrightarrow B$ . Here  $A$  and  $B$  are expressions denoting objects. These expressions are formed in turn by functorial operations and constants representing distinguished objects. The object terms can be considered untyped only within the context of one category. As soon as several categories are concerned, we must type the objects as well, with sorts representing categories. We thus have implicitly two levels of type structure.

The main difference between typed theories and untyped ones is that in untyped (homogeneous) theories one usually assume the domain of discourse to be non-empty. For instance, a first-order model has a non-empty carrier. Thus a variable always denotes something. In typed theories one does not usually make this restriction. Thus we do not want to impose the Hom-set

---

\*This is a remake of the paper *Cartesian Closed Categories and Lambda Calculus* originally published 1986. This version of the paper was typed out in 2025 by Pete Su.

$A \longrightarrow B$  to be always non-empty for every  $A$  and  $B$  in the category, in the same way that we want to consider partial orderings.

This has an unfortunate consequence: the law of substitution of equals for equals does not hold whenever one substitutes an expression containing a variable universally quantified over an empty domain by an expression not containing this variable, since we replace something that does not denote by something which may denote. For instance, consider the signature  $H : A \longrightarrow B$ , with  $T : B$ ,  $F : B$ , and the equations  $H(x) = T$  and  $H(x) = F$ . These equations are valid in the model where  $A$  is the empty set,  $H$  is the empty function, and  $B$  is a set of two elements  $\{0, 1\}$ , with  $T$  interpreted as 1 and  $F$  interpreted as 0. In this model we do not have  $T = F$ . We shall have to keep this problem in mind in the following.

### 1.1 The General Formalism

We have thus a formalism with four levels. At the first level, we have the alphabet of categories  $\mathbf{Cat} = \{\mathbf{A}, \dots, \mathbf{Z}\}$ . At the second level, we have the alphabet of object operators. Every category is defined over an object alphabet  $\Phi$  of operators given with an arity.  $\Phi$  is where the (internal) functors live. We then form sequents by pairs of terms  $M \rightarrow N$ , with  $M, N \in \mathbf{T}(\Phi, V)$ .  $V$  is a set of variables denoting arbitrary objects of the category. At the third level we have the alphabet  $\Sigma$  of arrow operators. An operator from  $\Sigma$  is given as an inference rule of the form:

$$S_1, \dots, S_n \vdash S$$

where the  $S_i$ 's and  $S$  are sequents. Such an operator is polymorphic over the free variables of the  $S_i$ 's and  $S$ , which are supposed to be universally quantified over the inference rule. Such operators are familiar from logic, either as schematic inference rules, or as (definite) Horn clauses. Of course the arrows with domain  $M$  and codomain  $N$  are represented as terms over  $\mathbf{T}(\Sigma, F)$  of type  $M \rightarrow N$ . Here  $F$  is a set of arrow variables, indexed by sequents  $A \rightarrow B$ . Finally, at the fourth level we have the proofs of arrow equalities. The alphabet consists of a set  $\mathcal{R}$  of conditional rules of the form:

$$f_1 =_{S_1} g_1, \dots, f_n =_{S_n} g_n \models f =_S g$$

Here the  $f$ 's and  $g$  are arrow expressions of type  $S$ , and similarly for the  $f_i$ 's and  $g_i$ 's. All object and arrow variables appearing in the rule are supposed to be universally quantified in front of the rule.

## 1.2 A Simplified Formalism

From now on, we shall assume that we are in one category of discourse which is left implicit. We shall therefore deal only with the last three levels. Furthermore, we shall assume that the only proof rules are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ref!}: f &=_{A \rightarrow B} f \\ \text{Trans}: f &=_{A \rightarrow B} g, g =_{A \rightarrow B} h \vdash f =_{A \rightarrow B} h \\ \text{Sym}: f &=_{A \rightarrow B} g \vdash g =_{A \rightarrow B} f \end{aligned}$$

together with the rules stating that  $=$  is a congruence with respect to the operators in  $\Sigma$ , all other rules being given by simple identities, i.e. by rules with an empty set of premisses ( $n = 0$ ).

The further simplification comes from the realization that we are not really obliged to completely specify the types of all variable arrows and equalities, since there is a lot of redundancy. This fact exploits unification, and the following:

### Meta-theorem

Let  $\Sigma$  be an arbitrary arrow signature, and  $E$  be an arbitrary term formed by operators from  $\Sigma$  and untyped variables. If there is an assignment of types to the variables of  $E$  that makes  $E$  well-typed with respect to  $\Sigma$ , there is a most general such assignment, independent in each variable, and furthermore the resulting type of  $E$  is most general. Here “more general” means “has as substitution instance”. We call this assignment, together with the resulting type of  $E$ , the principal typing of  $E$ . More generally, for every type sequent  $S$ , if there is an assignment of types which makes  $E$  of a type some instance of  $S$ , there is a principal such assignment.

The meta-theorem above is most useful. It permits to omit most of the types. When we write an equation  $E = E'$ , we shall implicitly refer to the principal typing giving  $E$  and  $E'$  the same type  $A \rightarrow B$ . So from now on, all equations in  $\mathcal{R}$  are written without type, the types being implicit from the principality assumption.

## 1.3 The initial theory **Categ**

We are now ready to start Category Theory. The initial theory **Categ** has  $\Phi = \emptyset$ , and  $\Sigma = \{Id, _ ; _\}$ , given with respective signatures:

$$\begin{aligned} Id &: A \rightarrow A \\ _ ; _ &: A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C \vdash A \rightarrow C \end{aligned}$$

The notation “ $_;_$ ” means that we use the infix notation  $f;g$  for the composition of arrows  $f$  and  $g$ . We can read “ $f$  then  $g$ ”, and follow arrow composition along diagrams with semi-colon as concatenation of the labels. But since more people are accustomed to the standard set-theoretic composition notation, we shall below use  $g \circ f$  as an abbreviation for  $f;g$ .

The equations  $\mathcal{R}$  of **Categ** are simply the laws of a monoid:

$$Assoc : (f \circ g) \circ h = f \circ (g \circ h)$$

$$Idl : Id \circ f = f$$

$$Idr : f \circ Id = f$$

It is to be noted that the identification of the Hom-set symbol  $\longrightarrow$  with the sequent entailment arrow is not fortuitous. Actually  $Id$  and  $_;_$  are well-known inference rules of intuitionistic propositional calculus. However, the logic is quite poor at this stage: we have no propositional connective whatsoever, just the basic mechanism for sequent composition, stating that entailment is reflexive and transitive. The rules of  $\mathcal{R}$ , considered as a left-to-right rewriting system, define a normal form on the sequent calculus proofs, i.e. on the arrow expressions

Before we embark on more complicated theories, let us give a recipe on how to cook an equational presentation from a categorical statement.

## 1.4 What the Category Theorists Don't Say

Open a standard book on category theory, and consider a typical categorical definition. It usually reads: “Mumble, such that the following diagram commutes.” Similarly, a typical categorical result states: “If  $diagram_1$  and ... and  $diagram_n$  commute, then  $diagram$  commutes.” The first step in understanding such statements is to determine exactly their universality: what is exactly quantified, universally or existentially, what depends on what, what are exactly the parameters of the (frequent) unicity condition. The next step is to realize that the diagram states conditional equalities on arrows, and that it is enough to state the equalities of the inside diagrams in order to get all equalities.

A uniform compilation of such statements as an equational theory proceeds as follows. First write completely explicitly the quantification prefix of the statement, in two lines, one for the objects and one for the arrows. Then Skolemize the statement independently in the first and the second line. That is, for every existentially quantified variable  $x$  following the universally quantified  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ , introduce a new  $n$ -ary operator  $X$  and substitute throughout  $x$  by  $X(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . The Skolemization of the object variables determines  $\Phi$ . The Skolemization of the second line, together with the types implicit from the

diagram determine  $\Sigma$ . Finally, following arrows around the inner diagrams determines  $\mathcal{R}$ . This concerns the existential part. For the unicity part, proceed as follows. Let  $f$  be the arrow whose unicity is asserted. The existence part provided by Skolemization an  $F(g_1, \dots, g_k)$  in place of  $f$ . Write a supplementary arrow  $h$  on the diagram parallel to  $f$ , and use the commutation conditions to eliminate all the  $g_i$ 's as  $G_i(h)$ . Add an extra equation  $F(G_1(h), \dots, G_k(h)) = h$ .


Once we have convinced ourselves that the category theoretic statements and proofs are of an equational nature, we may ask: why do the category theorists use diagrams at all? The reason is that diagram chasing is a sophisticated way of doing complex equality reasoning, using several equations simultaneously, on a shared data structure (the graph underlying the diagram). So diagrammatic reasoning may be considered a good tool for high level equational reasoning. On the other hand, equality reasoning techniques such as rewrite rules analysis is good for mechanical implementation, and this is why we stress here the equational theories hidden behind the diagrams.

**Remark.** Let us finally remark that more general categorical concepts than the simple universal statements that we shall now consider may force us to generalize the basic formalism. For instance, more complicated limit constructions such as pullbacks force the dependence of objects on arrows. The Skolemization cannot be effected separately on the object and the arrow variables, and we shall have to place ourselves in a more complicated type theory with dependent types.

## 2. Products

### 2.1 The Theory Prod


We shall apply the recipe above to the definition of product in a category. We recall that a category possesses a product if for all objects  $A, B$  there exists an object  $C$  and there exist arrows  $fst, snd$  such that for every object  $D$  and all arrows  $f, g$  there exists a unique arrow  $h$  such that the following diagram commutes:



We now get the theory **Prod** by enriching **Categ** as follows. The Skolemization of  $C$  gives the binary functor  $\times$ , and we write with the infix notation  $A \times B$  in place of  $C$ . So now  $\Phi = \{\times\}$ . Similarly, we add to  $\Sigma$  the following operators, issued respectively from  $fst$ ,  $snd$  and  $h$ :

$$\begin{aligned} fst &: A \times B \longrightarrow A \\ snd &: A \times B \longrightarrow B \\ \langle \_, \_ \rangle &: D \longrightarrow A, D \longrightarrow B \vdash D \longrightarrow A \times B \end{aligned}$$

and we now have the usual diagram:



The existence of  $h$ , that is the commutation of the two triangles, gives two new equations in  $\mathcal{R}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &: fst \circ \langle f, g \rangle = f \\ \pi_2 &: snd \circ \langle f, g \rangle = g \end{aligned}$$

Unicity of  $h$  gives one last equation:

$$Unipair : \langle fst \circ h, snd \circ h \rangle = h$$

The arrow part of the functor  $\times$  may be defined as a derived operator as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \_ \times \_ &: A \longrightarrow B, C \longrightarrow D \vdash A \times C \longrightarrow B \times D \\ Def \times &: f \times g = \langle fst \circ f, g \circ snd \rangle \end{aligned}$$

**Remark.** There is a possible source of confusion in our terminology. We talked about the elements of  $\Phi$  as functors. Actually these are just function symbols denoting object constructors. Skolemization of a diagram will determine certain such function symbols, but there is no guarantee that there will be a corresponding functor. For instance, for product, we had to define the arrow part of  $\times$  above, and to verify that indeed it obeys the functoriality laws.

## 2.2 The Logical Point of View

From the logical point of view, specifying a product amounts to defining conjunction. Read  $A \times B$  as  $A \wedge B$ , and recognize  $fst$ ,  $snd$  and  $\langle -, - \rangle$  as respectively  $\wedge$ -elim-left,  $\wedge$ -elim-right, and  $\wedge$ -intro respectively [7,15,24].

The rules of  $\mathcal{R}$  have a computational meaning: they specify how to reduce a proof to its normal form. Here we may apply known results from the theory of term rewriting systems, in order to complete  $\mathcal{R}$  to a canonical system [17,9].

The Knuth-Bendix completion procedure, when applied to theory **Prod**, generates two additional rewrite rules:

$$\begin{aligned} Id &: \langle fst, snd \rangle = Id \\ DistrPair &: \langle f, g \rangle \circ h = \langle f \circ h, g \circ h \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The resulting system  $\mathcal{R}$  is canonical, and can be used to decide the equality of arrows in the theory **Prod**. Of course, the equations above do not modify the theory, since they have been obtained by equational reasoning.

Finally, let us note that other presentations of the same theory is possible. For instance, we could have obtained product as the right adjoint of the diagonal functor. The unit of this adjunction is the *duplicator*, which may be defined here as:

$$D = \langle Id, Id \rangle$$

Note that type-checking imposes that the two identities are the same, so that  $D_A : A \longrightarrow A \times A$ . As its name suggests, the duplicator duplicates, in the sense that we can prove  $D \circ f = \langle f, f \rangle$ . The co-unit of the adjunction is the pair of projections  $(fst, snd)$ .

## 2.3 Finite products

We say that a category admits all finite products if it admits products and a terminal object. Equationally, this amounts to enrich the theory **Prod** to a theory **Prods** by adding a constant  $1$  to  $\Phi$ , a polymorphic constant  $Nil : A \longrightarrow 1$  to  $\Sigma$ , and a unicity equation  $Uni1$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ :

$$Uni1 : h = Nil.$$

Note that this does not make the equational theory inconsistent: the variable  $h$  above is principally typed to  $A \longrightarrow 1$ . However this equation brings up two problems. The first one is the one mentioned in the beginning of these notes, since variable  $h$  appears on the left but not on the right of  $Uni1$ . The second problem is that  $Uni1$  cannot be considered as a term rewriting rule in the usual

sense, since it would rewrite *Nil* to itself and therefore does not satisfy the finite termination criterion. Note that *Unil* entails with the other equations two consequences:

$$Zero : f \circ Nil = Nil$$

$$Id1 : Id = Nil$$

Again, *Id1* does not identify every *Id* with every *Nil*, but only (restoring explicit types) *Id*<sub>1</sub> with *Nil*<sub>1</sub>. Now it may be checked that *Unil* is actually a consequence of *Zero* and *Id1*. The rule *Zero* is a bona fide rewrite rule, which leaves the special equality *Id1* to be dealt with in an ad hoc fashion.