

# Aspects of Higher Order Categorical Logic\*

J. Lambek and P. J. Scott

## 0. Introduction

It has become clear for some time that categorists and logicians have been doing the same thing under different names. This situation is strikingly illustrated in higher order logic, where the connections are particularly illuminating. In this article we briefly survey portions of our forthcoming book [LS6], to which the reader is referred for more details.

Systems of higher order logic have been studied for a long time. We have in mind logical systems in which variables and quantifiers range over functions (as in the  $\lambda$ -calculus) or elements and subsets of given sets (as in type theory), not just over individuals (as in first order logic). Higher order concepts naturally occur in mathematics: algebraists quantify over ideals, topologists over open sets and analysts over functions. Yet, in spite of its expressive advantage, higher order logic never achieved the popularity of first order logic. Perhaps its proof theory and model theory were deemed to be too hard.

Thus, after the monumental work in type theory by Russell and Whitehead (*Principia Mathematica*, 1908), there are only sporadic important contributions to the literature. Gödel (1931) established his incompleteness theorem for type theory and related systems, Church (1940) combined  $\lambda$ -calculus with type theory, Henkin (1949) discussed models for type theory and, more recently, Abraham Robinson (1964) used type theory in his book “Nonstandard Analysis”, a lead not continued by his followers. Let us also mention that type theories have recently become important in computer science.

Theories of functionality, namely  $\lambda$ -calculi, have fared somewhat better. After pioneering work by Schönfinkel, Curry, Church and Rosser in the 1920’s and 30’s, these systems had a small but devoted following. In the late 60’s,

---

\*The authors belong to the “Groupe interuniversitaire en études categoriques” in Montreal. They acknowledge support from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and from the Quebec Department of Education. They wish to thank Denis Higgs and the referee for their careful reading of the manuscript.

an explosion of activity surrounding the models of Dana Scott (1971) and concomitant work in computer science revived interest in them.

Meanwhile, the categorical side saw rapid development. The ready acceptance of category theory as a working language in many areas of mathematics foreshadowed its introduction into logic and foundations. Nevertheless, it came as a surprise to many people when, in the 1960's, Lawvere (1969, 1970) and one of the present authors [L1] pointed out some remarkable connections between category theory and logic. Indeed, after the discovery of elementary toposes by Lawvere and Tierney (1970), the field of "categorical logic" underwent intense development. The reader is referred to the survey article by Kock and Reyes (1977) and the monograph by Makkai and Reyes (1977).

The situation in higher order logic, as far as it is treated in our book, is summarized as follows:

Logic	Algebra
untyped $\lambda$ -calculus	C-monoids
typed $\lambda$ -calculus	cartesian closed categories
type theory	toposes

Indeed, we shall see that each side, when suitably formulated, gives rise to a category. Moreover, the comparison between the two sides is mediated by functors which set up an equivalence or adjointness. In the meantime, Robert Seely, has found another such comparison:

Logic	Algebra
Martin-Löf type theory	locally cartesian closed categories

Undoubtedly, there are many other such situations. For example, it would be interesting to pinpoint the logical equivalent of cartesian closed categories with equalizers.

### 1. Cartesian closed categories and typed $\lambda$ -calculi

Cartesian closed categories are becoming increasingly important in many branches of mathematics. Indeed, as we shall see, in logic they play a fundamental role.

A *cartesian closed category* is a category  $\mathcal{C}$  with (canonical) finite products and exponentiation. This means that  $\mathcal{C}$  has a terminal object  $\mathbf{1}$  and objects  $A \times B$  and  $B^A$ , for all  $A, B$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , together with natural isomorphisms:

$$(a) \quad \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, A) \times \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, B) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, A \times B),$$

$$(b) \quad \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C} \times A, B) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathcal{C}, B^A).$$

Cartesian closed categories abound in mathematics. For example, all functor categories  $\mathbf{Sets}^{\mathcal{C}}$  ( $\mathcal{C}$  small) and all toposes (see below) are cartesian closed. So are the categories of Kelley spaces and Kuratowski limit spaces (see MacLane, 1971).

A useful alternative presentation considers both products and exponentials as adjoint functors, hence equationally definable (e.g., see MacLane, 1971).

**Definition 1.1.** A *cartesian closed category* has the following objects, arrows and equations:

#### Objects:

- (i)  $\mathbf{1}$  is an object.
- (ii) If  $A$  and  $B$  are objects, so are  $A \times B$  and  $B^A$

#### Arrows:

- (i)  $1_A : A \rightarrow A$ ,  $0_A : A \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ ,  $\pi_{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow A$ ,  $\pi'_{A,B} : A \times B \rightarrow B$ , and  $\varepsilon_{B,A} : B^A \rightarrow A \times B$  are arrows.
- (ii) The following rules generate new arrows from old:

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

#### Equations:

- (1)  $f1_A \doteq f$ ,  $1_B f \doteq f$ , and  $(hg)f \doteq g(hf)$ , for all  $f : A \rightarrow B$ ,  $g : B \rightarrow C$ ,  $h : C \rightarrow D$ ;
- (2)  $f \doteq 0_A$ , for all  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ ;  $\pi_{A,B} \langle f, g \rangle \doteq f$ ,  $\pi'_{A,B} \langle f, g \rangle \doteq g$ , and  $\langle \pi_{A,B} h, \pi'_{A,B} h \rangle \doteq h$ , for all  $f : C \rightarrow A$ ,  $g : C \rightarrow B$ , and  $h : C \rightarrow A \wedge B$ ;

- (3)  $\varepsilon_{B,A} \langle f^* \pi_{C,A}, \pi'_{C,A} \rangle \doteq f$ , and  $(\varepsilon_{B,A} \langle g \pi_{C,A}, \pi'_{C,A} \rangle)^* \doteq g$ , for all  $f : C \times A \longrightarrow B$ , and  $g : C \longrightarrow B^A$ .

It is understood that  $\doteq$  is a congruence relation<sup>\*</sup> on Hom-sets satisfying the above. There may be other objects, arrows and equations than follow from the above.

The reader may easily verify that the equations (1) to (3) contain not only the equations of a category with a terminal object, but yield also the natural isomorphisms (a) and (b). These equations may be viewed as presenting a multi-sorted partial algebra structure on the Hom-sets, with nullary, unary and binary operations satisfying appropriate identities. Alternatively, they may be looked upon as describing a “graphical algebra” in the spirit of Burroni (1981). To see this, the reader may first wish to replace the rule of arrow formation introducing  $f^*$  by another basic arrow  $\eta_{C,A} : C \longrightarrow (C \times A)^A$ .

Another view of cartesian closed categories is to consider them as *deductive systems* [L1]. Write the objects  $\mathbf{1}$ ,  $A \times B$ , and  $B^A$  as  $\top$ ,  $A \wedge B$ , and  $A \Rightarrow B$  respectively. One may then think of an arrow  $f : A \longrightarrow B$  as a *deduction* of  $B$  from  $A$  or as a *proof* of the *entailment*  $A \vdash B$ . Proofs may be written in “tree form”. For example:

$$\frac{A \wedge B \xrightarrow{\pi'} B \quad A \wedge B \xrightarrow{\pi} A}{A \wedge B \xrightarrow{\langle \pi', \pi \rangle} B \wedge A}$$

proves the commutative law for conjunction, while

$$\frac{}{(A \Rightarrow B) \wedge A \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{B,A}} B}$$

may be regarded as an “axiom” (at least in a freely generated deductive system).

Logicians might say that we have presented a system of natural deduction for the positive intuitionistic propositional calculus, but with an additional twist: the equations of a cartesian closed category impose an *equality relation* between proofs (or proof trees). For example:

$$\frac{\frac{C \xrightarrow{f} A \quad C \xrightarrow{g} B}{C \xrightarrow{\langle f, g \rangle} A \wedge B} \quad A \wedge B \xrightarrow{\pi} A}{C \xrightarrow{\pi \langle f, g \rangle} A} \quad \text{equals} \quad C \xrightarrow{f} A.$$

---

<sup>\*</sup>Editor’s note: the original paper used a symbol more like  $\doteq$  for this equivalence relation. I changed it to  $\doteq$  because to really do it right I’d need to make a new glyph in some font somewhere and I don’t want to do that.

This notion of “equivalence of proofs” is essentially the same as that introduced by logicians (Prawitz, 1971), as pointed out by Mann (1975).

There is still another connection of cartesian closed categories to logic. This is via the language of *typed  $\lambda$ -calculus*. Although older than category theory,  $\lambda$ -calculus may also be regarded as an equational theory of functions (or functional processes) in which composition is mirrored by substitution. As we shall see, some problems in cartesian closed categories are efficiently handled using typed  $\lambda$ -calculus.

**Definition 1.2.** A *typed  $\lambda$ -calculus* is a formal theory as follows. It consists of types, terms and equations (between terms of the same type).

(a) **Types:**

(a1)  $1$  is a type.

(a2) If  $A$  and  $B$  are types so are  $A \times B$  and  $B^A$

(b) **Terms:** (We write “ $t \in A$ ” to say that  $t$  is a term of type  $A$ .)

(b1) There are countably many variables of each type, say  $x_i^A \in A$  if  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(b2)  $\star \in 1$ .

(b3) If  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B$  and  $c \in A \times B$ , then  $\langle a, b \rangle \in A \times B$ ,  $\pi_{A,B}(c) \in A$  and  $\pi'_{A,B}(c) \in B$ .

(b4) If  $f \in B^A$  and  $a \in A$  then  $\varepsilon_{B,A}(f, a) \in B$ .

(b5) If  $x$  is a variable of type  $A$  and  $\phi(x) \in B$  then  $\lambda_{x \in A} \phi(x) \in B^A$ .

We often abbreviate  $\varepsilon_{B,A}(f, a)$  as  $f^1 a$  when the type subscripts are clear from the context.<sup>†</sup>

(c) **Equations:** All equations have the form  $a \overline{\overline{X}} a'$ , where  $a$  and  $a'$  have the same type and  $X$  is a set of variables containing all variables occurring freely in  $a$  and  $a'$ .

(c1)  $\overline{\overline{X}}$  is reflexive, symmetric and transitive. Moreover, if  $X \subseteq Y$  we have

$$\frac{a \overline{\overline{X}} b}{a \overline{\overline{Y}} b}$$

(that is, from  $a \overline{\overline{X}} b$  we may infer  $a \overline{\overline{Y}} b$ ).

---

<sup>†</sup>Editor’s note: Lambek uses this squiggle <sup>1</sup> to denote a binary operation for function application. It appears here and in his later book about this same subject. I made a best guess about how to translate this into L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X.

(c2) We have the substitution rules:

$$\frac{c \overline{\overline{X}} c'}{\varphi(c) \overline{\overline{X}} \varphi(c)'} \quad \frac{a \overline{\overline{X}} a', \quad b \overline{\overline{X}} b'}{\psi(a, b), \overline{\overline{X}} \psi(a', b')}$$

if  $\varphi(z) \equiv \pi(z)$  or  $\pi'(z)$  and  $\psi(x, y) = \langle x, y \rangle$  or  $x \cdot y$  and also

$$\frac{\varphi(x) \overline{\overline{X \cup x}} \psi(x)}{\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x) \overline{\overline{X}} \lambda_{x \in A} \psi(x)}$$

if  $x \notin X$ .

(c3) The following identities hold:

$$a \overline{\overline{X}} \star, \text{ for all } a \in \mathbf{1},$$

$$\pi(\langle a, b \rangle) \overline{\overline{X}} a, \text{ for all } a \in A, b \in B,$$

$$\pi'(\langle a, b \rangle) \overline{\overline{X}} b, \text{ for all } a \in A, b \in B,$$

$$\langle \pi(c), \pi'(c) \rangle \overline{\overline{X}} c, \text{ for all } c \in A \times B$$

$$\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x) \cdot a \overline{\overline{X}} \varphi(a), \text{ for all } a \in A \text{ substitutable for } x,$$

$$\lambda_{x \in A} (f \cdot x) \overline{\overline{X}} f, \text{ for all } f \in B^A, \text{ provided } x \notin X,$$

$$\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x) \overline{\overline{X}} \lambda_y \varphi(y)^\dagger$$

There may be types, terms and equations other than those following from (a), (b) and (c) above. Some comments are in order. The intuitive meaning of the term forming operations should be clear; for example,  $\varepsilon_{B,A}$  means evaluation,  $\langle a, b \rangle$  is pairing, and  $\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x)$  denotes the function  $x \mapsto \varphi(x)$ .  $\lambda$  acts like a quantifier, so the variable  $x$  in  $\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x)$  is *bound*, as in  $\forall_x \varphi(x)$  or  $\int_a^b f(x) dx$ . We have the usual conventions for free and bound variables and when a it is permitted to substitute a term for a variable.

The reader may wonder why we write the subscript  $X$  on  $\overline{\overline{X}}$ . The reason is that there may be "empty" types, that is, there may not exist any closed terms of certain types. This situation arises naturally when a  $\lambda$ -calculus is the internal language of certain categories (see Section 2).

---

<sup>†</sup>In their 1986 book on this subject Lambek and Scott write this equation like this: " $\lambda_{x \in A} \varphi(x) \overline{\overline{X}} \lambda_{x' \in A} \varphi(x')$  if  $x'$  is substitutable for  $x$  in  $\varphi(x)$  and  $x'$  is not free in  $\varphi(x)$ ". And I think that's what Lambek means here too.

**Proposition 1.3.** If  $\varphi(x) \equiv_{\overline{X}} \psi(x)$  with  $x$  of type  $A$  and if  $a$  is a term of type  $A$  such that  $X$  contain all free variables occurring in  $a$  (but not  $x$ ), then  $\varphi(a) \equiv_{\overline{X}} \psi(x)$ . In particular if  $f$  and  $g$  do not contain  $x$ ,  $f \equiv_{X \cup x} g$  provided there is at least one term of type  $A$  with free variables in  $X$ .

It follows from this result that, if there are closed terms of each type in a typed  $\lambda$ -calculus, then the subscript  $X$  on  $\equiv_{\overline{X}}$  is redundant.

The reader may feel a bit uneasy about the lack of examples so far. Let us rectify this at once. We recall that a graph consists of two classes, and two mappings between them:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{arrows} & \xrightarrow{\text{source}} & \text{objects} \\ & \xrightarrow{\text{target}} & \end{array}$$

Graph theorists would call the arrows “oriented edges” and the objects “vertices” or “nodes”. We write  $f : A \longrightarrow B$  for “source( $f$ ) =  $A$ ” and “target( $f$ ) =  $B$ ”.

**Example 1.4.** Given a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  the  $\lambda$ -calculus  $\Lambda(\mathcal{G})$  generated by  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined as follows. Its types are generated inductively by the type forming operations  $(-) \times (-)$  and  $(-)^{(-)}$  from the basic type **1** and the vertices of  $\mathcal{G}$  (which now count as basic types). Its terms are generated inductively from the basic terms  $x_i^A$  and  $\star$  by the term forming operations  $\langle -, - \rangle$ ,  $\pi(-)$ ,  $\pi'(-)$ ,  $\varepsilon(-, -)$ , and  $\lambda_{x \in A}(-)$ , together with the new term forming operations:

$$\frac{a \in A}{fa \in B}$$

for each arrow  $f : A \longrightarrow B$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Finally, its equations are precisely those which follow from (c1) to (c3) and no others.

In this example there are plenty of “empty” types; for instance, all the nodes of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

In the above example, as well as in the next section, we allow our languages to be proper classes in the sense of Gödel-Bernays. If necessary, we work in a set theory with universes, in which “classes” are replaced by “sets in a sufficiently large universe”.

## 2. The equivalence between Cart and $\lambda$ -calc

In this section we shall establish an equivalence between cartesian closed categories and typed  $\lambda$ -calculi. In order to state this properly, we define two categories:

**Cart** is the category whose objects are cartesian closed categories and whose arrows are those functors that preserve the structure on the nose.

$\lambda\text{-calc}$  is the category whose objects are  $\lambda$ -calculi and whose arrows are translations. A translation  $\Phi : \mathcal{L} \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}'$  does the following:

- (1)  $\Phi$  sends types of  $\mathcal{L}$  to types of  $\mathcal{L}'$ .
- (2)  $\Phi$  sends terms of  $\mathcal{L}$ , say of type  $A$ , to terms of  $\mathcal{L}'$  of type  $\Phi(A)$ , in particular, variables to variables.
- (3)  $\Phi$  preserves everything on the nose, for example:  $\Phi(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1}$ ,  $\Phi(A \times B) = \Phi(A) \times \Phi(B)$ ,  $\text{trans}(\star) = \star$ ,  $\Phi(\langle a, b \rangle) = \langle \Phi(a), \Phi(b) \rangle$ , and so on.
- (4)  $\Phi$  preserves equality: if  $a \equiv_{\bar{x}} b$  then  $\Phi(a) \equiv_{\Phi(\bar{x})} \Phi(b)$

Our next aim is to obtain a pair of functors

$$\text{Cart} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L} \\ \xleftarrow{C} \end{array} \lambda\text{-calc}$$

In particular, we wish to show that each cartesian closed category  $\mathcal{C}$  has an “internal language”  $L(\mathcal{C})$  which is a  $\lambda$ -calculus. But to describe this language, we first need to understand “variables”.

One can adjoin “variables” or “indeterminates” to cartesian closed categories much as one does to any universal algebra. Given a cartesian closed category  $\mathcal{C}$  with objects  $D$  and  $A$ , we adjoin an indeterminate arrow  $x : D \longrightarrow A$  to form the polynomial category  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  as follows:

Objects of  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  are the same as objects of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Arrows of  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  are generated from those in  $\mathcal{C}$  and the new basic arrow  $x : D \longrightarrow A$  using the arrow forming operations: composition,  $\langle -, - \rangle$ ,  $(-)^*$ . Equality  $\equiv_{\bar{x}}$  in  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  is the smallest congruence relation on hom-sets of  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  which respects equality  $\doteq_{\mathcal{C}}$  and assures that  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  is a cartesian closed category.

The category  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  satisfies the appropriate universal property in **Cart**. For the committed categorist,  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  may also be constructed directly as the Kleisli category of a certain co-monad (co-triple) on  $\mathcal{C}$ . For our purposes, the most interesting result concerns the normal forms of polynomials in  $\mathcal{C}[x]$ .

**Proposition 2.1.** (*functional completeness of cartesian closed categories*). For every polynomial  $\varphi(x) : B \longrightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  in an indeterminate arrow  $x : D \longrightarrow A$  there is a unique arrow  $f : A^D \times B \longrightarrow C$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that

$$f \langle (x\pi'_{B,D})^*, \mathbf{1}_B \rangle \doteq_{\bar{x}} \varphi(x)$$



An interesting alternative interpretation of this result is to think of  $\mathcal{C}[x]$  as a deductive system with the indeterminat  $x : D \longrightarrow A$  considered as a *new assumption*. Then functional completeness is simply a form of the deduction theorem in logic, with something extra added at the end: to every proof  $\varphi(x) : B \text{ to } C$  under the assumption  $x : D \longrightarrow A$  there is a unique proof  $f : (D \Rightarrow A) \wedge B \longrightarrow C$  such that the proof

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{B \wedge D \rightarrow D \quad D \xrightarrow{x} A}{B \wedge D \longrightarrow A} \\
 \frac{B \longrightarrow (D \Rightarrow A) \quad B \longrightarrow B}{B \longrightarrow (D \Rightarrow A) \wedge B} \quad (D \Rightarrow A) \wedge B \xrightarrow{f} C \\
 \hline
 B \longrightarrow C
 \end{array}$$

equals  $B \xrightarrow{\varphi(x)} C$ .