

Institute for Logic, Language and Computation

EXTENSIONAL REALIZABILITY

Jaap van Oosten

ILLC Prepublication Series
for Mathematical Logic and Foundations ML-93-18



University of Amsterdam

The ILLC Prepublication Series

1990 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language*

LP-90-01 Jaap van der Does — A Generalized Quantifier Logic for Naked Infinitives
LP-90-02 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Dynamic Montague Grammar
LP-90-03 Renate Bartsch — Concept Formation and Concept Composition
LP-90-04 Aarne Ranta — Intuitionistic Categorial Grammar
LP-90-05 Patrick Blackburn — Nominal Tense Logic
LP-90-06 Gennaro Chierchia — The Variablity of Impersonal Subjects
LP-90-07 Gennaro Chierchia — Anaphora and Dynamic Logic
LP-90-08 Herman Hendriks — Flexible Montague Grammar
LP-90-09 Paul Dekker — The Scope of Negation in Discourse, towards a Flexible Dynamic Montague grammar
LP-90-10 Theo M.V. Janssen — Models for Discourse Markers
LP-90-11 Johan van Benthem — General Dynamics
LP-90-12 Serge Lapierre — A Functional Partial Semantics for Intensional Logic
LP-90-13 Zhisheng Huang — Logics for Belief Dependence
LP-90-14 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Two Theories of Dynamic Semantics
LP-90-15 Maarten de Rijke — The Modal Logic of Inequality
LP-90-16 Zhisheng Huang, Karen Kwast — Awareness, Negation and Logical Omniscience
LP-90-17 Paul Dekker — Existential Disclosure, Implicit Arguments in Dynamic Semantics

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-90-01 Harold Schellinx — Isomorphisms and Non-Isomorphisms of Graph Models
ML-90-02 Jaap van Oosten — A Semantical Proof of De Jongh's Theorem
ML-90-03 Yde Venema — Relational Games
ML-90-04 Maarten de Rijke — Unary Interpretability Logic
ML-90-05 Domenico Zambella — Sequences with Simple Initial Segments
ML-90-06 Jaap van Oosten — Extension of Lifschitz' Realizability to Higher Order Arithmetic, and a Solution to a Problem of F. Richman
ML-90-07 Maarten de Rijke — A Note on the Interpretability Logic of Finitely Axiomatized Theories
ML-90-08 Harold Schellinx — Some Syntactical Observations on Linear Logic
ML-90-09 Dick de Jongh, Duccio Pianigiani — Solution of a Problem of David Guaspari
ML-90-10 Michiel van Lambalgen — Randomness in Set Theory
ML-90-11 Paul C. Gilmore — The Consistency of an Extended NaDSet

Computation and Complexity Theory

CT-90-01 John Tromp, Peter van Emde Boas — Associative Storage Modification Machines
CT-90-02 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Gerard R. Renardel de Lavalette — A Normal Form for PCSJ Expressions
CT-90-03 Ricard Gavaldà, Leen Torenvliet, Osamu Watanabe, José L. Balcázar — Generalized Kolmogorov Complexity in Relativized Separations
CT-90-04 Harry Buhrman, Edith Spaan, Leen Torenvliet — Bounded Reductions
CT-90-05 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast — Efficient Normalization of Database and Constraint Expressions
CT-90-06 Michiel Smid, Peter van Emde Boas — Dynamic Data Structures on Multiple Storage Media, a Tutorial
CT-90-07 Kees Doets — Greatest Fixed Points of Logic Programs
CT-90-08 Fred de Geus, Ernest Rotterdam, Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — Physiological Modelling using RL
CT-90-09 Roel de Vrijer — Unique Normal Forms for Combinatory Logic with Parallel

Other Prepublications

X-90-01 A.S. Troelstra — Conditional, a case study in conditional rewriting
X-90-02 Maarten de Rijke — Remarks on Intuitionism and the Philosophy of Mathematics, Revised Version
X-90-03 L.D. Beklemishev — Some Chapters on Interpretability Logic
X-90-04 — On the Complexity of Arithmetical Interpretations of Modal Formulae
X-90-05 Valentin Shehtman — Annual Report 1989
X-90-06 Valentin Goranko, Solomon Passy — Derived Sets in Euclidean Spaces and Modal Logic
X-90-07 V.Yu. Shavrukov — Using the Universal Modality: Gains and Questions
X-90-08 L.D. Beklemishev — The Lindenbaum Fixed Point Algebra is Undecidable
X-90-09 V.Yu. Shavrukov — Provability Logics for Natural Turing Progressions of Arithmetical Theories
X-90-10 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Peter van Emde Boas — On Rosser's Provability Predicate
X-90-11 Alessandra Carbone — An Overview of the Rule Language RL/1
X-90-12 Maarten de Rijke — Provable Fixed points in $I\Delta_0+\Omega_1$, revised version
X-90-13 K.N. Ignatiev — Bi-Unary Interpretability Logic
X-90-14 L.A. Chagrova — Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic: Arithmetical Completeness, Fixed Point Property, Craig's Property
X-90-15 A.S. Troelstra — Undecidable Problems in Correspondence Theory
— Lectures on Linear Logic

1991 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Language*

LP-91-01 Wiebe van der Hoek, Maarten de Rijke — Generalized Quantifiers and Modal Logic
LP-91-02 Frank Veltman — Defaults in Update Semantics
LP-91-03 Willem Groeneveld — Dynamic Semantics and Circular Propositions
LP-91-04 Makoto Kanazawa — The Lambek Calculus enriched with Additional Connectives
LP-91-05 Zhisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas — The Schoenmakers Paradox: Its Solution in a Belief Dependence Framework
LP-91-06 Zhisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas — Belief Dependence, Revision and Persistence
LP-91-07 Henk Verkuyl, Jaap van der Does — The Semantics of Plural Noun Phrases
LP-91-08 Víctor Sánchez Valencia — Categorial Grammar and Natural Reasoning
LP-91-09 Arthur Nieuwendijk — Semantics and Comparative Logic
LP-91-10 Johan van Benthem — Logic and the Flow of Information

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-91-01 Yde Venema — Cylindric Modal Logic
ML-91-02 Alessandro Berarducci, Rineke Verbrugge — On the Metamathematics of Weak Theories
ML-91-03 Domenico Zambella — On the Proofs of Arithmetical Completeness for Interpretability Logic
ML-91-04 Raymond Hoofman, Harold Schellinx — Collapsing Graph Models by Preorders
ML-91-05 A.S. Troelstra — History of Constructivism in the Twentieth Century
ML-91-06 Inge Bethke — Finite Type Structures within Combinatory Algebras
ML-91-07 Yde Venema — Modal Derivation Rules
ML-91-08 Inge Bethke — Going Stable in Graph Models
ML-91-09 V.Yu. Shavrukov — A Note on the Diagonalizable Algebras of PA and ZF
ML-91-10 Maarten de Rijke, Yde Venema — Sahlqvist's Theorem for Boolean Algebras with Operators
ML-91-11 Rineke Verbrugge — Feasible Interpretability
ML-91-12 Johan van Benthem — Modal Frame Classes, revisited

Computation and Complexity Theory

CT-91-01 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi — Kolmogorov Complexity Arguments in Combinatorics
CT-91-02 Ming Li, John Tromp, Paul M.B. Vitányi — How to Share Concurrent Wait-Free Variables
CT-91-03 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi — Average Case Complexity under the Universal Distribution Equals Worst Case Complexity
CT-91-04 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast — Weak Equivalence
CT-91-05 Sieger van Denneheuvel, Karen Kwast — Weak Equivalence for Constraint Sets
CT-91-06 Edith Spaan — Census Techniques on Relativized Space Classes
CT-91-07 Karen L. Kwast — The Incomplete Database
CT-91-08 Kees Doets — Levationis Laus
CT-91-09 Ming Li, Paul M.B. Vitányi — Combinatorial Properties of Finite Sequences with high Kolmogorov Complexity
CT-91-10 John Tromp, Paul Vitányi — A Randomized Algorithm for Two-Process Wait-Free Test-and-Set
CT-91-11 Lane A. Hemachandra, Edith Spaan — Quasi-Injective Reductions
CT-91-12 Krzysztof R. Apt, Dino Pedreschi — Reasoning about Termination of Prolog Programs

Computational Linguistics

CL-91-01 J.C. Scholtes — Kohonen Feature Maps in Natural Language Processing
CL-91-02 J.C. Scholtes — Neural Nets and their Relevance for Information Retrieval
CL-91-03 Hub Prüst, Remko Scha, Martin van den Berg — A Formal Discourse Grammar tackling Verb Phrase Anaphora

Other Prepublications

X-91-01 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyaschev — The Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics
X-91-02 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyaschev — On the Undecidability of the Disjunction Property of Intermediate Propositional Logics



Institute for Logic, Language and Computation
Plantage Muidergracht 24
1018TV Amsterdam
Telephone 020-525.6051, Fax: 020-525.5101

EXTENSIONAL REALIZABILITY

Jaap van Oosten
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Amsterdam

ILLC Prepublications
for Mathematical Logic and Foundations
ISSN 0928-3315
Coordinating editor: Dick de Jongh

received September 1993

Extensional realizability

Jaap van Oosten

September 30, 1993

Introduction

In many accounts of Kleene's realizability, the analogy with the Brouwer-Heyting-Kolmogorov proof interpretation is stressed. However, if one reads this interpretation (in the case of implication) as: "a proof of an implication $A \to B$ is an operation which assigns proofs of B to proofs of A", there is a problem with extensionality in the case of nested implications.

A Kleene realizer for $(A \to B) \to C$ codes an operation which assigns, to *codes* of operations for $A \to B$, a realizer for C; but two different codes for the "same" (in some sense) operation may well be sent to different realizers.

"Extensional realizability" is a modification of Kleene's original definition, where a notion of "x and y are equivalent as realizers of A" is built in; it is then required that realizers of $A \to B$ code operations which send equivalent realizers of A to equivalent realizers of B.

There are at least two ways to do this:

1. One may define, for every formula A, a partial equivalence relation $\sim_A$ on the set of Kleene realizers of A by recursion on A; I say that x $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizes A (abbreviated $x\ \mathbf{r}_e\ A$) if $x \sim_A x$.

2. One may simultaneously define, by recursion on A, the set of realizers of A and an equivalence relation $=_A$ on that set. I call this notion **e**-realizability; x **e**-realizes A ($x\ \mathbf{e}\ A$) iff $x =_A x$.

These two ways resemble the two constructions of an extensional type structure out of the structure **HRO** of hereditarily recursive operations: giving $\mathbf{HRO}^E$ and **HEO**, respectively (see [Tro 73] for details).

Inductive definitions for the two approaches are presented in section 1. The second approach was first given by Beeson ([Bee 85]) with an interpretation of Martin-Löf's Type Theory in mind.

It will be shown that $\mathbf{r}_e$- and **e**-realizability are not equivalent as interpretations of intuitionistic arithmetic **HA**. The proof rests on a lemma which has another interesting corollary: the open schema

$$A \to \exists x(x\ \mathbf{e}\ A)$$

is not **e**-realizable. This failure of 'idempotency' of **e**-realizability makes it impossible to prove a characterization result of the kind:

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash \exists x(x\ \mathbf{e}\ A) \ \Leftrightarrow\ \mathbf{HA} + F \vdash A \tag{1}$$

(for an axiom or axiom scheme F), in a straightforward way like Troelstra's characterization of Kleene's realizability ([Tro 71]). For there, he used

$$\mathbf{HA} + F \vdash A \leftrightarrow \exists x(x\ \mathbf{r}\ A) \tag{2}$$

for arbitrary *formulas* A, to derive (1) (here F was the schema ECT_0, and $x\ \mathbf{r}\ A$ means x realizes A in Kleene's sense).

However, I shall obtain a characterization of **e**-realizability over a conservative extension $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ of **HA**+Markov's Principle MP. More precisely, $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ has variables α of a new sort, and I define the notion "α realizes A" for formulas A in the extended language. This definition will be idempotent for arithmetical formulas (formulas in the language of **HA**), and we obtain:

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha + ECT^\alpha \vdash A \leftrightarrow \exists\alpha(\alpha \text{ realizes } A)$$

for some scheme ECT^α and arithmetical formulas A, as well as:

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha(\alpha \text{ realizes } A) \ \Leftrightarrow\ \mathbf{HA} + \mathrm{MP} \vdash \exists x(x\ \mathbf{e}\ A)$$

In section 2 I turn to proof-theoretical aspects of **e**-realizability. By a suitable "**q**-variant" of **e**-realizability, a derived rule of **HA** is obtained which subsumes the well-known Extended Church's Rule.

Section 3 deals with toposes generalizing notions of extensional realizability in the same way as Hyland's "effective topos" $\mathcal{E}ff$ ([Hy 82]) generalizes Kleene's realizability. The first description of a topos generalizing **e**-realizability was given by Pitts ([Pit 81]). I call this topos Ext and explain some of its internal logic. There is also a topos Ext' which generalizes $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizability. We have a commutative diagram of geometric morphisms between these toposes of the form:



In this diagram, j is an *open inclusion*, i.e. there is a subobject U of 1 in Ext' such that $\mathcal{E}ff$ is equivalent to the slice topos Ext'$/U$ and j^* is, modulo this equivalence, the pullback functor Ext' $\to$ Ext'$/U$.

The topos Ext seems rather hard to analyse. However, there is another topos (the construction of which mirrors the extension $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ of **HA** in section 1) into which Ext embeds; and this embedding preserves the logic of all finite types over the natural numbers. This new topos $\mathcal{A}$ is somewhat easier to handle because the construction is similar to that of $\mathcal{E}ff$ and several results about $\mathcal{E}ff$ have their counterparts for $\mathcal{A}$; in particular, the results in [RR 90] and [Car 93]. Behind the construction of $\mathcal{A}$ there is a generalization of the notion of "partial combinatory algebra" (pca), called $\leq$-pca, which I think may be independently interesting.

1 Definitions and basic properties

In the following definition, the notions $x \sim_A y$, $x\ \mathbf{r}_e\ A$, $x =_A y$ and $x\ \mathbf{e}\ A$ are defined, for numbers x, y and arithmetical formulas A. These notions will also be taken as arithmetical formulas themselves.

I write $x \bullet y$ for the outcome, if any, of the computation of the x-th Turing machine with input y; $\downarrow$ means "defined" so $x \bullet y \downarrow$ is equivalent to $\exists z T(x,y,z)$ where T is Kleene's predicate. $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, $(\cdot)_0$, $(\cdot)_1$ are primitive recursive functions such that $\langle (x)_0, (x)_1 \rangle = x$, $(\langle x, y \rangle)_0 = x$ and $(\langle x, y \rangle)_1 = y$.

The notation $x \mathbf{r} A$ means that x realizes A in Kleene's sense, or the formula expressing this in arithmetic.

Definition 1.1 *1. Define for every formula A the formula $x \sim_A y$, where x, y are variables which do not occur in A:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
x \sim_{t=s} y & \equiv & x = y \wedge t = s \\
x \sim_{A \wedge B} y & \equiv & (x)_0 \sim_A (y)_0 \wedge (x)_1 \sim_B (y)_1 \\
x \sim_{A \vee B} y & \equiv & ((x)_0 = (y)_0 = 0 \wedge (x)_1 \sim_A (y)_1) \vee \\
 & & ((x)_0 \neq 0 \wedge (y)_0 \neq 0 \wedge (x)_1 \sim_B (y)_1) \\
x \sim_{A \to B} y & \equiv & x \mathbf{r} A \to B \wedge y \mathbf{r} A \to B \wedge \\
 & & \forall w w' (w \sim_A w' \to x \bullet w \sim_B y \bullet w') \\
x \sim_{\neg A} y & \equiv & \forall w \neg (w \mathbf{r} A) \\
x \sim_{\forall n A(n)} y & \equiv & \forall n (x \bullet n \downarrow \wedge y \bullet n \downarrow \wedge x \bullet n \sim_{A(n)} y \bullet n) \\
x \sim_{\exists n A(n)} y & \equiv & (x)_0 = (y)_0 \wedge (x)_1 \sim_{A((x)_0)} (y)_1
\end{array}$$

I write $x \mathbf{r}_e A$ for $x \sim_A x$.

2. Define simultaneously by recursion on A, the formulas $x \mathbf{e} A$ and $x =_A y$ (again, x, y don't occur in A):

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
x \mathbf{e} t = s & \equiv & t = s \\
x =_{t=s} y & \equiv & x = y \wedge t = s \\
x \mathbf{e} A \wedge B & \equiv & (x)_0 \mathbf{e} A \wedge (x)_1 \mathbf{e} B \\
x =_{A \wedge B} y & \equiv & (x)_0 =_A (y)_0 \wedge (x)_1 =_B (y)_1 \\
x \mathbf{e} A \vee B & \equiv & ((x)_0 = 0 \wedge (x)_1 \mathbf{e} A) \vee ((x)_0 \neq 0 \wedge (x)_1 \mathbf{e} B) \\
x =_{A \vee B} y & \equiv & ((x)_0 = (y)_0 = 0 \wedge (x)_1 =_A (y)_1) \vee \\
 & & ((x)_0 \neq 0 \wedge (y)_0 \neq 0 \wedge (x)_1 =_B (y)_1) \\
x \mathbf{e} A \to B & \equiv & \forall y y' (y =_A y' \to x \bullet y \downarrow \wedge x \bullet y' \downarrow \wedge \\
 & & x \bullet y =_B x \bullet y') \\
x =_{A \to B} y & \equiv & x \mathbf{e} A \to B \wedge y \mathbf{e} A \to B \wedge \\
 & & \forall w (w \mathbf{e} A \to x \bullet w =_B y \bullet w) \\
x \mathbf{e} \neg A & \equiv & \forall w \neg (w \mathbf{e} A) \\
x =_{\neg A} y & \equiv & \forall w \neg (w \mathbf{e} A) \\
x \mathbf{e} \forall n A(n) & \equiv & \forall n (x \bullet n \downarrow \wedge x \bullet n \mathbf{e} A(n)) \\
x =_{\forall n A(n)} y & \equiv & \forall n (x \bullet n \downarrow \wedge y \bullet n \downarrow \wedge x \bullet n =_{A(n)} y \bullet n) \\
x \mathbf{e} \exists n A(n) & \equiv & (x)_1 \mathbf{e} A((x)_0) \\
x =_{\exists n A(n)} y & \equiv & (x)_0 = (y)_0 \wedge (x)_1 =_{A((x)_0)} (y)_1
\end{array}$$

Some obvious consequences of definition 1.1 are that $\sim_A$ and $=_A$ are symmetric and transitive relations, that $x \sim_A x$ implies $x \mathbf{r} A$ and that $x =_A x$ is equivalent to $x \mathbf{e} A$.

A difference between the notions $x \mathbf{r}_e A$ and $x \mathbf{e} A$ that presents itself immediately, is in the clause for implication (from which the one for negation follows). Using classical logic, it is easy to see that $A \vee \neg A$ is $\mathbf{e}$-realizable for sentences A; not so for $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizability. Classically again, it is true that $A \vee \neg A \vee \neg\neg A$ is $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizable for any sentence A: if A and $\neg A$ are not $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizable, then A must be Kleene-realizable, $\sim_{\neg A}$ is the empty relation and $\neg\neg A$ is $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizable.

We shall see that all three possibilities do in fact occur.

First, let's record:

Proposition 1.2 (Soundness) $\mathbf{HA} \vdash A \Rightarrow \mathbf{HA} \vdash \exists xy(x\ \mathbf{r}_e\ A \wedge y\ \mathbf{e}\ A)$

Proof. A routine induction on $\mathbf{HA} \vdash A$. Examples of this kind of proof abound in [Tro 73]. ∎

For the next lemma, recall that an *almost negative* formula is a formula built up from formulas of form $\exists y(t = s)$ using only the connectives $\wedge, \rightarrow, \forall$.

Lemma 1.3 *Let, for almost negative formulas A, ψ_A be the p-term (i.e. a "term" built up using $\bullet$, so it is not always defined) from* [Tro 73], *3.2.11. Then:*
$\mathbf{HA} \vdash A \rightarrow \psi_A \downarrow \wedge \psi_A\ \mathbf{r}_e\ A \wedge \psi_A\ \mathbf{e}\ A$
$\mathbf{HA} \vdash \exists y(y\ \mathbf{r}_e\ A \vee y\ \mathbf{e}\ A) \rightarrow A$

Proof. Trivial. ∎

Lemma 1.4 *The following sentence of* **HA** *is neither* $\mathbf{r}_e$*- nor* **e***-realizable:*

$$\forall e[\forall x \exists y(\neg\neg\exists z T(e,x,z) \rightarrow T(e,x,y)) \rightarrow$$

$$\exists v \forall x \exists u(T(v,x,u) \wedge (\neg\neg\exists y T(e,x,y) \rightarrow T(e,x,U(u))))]$$

(Here T is Kleene's predicate, and U the result extracting function)

Proof. The proof is similar for both realizabilities; I give it for **e**-realizability. The reasoning is informal; but can be carried out in **HA**+MP. Let A denote the sentence in the statement of the lemma, and suppose for contradiction that $w\ \mathbf{e}\ A$. Then w codes a total recursive function. I remark:

i) If e codes the empty function, then $\Lambda f.((w \bullet e) \bullet f)_0$ is an effective operation of type 2 (i.e. sends codes for the same total recursive function to the same number), for every code of a total recursive function will realize $\forall x \exists y(\neg\neg\exists z T(e,x,z) \rightarrow T(e,x,y))$, and these realizers are equivalent if they code the same function.

ii) If k realizes $\forall x \exists y(\neg\neg\exists z T(e,x,z) \rightarrow T(e,x,y))$, then $((w \bullet e) \bullet k)_1$ realizes the formula

$$\forall x \exists u(T(((w \bullet e) \bullet k)_0, x, u) \wedge (\neg\neg\exists y T(e,x,y) \rightarrow T(e,x,U(u))))$$

which is equivalent to an almost negative formula, and therefore holds. So in this case we always have:

$$\forall x[((w \bullet e) \bullet k)_0 \bullet x \downarrow \wedge(\neg\neg\exists y T(e,x,y) \rightarrow T(e,x,((w \bullet e) \bullet k)_0 \bullet x))]$$

Using the recursion theorem we can find a code e for a partial recursive function of three variables such that:

$$e \bullet (k,n,x) \simeq \begin{cases} & \text{undefined} & \text{if not } T(n,n,x) \\ & & \text{if } T(n,n,x): \\ & \text{undefined} & \text{if } ((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x \\ & & \text{is undefined} \\ & 0 & \text{if } ((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x \\ & & \text{is defined and not} \\ & & T(S_1^2(e,k,n),x, \\ & & ((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x) \\ U[((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x)] + 1 & & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Again some remarks:

iii) If $T(n,n,x)$, then $((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x$ is always defined. For if not, $S_1^2(e,k,n)$ would code the empty function, and see i)-ii).

iv) If $T(n,n,x)$, then never $T(S_1^2(e,k,n), x, ((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x)$. For were this the case we would have:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^2(e,k,n) \bullet x &= U[((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x)] \\ e \bullet (k,n,x) &= U[((w \bullet S_1^2(e,k,n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x)] + 1 \end{aligned}$$

which is contradictory.

Again using the recursion theorem, with e as just defined, we take a code k for a partial recursive function of two variables, such that:

$$k \bullet (n,x) \simeq \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if not } T(n,n,x) \\ \langle \mu z.T(S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n), x, z), \Lambda x.0 \rangle & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Then $S_1^1(k,n)$ always realizes

$$\forall x \exists y (\neg\neg \exists z T(S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n), x, z) \to T(S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n), x, y))$$

Furthermore:
If $n \bullet n$ is undefined then $S_1^1(k,n)$ codes the constant zero function and $S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)$ the empty function, so

$$((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet S_1^1(k,n))_0 = ((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0$$

If $n \bullet n$ is defined, say $T(n,n,x)$, then (see remark ii))

$$((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet S_1^1(k,n))_0 \bullet x$$

is defined, and

$$T(S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n), x, ((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet S_1^1(k,n))_0 \bullet x)$$

holds. By remarks iii)-iv) we have that

$$((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x$$

is defined and *not*

$$T(S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n), x, ((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0 \bullet x)$$

Therefore in this case:

$$((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet S_1^1(k,n))_0 \neq ((w \bullet S_1^2(e, S_1^1(k,n),n)) \bullet \Lambda x.0)_0$$

(Note, that both sides are always defined!)
This gives us a decision procedure for the question: "is $n \bullet n$ defined?", and the contradiction is obtained. ∎

Corollary 1.5 $\mathbf{r}_e$- *and* $\mathbf{e}$-*realizability are not equivalent.*

Proof. For the sentence A of lemma 1.4 we clearly have that $\neg A$ is **e**-realizable. However, the sentence A is an instance of Church's Thesis CT_0 so Kleene-realizable; it follows that $\neg\neg A$ is $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizable. These facts are provable in **HA**+MP, where MP denotes Markov's Principle. ∎

Corollary 1.6 *The open schema*

$$B \to \exists x(x \ \mathbf{e}\ B)$$

is not **e***-realizable.*

Proof. Take for B the formula $\forall x \exists y(\neg\neg\exists z T(e,x,z) \to T(e,x,y))$. Then $\exists v(v \ \mathbf{e}\ B)$ is equivalent to

$$\exists v \forall x \exists u(T(v,x,u) \wedge (\neg\neg\exists z T(e,x,z) \to T(e,x,U(u))))$$

and apply lemma 1.4. ∎

As hinted in the Introduction, Corollary 1.6 blocks the way to a straightforward characterization result for **e**-realizability. I now present an extension of **HA** over which **e**-realizability can be characterized.

Definition 1.7 *The theory* $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ *is an extension of* **HA** *in a 2-sorted language. Variables of the extra sort are denoted* $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ *There is an extra non-logical symbol* $\in$ *and the new atomic formulas are of form* $t \in \alpha$ *and* $\alpha = \beta$.

$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ *has the following extra axioms (besides those of* **HA***, and induction for the full extended language):*

1) $\neg\neg\exists n(n \in \alpha)$

2) $\forall n(\neg\neg n \in \alpha \to n \in \alpha)$

3) $\forall \alpha\beta(\alpha = \beta \leftrightarrow \forall n(n \in \alpha \leftrightarrow n \in \beta))$

4) $\forall \alpha\beta(\forall nm(n \in \alpha \wedge m \in \beta \to n \bullet m\downarrow) \to$
$\exists \gamma \forall k(k \in \gamma \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists n \in \alpha \exists m \in \beta(k = n \bullet m)))$

5) $\neg\neg\exists n \forall y(y \in \alpha \leftrightarrow y = n) \to \exists n \forall y(y \in \alpha \leftrightarrow y = n)$

6) $\forall nm \exists \alpha(n \in \alpha \wedge m \in \alpha)$

7) $\forall n \exists \alpha \forall m(m \in \alpha \leftrightarrow m = n)$

8) Markov's Principle: $\neg\neg\exists y(t = s) \to \exists y(t = s)$

We can (and do) think about the α's as some sort of sets of numbers; I shall often refer to the variables α as *set* variables.

In view of the extensionality axiom 3) and axioms 4) and 7) we may pass to a definitional extension of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ and introduce terms $\{n\}$ and partial terms $\alpha \bullet \beta$ with definitions:

$$x \in \{n\} \leftrightarrow x = n$$
$$\alpha \bullet \beta\downarrow \leftrightarrow \forall n \in \alpha \forall m \in \beta(n \bullet m\downarrow)$$
$$\alpha \bullet \beta\downarrow \to \forall n(n \in \alpha \bullet \beta \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists k \in \alpha \exists l \in \beta(n = k \bullet l))$$

Note that from 6) and 7) we can derive

$$\forall nm \exists \alpha \forall k(k \in \alpha \leftrightarrow k = n \vee k = m)$$

For, given n and m first pick (by 6)) a β with $n \in \beta \wedge m \in \beta$. If e is such that

$$e \bullet x \simeq \begin{cases} n & \text{if } x = n \\ m & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

then for $\alpha = \{e\} \bullet \beta$ we have

$$k \in \alpha \leftrightarrow \neg\neg(k = n \vee k = m) \leftrightarrow k = n \vee k = m$$

This extends to sequences. I shall therefore also use the notation $\{n, m\}$.

From now on, I call formulas in which no set variables occur (either free or bound) *arithmetical*.

Proposition 1.8 *1.* $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ *is conservative over* $\mathbf{HA}$+MP

2. For arithmetical formulas $A(x)$*:*

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha\forall n \in \alpha A(n) \Rightarrow \mathbf{HA}\text{+MP} \vdash \exists n A(n)$$

Proof. Both results follow directly from a translation of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ into $\mathbf{HA}$, which interprets the α's as codes for nonempty finite sets. All axioms of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ are valid under this translation, as well as the axiom $\exists x(x \in \alpha)$; this gives the second statement at once. ∎

Definition 1.9 (realizability for $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$) *Define a realizability notion* $\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A$ *for formulas* A *in the language of* $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ *not containing the variable* α*:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ t = s & \equiv & \alpha = \{t\} \wedge t = s \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ n \in \beta & \equiv & \alpha = \{n\} \wedge n \in \beta \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \beta = \gamma & \equiv & \alpha \subseteq \beta \wedge \beta = \gamma \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A \wedge B & \equiv & p_0\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A \wedge p_1\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ B \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A \to B & \equiv & \forall\beta(\beta\ \mathbf{r}\ A \to \alpha \bullet \beta\downarrow \wedge \alpha \bullet \beta\ \mathbf{r}\ B) \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \exists n A(n) & \equiv & \exists n(p_0\alpha = \{n\} \wedge p_1\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A(n)) \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \exists\beta A(\beta) & \equiv & \exists\beta(p_0\alpha \subseteq \beta \wedge p_1\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A(\beta)) \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \forall n A(n) & \equiv & \forall n(\alpha \bullet \{n\}\downarrow \wedge \alpha \bullet \{n\}\ \mathbf{r}\ A(n)) \\
\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \forall\beta A(\beta) & \equiv & \forall\beta(\alpha \bullet \beta\downarrow \wedge \alpha \bullet \beta\ \mathbf{r}\ A(\beta))
\end{array}$$

Here, $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ *abbreviates* $\forall n(n \in \alpha \to n \in \beta)$ *and* $p_i\alpha = \{\Lambda x.(x)_i\} \bullet \alpha$ *for* $i = 0, 1$*; so*

$$x \in p_i\alpha \leftrightarrow \neg\neg\exists y \in \alpha(x = (y)_i)$$

Lemma 1.10 *For arithmetical* A*:*

1. $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \forall xy(\neg\neg(x =_A y) \to x =_A y)$
2. $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \forall\alpha(\neg\neg(\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A) \to \alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A)$

Proof. The only nontrivial induction step (for 2.; 1.is immediate by Markov's Principle) is $\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ \exists n An$, which is equivalent to

$$\exists n(p_0\alpha = \{n\}) \wedge \forall n(p_0\alpha = \{n\} \to p_1\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A(n))$$

and this is $\neg\neg$-stable by axiom 5). ∎

Proposition 1.11 *For arithmetical A,*

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \alpha \mathbf{r} A \leftrightarrow \forall nm \in \alpha(n =_A m)$$

Proof. Induction on A; I do two cases, leaving te others to the reader.

- Let $A \equiv B \wedge C$; suppose $\alpha \mathbf{r} A$ and $n, m \in \alpha$. Then $(n)_i, (m)_i \in p_i\alpha$ $(i = 0, 1)$ and since $p_0\alpha \mathbf{r} B$, $p_1\alpha \mathbf{r} C$ we have $(n)_0 =_B (m)_0$, $(n)_1 =_C (m)_1$ by induction hypothesis, so $n =_A m$.
  Conversely, suppose $\forall nm \in \alpha(n =_A m)$ so $\forall nm \in \alpha((n)_0 =_B (m)_0 \wedge (n)_1 =_C (m)_1)$. Then $\forall nm \in p_0\alpha \neg\neg(n =_B m)$ so $\forall nm \in p_0\alpha(n =_B m)$ by lemma 1.10, which gives $p_0\alpha \mathbf{r} B$ by induction hypothesis. Similarly, $p_1\alpha \mathbf{r} C$ and $\alpha \mathbf{r} A$.

- Let $A \equiv B \to C$. Suppose $\alpha \mathbf{r} B \to C$ and $n, m \in \alpha$. Given y, y' with $y =_B y'$, by induction hypothesis we have that $\{y, y'\} \mathbf{r} B$ so $n \bullet y \downarrow \wedge n \bullet y' \downarrow \wedge \{n \bullet y, n \bullet y'\} \mathbf{r} C$ so by induction hypothesis it follows that $n \mathbf{e} B \to C$. Similarly, $m \mathbf{e} B \to C$ and $n =_{B\to C} m$ follow.
  Conversely, if $\forall nm \in \alpha(n =_{B\to C} m)$ and $\beta \mathbf{r} B$ then $\alpha \bullet \beta \downarrow \wedge \forall k, l \in \alpha \bullet \beta(\neg\neg k =_C l)$, so by lemma 1.10 $\forall k, l \in \alpha \bullet \beta(k =_C l)$ so by induction hypothesis $\alpha \bullet \beta \mathbf{r} C$; so $\alpha \mathbf{r} B \to C$.

∎

Proposition 1.12 *For any A in the language of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$,*

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \alpha \mathbf{r} A \wedge \beta \subseteq \alpha \to \beta \mathbf{r} A$$

Proof. At once. ∎

Proposition 1.13 (Soundness for $\alpha \mathbf{r} A$) *For any A in the language of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$,*

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash A \Rightarrow \mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha(\alpha \mathbf{r} A)$$

Proof. In essence, there is nothing new here. To see this, note the following fact: given a set expression T built up from variables $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$, the partial application $\bullet$ and p_0, p_1; consider the numerical partial term $t = \Lambda x_1 \cdots x_n.T[x_1/\alpha_1, \ldots, x_n/\alpha_n]$ where the x_i are new number variables, the $\bullet$ is now interpreted as Kleene application for numbers, and p_i is replaced by $(\cdot)_i$. Then one proves by induction on T:

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \forall\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n(T \downarrow \to \{t\} \bullet \alpha_1 \bullet \cdots \bullet \alpha_n \downarrow \wedge \subseteq T)$$

Now one forms the terms realizing formulas about just as in the sondness proof for Kleene realizability, and uses lemma 1.12. ∎

Definition 1.14 ECT^α *is the following axiom scheme:*

$$\forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \exists\beta B(\alpha, \beta)) \to$$

$$\exists\gamma\forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge \exists\beta(\gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta \wedge B(\alpha, \beta)))$$

Proposition 1.15 ECT^α *is* $\mathbf{r}$*-realizable, i.e.*

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha(\alpha \mathbf{r} F)$$

for any instance F of ECT^α

Proof. Of course, the "formulas" $\gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow$ and $\gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta$ are read as

$$\forall nm(n \in \gamma \wedge m \in \alpha \to n \bullet m \downarrow)$$

and

$$\forall k(\neg\neg\exists n \in \gamma \exists m \in \alpha(k = n \bullet m) \to k \in \beta)$$

respectively; the reader is kindly requested to convince himself that there are numbers n and m such that

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \forall \alpha\gamma(\gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow \leftrightarrow \{n\}\ \mathbf{r}\ (\gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow))$$

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \forall \alpha\beta\gamma(\gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta \leftrightarrow \{m\}\ \mathbf{r}\ (\gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta))$$

Fix these n and m for the rest of the proof. Write

$$\begin{aligned} f_e &= \Lambda x.((e \bullet x)_0)_0 \\ g_e &= \Lambda xy.\langle n, \langle m, ((e \bullet x) \bullet 0)_1\rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Then I claim that $\{\Lambda e.\langle f_e, g_e\rangle\}$ realizes ECT^α.

A verification of this is left to the reader, who may wish to contemplate the following: $\epsilon\ \mathbf{r}\ \forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \exists\beta B(\alpha,\beta))$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \forall\alpha[\epsilon \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge(\neg\exists\delta(\delta\ \mathbf{r}\ A(\alpha)) \to \forall\zeta\{(\epsilon \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta \downarrow \wedge \\ \exists\beta[p_0((\epsilon \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta) \subseteq \beta \wedge \\ p_1((\epsilon \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta)\ \mathbf{r}\ B(\alpha,\beta)]\})] \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, writing out

$$\epsilon'\ \mathbf{r}\ \exists\gamma\forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge\ \exists\beta(\gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta \wedge B(\alpha,\beta)))$$

one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \exists\gamma[p_0\epsilon' \subseteq \gamma \wedge \forall\alpha(p_1\epsilon' \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge(\neg\exists\delta(\delta\ \mathbf{r}\ A(\alpha)) \to \\ \forall\zeta\{(p_1\epsilon' \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta \downarrow \wedge \\ p_0((p_1\epsilon' \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta)\ \mathbf{r}\ \gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge \\ \exists\beta(p_0p_1((p_1\epsilon' \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta)\ \mathbf{r}\ \gamma \bullet \alpha \subseteq \beta \wedge \\ p_1p_1((p_1\epsilon' \bullet \alpha) \bullet \zeta)\ \mathbf{r}\ B(\alpha,\beta))\}))] \end{aligned}$$

(I apologize) ∎

Remark. The stronger scheme (and perhaps the one some readers expected to turn up):

$$\forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \exists\beta B(\alpha,\beta)) \to \exists\gamma\forall\alpha(\neg A(\alpha) \to \gamma \bullet \alpha \downarrow \wedge B(\alpha, \gamma \bullet \alpha))$$

cannot be realizable: think of the interpretation of the α's as finite sets. There can be no finite set α such that for all β,

$$\beta \bullet \beta \downarrow \Rightarrow \alpha \bullet \beta = \beta \bullet \beta$$

(finite sets with such an application are *not* a partial combinatory algebra; there will be some remarks around this in section 3)

Proposition 1.16 *For arithmetical formulas A,*

i) $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha + \mathrm{ECT}^\alpha \vdash A \leftrightarrow \exists\alpha(\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A)$

ii) $\mathbf{HA}{+}\mathrm{MP} \vdash \exists x(x\ \mathbf{e}\ A) \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{HA}^\alpha + \mathrm{ECT}^\alpha \vdash A$

Proof. For i), note that ECT^α, together with proposition 1.12 and lemma 1.10, implies for arithmetical A and B:

$$\forall\alpha(\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A \to \exists\beta(\beta\ \mathbf{r}\ B)) \to \exists\gamma(\gamma\ \mathbf{r}\ (A \to B))$$

which gives the only nontrivial induction step.

For ii), $\Rightarrow$ follows at once, using i) and proposition 1.11; for $\Leftarrow$ suppose $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha + \mathrm{ECT}^\alpha \vdash A$ so $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash F \to A$ for a finite conjunction F of instances of ECT^α. Since F is realizable by 1.15, from 1.13 we have

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha(\alpha\ \mathbf{r}\ A)$$

By 1.11 then

$$\mathbf{HA}^\alpha \vdash \exists\alpha\forall n \in \alpha(n\ \mathbf{e}\ A)$$

so by 1.8ii) one gets

$$\mathbf{HA}{+}\mathrm{MP} \vdash \exists x(x\ \mathbf{e}\ A)$$

∎

This completes the characterization of extensional realizability in a conservative extension of $\mathbf{HA}$+MP.

Remarks

1) The following weakening of the scheme ECT_0 is, in $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$, implied by ECT^α:

$$\forall x(\neg A(x) \to \exists y B(x,y)) \to \neg\neg\exists z\forall x(\neg A(x) \to z \bullet x \downarrow \wedge B(x, z \bullet x))$$

I propose the name WECT_0 (Weak Extended Church's Thesis) for this scheme.

2) Let us consider (over $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ minus axiom 6) of definition 1.7) the following three axioms in isolation:

   i) Axiom 6): $\forall nm\exists\alpha(n \in \alpha \wedge m \in \alpha)$

   ii) ECT^α

   iii) $\exists x(x \in \alpha)$

   It is not hard to see that these three, taken together, are inconsistent. Our realizability has just i) and ii); if one takes ii) and iii) one derives $\forall\alpha\exists n(\alpha = \{n\})$, and one has, essentially, Kleene's realizability back.

2 Extensional q-realizability and Extensional Church's Rule

Definition 2.1 (extensional q-realizability) *Define simultaneously, by recursion on A, formulas $Q_A(x)$ and $x \asymp_A x'$ for x, x' not occurring in A, as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
Q_{t=s}(x) & \equiv & t = s \\
x \asymp_{t=s} x' & \equiv & x = x' \wedge t = s \\
Q_{A\wedge B}(x) & \equiv & Q_A((x)_0) \wedge Q_B((x)_1) \\
x \asymp_{A\wedge B} x' & \equiv & (x)_0 \asymp_A (x')_0 \wedge (x)_1 \asymp_B (x')_1 \\
Q_{A\to B}(x) & \equiv & \forall yy'(y \asymp_A y' \to x \bullet y \downarrow \wedge x \bullet y' \downarrow \wedge \\
 & & x \bullet y \asymp_B x \bullet y') \ \wedge \ A \to B \\
x \asymp_{A\to B} x' & \equiv & Q_{A\to B}(x) \wedge Q_{A\to B}(x') \wedge \\
 & & \forall y(Q_A(y) \to x \bullet y \asymp_B x' \bullet y) \\
Q_{\forall yA(y)}(x) & \equiv & \forall n(x \bullet n \downarrow \wedge Q_{A(n)}(x \bullet n)) \\
x \asymp_{\forall yA(y)} x' & \equiv & \forall n(x \bullet n \downarrow \wedge x' \bullet n \downarrow \wedge x \bullet n \asymp_{A(n)} x' \bullet n) \\
Q_{\exists yA(y)}(x) & \equiv & Q_{A((x)_0)}((x)_1) \\
x \asymp_{\exists yA(y)} x' & \equiv & (x)_0 = (x')_0 \wedge (x)_1 \asymp_{A((x)_0)} (x')_1
\end{array}$$

Again, $\asymp_A$ is symmetric and transitive, and $Q_A(x)$ is equivalent to $x \asymp_A x$. It also follows by an easy induction that

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash Q_A(x) \to A \tag{3}$$

for all formulas A.

Proposition 2.2 (soundness for extensional q-realizability)

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash A \ \Rightarrow \ \mathbf{HA} \vdash \exists x Q_A(x)$$

Proof. As usual. ∎

Proposition 2.3 *Let ψ_A be as in lemma 1.3. Then for almost negative A:*

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash A \leftrightarrow \ \psi_A \downarrow \wedge Q_A(\psi_A)$$

Proof. Easy. ∎

Proposition 2.4 (Extensional Church's Rule for HA) **HA** *obeys the following rule: if*

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash \forall e(\forall x \exists y B(e,x,y) \to \exists z C(e,z))$$

for some almost negative formula B, then there is a number n such that:

$$\begin{array}{rl}
\mathbf{HA} \vdash & \forall e(n \bullet e \downarrow \ \wedge \\
 & \forall ff'(\forall x(f \bullet x \downarrow \wedge f' \bullet x \downarrow \wedge f \bullet x = f' \bullet x \wedge B(e,x,f \bullet x)) \to \\
 & (n \bullet e) \bullet f \downarrow \wedge (n \bullet e) \bullet f' \downarrow \wedge (n \bullet e) \bullet f = (n \bullet e) \bullet f' \\
 & \wedge C(e,(n \bullet e) \bullet f)))
\end{array}$$

Proof. Let A be the formula $\forall e(\forall x \exists y B(e,x,y) \to \exists z C(e,z))$; suppose $\mathbf{HA} \vdash A$. By 2.2 and the numerical existence property for **HA**, let m be such that $\mathbf{HA} \vdash Q_A(m)$. Then

$$\mathbf{HA} \vdash \forall e(m \bullet e \downarrow) \wedge \forall ff'(f \asymp_{\forall x \exists y B(e,x,y)} f' \to (m \bullet e) \bullet f \asymp_{\exists z C(e,z)} (m \bullet e) \bullet f')$$

If $\forall x(f \bullet x = f' \bullet x \wedge B(e, f \bullet x))$ then by 2.3, since B is almost negative,

$$\Lambda x.\langle f \bullet x, \psi_B(e, x, f \bullet x)\rangle \asymp_{\forall x \exists y B(e,x,y)} \Lambda x.\langle f' \bullet x, \psi_B(e, x, f' \bullet x)\rangle$$

Write this as $a \asymp_{\forall x \exists y B(e,x,y)} a'$. Then for $y = ((m \bullet e) \bullet a)_0 = ((m \bullet e) \bullet a')_0$,

$$Q_{C(e,y)}(((m \bullet e) \bullet a))_1$$

By (3),

$$C(e, y)$$

Therefore the number $n = \Lambda ef.y$ satisfies the proposition. ∎

Note that the well known Extended Church's Rule (see [TvD 88]) is a consequence of Extensional Church's Rule by letting x and y be dummy variables.

3 Some toposes for extensional realizabilities

In this section I have to assume that the reader is familiar with the elementary concepts of categorical logic (in particular, the notion of validity of a statement in a topos) and some basic topos theory. There is by now a wealth of textbooks in the area, but the reader is sure to find everthing that I use in either [PTJ 77] or [MM 92].

The construction of the toposes below goes via *tripos theory*, a categorical framework treated in [HJP 80]. This, and Hyland's paper on the Effective topos ([Hy 82]) will also be used.

The first two subsections define toposes Ext and Ext', generalizing **e** and $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizability, respectively. Some internal logic is explained. Subsection 1 makes no claim at originality; the material was certainly known to various people ([Hy 82a]), but had never been laid down.

Subsections 3 and 4 describe another topos construction, for a topos $\mathcal{A}$ generalizing **e**-realizability. It will be seen that Ext is a sheaf subtopos of $\mathcal{A}$. The construction uses a generalization of the notion of partial combinatory algebra, called $\leq$-pca, which I believe may be of independent interest. This is defined in subsection 3. Subsection 4, finally, shows how the categorical results about $\mathcal{E}ff$, obtained in [RR 90] and [Car 93], can be adapted to $\mathcal{A}$.

3.1 Pitts' topos Ext

The topos Ext, defined by A. Pitts in his thesis ([Pit 81]) although he did not give it a name, runs on partial equivalence relations on the natural numbers (pers); first, let's establish some notation for these.

I find it convenient to denote a per by $(A, \sim)$ so A (the *domain* of $(A, \sim)$) is a subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on A. Now let:

$$\begin{aligned}
(A_1, \sim_1) \times (A_2, \sim_2) &\equiv (\{\langle a, a'\rangle \mid a \in A_1, a' \in A_2\}, \sim) \text{ with} \\
&\quad \langle a, a'\rangle \sim \langle b, b'\rangle \text{ iff } a \sim_1 b \text{ and } a' \sim_2 b' \\
(A_1, \sim_1) \to (A_2, \sim_2) &\equiv (\{c \mid \forall a a' \in A_1(a \sim_1 a' \Rightarrow c \bullet a \sim_2 c \bullet a')\}, \sim) \\
&\quad \text{with } c \sim c' \text{ iff } \forall a \in A_1(c \bullet a \sim_2 c' \bullet a) \\
\textstyle\prod_{x \in X}(A_x, \sim_x) &\equiv (\textstyle\bigcap_{x \in X}\{c \mid \forall n \in \mathbb{N}(c \bullet n \in A_x)\}, \sim) \text{ with} \\
&\quad c \sim c' \text{ iff for all } x \in X \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N},\ c \bullet n \sim_x c' \bullet n \\
\textstyle\sum_{x \in X}(A_x, \sim_x) &\equiv (\textstyle\bigcup_{x \in X} A_x, \sim) \text{ with } c \sim c' \text{ the transitive closure} \\
&\quad \text{of the relation } \exists x \in X(c \sim_x c') \\
(A, \delta) &\equiv A \text{ with the minimal equivalence relation} \\
(A, \top) &\equiv A \text{ with the maximal equivalence relation}
\end{aligned}$$

Let PER denote the set of pers. There is a tripos $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)}$ on the category of Sets which assigns to each set X the set PER^X of X-indexed families of pers. This is ordered by (writing φ and ψ for such families):

> $\varphi \vdash \psi$ iff there is a number n such that for all $x \in X$, n is in the domain of $\varphi(x) \to \psi(x)$

This ordering is a Heyting prealgebra: the meet $\wedge$ and Heyting implication $\to$ are given respectively by applying the operations $\times$ and $\to$ between pers pointwise.

For any function $f : X \to Y$ the map $\mathrm{PER}^f : \mathrm{PER}^Y \to \mathrm{PER}^X$ is a morphism of Heyting prealgebras (i.e. preserving the propositional structure) that has both adjoints $\exists f$ and $\forall f$:

$$(\exists f(\varphi))(y) = \textstyle\sum_{f(x)=y} \varphi(x)$$
$$(\forall f(\varphi))(y) = \textstyle\prod_{f(x)=y} \varphi(x)$$

I call the topos represented by the tripos $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)}$, Ext.

The map $\pi : \mathrm{PER} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ which sends a per to its domain, induces an indexed map of preorders: $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{(-)}$ ($\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{(-)}$ denotes the tripos underlying the effective topos $\mathcal{E}ff$). This has both an indexed left and right adjoint, which are induced respectively by $f_1, f_2 : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathrm{PER}$ given by

$$f_1(A) = (A, \delta)$$
$$f_2(A) = (A, \top)$$

Moreover, the indexed left adjoint preserves finite meets; so we have a commutative diagram of geometric morphisms of triposes



inducing geometric morphisms of toposes



I denote the natural numbers object in each topos by N; context makes clear in which topos we are.

Since inverse image functors of geometric morphisms preserve natural numbers objects, N in Ext is given (up to isomorpism) by $(\mathbb{N}, =)$ with

$$[\![n = m]\!] \text{ is } (\{n\} \cap \{m\}, \sim)$$

($\sim$ being the unique equivalence relation). From this:

Proposition 3.1 *First order arithmetic in* Ext *is given by* **e***-realizability.*

Proof. Routine. ∎

In general, computing the direct image functor i_* from the given geometric morphism of triposes is a bit involved (there is a complicated formula for this in [HJP 80]). However we can simplify in the case of *canonically separated* objects of $\mathcal{E}ff$ (recall that an object $(X,=)$ of $\mathcal{E}ff$ is canonically separated if $[\![x = y]\!] = \emptyset$ for different $x, y \in X$).

Proposition 3.2 *Let $(X,=)$ be canonically separated in $\mathcal{E}ff$. Then $i_*(X,=)$ is isomorphic to $(X, f_2(=))$.*

Proof. First observe that for sets X, Y, functions $f : X \to Y$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^X$, $f_2^Y(\exists f(\varphi))$ is isomorphic to $\exists f(f_2^X(\varphi))$ if for all $x, x' \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$:

> if $n \in \varphi(x)$, $m \in \varphi(x')$ and $f(x) = f(x') = y$ then there are $x = x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1} = x'$, $n = n_1, \ldots, n_k = m$ with $f(x_1) = \cdots = f(x_{k+1})$ and $n_i \in \varphi(x_i) \cap \varphi(x_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Clearly, this condition holds if $(X,=)$ is canonically separated, $(Y,=)$ arbitrary, f is a projection $Y \times X \to Y$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{Y \times X}$ is a functional relation representing a morphism $(Y,=) \to (X,=)$ in $\mathcal{E}ff$. So if $\varphi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{Y \times X}$ represents a morphism into a canonically separated object $(X,=)$, $f_2^{Y \times X}(\varphi)$ represents a morphism in Ext: $(Y, f_2(=)) \to (X, f_2(=))$.

Now there is a natural isomorphism

$$K : \mathcal{E}ff((Z, \pi(=)), (X,=)) \to \mathrm{Ext}((Z,=), (X, f_2(=)))$$

for objects $(Z,=)$ of Ext and canonically separated $(X,=)$ in $\mathcal{E}ff$ (natural means natural in $(Z,=)$), as follows: given $F : (Z, \pi(=)) \to (X,=)$ in $\mathcal{E}ff$, represented by the functional relation φ, let $K(F)$ be represented by the functional relation $f_2^{Z \times X}(\varphi) \wedge [\![z = z]\!]$. It has an inverse L defined (again, on representing functional relations) as $L(\psi) = \pi^{Z \times X}(\psi)$:

For, $LK([\varphi])$ is iso to $\pi f_2(\varphi) \wedge \pi(z = z)$ which is iso to φ since πf_2 is the identity and φ is strict for the equality $\pi(=)$; and $\varphi \vdash KL(\varphi)$ is easy; and since both are functional relations, they are isomorphic.

This proves that $i_*(X,=)$ must be isomorphic to $(X, f_2(=))$. ∎

Proposition 3.3 *The finite type structure over N in* Ext *(i.e. the structure built from N and exponentials) is given by:*

> *The object of type σ has as underlying set the hereditarily effective operations of type σ, and as equality*
>
> $$[\![\alpha = \alpha']\!] = \begin{cases} (\{n \mid n \text{ codes } \alpha\}, \top) & \text{if } \alpha = \alpha' \\ (\emptyset, \emptyset) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The type structure of the hereditarily effective operations is defined in [Tro 73].

Proof. This follows from the preceding proposition, combining the following ingredients:

1. the description in [Hy 82] of the finite type objects in $\mathcal{E}ff$, and the fact that they are canonically separated;
2. the description of N in Ext given above, implying $N = i_*(N)$;
3. the fact that i_*, being the direct image part of a geometric inclusion, preserves exponents.

I now discuss briefly some principles that can be expressed in the language of the finite type structure over N (to be precise, the language of the system $\mathbf{HA}^\omega$; again, see [Tro 73] for a definition). Some definitions:

- *Church's Thesis* CT is the axiom

$$\forall f : N^N \exists e : N \forall x : N \exists y : N(T(e,x,y) \wedge U(y) = f(x))$$

  expressing in a strong sense that every function from natural numbers to natural numbers is recursive;

- The *axiom of choice* for types σ, τ, $\mathrm{AC}_{\sigma,\tau}$ is the axiom scheme

$$\forall x : \sigma \exists y : \tau \varphi(x,y) \to \exists f : \tau^\sigma \forall x : \sigma \varphi(x, f(x))$$

- The scheme of *Weak Continuity for Numbers* WC-N is:

$$\forall f : N^N \exists x : N \varphi(f,x) \to \forall f : N^N \exists x,y : N \forall g : N^N (\overline{f}y = \overline{g}y \to \varphi(g,x))$$

  where $\overline{f}y = \overline{g}y$ abbreviates $\forall z \leq y(f(z) = g(z))$

- *Brouwer's Principle* BP states that all functions from N^N to N are continuous:

$$\forall \zeta : N^{N^N} \forall f : N^N \exists x : N \forall g : N^N (\overline{g}x = \overline{f}x \to \zeta(g) = \zeta(f))$$

We also consider two weakenings of these axioms:

- WCT (Weak Church's Thesis) is

$$\forall f : N^N \neg\neg \exists e : N \forall x : N \exists y : N(T(e,x,y) \wedge U(y) = f(x))$$

- WBP (Weak Brouwer's Principle) is

$$\forall \zeta : N^{N^N} \forall f : N^N \neg\neg \exists x : N \forall g : N^N (\overline{g}x = \overline{f}x \to \zeta(g) = \zeta(f))$$

Proposition 3.4 *The principles* $\mathrm{AC}_{\sigma,\tau}$, WCT *and* WBP *are valid in* Ext, *but* CT, WC-N *and* BP *fail in it.*

Proof. Given a realizer for $\forall x : \sigma \exists y : \tau \varphi(x,y)$ we find a code for an operation which sends all codes of x to codes of one and the same y (because equivalences must be preserved). Thus one readily sees that $\mathrm{AC}_{\sigma,\tau}$ must hold.

The validity of WCT is left to the reader. WBP is a consequence of the Kreisel-Lacombe-Shoenfield theorem in recursion theory.

CT fails since by $\mathrm{AC}_{1,0}$ it would imply the existence of a $\zeta \in N^{N^N}$ such that $\zeta(f)$ is a code for f as recursive function. But this cannot be true for an effective operation ζ.

$\mathrm{AC}_{\sigma,\tau}$ implies that the principles WC-N and BP are equivalent, so it suffices to treat one of them. For any effective operation of type 2, the Kreisel-Lacombe-Shoenfield theorem gives us a modulus of continuity for every function, but this can not be done extensionally in codes (see [Tro 77]). ∎

3.2 A topos for $\mathbf{r}_e$-realizability

I call this topos Ext' and the construction is very similar to that of Ext. The basic objects are now pairs $(A, \sim)$ where $\sim$ is a *partial* equivalence relation on A (let's call these objects ppers). The basic operations $\times$, $\prod$ and $\sum$ are the same as for pers, and $\to$ is defined by:

$(A_1, \sim_1) \to (A_2, \sim_2) \equiv (\{c \mid \forall a \in A_1(c \bullet a \in A_2)\}, \sim)$ where $c \sim c'$ iff $\forall aa' \in A_1(a \sim_1 a' \Rightarrow c \bullet a \sim_2 c' \bullet a')$

and the order on PPER^X (denoting the set of ppers by PPER) is given by

$\varphi \vdash \psi$ iff there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in X$, $n \sim n$ in $\varphi(x) \to \psi(x)$

Analogously to the preceding subsection, there is a tripos $\mathrm{PPER}^{(-)}$. Now consider the following maps:

$u : \mathrm{PER} \to \mathrm{PPER}$	is the inclusion
$g_1 : \mathrm{PPER} \to \mathrm{PER}$	sends $(A, \sim)$ to $(\{a \in A \mid a \sim a\}, \sim)$
$g_2 : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \to \mathrm{PPER}$	sends A to $(A, \top)$
$\pi' : \mathrm{PPER} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$	sends $(A, \sim)$ to A

The pair (g_1, u) induces a geometric morphism of triposes:

$$\mathrm{PPER}^{(-)} \to \mathrm{PER}^{(-)}$$

and (g_2, π') gives rise to one:

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{(-)} \to \mathrm{PPER}^{(-)}$$

and since $g_1 g_2 = f_2$, we have a commutative diagram of geometric morphisms of toposes:



The proof of the following proposition is left to the reader.

Proposition 3.5 *First order arithmetic in* Ext' *corresponds to* $\mathbf{r}_e$*-realizability.*

Proposition 3.6 $j : \mathcal{E}ff \to$ Ext' *is an open inclusion, i.e. there is a subobject* U *of* 1 *in* Ext' *such that* $\mathcal{E}ff$ *is equivalent to the slice topos* Ext'$/U$*, and* j^* *is, modulo this equivalence, the pullback functor* Ext' $\to$ Ext'$/U$.

Proof. Let U be the object $(\{*\}, =)$ with

$$[\![* = *]\!] = (\mathbb{N}, \emptyset)$$

Then the slice topos Ext'$/U$ is equivalent to the full subcategory of Ext' on those objects whose equalities all have the empty equivalence relation. But it is clear that this is equivalent to $\mathcal{E}ff$, and that pulling back along $U \to 1$ is the same as forgetting the equivalence relation, which is j^*. ∎

Corollary 3.7 *Any statement of higher order arithmetic which holds in* Ext' *also holds in* $\mathcal{E}ff$.

Proof. For, pullback functors are logical functors. ∎

Corollary 3.8 *In* Ext', *we have* $\neg\neg$CT *and* $\neg\neg$BP, *but instances of* WC-N *and* AC *are false.*

3.3 $\leq$-partial combinatory algebras

In the next subsection there will be another topos for **e**-realizability, into which Ext embeds. The construction of this topos can be seen as a generalization of the construction of $\mathcal{E}ff$. Because I think this generalization may be of independent interest, I present it separately.

The point is a generalization of the notion of partial combinatory algebra.

Definition 3.9 *A $\leq$-pca ($\leq$-partial combinatory algebra) is a partially ordered set A together with a partial binary function (written by juxtaposition; $ab\downarrow$ means that the pair (a,b) is in the domain of the function, ab denotes the value), satisfying:*

1. *If $ab\downarrow$, $a' \leq a$ and $b' \leq b$ then $a'b'\downarrow$ and $a'b' \leq ab$*
2. *There are elements k and s in A such that:*
   - *for all $a,b \in A$: $ka\downarrow$ and $kab\downarrow$ and $kab \leq a$*
   - *for all $a,b,c \in A$: $sa\downarrow$, $sab\downarrow$ and, if $(ac)(bc)\downarrow$, then $sabc\downarrow$ and $sabc \leq (ac)(bc)$*

We employ the convention of association to the left: so abc abbreviates $(ab)c$. The partial binary function is often called *application.*

Part of the definition of a $\leq$-pca (the axioms for the combinators k and s) already appeared in the manuscript [Acz 80], without any relation to extensional realizability, though.

Examples

1. Given any set A with a partial binary function on it, we may add an element $\perp$, introduce a partial order by just adding $\perp \leq a$ for all $a \in A$ and extending the application by

   $$\perp a = a\perp = \perp$$

   Then $\perp$ serves both as k and as s. $\leq$-Pcas like this (with a least element $\perp$ satisfying $\perp a = a\perp = \perp$) will be called *trivial.*

2. Any pca is a $\leq$-pca with the discrete order; conversely a $\leq$-pca for which the order is discrete, is a pca iff $sabc\downarrow$ implies $ac(bc)\downarrow$.

3. Given a pca A, we may define a $\leq$-pca structure on the powerset $\mathcal{P}(A)$ as follows: the order is the inclusion order, and $\alpha\beta\downarrow$ if and only if for all $a \in \alpha$ and $b \in \beta$, $ab\downarrow$ in A, in which case

   $$\alpha\beta = \{ab \mid a \in \alpha, b \in \beta\}$$

   This $\leq$-pca is trivial. To make it less trivial, restrict to the nonempty subsets of A. One can also restrict to the nonempty, finite subsets of A. This is my motivating example.

4. Suppose A is a pca and $(P,\preceq)$ is a linear order with top element $\top$. Order the set $A \times P$ partially by putting

   $$(a,p) \leq (b,q) \text{ iff } a = b \text{ and } p \preceq q$$

   and let $(a,p)(b,q)$ be defined iff $ab\downarrow$ in A; in which case

   $$(a,p)(b,q) = (ab, \min\{p,q\})$$

5. Given a pca A, construct a nontrivial total $\leq$-pca into which A embeds, as follows: the set of *A-terms* is inductively defined by: every $a \in A$ is an A-term, and if u and v are A-terms, then so is (uv). Now choose elements $k, s \in A$ satisfying the combinator axioms, and define a *reduction relation* $\rightsquigarrow$ by the clauses:

   - $(ab) \rightsquigarrow c$ if, in A, ab is defined and equal to c
   - If $u \rightsquigarrow u'$ then $(vu) \rightsquigarrow (vu')$ and $(uv) \rightsquigarrow (u'v)$
   - $((ku)v) \rightsquigarrow u$ and $(((su)v)w) \rightsquigarrow ((uw)(vw))$

   The reflexive-transitive closure of $\rightsquigarrow$ gives only a preorder on the set of A-terms, so we have to quotient by an equivalence relation: two A-terms u and v are equivalent iff there is a sequence

   $$u = u_1 \rightsquigarrow u_2 \cdots \rightsquigarrow u_n \rightsquigarrow v = v_1 \rightsquigarrow \cdots \rightsquigarrow v_m = u$$

   Define application by $[u][v] = [(uv)]$; this is well-defined. A is embedded in this in the following sense: the embedding I does not preserve application, but if ab is defined then $I(a)I(b) \leq I(ab)$. This seems to me the natural notion of "morphism of $\leq$-pcas", but I won't pursue this further here.

From the examples it is immediate that a lot of the beautiful (but also sometimes rather bizarre) theory of pcas is lost in this context: we may have $k = s$ without having every possible identity, a $\leq$-pca may be nontotal without there being a nowhere defined element, every pca may be embedded in a total $\leq$-pca. However, what remains is sufficient for my purposes:

Proposition 3.10 (Combinatory completeness for $\leq$-pcas) *Let A be a $\leq$-pca. For every term t composed by elements of A, application and the variable x, there is an element $[\Lambda x.t]$ in A such that for all $a \in A$: if $t[a/x] \downarrow$ then $[\Lambda x.t]a \downarrow$, and*

$$[\Lambda x.t]a \leq t[a/x]$$

Proof. The construction of these terms in the usual proof of combinatory completeness for pcas will do. ∎

In the case of a pca A one can form a category $P(A)$ with objects the subsets of A, and as morphisms: $\alpha \to \beta$ those functions $f : \alpha \to \beta$ such that for some $a \in A$ for all $b \in \alpha$: $ab \downarrow$ and $ab = f(b)$.

For $\leq$-pcas A one has to modify this: morphisms are those functions f for which there is a satisfying for all $b \in \alpha$,

$$ab \downarrow \wedge\, ab \leq f(b)$$

That this gives a category follows at once by combinatory completeness.

Furthermore:

Proposition 3.11 *Given a $\leq$-pca A, there is a tripos $I(A)^{(-)}$, where $I(A)$ denotes the set of downwards closed subsets of A ($\alpha \in I(A)$ iff $a \in \alpha$ and $a' \leq a$ imply $a' \in \alpha$), and $I(A)^X$ is preordered by: $\varphi \vdash \psi$ iff there is $a \in A$ such that for all $x \in X$ and all $b \in \varphi(x)$, $ab \downarrow$ and $ab \in \psi(x)$.*

Proof. The proof for pcas, in [HJP 80], suffices; use combinatory completeness. The same terms testify all desired entailments. ∎

Note, that if A is trivial in the sense defined above, the tripos $I(A)^{(-)}$ is equivalent to the tripos $2^{(-)}$ (with the subset order).

Still another definition:

Definition 3.12 *A $\leq$-pca A will be said to have the pasting property iff the underlying partial order has pushouts (i.e. for every $a, b \in A$: if there is $c \leq a, c \leq b$ in A, then the join $a \vee b$ exists in A) and application preserves them in each variable separately (i.e. $a(b \vee b') = ab \vee ab'$ and $(a \vee a')b = ab \vee a'b$ whenever this is defined).*

Proposition 3.13 *Let A be a $\leq$-pca with the pasting property. Denote by $J(A)$ the set of those downwards closed subsets of A which are also closed under pushouts. Preorder $J(A)^X$ in the same way as $I(A)^X$. Then $J(A)^{(-)}$ is a tripos, and the inclusion $J(A) \subseteq I(A)$ induces a geometric inclusion of triposes: $J(A)^{(-)} \to I(A)^{(-)}$*

A geometric inclusion of triposes is a geometric morphism of triposes for which each counit is an isomorphism. It was noted in [Pit 81] (and straightforward to check directly), that a geometric inclusion of triposes gives rise to a geometric inclusion of the represented toposes.

Proof. Left adjoint to the inclusion is of course the map which takes for every downward closed set, its closure under pushouts. ∎

3.4 Another topos for e-realizability

The idea for finding a "simpler" topos for **e**-realizability is as follows: instead of looking at partial equivalence relations, look at what "generates" them, in a suitable way (this is familiar practice: e.g. in the theory of locales one often works not with locales but with *presentations* of them).

In [vanO 9?] the fact is exploited (for an axiomatization of higher order Kleene realizability) that in the effective topos $\mathcal{E}ff$, there is a surjection $\Delta(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) \longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\triangleright \Omega$ which classifies (viewing $\Delta(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ as the objet of $\neg\neg$-closed subsets of N) exactly the *inhabited* elements of $\Delta(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$.

Somehow this highlighted for me the trivial observation that subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ are generated by singletons under the operation of taking unions. Similarly, partial equivalence relations are generated by nonempty finite sets under the operations of taking unions and closing under pushouts.

So let $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ be the $\leq$-pca of finite, nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, as in example 3 of the preceding subsection. This $\leq$-pca clearly has the pasting property. It is clear that there is a bijection

$$P : \mathrm{PER} \to J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$$

(where $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ refers to proposition 3.13), sending $(A, \sim)$ to

$$\{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid \alpha \subseteq A \wedge \forall ab \in \alpha (a \sim b)\}$$

and that, for pers $(A_1, \sim_1)$ and $(A_2, \sim_2)$,

$$P((A_1, \sim_1) \to (A_2, \sim_2)) = P(A_1, \sim_1) \to P(A_2, \sim_2)$$

where the $\to$ on the right hand side refers to the tripos $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$.

So $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)}$ is the same as $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$ and a subtripos of $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$, and it is this last tripos and the topos represented by it, that will be studied a bit in this subsection.

Some logic of the tripos $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$: define for $P, Q \in I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} P \times Q & = & \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid p_0\alpha \in P \text{ and } p_1\alpha \in Q\} \\ P \to Q & = & \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid \forall \beta \in P(\alpha \bullet \beta \downarrow \text{ and } \alpha \bullet \beta \in Q)\} \\ P + Q & = & \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid p_0\alpha = \{0\} \text{ and } p_1\alpha \in P\} \cup \\ & & \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid p_0\alpha = \{1\} \text{ and } p_1\alpha \in Q\} \\ \prod_{x \in X} P_x & = & \bigcap_{x \in X} (\overline{\mathbb{N}} \to P_x) \\ \sum_{x \in X} P_x & = & \bigcup_{x \in X} P_x \end{array}$$

Where $p_i\alpha = \{(a)_i \mid a \in \alpha\}$.

The preorder $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^X$ has meets $\varphi \wedge \psi$ given by $\lambda x.\varphi(x) \times \psi(x)$, joins and Heyting implication similarly given by $+$ and $\rightarrow$, and top and bottom elements $\top = \lambda x.\overline{\mathbb{N}}$, $\bot = \lambda x.\emptyset$. For maps $f : X \rightarrow Y$, left and right adjoint $\exists f$ and $\forall f$ to $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^f$ are given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (\exists f(\varphi))(y) & = & \sum_{f(x)=y} \varphi(x) \\ (\forall f(\varphi))(y) & = & \prod_{f(x)=y} \varphi(x) \end{array}$$

The topos represented by $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$ will be called $\mathcal{A}$.

Let us first observe that the geometric morphism of triposes $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{(-)}$ factors through the inclusion $\mathrm{PER}^{(-)} \rightarrow I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$ by maps $g : I(\overline{\mathbb{N}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ and $f : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ given by

$$g(P) = \bigcup P \text{ and } f(A) = \{\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid \alpha \subseteq A\}$$

From the description of finite meets in $I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$ it is immediate that $f^{(-)}$ preserves them. Also, $f \dashv g$.

From this, it follows that the natural number object N of $\mathcal{A}$ can be given as $(\mathbb{N}, =)$with

$$[\![n = m]\!] = \begin{cases} \{\{n\}\} & \text{if } n = m \\ \emptyset & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

We also need another object of $\mathcal{A}$: the object $\overline{N} = (\overline{\mathbb{N}}, =)$ with

$$[\![\alpha = \beta]\!] = \begin{cases} \{\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\} & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ \emptyset & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

There is an element relation $\epsilon \rightarrow N \times \overline{N}$ represented by

$$[\![n \,\epsilon\, \alpha]\!] = \begin{cases} \{\{n\}\} & \text{if } n \in \alpha \\ \emptyset & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Using this relation ϵ we can interpret the language of $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ (see definition 1.7) in $\mathcal{A}$, letting $\overline{N}$ be the sort of the set variables α and N be the sort of the natural numbers. We have:

Proposition 3.14 *All the axioms of* $\mathbf{HA}^\alpha$ *are valid in* $\mathcal{A}$ *under this interpretation, and moreover: truth in* $\mathcal{A}$ *of sentences in this language coincides with the realizability notion of definition 1.9.*

Proof. Again, left to the reader. ∎

Corollary 3.15 *First order arithmetic in* $\mathcal{A}$ *coincides with* **e***-realizability.*

So, true first order arithmetic in $\mathcal{A}$ is the same as in Ext. I now want to extend this result to the logic of all finite types over N.

By a straightforward analogy to [Hy 82], there is a geometric inclusion $(\Delta, \Gamma) : \mathrm{Sets} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. It is defined in exactly the same way as for $\mathcal{E}ff$, and Sets is $\neg\neg$-sheaves in $\mathcal{A}$.

Consequently, an object of $\mathcal{A}$ is *separated* iff it is isomorphic to an object $(X, =)$ which has the property that $[\![x = y]\!] = \emptyset$ for different $x, y \in X$. Such objects are called *canonically separated*.

From now on I identify Ext with the topos represented by the tripos $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$; the sheafification $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}$ is induced by the map $J : I(\overline{\mathbb{N}}) \rightarrow J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ which takes every downwards closed subset of $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ to its closure under pushouts. The internal topology in $\mathcal{A}$ to which this gives rise, is denoted by j.

Proposition 3.16 *Suppose $(X,=)$ is a canonically separated object of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $[\![x = x]\!] \in J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ for all $x \in X$. Then $(X,=)$ is a j-sheaf.*

Proof. The heart of the matter is that if $F : Y \times X \to J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ represents a morphism: $(Y, J(=)) \to (X, J(=))$ in Ext and $(X,=)$ is canonically separated in $\mathcal{A}$, then F is a total relation (for the equalities $J(=)$), i.e. $J(y = y) \to \exists x F(y,x)$ is valid in the topos $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$. Now

$$[\![\exists x F(y,x)]\!] = J(\bigcup_{x \in X} F(y,x))$$

which, since F is single-valued and $(X,=)$ canonically separated, is equal to $\bigcup_{x \in X} J(F(y,x))$, which is

$$\bigcup_{x \in X} F(y,x)$$

because F maps into $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$. So if we define, for such F, a map $\tilde{F} : Y \times X \to I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ by

$$\tilde{F}(y,x) = \bigcup_{y' \in Y} ([\![y' = y]\!] \wedge F(y', x'))$$

then $\tilde{F}$ represents a map: $(Y,=) \to (X,=)$ in $\mathcal{A}$ (check that it is single-valued!). So there is a natural 1-1 correspondence between maps: $(Y, J(=)) \to (X, J(=))$ in Ext, and maps $(Y,=) \to (X,=)$ in $\mathcal{A}$; which by the Yoneda Lemma proves that $(X,=)$ is a j-sheaf. ∎

So N is a j-sheaf, and since for any topology the sheaves form an exponential ideal, the finite type structure over N consists of j-sheaves. The computation of this structure is easy: if $(Y,=)$ is separated there is an expression for $(Y,=)^{(X,=)}$ completely similar to the one in [Hy 82], and we see:

Proposition 3.17 *The finite type structure over N in $\mathcal{A}$ is the following: the object of type σ has as underlying set the effective operations of type σ, and equality: $[\![x = x]\!]$ is the set of those α which consist of codes for x, whereas $[\![x = y]\!]$ is empty for $x \neq y$.*

Proposition 3.18 *The logic of the finite type structure over N in $\mathcal{A}$ is the same as that in* Ext.

Proof. The finite type objects in $\mathcal{A}$ as defined in the preceding proposition, have the following properties:

- They are *modest*, i.e. canonically separated and such that for different x, y, the set $[\![x = x]\!] \cap [\![y = y]\!]$ is empty;
- The equalities are all closed under pushouts, as well as the relations representing the evaluation maps.

Now if $\varphi(x)$ is a strict predicate for x of type a modest object, and $\varphi(x)$ is closed under pushouts, then $\exists x \varphi(x)$ is also closed under pushouts. It is trivial that the property of being closed under pushouts (for predicates) is preserved under the logical operations $\to, \wedge, \vee$ and $\forall$, so there you are. ∎

The categorical and logical analysis of $\mathcal{A}$ can be pushed a lot further, exploiting the analogy with $\mathcal{E}ff$ and what is known for that topos. For example, there is a surjection: $\Delta(I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})) \twoheadrightarrow \Omega$

in $\mathcal{A}$, which classifies, viewing $\Delta(I(\overline{\mathbb{N}}))$ as the object of $\neg\neg$-closed, downwards closed subsets of $\overline{N}$ in $\mathcal{A}$, exactly the inhabited ones; this should be the starting point for the definition of an "internal realizability" as in [vanO 9?], and an axiomatization (over a suitable expansion of higher order arithmetic) of an extension of the realizability of definition 1.9. In the expansion of arithmetic one will need sorts for $\overline{N}$ and its powers; it would be nice if these could be eliminated, i.e. if $\overline{N}$ would be, in $\mathcal{A}$, definable from higher order arithmetic. I doubt this, but do not know.

Here I just present an analogy of a characterization of $\mathcal{E}ff$ as *exact completion of its category of projectives*, obtained in [RR 90] and also explained in [Car 93]. Both papers start from the basic result in [CCM 82], which is the construction of the exact completion $E_{\mathrm{ex/lex}}$ of a left exact category E. Let me first explain what is meant. A left exact category is said to be *exact* if

a) For every map $f : A \to B$ the coequalizer of the kernel pair of f (i.e. the two projections $A \times_B A \to A$) exists;

b) Regular epimorphisms (i.e. those which are coequalizers) are stable under pullback;

c) Equivalence relations are effective, that is: kernel pairs.

A left exact functor between exact categories is called exact if it preserves regular epimorphisms.

If EX denotes the (2-)category of exact categories and exact functors, and LEX is the category of left exact categories and left exact functors, then the exact completion $E_{\mathrm{ex/lex}}$ of a left exact category E is its image under the reflection of LEX to EX (the left adjoint to the inclusion of EX into LEX). It is important to notice that the inclusion of EX into LEX is *not* full and faithful, so an exact category is not automatically equivalent to the exact completion of something. For this to be the case, we need to look at the *projective* objects of the category: an object A is projective (One should say: regular projective, but never mind) iff every regular epimorphism to A has a section.

It turns out that an exact category E is an exact completion if and only if the following two conditions hold:

i E *has enough projectives*, which means that for every object A of E there is a projective object B and a regular epimorphism $B \twoheadrightarrow A$;

ii The full subcategory of E on the projective objects is left exact.

([Car 93]) If these conditions are satisfied, E is the exact completion of its category of projectives.

The authors of [RR 90] were able to identify the projectives of $\mathcal{E}ff$ and show that $\mathcal{E}ff$ is the exact completion of its category of projectives. This category looks as follows: objects are surjective functions $X \twoheadrightarrow I$ where X is a set and $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$; morphisms are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \twoheadrightarrow & I \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow \psi \\ Y & \twoheadrightarrow & J \end{array}$$

where $\psi : I \to J$ is the restriction to I of a partial recursive function (ψ is uniquely determined by f since the horizontal maps are surjective). In other words, this category is the full subcategory of the comma category (Sets $\downarrow P(\mathbb{N})$) on the surjections ($P(\mathbb{N})$ is the category of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and partial recursive functions).

Since $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$ is only a $\leq$-pca, the category $P(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ (as defined in subsection 3.3) has as maps $f : A \to B$, those functions f such that for some partial recursive function ψ, for all $\alpha \in A$ and for all $n \in \alpha$, $\psi(n)$ is defined, and

$$\psi[\alpha] \subseteq f(\alpha)$$

So the full subcategory of (Sets $\downarrow P(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$) on the surjective functions looks as follows:

- Objects are surjective functions $f : X \twoheadrightarrow A$ from a set X to a subset A of $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$;
- Morphisms from f to $g : Y \twoheadrightarrow B$ are functions $h : X \to Y$ such that for some partial recursive function ψ there is a diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & A \\ \downarrow h & \supseteq & \downarrow \psi \\ Y & \xrightarrow{g} & B \end{array}$$

  where it is meant that ψ acts on α to give $\psi[\alpha] = \{\psi(n) \mid n \in \alpha\}$, and the diagram commutes "up to inclusion".

The claim is now that this category is the category of projectives in $\mathcal{A}$, that it is left exact and that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives, so that $\mathcal{A}$ is the exact completion of this category.

The result is a direct adaptation of the method of [RR 90]. First a lemma:

Lemma 3.19 *Every object of $\mathcal{A}$ is covered by a separated object.*

Proof. Given $(X, =)$, define the object $(Q, =)$ by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} Q & = & \{(x, \alpha) \mid x \in X, \alpha \in [\![x = x]\!]\} \\ [\![(x, \alpha) = (y, \beta)]\!] & = & \begin{cases} \{\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{N}} \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\} & \text{if } x = y \text{ and } \alpha = \beta \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{array}$$

The reader can check that the function Ku:$Q \times X \to I(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$ given by

$$\mathrm{Ku}((x, \alpha), y) = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\} \times [\![x = y]\!]$$

represents a surjection: $(Q, =) \twoheadrightarrow (X, =)$. ∎

Proposition 3.20 *Call an object $(X, =)$ of $\mathcal{A}$* canonically projective *if it is canonically separated, and for all $x \in X$ there is $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ such that*

$$[\![x = x]\!] = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\}$$

Then an object of $\mathcal{A}$ is projective if and only if it is isomorphic to a canonically projective object.

It is easily seen that the category of canonically projectives is the same as the full subcategory of (Sets $\downarrow P(\overline{\mathbb{N}})$) on the surjections, as given above. Also, from this description it is obvious that this is a left exact category: it has products because if $[\![x = x]\!] = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\}$ and $[\![y = y]\!] = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \beta\}$ then for (x, y) (in the product) we have

$$[\![(x, y) = (x, y)]\!] = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha \times \beta\}$$

with $\alpha \times \beta = \{\langle n, m\rangle \mid n \in \alpha \wedge m \in \beta\}$; it has equalizers because $\neg\neg$-closed subobjects of canonically projective objects are canonically projective: in complete analogy to the situation for $\mathcal{E}ff$ (see [Hy 82]), a subobject of $(X, =)$ is $\neg\neg$-closed iff isomorphic to one of form $(A, =)$ with $A \subseteq X$ and $=$ the restriction to A of the equality $=$ on X.

Proof. Suppose X is projective; let $Q \overset{m}{\longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\triangleright} X$ be the cover in the proof of lemma 3.19. Then Q is canonically projective, m has a section i, and X is isomorphic to the equalizer of im and $\mathrm{id} : Q \to Q$. Since the canonically projective objects are closed under equalizers, X is isomorphic to a canonically projective object.

To show the converse, suppose $(P, =)$ canonically projective and

$$(X, =) \longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\triangleright (P, =)$$

a surjection, represented by G. By surjectivity, pick a β with

$$\beta \in \bigcap_{p \in P} (\llbracket p = p \rrbracket \to \llbracket \exists x G(x, p) \rrbracket)$$

Let $\llbracket p = p \rrbracket = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha_p\}$. Pick for each $p \in P$ a x_p with $\beta \bullet \alpha_p \in G(x_p, p)$; then the relation

$$H(p, y) = \llbracket p = p \rrbracket \times \llbracket y = x_p \rrbracket$$

is easily seen to represent a section for the given surjection. ∎

Of course, the real content of [RR 90] is in their argument that the category of projectives of $\mathcal{E}ff$ is itself a completion: it is the category which results from freely adding nonempty, recursively indexed coproducts to the category of sets (there are very elucidating remarks concerning this in [Car 93], too).

I do not know whether a similar nice universal property can also be shown for the category of projectives of $\mathcal{A}$.

What about Ext? Does it have enough projectives? Is it an exact completion? The first question would be easy to answer if the inclusion $\mathrm{Ext}{\to} \mathcal{A}$ would preserve epimorphisms. However:

Proposition 3.21 *The inclusion* $\mathrm{Ext} \to \mathcal{A}$ *does not preserve epis.*

Proof. Given the inclusion: $\mathrm{Ext}{\to} \mathcal{A}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{A}$ has enough projectives, this is equivalent to the statement that the inverse image functor of the inclusion does not preserve projectives. So I give a counterexample to this.

Let $(X, =)$ and $(Y, =)$ be the canonically separated objects of $\mathcal{A}$ given by:

$$X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \llbracket x_1 = x_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket x_2 = x_2 \rrbracket = {\downarrow}\{0, 1\} \\ \llbracket x_3 = x_3 \rrbracket = \llbracket x_4 = x_4 \rrbracket = {\downarrow}\{0, 2\} \end{cases}$$

$$Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} \llbracket y_1 = y_1 \rrbracket = {\downarrow}\{0, 1\} \\ \llbracket y_2 = y_2 \rrbracket = {\downarrow}\{0, 1, 2\} \\ \llbracket y_3 = y_3 \rrbracket = {\downarrow}\{0, 2\} \end{cases}$$

I've started writing $\downarrow \alpha$ for $\{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\}$.

Let $f : X \to Y$ be the function: $f(x_1) = y_1$, $f(x_2) = f(x_3) = y_2$, $f(x_4) = y_3$. Then

$$\{\Lambda x.x\} \in \bigcap_{x \in X} (\llbracket x = x \rrbracket \to \llbracket f(x) = f(x) \rrbracket)$$

so the predicate F defined by $F(x,y) = [\![x = x]\!] \wedge [\![f(x) = y]\!]$ represents a morphism $[F]$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Now the objects $(X,=)$, $(Y,=)$ and the morphism $[F]$ also live in Ext; and by proposition 3.20 both are projective in $\mathcal{A}$. But $(Y,=)$, taken as object of Ext (which is the inverse image of itself as object of $\mathcal{A}$) is not projective: the map $[F]$ is surjective in Ext (not in $\mathcal{A}$!) since

$$[\![\exists x F(x,y_2)]\!]_{\mathrm{Ext}} = J(F(x_2,y_2) \cup F(x_3,y_2))$$

which is equal to

$$\downarrow \{0,1,2\} \times \downarrow \{0,1,2\}$$

So $\{\Lambda x.\langle x,x\rangle\} \in \bigcap_{y\in Y} [\![y = y]\!] \to [\![\exists x F(x,y)]\!]$. But of course, $[F]$ cannot have a section in Ext. ∎

The above proof clearly indicates what should be the projectives in Ext, since obviously, in the example, the element y_2 is the problematic guy. Its existence, the downset of a three-element set, can be glued together from two downsets of two-element sets by pushout. This suggests the following definition, which embodies the deep mathematical intuition that an equivalence relation is generated by sets of "equivalent pairs".

Definition 3.22 *Call an object $(X,=)$ of* Ext canonically projective *if it is canonically separated, and for all $x \in X$ there is an α with at most two elements such that*

$$[\![x = x]\!] = \downarrow \alpha = \{\gamma \mid \gamma \subseteq \alpha\}$$

Lemma 3.23 *Every object of* Ext *is covered by a canonically projective object.*

Proof. Given $(X,=)$, let $(Q,=)$ be defined by

$$Q = \{(x,\alpha) \mid \alpha \in [\![x = x]\!] \text{ and } \sharp\alpha \leq 2\}$$
$$[\![(x,\alpha) = (y,\beta)]\!] = \begin{cases} \downarrow \alpha & \text{if } x = y \text{ and } \alpha = \beta \\ \emptyset & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The rest is left to the reader, who just has to keep in mind how an existential quantifier is interpreted in the tripos $J(\overline{\mathbb{N}})^{(-)}$. ∎

Proposition 3.24 *An object of* Ext *is projective if and only if it is isomorphic to a canonically projective object.*

Proof. This is completely analogous to the proof of proposition 3.20; one uses the canonially projective cover and one realizes that, if

$$\bigcap_{p\in P} ([\![p = p]\!] \to J(\bigcup_{x\in X} G(x,p)))$$

is nonempty and $[\![p = p]\!]$ is of form $\downarrow \alpha$ with $\sharp\alpha \leq 2$, then so is

$$\bigcap_{p\in P} ([\![p = p]\!] \to \bigcup_{x\in X} G(x,p))$$

nonempty. ∎

So Ext does have enough projectives; from the definition of canonically projective however,

it is clear that this is not closed under products. In fact, if A is the canonically separated object $(\{a,b\},=)$ with $[\![a = a]\!] =\downarrow \{0\}$ and $[\![b = b]\!] =\downarrow \{0,1\}$ then one can check that $A \times A$ is not projective in Ext.

It follows, that in Ext, the notions of projective and *internally projective* (in a topos, an object Q is called internally projective if the functor $(-)^Q$ preserves surjections) do *not* coincide, as they do in $\mathcal{E}ff$.

Also, it is questionable whether Ext can be seen as some sort of exact completion. It cannot be of the form $E_{\mathsf{ex/lex}}$; might it be of form $E_{\mathsf{ex}/..?..}$?

References

[Acz 80] P. Aczel, *A note on interpreting higher order intuitionistic logic*, manuscript, Manchester 1980

[Bee 85] M. Beeson, *Foundations of Constructive Mathematics*, Berlin (Springer) 1985

[Car 93] A. Carboni, *Some free constructions in realizability and proof theory*, typeset manuscript, Milano 1993

[CCM 82] A. Carboni & R. Celia Magno, *The free exact category on a left exact one*, Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society **33**A (1982), 295-301

[Hy 82] J.M.E. Hyland, *The effective topos*, in: Troelstra & Van Dalen (eds.), *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, Studies in Logic, Amsterdam 1982, pp. 165-216

[Hy 82a] J.M.E. Hyland, *Realizability toposes*, talk given in Amsterdam, november 1982 (notes by A.S. Troelstra)

[HJP 80] J.M.E. Hyland, P.T. Johnstone & A.M. Pitts, *Tripos Theory*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **88** (1980), 205-232

[PTJ 77] P.T. Johnstone, *Topos Theory*, Academic Press 1977

[Pit 81] A.M. Pitts, *The theory of triposes*, Ph.D. Thesis, Cambridge 1981

[MM 92] S. MacLane & I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic*, Berlin (Springer) 1992

[RR 90] E. Robinson & G. Rosolini, *Colimit completions and the effective topos*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **55** (1990), pp. 678-699

[Tro 71] A.S. Troelstra, *Notions of realizability for intuitionistic arithmetic and intuitionistic arithmetic in all finite types*, in: J.E. Fenstad (ed.), *Proceedings of the Second Scandinavian Logic Symposium*, North Holland 1971, pp. 369-405

[Tro 73] A.S. Troelstra, *Metamathematical Investigations in Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 344, Berlin 1973

[Tro 77] A.S.Troelstra, *A note on non-extensional operations in connection with continuity and recursiveness*, Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Academie van Wetenschappen **80**(5) (1977), 455-462

[TvD 88] A.S. Troelstra & D. van Dalen, *Constructivism in Mathematics*, Amsterdam 1988

[vanO 9?] J. van Oosten, *Axiomatizing higher order Kleene realizability*, preprint, University of Utrecht 1993 (to appear in: Annals of Pure and Applied Logic)

The ILLC Prepublication Series

X-91-03 V. Yu. Shavrukov — Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras of Theories containing Arithmetic
X-91-04 K.N. Ignatiev — Partial Conservativity and Modal Logics
X-91-05 Johan van Benthem — Temporal Logic
X-91-06 — Annual Report 1990
X-91-07 A.S. Troelstra — Lectures on Linear Logic, Errata and Supplement
X-91-08 Giorgie Dzhaparidze — Logic of Tolerance
X-91-09 L.D. Beklemishev — On Bimodal Provability Logics for Π_1-axiomatized Extensions of Arithmetical Theories
X-91-10 Michiel van Lambalgen — Independence, Randomness and the Axiom of Choice
X-91-11 Michael Zakharyaschev — Canonical Formulas for K4. Part I: Basic Results
X-91-12 Herman Hendriks — Flexibele Categoriale Syntaxis en Semantiek: de proefschriften van Frans Zwarts en Michael Moortgat
X-91-13 Max I. Kanovich — The Multiplicative Fragment of Linear Logic is NP-Complete
X-91-14 Max I. Kanovich — The Horn Fragment of Linear Logic is NP-Complete
X-91-15 V. Yu. Shavrukov — Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras of Theories containing Arithmetic, revised version
X-91-16 V.G. Kanovei — Undecidable Hypotheses in Edward Nelson's Internal Set Theory
X-91-17 Michiel van Lambalgen — Independence, Randomness and the Axiom of Choice, Revised Version
X-91-18 Giovanna Cepparello — New Semantics for Predicate Modal Logic: an Analysis from a standard point of view
X-91-19 Papers presented at the Provability Interpretability Arithmetic Conference, 24-31 Aug. 1991, Dept. of Phil., Utrecht University

1992 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Langauge*

X-92-00 — Annual Report 1991
LP-92-01 Víctor Sánchez Valencia — Lambek Grammar: an Information-based Categorial Grammar
LP-92-02 Patrick Blackburn — Modal Logic and Attribute Value Structures
LP-92-03 Szabolcs Mikulás — The Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relational Semantics
LP-92-04 Paul Dekker — An Update Semantics for Dynamic Predicate Logic
LP-92-05 David I. Beaver — The Kinematics of Presupposition
LP-92-06 Patrick Blackburn, Edith Spaan — A Modal Perspective on the Computational Complexity of Attribute Value Grammar
LP-92-07 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — A Note on Interrogatives and Adverbs of Quantification
LP-92-08 Maarten de Rijke — A System of Dynamic Modal Logic
LP-92-09 Johan van Benthem — Quantifiers in the world of Types
LP-92-10 Maarten de Rijke — Meeting Some Neighbours (a dynamic modal logic meets theories of change and knowledge representation)
LP-92-11 Johan van Benthem — A note on Dynamic Arrow Logic
LP-92-12 Heinrich Wansing — Sequent Caluli for Normal Modal Propositional Logics
LP-92-13 Dag Westerståhl — Iterated Quantifiers
LP-92-14 Jeroen Groenendijk, Martin Stokhof — Interrogatives and Adverbs of Quantification

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-92-01 A.S. Troelstra — Comparing the theory of Representations and Constructive Mathematics
ML-92-02 Dmitrij P. Skvortsov, Valentin B. Shehtman — Maximal Kripke-type Semantics for Modal and Superintuitionistic Predicate Logics
ML-92-03 Zoran Marković — On the Structure of Kripke Models of Heyting Arithmetic
ML-92-04 Dimiter Vakarelov — A Modal Theory of Arrows, Arrow Logics I
ML-92-05 Domenico Zambella — Shavrukov's Theorem on the Subalgebras of Diagonalizable Algebras for Theories containing $I\Delta_0 + EXP$
ML-92-06 D.M. Gabbay, Valentin B. Shehtman — Undecidability of Modal and Intermediate First-Order Logics with Two Individual Variables
ML-92-07 Harold Schellinx — How to Broaden your Horizon
ML-92-08 Raymond Hoofman — Information Systems as Coalgebras
ML-92-09 A.S. Troelstra — Realizability
ML-92-10 V.Yu. Shavrukov — A Smart Child of Peano's

Compution and Complexity Theory

CT-92-01 Erik de Haas, Peter van Emde Boas — Object Oriented Application Flow Graphs and their Semantics
CT-92-02 Karen L. Kwast, Sieger van Denneheuvel — Weak Equivalence: Theory and Applications
CT-92-03 Krzysztof R. Apt, Kees Doets — A new Definition of SLDNF-resolution

Other Prepublications

X-92-01 Heinrich Wansing — The Logic of Information Structures
X-92-02 Konstantin N. Ignatiev — The Closed Fragment of Dzhaparidze's Polymodal Logic and the Logic of Σ_1 conservativity
X-92-03 Willem Groeneveld — Dynamic Semantics and Circular Propositions, revised version
X-92-04 Johan van Benthem — Modeling the Kinematics of Meaning
X-92-05 Erik de Haas, Peter van Emde Boas — Object Oriented Application Flow Graphs and their Semantics, revised version

1993 *Logic, Semantics and Philosophy of Langauge*

LP-93-01 Martijn Spaan — Parallel Quantification
LP-93-02 Makoto Kanazawa — Dynamic Generalized Quantifiers and Monotonicity
LP-93-03 Nikolai Pankrat'ev — Completeness of the Lambek Calculus with respect to Relativized Relational Semantics
LP-93-04 Jacques van Leeuwen — Identity, Quarrelling with an Unproblematic Notion
LP-93-05 Jaap van der Does — Sums and Quantifiers
LP-93-06 Paul Dekker — Updates in Dynamic Semantics
LP-93-07 Wojciech Buszkowski — On the Equivalence of Lambek Categorial Grammars and Basic Categorial Grammars
LP-93-08 Zisheng Huang, Peter van Emde Boas — Information Acquisition from Multi-Agent resources; abstract

Mathematical Logic and Foundations

ML-93-01 Maciej Kandulski — Commutative Lambek Categorial Grammars
ML-93-02 Johan van Benthem, Natasha Alechina — Modal Quantification over Structured Domains
ML-93-03 Mati Pentus — The Conjoinablity Relation in Lambek Calculus and Linear Logic
ML-93-04 Andreja Prijatelj — Bounded Contraction and Many-Valued Semantics
ML-93-05 Raymond Hoofman, Harold Schellinx — Models of the Untyped λ-calculus in Semi Cartesian Closed Categories
ML-93-06 J. Zashev — Categorial Generalization of Algebraic Recursion Theory
ML-93-07 A.V. Chagrov, L.A. Chagrova — Algorithmic Problems Concerning First-Order Definability of Modal Formulas on the Class of All Finite Frames
ML-93-08 Raymond Hoofman, Ieke Moerdijk — Remarks on the Theory of Semi-Functors
ML-93-09 A.S. Troelstra — Natural Deduction for Intuitionistic Linear Logic
ML-93-10 Vincent Danos, Jean-Baptiste Joinet, Harold Schellinx — The Structure of Exponentials: Uncovering the Dynamics of Linear Logic Proofs
ML-93-11 Lex Hendriks — Inventory of Fragments and Exact Models in Intuitionistic Propositional Logic
ML-93-12 V.Yu. Shavrukov — Remarks on Uniformly Finitely Precomplete Positive Equivalences
ML-93-13 V.Yu. Shavrukov — Undecidability in Diagonizable Algebras
ML-93-14 Dick de Jongh, Albert Visser — Embeddings of Heyting Algebras
ML-93-15 G.K. Dzhaparidze — Effective Truth
ML-93-16 Maarten de Rijke — Correspondence Theory for Extended Modal Logics
ML-93-17 Alexander Chagrov, Michael Zakharyaschev — On the Independent Axiomatizability of Modal and Intermediate Logics
ML-93-18 Jaap van Oosten — Extensional Realizability

Compution and Complexity Theory

CT-93-01 Marianne Kalsbeek — The Vanilla Meta-Interpreter for Definite Logic Programs and Ambivalent Syntax
CT-93-02 Sophie Fischer — A Note on the Complexity of Local Search Problems
CT-93-03 Johan van Benthem, Jan Bergstra — Logic of Transition Systems
CT-93-04 Karen L. Kwast, Sieger van Denneheuvel — The Meaning of Duplicates in the Relational Database Model
CT-93-05 Erik Aarts — Proving Theorems of the Lambek Calculus of Order 2 in Polynomial Time
CT-93-06 Krzysztof R. Apt — Declarative programming in Prolog

Computaional Linguistics

CL-93-01 Noor van Leusen, László Kálmán — The Interpretation of Free Focus
CL-93-02 Theo M.V. Janssen — An Algebraic View On Rosetta

Other Prepublications

X-93-01 Paul Dekker — Existential Disclosure, revised version
X-93-02 Maarten de Rijke — What is Modal Logic?
X-93-03 Michiel Leezenberg — Gorani Influence on Central Kurdish: Substratum or Prestige Borrowing
X-93-04 A.S. Troelstra (editor) — Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Corrections to the First Edition
X-93-05 A.S. Troelstra (editor) — Metamathematical Investigation of Intuitionistic Arithmetic and Analysis, Second, corrected Edition
X-93-06 Michael Zakharyashev — Canonical Formulas for K4. Part II: Cofinal Subframe Logics