

Notes on categorical semantics of logic

Adrien MATHIEU

Contents

1. Shape calculus	2
1.1. Category of shapes	2
1.2. \mathcal{F} -complete categories	2
1.3. \mathcal{F} theory	4
1.4. Model of a \mathcal{F} theory	4
1.5. Monad on an \mathcal{F} theory	5
2. Quantifier-free first order logic	6
2.1. Algebraic theories	6
2.2. Horn theories	6
2.3. Essentially algebraic theories	6
3. Higher order logic	7
4. Lawvere Theories	8

Introduction

The idea that motivates the current note is that every class of theories can be expressed as a category of sufficiently structure rich categories. For instance, when a category has a terminal object 1 , one can see objects of this category as collection of their elements, where an *element of an object* A is simply a morphism $1 \rightarrow A$. This suggests that, to be able to speak categorically of theories that exhibit constants, one just needs the “ambient category” to have a terminal object.

Taking this idea further, one can see classes of categories having sufficiently rich structure as those categories that can be taken as “ambient” categories in which to develop a given theory. We will begin by investigating categories in which one can take limits of a given shape. Each class of shapes will produce a class of theories one can speak of, but, most importantly, the categorical structure of the class of shapes, **Shp**, will give us a way to *mix* theories of different kind.

For instance, one can see categories as “higher sets”, that is, a (large) set equipped with morphisms. This suggests that in order to get a “higher” version of a theory that usually takes place in sets, one can perform the theory with categories rather than sets. For instance, given a field \mathbb{K} , one can consider vector spaces over \mathbb{K} , but also vector spaces over \mathbb{K} internal to **Cat**. However, we can also recover the same models by considering models of a *product theory* (the product of then theory of vector spaces, and the theory of categories). One therefore derives $2\text{-Vect}_{\mathbb{K}} := \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \text{Cat}$, the theory of 2-vector spaces. The main interest here of doing so is that one recovers the ability to interpret this theory in different categories.

Chapter 1. Shape calculus

For this section, consider \mathcal{F} a class of (small) categories. Elements of \mathcal{F} are called *shapes*.

Definition 1.1 (\mathcal{F} -complete category)

A \mathcal{F} -complete category is a category that has all limits of all shapes $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}$.

1.1. Category of shapes

At first, we will consider a fixed \mathcal{F} , and develop the theory around it. For instance, we will see how to compute the product of two \mathcal{F} theories. However, this doesn't inform us on how to do the product of an \mathcal{F} theory with a \mathcal{F}' theory: for instance, the theory of higher vector spaces will be built as a product of the theory of vector spaces with the theory of higher categories.

Definition 1.1.1 (Category of shapes)

Let **Shp** be the preorder category whose objects are collection of categories, and there is a morphism from \mathcal{F} to \mathcal{F}' if every \mathcal{F}' -complete category \mathcal{C} is also \mathcal{F} -complete.

1.2. \mathcal{F} -complete categories

Let us note $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ the category of \mathcal{F} -complete categories with morphisms \mathcal{S} -continuous functors for every $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}$.

Example. The category of cartesian categories \mathbf{CCat} is a category of \mathcal{F} -complete categories for

$$\mathcal{F} := \{\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}\}$$

where $\mathbf{2}$ is the discrete category with two elements.

Example. The category of (finitely) complete categories is a category of \mathcal{F} -complete category, by taking \mathcal{F} to be the class of all (finite) categories.

Remark

Multiple different \mathcal{F} can lead to the same category $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$. For instance, equalizers and finite products are enough to have all finite limits; similarly, having pullbacks and a terminal object is enough to have all finite limits.

The cornerstone of the theory of \mathcal{F} -complete categories is stated as follows.

Theorem 1.2.1

$\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ is cartesian closed.

Proof. First of all, $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ has a terminal object: $\mathbf{1}$. Indeed, $\mathbf{1}$ is complete. Furthermore, every functor $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1}$ is complete. Let us now consider $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ two categories, and let us show that $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$ is in $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$. Let $\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{F}$ be a shape, and $F : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$ a functor. We can write $F = \langle F_1, F_2 \rangle$. Let us show that $(\lim F_1, \lim F_2)$ is a limit of F . This stems from the following (natural) identities, for $(X, Y) : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D})((X, Y), (\lim F_1, \lim F_2)) &= \mathcal{C}(X, \lim F_1) \times \mathcal{D}(Y, \lim F_2) \\
&\cong (X \Rightarrow F_1) \times (Y \Rightarrow F_2) \\
&\cong (X, Y) \Rightarrow F_1 \times F_2
\end{aligned}$$

By the particular choice of limits in $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$ that we have exhibited, we can immediately deduce that $\pi_{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ are continuous for shapes in \mathcal{F} . It is immediate that $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{D}$ is a cartesian product of \mathcal{C} with \mathcal{D} .

Let us finally check that $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ is closed. Consider \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be two categories in $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$, define $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$ be the category of \mathcal{F} -continuous functors, with natural transformations as morphisms. Since limits of shapes in \mathcal{F} exist in \mathcal{D} , they exist in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$. Since limits are computed pointwise, the same proof that show that \mathbf{Cat} is closed works to show that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is an internal hom. \square

Definition 1.2.2 (Shape functor)

There is a functor

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathbf{Cat} : \mathbf{Shp}^{\text{op}} &\rightarrow \mathbf{Cat} \\
\mathcal{F} &\mapsto \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat} \\
\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{F}' &\mapsto \mathcal{F}'\mathbf{Cat} \subseteq \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}
\end{aligned}$$

♣

Theorem 1.2.3

Let $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{F}'$, the functor $(\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{F}')\mathbf{Cat} : \mathcal{F}'\mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ has a left adjoint. Let us call this left adjoint $F_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{F}'} : \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'\mathbf{Cat}$.

♡

Proof. See [1] Let \mathcal{C} be a \mathcal{F} -complete category. Let us first show that we can freely add all limits of shape \mathcal{F}' in \mathcal{C} . Define $\hat{\mathcal{F}}'$ be the greatest class of shapes equivalent to \mathcal{F}' , that is,

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}' := \bigcup \{ \tilde{\mathcal{F}} : \mathbf{Shp} \mid \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \leq \mathcal{F}' \wedge \mathcal{F}' \leq \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \}$$

Consider the category $\mathcal{C}_{\hat{\mathcal{F}}'}$, where objects are of the form $F : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{S} : \hat{\mathcal{F}}'$. Intuitively, such a diagram represents its added limit in \mathcal{C} . Hence, we must have, for $F : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and $G : \mathcal{S}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\hat{\mathcal{F}}'}(F, G) := \lim_{s' : \mathcal{S}'} \text{colim}_{s : \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}(F(s), G(s'))$$

This is a category. Indeed, for $F : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, we have an identity given by the following family of elements

If I have a natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, and a functor $H : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\text{Id-I}} \quad - \\
\frac{* : 1, s : \mathcal{S} \vdash_{\mathbf{Set}} \text{id}_{F(s)} : \mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(s), F(s))}{\text{nat}} \\
\frac{* : 1 \vdash_{\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{S}}} \text{id} * F : \mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(-), F(-))}{- * \iota} \\
\frac{* : 1 \vdash_{\mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{S}}} - : \text{colim}_{s : \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(s), F(-))}{\text{lim-I}} \\
\frac{* : 1 \vdash_{\mathbf{Set}^-} : \lim_{s' : \mathcal{S}'} \text{colim}_{s : \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(s), F(s'))}{- (*)} \\
\vdash_{\mathbf{Set}^-} : \lim_{s' : \mathcal{S}'} \text{colim}_{s : \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(s), F(s')) \\
\left(s, \text{id}_{F(s)} \right)_{s : \mathcal{S}} \in \lim_{s : \mathcal{S}} \text{colim}_{s : \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}(F(s), F(s))
\end{array}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}'}(F, F)$$

so, for $s : \mathcal{S}^{\text{op}}$, and $s' : \mathcal{S}$, we have to find an element of

$$\mathcal{C}(F^{\text{op}}(s), F(s'))$$

□

Proposition 1.2.4

For $\mathcal{F} \leq \mathcal{F}' \leq \mathcal{F}''$, we have

$$F_{\mathcal{F}''}^{\mathcal{F}} \cong F_{\mathcal{F}'}^{\mathcal{F}} \circ F_{\mathcal{F}''}^{\mathcal{F}'}$$

▴

Proof. TODO this stems by uniqueness of left adjoints. □

1.3. \mathcal{F} theory

Definition 1.3.1 (\mathcal{F} theory)

A \mathcal{F} theory \mathcal{T} is an \mathcal{F} -complete category. ♣

A morphism of \mathcal{F} theory is simply a morphism of \mathcal{F} -complete category. In fact, there is no technical distinction between the category of \mathcal{F} theories and $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$. However, in what follows, we want to see those categories as *theories*, in the sense that they admit a (meta) theory of models.

1.4. Model of a \mathcal{F} theory

Let $\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$ be a category, called in this context a *universe*, and \mathcal{T} be a \mathcal{F} theory.

Definition 1.4.1 (Model of a theory)

A *model* M of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{U} is a morphism $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$, that is, a functor that is continuous with respect to all limits of shapes in \mathcal{F} . ♣

Definition 1.4.2 (Morphism of models)

Given M and M' be two models of \mathcal{T} , a *morphism from M to M'* is a natural transformation $M \Rightarrow M'$. ♣

Definition 1.4.3 (Category of models)

For a given theory \mathcal{T} , we define its category of models (in \mathcal{U})

$$\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{U}) := \mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U})$$

♣

Remark

We are often primarily interested in models in \mathbf{Set} (which belongs to every $\mathcal{F}\mathbf{Cat}$). However, being able to change the category in which we interpret are theory will be an other important tool to make compute describe theories later on.

1.5. Monad on an \mathcal{F} theory

For this section, fix \mathcal{T} a \mathcal{F} theory, and \mathcal{U} be a universe, which has all limits shaped by \mathcal{T} .

Definition 1.5.1 (Free algebra monad)

Let us note $F_{\mathcal{T}} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ the monad on \mathcal{U} derived from the following adjunction

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{U} & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{U}) \\ & \perp & \\ \mathcal{U} & \xleftarrow{\lim} & \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{U}) \end{array}$$

which we call the *free algebra monad over \mathcal{U}* .

Remark

If \mathcal{U} is complete, then in particular it has all limits of shape \mathcal{T} , so we can always build the free algebra monad over it.

Example. **Set** is complete. Therefore, every theory induces a free algebra monad over the universe **Set**. We will see how to recover usual monads on **Set** with this construction.

Proposition 1.5.2

The adjunction $\Delta \dashv \lim$ is monadic.

Proof. Consider the category $\mathcal{U}^{F_{\mathcal{T}}}$ of algebras of the monad $F_{\mathcal{T}}$. There is a functor

$$G : \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{U}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}^{F_{\mathcal{T}}}$$

given by, for any element $M : \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{U})$,

$$(\lim M, \lim \varepsilon_M)$$

□

Corollary 1.5.2.1

The category of algebras of the free algebra monad $F_{\mathcal{T}}$ is isomorphic to the category of models of \mathcal{T} .

Finish this proof.

Chapter 2. Quantifier-free first order logic

2.1. Algebraic theories

For this section, we will consider categories with finite products, that is, $\mathcal{F} = \{0, 2\}$.

Definition 2.1.1 (Multi-sorted Lawvere theory)

A \mathcal{F} theory \mathcal{T} is called a *multi-sorted Lawvere theory*.

Definition 2.1.2 (Category of models of T)

Given an algebraic theory T , its models, equipped with morphisms of models, form a category \mathbf{Mod}_T of models of T .

2.2. Horn theories

2.3. Essentially algebraic theories

Chapter 3. Higher order logic

Chapter 4. Lawvere Theories

Definition 4.1 (Lawvere theory)

A (generalized) Lawvere theory is a cartesian category. ♣

Definition 4.2 (Model of a Lawvere theory)

A model of a lawvere theory \mathcal{T} in a cartesian category \mathcal{C} is a cartesian functor $M : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. ♣

Definition 4.3 (Category of models of a Lawvere theory)

Given a Lawvere theory \mathcal{T} , we define its *category of models* $\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$ in a cartesian category \mathcal{C} as

$$\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C}) = [\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{C}]$$
♣

Definition 4.4 (Morphism of Lawvere theory)

Given two Lawvere theories \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , a *morphism of Lawvere theories* $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$ is a cartesian functor $F : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$. ♣

Proposition 4.5

Given two Lawvere theories \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , and a morphism $F : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$. Let \mathcal{C} be a cartesian category. There exists a cartesian functor $\mathbf{Mod}_F(\mathcal{C}) : \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}'}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathcal{C})$. ♣

Proof. Let $M : \mathcal{T}' \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, we have $M \circ F : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, given a natural transformation $\alpha : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$, we have

$$\alpha * F : M_1 \circ F \rightarrow M_2 \circ F$$

which is functorial: $\text{id}_M * F = \text{id}_{M \circ F}$ and $(\alpha \circ \beta) * F = (\alpha * F) \circ (\beta * F)$.

Let $M_1, M_2 : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be two models. $(M_1 \times M_2) \circ F = (M_1 \circ F) \times (M_2 \circ F)$ by definition, since limits are computed pointwise. Similarly, $\pi_i * F = \pi_i \circ (M_1 \circ F) \times (M_2 \circ F) \rightarrow M_i \circ F$. □

Proposition 4.6

$\mathbf{Mod}_-(\mathcal{C}) : \mathbf{CCat}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{CCat}$ est un foncteur contravariant continu. ♣

Proof. C'est exactement le foncteur $\mathbf{CCat}(-, \mathcal{C})$, c'est donc bien un foncteur contravariant, et il est bien continu. □

Example. Consider an algebraic theory T . We can build its Lawvere theory \mathcal{T} as follows: objects of \mathcal{T} are words of S , noted $s_1 \times \dots \times s_n$. A morphism from a $\prod_{i=1}^n s_i \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^m s'_i$ is a tuple (t_1, \dots, t_m) where each t_i is a term in the context $\Gamma := x_1 : s_1, \dots, x_n : s_n$ on the language \mathcal{L} , quotiented by the equivalence relation $t_i \sim t'_i$ if $T \vdash t_i = t'_i$.

We have an important result:

$$\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}(\mathbf{Set}) \cong \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}}$$

Theorem 4.7

Consider \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 two Lawvere theories. A \mathcal{T}_1 -model in the category of \mathcal{T}_2 -models is the same thing as a \mathcal{T}_2 -model in the category of \mathcal{T}_1 -models. In fact, there is a (natural) isomorphism, for any cartesian category \mathcal{C} ,

$$\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\mathcal{C})) \cong \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\mathcal{C}))$$

Proof.

□

Theorem 4.8

Two Lawvere theories \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 such that, for any cartesian category \mathcal{C} , $\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_1}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathbf{Mod}_{\mathcal{T}_2}(\mathcal{C})$ naturally in \mathcal{C} , then $\mathcal{T}_1 \cong \mathcal{T}_2$.

Proof. This stems directly from the Yoneda lemma.

□

Bibliography

- [1] E. Beurier, D. Pastor, and R. Guitart, “Presentations of Clusters and Strict Free-Cocompletions,” *Theory and Applications of Categories*, vol. 36, no. 17, pp. 492–513, Aug. 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://imt-atlantique.hal.science/hal-03329332>