

1 March 2007

We've seen any typed  $\lambda$ -calculus  $\mathcal{P}$  (e.g. the "typed  $\lambda$ -calculus for commutative rings" - which doesn't take full advantage of the features of the  $\lambda$ -calculus) gives a cartesian closed category  $C_P$  where ~~objects of~~

objects of  $C_P$  are types of  $\mathcal{P}$   
 morphisms of  $C_P$  come from terms of  $\mathcal{P}$   
 equations between morphisms of  $C_P$  come from equations in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Then we can look at models of  $\mathcal{P}$ , which are just cartesian closed functors

$$F: C_P \longrightarrow \text{Set}$$

(where  $\text{Set}$  could be replaced by any other CCC if we wanted).

Last time we considered  $\mathcal{P} = \lambda\text{Th}(\text{CommRing})$   
 - the typed  $\lambda$ -calculus for comm. rings - and asked,  
 "What's a Cartesian Closed functor

$$F: C_{\lambda\text{Th}(\text{CommRing})} \longrightarrow \text{Set} \quad ?"$$

We guessed that the answer to this question is "a commutative ring", i.e. a "model of the typed  $\lambda$ -calculus for commutative rings". This is true. Let's look at it: what does  $F$  give us? We have  $R \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\text{Th}(\text{CommRing})}$ , so we get

$$F(R) \in \text{Set}.$$

Any CCC has a terminal object,  $1$ , so we get

$$F(1) \cong 1 \in \text{Set}$$

where the isomorphism comes from the fact that a CCF preserves terminal objects. Similarly we get

$$F(R \times R) \cong F(R) \times F(R) \in \text{Set}$$

since CCF's preserve products, and

$$F(\text{hom}(R, R)) \cong \text{hom}(F(R), F(R)) \in \text{Set}$$

since CCF's preserve internal homs.

In  $\mathcal{C}_{\lambda\text{Th}(\text{CommRing})}$  we also have morphisms like

$$\begin{aligned} + &: R \times R \longrightarrow R \\ 0 &: 1 \longrightarrow R \\ - &: R \longrightarrow R \\ \cdot &: R \times R \longrightarrow R \\ 1 &: 1 \longrightarrow R \end{aligned}$$

and these give morphisms in Set:

$$F(+): F(R \times R) \dashrightarrow F(R)$$

$$\parallel$$

$$F(R) \times F(R)$$

$$F(0): F(1) \longrightarrow F(R)$$

$$\parallel$$

$$1$$

etc. Finally, these functions satisfy the usual commutative ring axioms... so  $F(R)$  is a commutative ring!

Here's a slightly more interesting example:

Example 2: The typed  $\lambda$ -calculus for "high school calculus." -- how to differentiate polynomials. This typed  $\lambda$ -calculus  $\lambda\text{Th}(\text{Calc})$ , includes  $\lambda\text{Th}(\text{CommRing})$  and one more term, " $\frac{d}{dx}$ " or "D"

$$D \in \text{hom}(\text{hom}(R, R), \text{hom}(R, R))$$

since  $\frac{d}{dx}$  "eats a function and spits out a function."

We also have extra equations. For example, we need an equation corresponding to

$$\frac{d}{dx} [f(x) + g(x)] = \frac{d}{dx} f(x) + \frac{d}{dx} g(x)$$

Formally, we'll say  $x$  is a variable of type  $R$  and  $f$  &  $g$  are variables of type  $\text{hom}(R, R)$ :

$$D \left( \underset{\text{R}}{\lambda x} \vdash + (f(x), g(x)) \right) \stackrel{\{\lambda x, f, g\}}{=} \underset{\text{R}}{\lambda x} \vdash + ((Df)(x), (Dg)(x))$$

Similarly we've got equations corresponding to

- product rule
- rule for differentiating " $-f$ "
- rule for " $\frac{d}{dx} x = 1$ ":

$$D(x \in R \vdash x) = x \in R \vdash 1(*)$$

- rules " $\frac{d}{dx} 0 = 0$ " " $\frac{d}{dx} 1 = 0$ ".
- chain rule: " $\frac{d}{dx} f(g(x)) = f'(g(x))g'(x)$ "

$$D(x \in R \vdash f(g(x))) \stackrel{\{\lambda x, f, g\}}{=} x \in R \vdash \cdot ((Df)(g(x)), (Dg)(x))$$

If we use this as our (rough) definition of  $\lambda\text{Th}(\text{Calc})$ , what's a model of it like?

$$F: \text{C}\lambda\text{Th}(\text{Calc}) \longrightarrow \text{Set} ?$$

You might try  $F(R) = R \in \text{Set}$ , but

$$\begin{aligned} \text{hom}(F(\mathbb{R}), F(\mathbb{R})) &\cong \text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \\ &= \underline{\underline{\{ \text{all functions } f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \}}}. \end{aligned}$$

and we have

$$D: \text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \text{ in } \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\text{Th}(\text{Calc})}$$

& thus

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(D): F(\text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})) & \longrightarrow & F(\text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})) \text{ in Set.} \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ \text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & \text{hom}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \end{array}$$

Challenge: show no model of this type (i.e. one with  $F(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$ ) exists, or construct one! (So, perhaps  $\lambda\text{Th}(\text{Calc})$  describes the "freshman's paradise" where all functions are differentiable!)