


Provided for non-commercial research and education use.  
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:


<http://www.elsevier.com/authorsrights>



Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

## Annals of Pure and Applied Logic

www.elsevier.com/locate/apal



## Basic subtoposes of the effective topos



Sori Lee, Jaap van Oosten\*

Department of Mathematics, Utrecht University, P.O. Box 80.010, 3508 TA Utrecht, The Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 12 January 2012

Received in revised form 7 February 2013

Accepted 24 March 2013

Available online 22 April 2013

## MSC:

18B25

03G30

03D80

## Keywords:

Effective topos

Local operators

Realizability

Sights

## ABSTRACT

We study the lattice of local operators in Hyland's *Effective Topos*. We show that this lattice is a free completion under internal sups indexed by the natural numbers object, generated by what we call *basic* local operators.

We produce many new local operators and we employ a new concept, *sight*, in order to analyze these.

We show that a local operator identified by A.M. Pitts in his thesis, gives a subtopos with classical arithmetic.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 0. Introduction

A fundamental concept in Topos Theory is the notion of *subtopos*: a subtopos of a topos  $\mathcal{E}$  is a full subcategory which is closed under finite limits in  $\mathcal{E}$ , and such that the inclusion functor has a left adjoint which preserves finite limits. It then follows that this subcategory is itself a topos, and its internal logic has a convenient description in terms of the internal logic of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Subtoposes of  $\mathcal{E}$  are in 1–1 correspondence with *local operators* in  $\mathcal{E}$ : these are certain endomaps on the subobject classifier of  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Whereas local operators/subtoposes of Grothendieck toposes can be neatly described in terms of Grothendieck topologies, for realizability toposes the study of local operators is not so easy. Yet it is important, since many variations on realizability, such as modified realizability, extensional realizability and Lifschitz realizability arise as the internal logic of subtoposes of standard realizability toposes.

Already in his seminal paper [2] where he introduces the effective topos  $\mathcal{E}ff$  (the mother of all realizability toposes), Martin Hyland studied local operators and established that there is an order-preserving embedding of the Turing degrees in the lattice of local operators. Part of the groundwork for this treatment was laid by Andy Pitts in his thesis [13]. Moreover, Pitts exhibits a local operator which is different from Hyland's examples; this local operator will be studied also in the present paper. Wesley Phoa [12] has an alternative description of Hyland's "relative computability" local operators. Matías Menni [9] develops some general results on local operators in exact completions (such as  $\mathcal{E}ff$ ). Finally, the second author of the present paper identified the local operator which corresponds to Lifschitz' realizability [19,20]. But as far as we are aware, this is all.

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: j.vanoosten@uu.nl (J. van Oosten).

The lattice of local operators in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  is vast and notoriously difficult to study. We seem to lack methods to construct local operators and tell them apart. The present paper aims to improve on this situation in the following way: it is shown (Theorem 2.4) that every local operator is the internal join of a family (indexed by a nonempty set of natural numbers) of local operators induced by a nonempty family of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  (which we call *basic* local operators). Then, we introduce a technical tool (*sights*) by which we can study inequalities between basic local operators. We construct an infinity of new basic local operators and we have some results about what new functions from natural numbers to natural numbers arise in the corresponding subtoposes. For many of our finitary examples (finite collections of finite sets) we can show that they do not create any new number-theoretic functions; for Pitts' example we can show that it forces all *arithmetical* functions to be total. This seems interesting: we have a realizability-like topos which, though far from being Boolean, nonetheless satisfies true arithmetic (Theorem 6.4). There might be genuine models of nonstandard arithmetic in this topos (by McCarty's [7], such cannot exist in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ : see also [18]). Since Pitts' local operator is induced by the collection of cofinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , this is reminiscent of Moerdijk and Palmgren's work on intuitionistic nonstandard models [10,11] obtained by filters.

There are other reasons why one should be interested in the lattice of local operators in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ . It is a Heyting algebra in which, as we saw, the Turing degrees embed. It shares this feature with the (dual of the) Medvedev lattice [8], which enjoys a lot of attention these days. Apart from the work by Sorbi and Terwijn (see, e.g., [15,17,16]) who study the logical properties of this lattice, there is the program *Degree Theory: a New Beginning* of Steve Simpson, who argues that degree theory should be studied within the Medvedev lattice. From his plenary address 'Mass Problems' at the Logic Colloquium meeting in Bern, 2008 [14]: "In the 1980s and 1990s, degree theory fell into disrepute. In my opinion, this decline was due to an excessive concentration on methodological aspects, to the exclusion of foundationally significant aspects". Indeed, it is commonplace in mathematics, in order to study certain structures, to embed them into larger ones with better properties (the passage from ring elements to ideals in number theory; the passage from elements of a structure to types in model theory). By the way, the relationship between the Medvedev lattice and the lattice of local operators in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  seems a worthwhile research project.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 reminds the reader of some generalities about the subobject classifier  $\Omega$ , its set of monotone endomaps and local operators, for as much as is relevant to this paper. Section 2 studies these things in the effective topos. Section 3 recalls known facts from the (limited) literature on the subject. In Section 4 we introduce our main innovation: the concept of sights. Section 5, Calculations, then presents our results. Finally, we present a concrete definition of truth for first-order arithmetic in subtoposes corresponding to local operators, using the language of sights.

### 0.1. Notation

In this paper, juxtaposition of two terms for numbers:  $nm$  will almost always stand for: the result of the  $n$ -th partial recursive function to  $m$ . The only exception is in the conditions in statements in Section 5, where '2m' really means 2 times  $m$ , and in the proof of 5.3 where  $dm$  also means  $d$  times  $m$ . We hope the reader can put up with this.

We use the Kleene symbol  $\simeq$  between two possibly undefined terms. We use  $\langle -, \dots, - \rangle$  for coded sequences and  $(-)_i$  for the  $i$ -th element of a coded sequence. The symbol  $*$  between coded sequences means: take the code of the concatenated sequence; so if  $a = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$  and  $b = \langle b_0, \dots, b_{m-1} \rangle$  then  $a * b = \langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b_0, \dots, b_{m-1} \rangle$ . We use  $\lambda x.t$  for a standard index of a partial recursive function sending  $x$  to  $t$ .

We employ the logical symbols  $\wedge, \rightarrow$  etc. between formulas, but in the context of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  also between subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , where

$$A \wedge B = \{ \langle a, b \rangle \mid a \in A, b \in B \}$$

$$A \rightarrow B = \{ e \mid \text{for all } a \in A, ea \text{ is defined and in } B \}$$

For further, unexplained, standard notations regarding the effective topos, we refer to the monograph [21].

## 1. Subobject classifier, monotone maps and local operators

We shall use the internal language of toposes freely; we refer to one of several available text books on Topos Theory [5,6,4] for expositions of this topic.

If  $1 \xrightarrow{\text{true}} \Omega$  is a subobject classifier, elements of  $\Omega$  will act as propositions ( $\Omega$  is the power set of a one-element set  $\{*\}$ ); and the element  $p$  of  $\Omega$  will also denote the proposition " $* \in p$ "; hence  $\Omega$  is a model of second-order intuitionistic propositional logic. When we use an expression from this logic and say that it 'holds', or is 'true', we have this standard interpretation in mind.

Top and bottom elements of  $\Omega$  are denoted by  $\top$  and  $\perp$ , respectively.

**Definition 1.1.** A *local operator* is a map  $j : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  such that the following statements are true:

- (a)  $\forall p. p \rightarrow j(p)$ ,
- (b)  $\forall pq. j(p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow j(p) \wedge j(q)$ ,
- (c)  $\forall p. j(j(p)) \rightarrow j(p)$ .

Equivalently,  $j$  is a local operator iff the following statements are true:

- (i)  $\forall pq. (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (j(p) \rightarrow j(q))$ ,
- (ii)  $\top \rightarrow j(\top)$ ,
- (iii)  $\forall p. j(j(p)) \rightarrow j(p)$ .

A *monotone map* is a map  $j : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  for which (i) holds.

We have a subobject  $\text{Mon}$  of the exponential  $\Omega^\Omega$ , consisting of the monotone maps, and a subobject  $\text{Loc}$  of  $\text{Mon}$ , consisting of the local operators.

We note that  $\text{Mon}$  is the free suplattice (for suplattices and locales, see [4]) on a poset: the object  $\Omega^\Omega$  represents both the endomaps on  $\Omega$  and the subobjects of  $\Omega$ ; under this correspondence the monotone functions are the upwards closed subobjects of  $\Omega$ . It follows that  $\text{Mon}$  is the free suplattice on  $\Omega^{\text{op}}$  (recall that the free suplattice on a poset  $P$  is the set of downwards closed subsets of  $P$ ). In particular,  $\text{Mon}$  is an internal locale.

We also observe that since  $\Omega$  is (internally) complete,  $\text{Mon}$  is a retract of  $\Omega^\Omega$ : the retraction sends  $g \in \Omega^\Omega$  to the map  $p \mapsto \exists q. (g(q) \wedge (q \leq p))$ .

Also  $\text{Loc}$  is an internal locale, as we conclude from the following folklore result in Topos Theory:

**Proposition 1.2.** *The inclusion  $\text{Loc} \rightarrow \text{Mon}$  has a left adjoint  $L$  which preserves finite meets.*

**Proof.** Define  $L(f)$  by the second-order propositional expression:

$$L(f)(p) = \forall q. [(p \rightarrow q) \wedge (f(q) \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$$

It is easy to deduce that  $p \rightarrow r$  implies  $L(f)(p) \rightarrow L(f)(r)$ , so (i) of Definition 1.1 is satisfied; also (ii) holds since  $L(f)(\top)$  is valid.

For (iii), we first prove the implication

$$f(L(f)(p)) \rightarrow L(f)(p)$$

as follows: assume  $f(L(f)(p))$ ,  $f(r) \rightarrow r$ ,  $p \rightarrow r$ . Since  $L(f)(p)$  implies  $[(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (f(r) \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow r$  and  $f$  is assumed to be in  $\text{Mon}$ , we have  $f(r)$ , and hence  $r$  by assumption. We conclude that  $f(L(f)(p))$  implies

$$\forall r. [(p \rightarrow r) \wedge (f(r) \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow r$$

which is  $L(f)(p)$ , as desired. Since we know  $f(L(f)(p)) \rightarrow L(f)(p)$  we can instantiate  $L(f)(p)$  for  $q$  in

$$\forall q. [(L(f)(p) \rightarrow q) \wedge (f(q) \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$$

which is the formula for  $L(f)(L(f)(p))$ , and get  $L(f)(L(f)(p)) \rightarrow L(f)(p)$ , as desired. We conclude that  $L(f) \in \text{Loc}$ .

For  $j \in \text{Loc}$  and  $f \in \text{Mon}$ , the equivalence

$$f \leq j \iff L(f) \leq j$$

is easy, which establishes the adjunction.

It remains to be seen that  $L$  preserves finite meets. It is straightforward that  $L$  preserves the top element. For binary meets, consider that these are given pointwise in  $\text{Mon}$ . So assume  $L(f)(p) \wedge L(g)(p)$ ; we must prove

$$\forall s. [((f(s) \wedge g(s) \rightarrow s) \wedge (p \rightarrow s)) \rightarrow s]$$

Assuming  $f(s) \wedge g(s) \rightarrow s$ , or equivalently  $f(s) \rightarrow (g(s) \rightarrow s)$ , as well as  $p \rightarrow s$ ,  $L(g)(p)$  gives  $f(s) \rightarrow s$ . Again using  $p \rightarrow s$  and  $L(f)$  we get  $s$ , as desired.  $\square$

## 2. Monotone maps, local operators and basic local operators in $\mathcal{E}ff$

In  $\mathcal{E}ff$ , the object  $\text{Mon}$  of monotone maps  $\Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is covered by the assembly  $M = (M, E)$  where

$$M = \left\{ f : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \mid \bigcap_{p, q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (f(p) \rightarrow f(q)) \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

and

$$E(f) = \bigcap_{p, q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (f(p) \rightarrow f(q))$$

Mon is endowed with a preorder structure: we put

$$[f \leq g] = E(f) \wedge E(g) \wedge \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} f(p) \rightarrow g(p)$$

The actual object Mon of monotone maps is a quotient of  $M$  by the equivalence relation  $\cong$  induced by this preorder. However, we shall find it more convenient to work with the preorder  $M$  than with its quotient.

**Remark 2.1.** The object  $(M, E)$  is a  $\neg\neg$ -sheaf. Moreover, every  $f \in M$  is uniformly isomorphic to a function  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  which preserves inclusions.

**Proof.** Given  $f \in M$ , let  $F(f)$  be the function defined by

$$F(f)(p) \equiv \bigcup_{q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} ((q \rightarrow p) \wedge f(q))$$

The reader can verify the following statements:

- (1) if  $\beta$  is such that  $\beta z \langle x, y \rangle w \simeq \langle z(xw), y \rangle$  then  $\beta \in E(F(f))$  always;
- (2) from  $a \in E(f)$  we can recursively obtain an element of  $[f \cong F(f)]$ ;
- (3) the function  $F(f)$  preserves inclusions.  $\square$

We also have an internal preorder Lo, a sub-assembly of  $M$  which covers the object Loc of local operators:

$$\text{Lo} = (\{f : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \mid E_1(f) \wedge E_2(f) \wedge E_3(f) \neq \emptyset\}, E)$$

where

$$E_1(f) = \bigcap_{p, q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} [(p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (f(p) \rightarrow f(q))]$$

$$E_2(f) = f(\mathbb{N})$$

$$E_3(f) = \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} [f(f(p)) \rightarrow f(p)]$$

$$E(f) = E_1(f) \wedge E_2(f) \wedge E_3(f)$$

and Lo inherits the preorder from  $M$ .

The reflection map  $L : \text{Mon} \rightarrow \text{Loc}$  lifts to a map  $L : M \rightarrow \text{Lo}$ , given by

$$L(f)(p) = \bigcap_{q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} ((p \rightarrow q) \wedge (f(q) \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$$

Then Lo as internal preorder is equivalent to the preorder  $(M, \leq_L)$  where  $f \leq_L g$  iff  $f \leq L(g)$ .

The following form of the map  $L$  is essentially due to A. Pitts [13, 5.6]:

**Proposition 2.2.** *The map  $L : M \rightarrow \text{Lo}$  is isomorphic (as maps of preorders) to the map*

$$L'(f)(p) = \bigcap \{q \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \{0\} \wedge p \subseteq q \text{ and } \{1\} \wedge f(q) \subseteq q\}$$

**Proof.** Given  $f \in M$  and  $d \in E(f)$ , we shall produce, recursively in  $d$ , elements of  $[L(f) \leq L'(f)]$  and  $[L'(f) \leq L(f)]$ .

First, for  $e \in L(f)(p)$  and indices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that  $\alpha x = \langle 0, x \rangle$  and  $\beta x = \langle 1, x \rangle$ , we have: if  $\{0\} \wedge p \subseteq q$  and  $\{1\} \wedge f(q) \subseteq q$  then  $\alpha : p \rightarrow q$  and  $\beta : f(q) \rightarrow q$  hence  $e \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in q$ . We conclude that  $\lambda e.e \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in [L(f) \leq L'(f)]$ .

Conversely, from the interpretation in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  of the true propositional formulas  $\forall p.p \rightarrow L(f)(p)$  and  $\forall p.f(L(f)(p)) \rightarrow L(f)(p)$  (as we saw in the proof of 1.2) we find elements

$$a \in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} [p \rightarrow L(f)(p)]$$

$$b \in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} [f(L(f)(p)) \rightarrow L(f)(p)]$$

Let  $d \in E(f)$ . By the recursion theorem, choose an index  $c$  such that for all  $x, y$ :

$$c(0, x) \simeq ax$$

$$c(1, y) \simeq b(dcy)$$

Let  $S = \{z \mid cz \in L(f)(p)\}$ . Then clearly  $\{0\} \wedge p \subseteq S$ . Moreover we have  $c : S \rightarrow L(f)(p)$  hence  $\lambda y.dcy : f(S) \rightarrow f(L(f)(p))$ . So if  $\langle 1, y \rangle \in \{1\} \wedge f(S)$  then  $c(1, y) \in L(f)(p)$ . We see therefore, that also  $\{1\} \wedge f(S) \subseteq S$ . By definition of  $L'(f)(p)$  we have  $L'(f)(p) \subseteq S$  and thus  $c : L'(f)(p) \rightarrow L(f)(p)$  for all  $p$ , whence  $c \in [L'(f) \leq L(f)]$ , as desired.  $\square$

Let us examine some structure of the preorder  $M$ .  $(M, \leq)$  is an internal Heyting prealgebra (a Cartesian closed preorder with finite joins): finite joins and meets are given pointwise (and the constant maps to  $\emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  are the bottom and top elements, respectively), and Heyting implication is given by the formula

$$(f \rightarrow g)(p) = \{ \langle a, b, c \rangle \mid \text{there is an } h \in M \text{ such that } a \in E(h), b \in [(h \wedge f) \leq g] \text{ and } c \in h(p) \}$$

as is easy to verify.

Next, we discuss internal joins. The preorder  $(M, \leq)$  is internally cocomplete. Since any object of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  is covered by a partitioned assembly, it suffices to consider maps into  $M$  from partitioned assemblies. So, let  $(X, \pi)$  and  $(Y, \rho)$  be partitioned assemblies (with  $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, \rho : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ); let  $A$  be a subobject of  $(X, \pi) \times (Y, \rho)$  and  $q : A \rightarrow M$  a map. The internal join along  $q$ , i.e. the map  $(X, \pi) \rightarrow M$  defined internally by

$$x \mapsto \bigvee_{(x,y) \in A} q(x, y)$$

is represented by the function

$$H_A(x) = \bigcup_{y \in Y} \{ \langle n, e \rangle \mid n \in [A(x, y)], e \in q(x, y) \}$$

We now wish to establish a connection between  $M$  and a preorder structure on the sheaf  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ , but actually the theorem we have in mind works only if we restrict to the sub-assembly  $M^*$  of  $M$  on those functions  $f$  which satisfy  $\bigcup_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} f(p) \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  (writing  $\mathcal{P}^*(X)$  for the set of nonempty subsets of  $X$ ). Note that the condition defining elements of  $M^*$  is always satisfied by  $L(f)$ , so we still have that  $\text{Lo}$  is equivalent to  $(M^*, \leq_L)$ .

The reader should note that in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ ,  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  is the object  $\mathcal{P}_{\neg\neg}(N)$  of  $\neg\neg$ -closed subobjects of  $N$ , and  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  is the object of  $\neg\neg$ -inhabited,  $\neg\neg$ -closed subobjects of  $\mathcal{P}_{\neg\neg}(N)$ . Also, the image of  $M^*$  under the projection  $M \rightarrow \text{Mon}$  is  $\{f : \text{Mon} \mid \neg\neg\exists p.f(p)\}$ .

For  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  let

$$[\mathcal{A} \leq \mathcal{B}] = \{k \mid \forall A \in \mathcal{A} \exists B \in \mathcal{B} (k : B \rightarrow A)\}$$

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

**Proposition 2.3.** Define a function  $G_{(-)} : \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})^{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})}$  by

$$G_{\mathcal{A}}(p) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (A \rightarrow p)$$

- (a)  $G_{(-)}$  is a well-defined map:  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) \rightarrow M^*$  and an embedding of preorders (it preserves and reflects the order).
- (b)  $G_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the least  $f \in M^*$  such that  $\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f(A)$  is inhabited. That is: there are indices  $b$  and  $c$  such that for each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $f \in M^*$  and  $a \in E(f)$  the following hold:

- (i) if  $x \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f(A)$  then  $b(a, x) \in [G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq f]$ ,
- (ii) if  $y \in [G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq f]$  then  $c(a, y) \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f(A)$ .

In other words, if  $\pi : \nabla(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) \rightarrow \Omega$  is the standard surjection, then the following is internally true in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ :

$$\forall \mathcal{A} : \nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) \forall f : M^* [G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq f \leftrightarrow \forall A \in \mathcal{A} . \pi(f(A))]$$

**Theorem 2.4.** The preorder  $(M^*, \leq)$  is (internally in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ ) the free completion of  $(\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \leq)$  under joins indexed by nonempty subsets of  $N$  (where, internally,  $A \subseteq N$  is ‘nonempty’ iff  $\neg\neg\exists n(n \in A)$ ).

**Proof.** First of all we remind the reader that in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ , by “Shanin’s Principle” every subset of  $N$  is the epimorphic image of a  $\neg\neg$ -closed subset. Therefore, we can restrict ourselves to joins indexed by nonempty  $\neg\neg$ -closed subsets of  $N$ .

Recall that in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ , the object of nonempty  $\neg\neg$ -closed subobjects of  $N$  is  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*(N))$ , with element relation  $[n \in A] \equiv \{n \mid n \in A\}$ .

For  $f \in M^*$ , define  $A \in \nabla(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  and  $\theta : A \rightarrow \nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$  by

$$A = \bigcup_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} f(p)$$

$$\theta(n) = \{q \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid n \in f(q)\}$$

The reader can verify that  $A$  and  $\theta$  are well-defined. Now recall from the remark we made at the beginning of this section that  $f$  is isomorphic (in the preorder  $(M^*, \leq)$ ) to  $F(f)$  where

$$F(f)(p) = \bigcup_{q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} (f(q) \wedge (q \rightarrow p))$$

From which we derive

$$F(f)(p) = \left\{ \langle n, e \rangle \mid n \in A, e \in \bigcup_{q \in \theta(n)} (q \rightarrow p) \right\} = \left( \bigvee_{n \in A} G_{\theta(n)} \right)(p)$$

So we see that  $f$  is a join of a family of elements of  $\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ , indexed by a nonempty subset of  $N$ .

Next, we see that elements of the form  $G_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ , are *inaccessible for joins indexed by nonempty subsets of  $N$* . That is, let  $A \subseteq N$  nonempty,  $h : A \rightarrow M^*$  a map. Then  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigvee_{n \in A} h_n$  implies  $\exists n \in A. G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq h_n$ , internally in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ . This is seen as follows:

Suppose  $e \in [G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \bigvee_{n \in A} h_n]$ , so

$$e \in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} \left[ \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{A}} (B \rightarrow p) \rightarrow \{ \langle n, u \rangle \mid n \in A, u \in h_n(p) \} \right]$$

Since  $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ , there is some  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $i$  be an index for the identity function, then instantiating this  $B$  for  $p$  we get

$$ei \in \{ \langle n, u \rangle \mid n \in A, u \in h_n(B) \}$$

This holds for all  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ . So we have found an  $n = (ei)_0$ , satisfying  $(ei)_1 \in h_n(B)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Since  $h : A \rightarrow M^*$  is a map, from  $n$  we find some element  $a_n \in E(h_n)$ .

Now if  $d : B \rightarrow p$  is arbitrary,  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , then  $a_n d : h_n(B) \rightarrow h_n(p)$ , hence  $(a_n d)(ei)_1 \in h_n(p)$ . We see that for all  $p$ ,

$$\lambda d. (a_n d)(ei)_1 : \left( \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{A}} (B \rightarrow p) \right) \rightarrow h_n(p)$$

which means  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq h_n$ , as desired.

The two properties together imply, constructively, that  $M^*$  is the stated free completion.

Indeed, suppose  $(P, \leq)$  is an internal preorder in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  which has joins indexed by nonempty subsets of  $N$ , and  $w : (\nabla(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})), \leq) \rightarrow P$  is order-preserving. Then we extend  $w$  uniquely to a map  $W : M^* \rightarrow P$  which preserves joins indexed by nonempty subsets of  $N$ : for  $f \in M^*$ , express  $f$  as  $\bigvee_{n \in A} \theta(n)$ . Define  $W(f) = \bigvee_{n \in A} w(\theta(n))$ . Use the inaccessibility property to show that  $W$  is well-defined.  $\square$

In view of [Theorem 2.4](#) we shall call elements of  $M^*$  of the form  $G_{\mathcal{A}}$  *basic*; and we shall call local operators of the form  $L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$  also basic.

### 3. Known results about local operators in $\mathcal{E}ff$

In this section we collect some results which have appeared in the literature, as far as relevant for this paper.

The top element of  $\text{Loc}$ , the function constant  $\top$ , is the local operator whose category of sheaves is the trivial topos; hence this local operator will also be called *trivial*. The least element of  $\text{Loc}$ , the identity map on  $\Omega$ , will be denoted  $\text{id}$ .

As is well known from [\[2\]](#), there is a largest nontrivial local operator. This is the *double negation* operator  $\neg\neg$ : the function sending  $\emptyset$  to  $\emptyset$  and everything else to  $\mathbb{N}$ .

#### Proposition 3.1 (Hyland–Pitts).

- (i) Let  $j \in M$ . Then  $L(j)$  represents the trivial local operator if and only if  $j(\emptyset) \neq \emptyset$ .
- (ii) Let  $j \in M$ . Then  $L(j)$  represents the  $\neg\neg$ -operator if and only if any of the following equivalent conditions holds:
  - (a)  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  and  $\bigcap_{p \neq \emptyset} L(j)(p) \neq \emptyset$ ,
  - (b)  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  and  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} L(j)(\{n\}) \neq \emptyset$ ,
  - (c)  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  and  $L(j)(\{0\}) \cap L(j)(\{1\}) \neq \emptyset$ .
- (iii) Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . Then  $\text{id} < L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$  if and only if  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ .



We conclude that the identity, the trivial local operator and the  $\neg\neg$ -operator are basic: the identity is  $L(G_{\{0\}})$ , the trivial one is  $L(G_{\{\emptyset\}})$  and  $\neg\neg$  is  $L(G_{\{0,1\}}) = L(G_{\{p \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid p \neq \emptyset\}})$ .

The following corollary is easy.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  contains two r.e. separable sets, that is: sets  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  such that for two disjoint recursively enumerable sets  $C, D$  we have  $A_1 \subseteq C, A_2 \subseteq D$ . Then  $\neg\neg \leq L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$ .*

A different basic local operator was identified by Pitts in [13, 5.8]:

**Proposition 3.3** (Pitts). *Let  $\mathcal{A} = \{m \mid m \geq n\} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$  is strictly between  $\text{id}$  and  $\neg\neg$ .*

Examples of non-basic local operators are those which force a partial function to be total. Suppose  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a function. The  $\neg\neg$ -closed subobject of  $N \times N$  in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  given by  $\{(n, f(n)) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is a single-valued relation whose domain  $D_f$  is a  $\neg\neg$ -dense subobject of  $N$ . The least local operator which forces  $D_f$  to be the whole of  $N$  is  $L(\bigvee_n G_{\rho(n)})$  where  $\rho(n) = \{f(n)\}$ . Recall that  $\bigvee_n G_{\rho(n)}(p) = \{n, e \mid ef(n) \in p\}$ .

**Theorem 3.4** (Hyland). *Denoting this least local operator by  $j_f$ , we have  $j_f \leq j_g$  if and only if  $f$  is Turing reducible to  $g$ .*

The following proposition is due to Phoa [12]:

**Proposition 3.5** (Phoa). *If  $j$  is a local operator such that  $j_f \leq j$  for each  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\neg\neg \leq j$ .*

In general, if  $X \xrightarrow{m} Y$  is a monomorphism in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  there is (by standard topos theory) a least local operator  $j$  with respect to which  $m$  is dense. Let us write this out explicitly for the case that  $Y$  is an assembly (since every object of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  is covered by an assembly, this covers the general case): let  $Y = (Y, E)$  and  $R : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  be such that  $\bigcap_{y \in Y} (R(y) \rightarrow E(y))$  is nonempty, representing the subobject  $m$ . Then the least local operator for which  $m$  is dense is  $L(\bigvee_n G_{\theta(n)})$  where  $\theta(n) = \{R(y) \mid n \in E(y)\}$ .

Another non-basic local operator in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  is described in [19,20]. Let  $\text{Tot}$  be the set of indices of total recursive functions. Consider the assembly  $A = (A, E)$  where

$$A = \{ \langle e, f \rangle \mid e, f \in \text{Tot} \text{ and } \forall n m(en = 0 \vee fm = 0) \}$$

$$E(\langle e, f \rangle) = \{ \langle e, f \rangle \}$$

Let  $R : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  send  $\langle e, f \rangle$  to the set

$$\{ \langle e, f, 0 \rangle \mid \forall n(en = 0) \} \cup \{ \langle e, f, 1 \rangle \mid \forall n(fm = 0) \}$$

Then  $R$  determines a subobject  $[R]$  of  $A$  and let  $j_L$  be the least local operator for which this inclusion is dense.

The local operator  $j_L$  corresponds to the Lifschitz subtopos of  $\mathcal{E}ff$ . In [20] it is proved that  $j_L$  is the least local operator for which the following principle of first-order arithmetic, there called  $B\Sigma_1^0$ -MP is true in the corresponding sheaf subtopos:

$$\forall e (\neg\neg \exists n(n \in [e]) \rightarrow \exists n(n \in [e]))$$

where  $[e]$  denotes  $\{n \leq (e)_1 \mid (e)_0 n \uparrow\}$ . It can be shown that  $B\Sigma_1^0$ -MP is equivalent to the ‘‘Lesser Limited Principle of Omniscience’’, which has some standing in generalized computability and constructive analysis (see e.g. [1,3]). Since decidability of the Halting Problem implies this principle, we conclude that  $j_L \leq j_h$ , if  $h$  is a decision function for the Halting Problem. In fact we have  $j_L < j_h$ , since the Halting Problem is not decidable in the Lifschitz topos.

#### 4. Sights

In this section we develop some theory of a certain type of well-founded trees, which we call *sights*, which will enable us to derive inequalities and non-inequalities between a number of new local operators in  $\mathcal{E}ff$ . The basic insight is that elements of  $L(f)(p)$  are functions defined by recursion over a well-founded tree (see in particular Definition 4.8 and the discussion preceding it, and Proposition 4.9).

Let us look again at the operator  $L'$  from Proposition 2.2:

$$L'(f)(p) = \bigcap \{ q \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid \{0\} \wedge p \subseteq q \text{ and } \{1\} \wedge f(q) \subseteq q \}$$

for  $f \in M$ .

In view of Remark 2.1 we may assume that  $f$  preserves inclusions. This enables us to present  $L'$  in the following way:



**Proposition 4.1.** For ordinals  $\alpha \leq \omega_1$ , define  $L(f)(p)_\alpha$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} L(f)(p)_0 &= \{0\} \wedge p \\ L(f)(p)_{\alpha+1} &= L(f)(p)_\alpha \cup (\{1\} \wedge f(L(f)(p)_\alpha)) \\ L(f)(p)_\lambda &= \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda} L(f)(p)_\beta \quad \text{for limit } \lambda \end{aligned}$$

Then  $L'(f)(p) = L(f)(p)_{\omega_1}$ . Of course, since  $L'(f)(p)$  is a countable set, there is a countable ordinal  $\alpha$  such that  $L'(f)(p) = L(f)(p)_\alpha$ .

Proposition 4.1 leads us to the following definition.

**Definition 4.2.** A sight is, inductively,

either a thing called NIL,  
or a pair  $(A, \sigma)$  where  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma$  a function on  $A$  such that  $\sigma(a)$  is a sight for each  $a \in A$ .

Let  $\theta$  be a function  $B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  for  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  nonempty. With  $\theta$  we associate (as in 2.4) the element  $G_\theta$  of  $M^*$  given by

$$G_\theta(p) = \{ \langle n, e \rangle \mid n \in B, \exists A \in \theta(n)(e : A \rightarrow p) \}$$

So,  $G_\theta = \bigvee_{n \in B} G_{\theta(n)}$ .

**Definition 4.3.** For  $\theta$  as above,  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{N}$  we say that a sight  $S$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated if

either  $S = \text{NIL}$  and  $z \in \{0\} \wedge p$ ,  
or  $S = (A, \sigma)$ ,  $z = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$ ,  $A \in \theta(n)$ , and for all  $a \in A$ ,  $ea$  is defined and  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(ea, \theta, p)$ -dedicated.

**Proposition 4.4.** For  $\theta, z, p$  as before, we have:  $z \in L'(G_\theta)(p)$  if and only if there is a  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated sight.

**Proof.** We use 4.1. First we prove that for each  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , if  $z \in L(G_\theta)(p)_\alpha$  then there is a  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated sight.

For  $\alpha = 0$ : if  $z \in L(G_\theta)(p)_0 = \{0\} \wedge p$ , then NIL is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated.

For  $\alpha + 1$ : suppose  $z \in L(G_\theta)(p)_{\alpha+1}$ . By induction hypothesis we may assume  $z \in \{1\} \wedge G_\theta(L(G_\theta)(p)_\alpha)$ . Then  $z = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$  and for some  $A \in \theta(n)$  we have  $e : A \rightarrow L(G_\theta)(p)_\alpha$ . By induction hypothesis, for each  $a \in A$  there is an  $(ea, \theta, p)$ -dedicated sight  $\sigma(a)$ . Then  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated.

The case of limit ordinals is obvious.

Conversely, suppose that  $S$  is a  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated sight. If  $S = \text{NIL}$ , then  $z \in \{0\} \wedge p$  so  $z \in L(G_\theta)(p)_0$ . If  $S = (A, \sigma)$  then  $z = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$  and for some  $A \in \theta(n)$ ,  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(ea, \theta, p)$ -dedicated for each  $a \in A$ . By induction hypothesis, for each  $a \in A$  there is some  $\alpha_a < \omega_1$  such that  $ea \in L(G_\theta)(p)_{\alpha_a}$ . Then  $z \in L(G_\theta)(p)_\beta$  where  $\beta = (\bigcup_{a \in A} \alpha_a) + 1$ , as is easy to see.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** For  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  nonempty and  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  we have:  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_L G_\theta$  if and only if there exists a number  $z$  such that for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  there exists a  $(z, \theta, A)$ -dedicated sight.

**Proof.** By 2.3,  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq L'(G_\theta)$  if and only if  $\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} L'(G_\theta)(A)$  is nonempty, which, by 4.4, is equivalent to the given statement.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.6.** For  $B, B' \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  nonempty,  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $\zeta : B' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  we have:  $G_\zeta \leq_L G_\theta$  if and only if there is a partial recursive function  $f$  defined on  $B'$ , and for every  $n \in B'$  an  $(f(n), \theta, \zeta(n))$ -dedicated sight.

To any sight  $S$  we associate a well-founded tree  $\text{Tr}(S)$  of coded sequences of natural numbers together with a specified subset of its set of leaves (which we will call *good leaves*) as follows:

If  $S = \text{NIL}$  then  $\text{Tr}(S) = \{ \langle \rangle \}$  and  $\langle \rangle$  is a good leaf of  $S$ .

If  $S = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  then  $\text{Tr}(S) = \{ \langle \rangle \}$  and  $\text{Tr}(S)$  has no good leaf.

If  $S = (A, \sigma)$  with  $A \neq \emptyset$  then  $\text{Tr}(S) = \{ \langle a \rangle * t \mid a \in A, t \in \text{Tr}(\sigma(a)) \}$  and  $\langle a \rangle * t$  is a good leaf of  $\text{Tr}(S)$  if and only if  $t$  is a good leaf of  $\text{Tr}(\sigma(a))$ .

We shall often abuse language and talk about the “(good) leaves of a sight  $S$ ” instead of  $\text{Tr}(S)$ .

We call a sight *degenerate* if not all its leaves are good.

Given a sight  $S$  and  $s \in \text{Tr}(S)$ , we write  $\text{Out}(s)$  (or  $\text{Out}_s(s)$  if we wish to emphasize the sight  $s$  lives in) for the set  $\{ a \in \mathbb{N} \mid s * \langle a \rangle \in \text{Tr}(S) \}$ .

The following proposition follows by an easy induction on sights.

**Proposition 4.7.** *If a degenerate sight is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated then  $\emptyset \in \bigcup_n \theta(n)$ .*

**Definition 4.8.** Let  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  nonempty,  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ . For a number  $w$ , we call a sight  $S$   $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting if

- whenever  $s$  is a good leaf of  $S$ ,  $ws \in \{0\} \wedge p$ ,
- whenever  $s$  is not a good leaf of  $S$ ,  $ws = \langle 1, n \rangle$  with  $n \in B$  and  $\text{Out}_S(s) \in \theta(n)$ .

**Proposition 4.9.** *There are partial recursive functions  $F$  and  $G$  such that for each  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  nonempty,  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ ,  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , sight  $S$  and  $z \in \mathbb{N}$ :*

- (i) *If  $S$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated then  $F(z)$  is defined and  $S$  is  $(F(z), \theta, p)$ -supporting.*
- (ii) *If  $S$  is  $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting then  $G(w)$  is defined and  $S$  is  $(G(w), \theta, p)$ -dedicated.*

**Proof.** (i) Note that from the definition of “ $S$  is  $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting” it follows that if  $H$  is a partial recursive function such that for each  $a \in A$ ,  $H(a)$  is defined and the sight  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(H(a), \theta, p)$ -supporting, and

$$w = \lambda s. \begin{cases} \langle 1, n \rangle & \text{if } s = \langle \rangle \\ H((s)_0)\langle (s)_1, \dots, (s)_{\text{lh}(s)-1} \rangle & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

then the sight  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting:  $s$  is a good leaf of  $(A, \sigma)$  if and only if  $\langle (s)_1, \dots, (s)_{\text{lh}(s)-1} \rangle$  is a good leaf of  $\sigma((s)_0)$ .

Therefore, using the recursion theorem let  $F$  be partial recursive such that

$$F(z)s \simeq \begin{cases} z & \text{if } z = \langle 0, y \rangle \\ \begin{cases} \langle 1, n \rangle & \text{if } s = \langle \rangle \\ F(e(s)_0)\langle (s)_1, \dots, (s)_{\text{lh}(s)-1} \rangle & \text{else} \end{cases} & \text{if } z = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle \end{cases}$$

The proof is now by induction on  $S$ : if  $S = \text{NIL}$  and  $S$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated then  $z = \langle 0, y \rangle$ ,  $y \in p$ ,  $F(z)\langle \rangle = z$  and  $S$  is  $(F(z), \theta, p)$ -supporting. If  $S = (A, \sigma)$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated then  $z = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$  etc., and for each  $a \in A$  by induction hypothesis  $F(e(s)_0)$  is defined and  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(F(e(s)_0), \theta, p)$ -supporting. By our first remark it now follows that  $S = (A, \sigma)$  is  $(F(z), \theta, p)$ -supporting.

(ii) Here we remark that if  $A \in \theta(n)$  and for each  $a \in A$ ,  $ea$  is defined and  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(ea, \theta, p)$ -dedicated, then  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(\langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle, \theta, p)$ -dedicated.

Also, note that if  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting then for each  $a \in A$ ,  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(\lambda s.w(\langle a \rangle * s), \theta, p)$ -supporting.

Define  $G$ , using the recursion theorem, by

$$G(w) \simeq \begin{cases} \langle 0, y \rangle & \text{if } w\langle \rangle = \langle 0, y \rangle \\ \langle 1, \langle n, \lambda a.G(\lambda s.w(\langle a \rangle * s)) \rangle \rangle & \text{if } w\langle \rangle = \langle 1, n \rangle \end{cases}$$

Proof, again by induction on  $S$ : suppose  $S$  is  $(w, \theta, p)$ -supporting. If  $S = \text{NIL}$  then  $w\langle \rangle = \langle 0, y \rangle$ ,  $y \in p$  and  $G(w) = \langle 0, y \rangle$ , so  $S$  is  $(G(w), \theta, p)$ -dedicated.

If  $S = (A, \sigma)$  then  $w\langle \rangle = \langle 1, n \rangle$  for an  $n$  such that  $A \in \theta(n)$ . By our remark, for each  $a \in A$  the sight  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(\lambda s.w(\langle a \rangle * s), \theta, p)$ -supporting hence by induction hypothesis,  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(G(\lambda s.w(\langle a \rangle * s)), \theta, p)$ -dedicated. Then if  $e = \lambda a.G(\lambda s.w(\langle a \rangle * s))$ ,  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(\langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle, \theta, p)$ -dedicated; i.e.,  $(A, \sigma)$  is  $(G(w), \theta, p)$ -dedicated, as desired.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.10.** *For  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ , the element  $L'(G_\theta)$  of  $M^*$  is, in  $M^*$ , isomorphic to the function which sends  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  to*

$$\{z \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there is a } (z, \theta, p)\text{-supporting sight}\}$$

The following corollary shows that the local operators  $j_f$  from 3.4 are not basic, in fact are not majorizing any nontrivial basic local operator.

**Corollary 4.11.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  a function. Let  $j_f$  be the least local operator which forces  $f$  to be total, as in 3.4. Then if  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_L j_f$ ,  $L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$  is the identity local operator.*

**Proof.** Let  $\rho_f : n \mapsto \{\{f(n)\}\}$  be as just above 3.4, so  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq j_f$  if and only if  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_L \rho_f$ . First, we prove the following

**Claim.** *Given  $z \in \mathbb{N}$  and sights  $S$  and  $T$  such that both  $S$  and  $T$  are  $(z, \rho_f, \mathbb{N})$ -dedicated, then  $S = T$ .*

We prove the Claim by induction on  $S$ . If  $S = \text{NIL}$  then  $z = \langle 0, y \rangle$  for some  $y$ . It follows that also  $T = \text{NIL}$ . If  $S = (A, \sigma)$  then  $z = \langle 1, (n, e) \rangle$ ,  $A = \{f(n)\}$  and  $\sigma(f(n))$  is  $(ef(n), \rho_f, \mathbb{N})$ -dedicated. Similarly,  $T = (\{f(n)\}, \tau)$  and  $\tau(f(n))$  is  $(ef(n), \rho_f, \mathbb{N})$ -dedicated. By induction hypothesis,  $\sigma(f(n)) = \tau(f(n))$  whence  $S = T$ , as desired. This proves the Claim.

Now suppose  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_L \rho_f$ . By 4.5, there is a number  $z$  and, for each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , a  $(z, \rho_f, A)$ -dedicated sight  $S_A$ . By the Claim, all  $S_A$  are equal, say  $S$ . Since  $\rho_f(n)$  never contains the empty set,  $S$  is non-degenerate and by 4.9, it is  $(F(z), \rho_f, A)$ -supporting for each  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Take any good leaf  $d$  of  $S$ . Then  $F(z)d = \langle 0, y \rangle$  with  $d \in \bigcap \mathcal{A}$ . By 3.1(iii),  $L(G_{\mathcal{A}})$  is the identity local operator, as claimed.  $\square$

**Definition 4.12.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . We say that the  $\mathcal{A}_i$  have the *joint intersection property* if for all  $A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}_n$ ,  $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$ .

Similarly, we say that  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  has the *n-intersection property* if for all  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$ .

We say that a sight  $S$  is *on*  $\mathcal{A}$  if, inductively,  $S = \text{NIL}$  or  $S = (A, \sigma)$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  and for all  $a \in A$  the sight  $\sigma(a)$  is on  $\mathcal{A}$ . This means that for every  $d \in \text{Tr}(S)$  which is not a good leaf,  $\text{Out}_S(d) \in \mathcal{A}$ . We say that  $S$  is *on*  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  if  $S$  is on  $\bigcup_{n \in B} \theta(n)$ .

**Proposition 4.13.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_n$  have the joint intersection property. Then if  $S_i$  is a sight on  $\mathcal{A}_i$  for each  $i$ , there is a coded sequence  $d$  such that

$d \in \text{Tr}(S_i)$  for each  $i$ , and  
 $d$  is a good leaf of some  $S_i$ .

**Proof.** Induction on  $S_1$ . If  $S_1 = \text{NIL}$  then we can take  $\langle \rangle$  for  $d$ . Similarly, if  $S_i = \text{NIL}$  for some  $i \geq 2$  we can take  $\langle \rangle$  for  $d$ . So assume each  $S_i$  is  $(A_i, \sigma_i)$ . By the joint intersection property, take  $a \in \bigcap_i A_i$ . By the induction hypothesis, there is a  $d'$  such that  $d' \in \text{Tr}(\sigma_i(a))$  for each  $i$ , and  $d'$  is a good leaf of some  $\sigma_i(a)$ . Then  $\langle a \rangle * d'$  satisfies the proposition.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.14.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  has the n-intersection property. Then for every n-tuple of sights  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  there is a sequence  $d \in \bigcap_i \text{Tr}(S_i)$  such that  $d$  is a good leaf of at least one  $S_i$ .

**Definition 4.15.** For a sight  $S$  and a number  $z$ , we say that  $z$  is *r-defined on*  $S$  if for some  $\theta$ ,  $S$  is  $(z, \theta, \mathbb{N})$ -dedicated.

**Proposition 4.16.** Suppose  $S$  and  $T$  are sights and  $d = \langle d_1, \dots, d_n \rangle$  is an element of  $\text{Tr}(S) \cap \text{Tr}(T)$ . If some  $z$  is *r-defined on* both  $S$  and  $T$  and  $d$  is a good leaf of  $S$ , then  $d$  is also a good leaf of  $T$ .

**Proof.** Induction on  $n$ . If  $n = 0$  then  $d = \langle \rangle$ , so if  $d$  is a good leaf of  $S$ ,  $S = \text{NIL}$ . Then  $z$ , being *r-defined on*  $S$ , must be  $\langle 0, y \rangle$ ; hence, since  $z$  is *r-defined on*  $T$ ,  $T = \text{NIL}$  and  $d$  is a good leaf of  $T$ .

If  $n > 0$  then  $S = (A, \sigma)$ ,  $T = (B, \tau)$ . Then  $\langle d_2, \dots, d_n \rangle$  (which is  $\langle \rangle$  if  $n = 1$ ) is a good leaf of  $\sigma(d_1)$  and an element of  $\text{Tr}(\tau(d_1))$ ; by induction hypothesis  $\langle d_2, \dots, d_n \rangle$  is a good leaf of  $\tau(d_1)$  hence  $d$  is a good leaf of  $T$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.17.** Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  and  $n \geq 1$  be such that  $\mathcal{B}$  has the n-intersection property whereas  $\mathcal{A}$  contains sets  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  satisfying  $\bigcap_i A_i = \emptyset$ . Then  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \not\leq_L G_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

**Proof.** Suppose  $G_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_L G_{\mathcal{B}}$  and let  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ . By 4.5 there is a number  $z$  and for each  $i$  a  $(z, \mathcal{B}, A_i)$ -dedicated sight  $S_i$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  has the n-intersection property, by 4.14 there is a coded sequence  $d \in \bigcap_i \text{Tr}(S_i)$  which is a good leaf of at least one  $S_i$ . Since  $z$  is *r-defined on* each  $S_i$ , 4.16 gives that  $d$  is a good leaf of each  $S_i$ . By 4.9, every  $S_i$  is  $(F(z), \mathcal{B}, A_i)$ -supporting, which means that  $F(z)d = \langle 0, y \rangle$  with  $y \in \bigcap_i A_i$ . This holds for any n-tuple  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ , so we see that  $\mathcal{A}$  has the n-intersection property.  $\square$

## 5. Calculations

We are now ready to investigate some basic local operators.

Let  $\alpha$  be a natural number  $> 1$ , or  $\omega$ . With  $\alpha$  we associate the set  $\{1, \dots, \alpha\}$  if  $\alpha$  is a natural number, or  $\mathbb{N}$  if  $\alpha = \omega$ . For  $m \leq \alpha \leq \omega$  let

$$O_m^\alpha = \{X \subseteq \alpha \mid |\alpha - X| = m\}$$

be the set of ‘co- $m$ -tons’ in  $\alpha$ . Via the map  $G_{(-)}$  of 2.3 we regard the  $O_m^\alpha$  as elements of  $M^*$  (and we write  $O_m^\alpha$  instead of  $G_{O_m^\alpha}$ ). Of course, we are really interested in the local operators generated by the  $O_m^\alpha$ , and therefore we first get some trivial cases out of the way: if  $\alpha = m$  so  $O_m^\alpha = \{\emptyset\}$ , then  $L(O_m^\alpha)$  is the trivial local operator, and if  $m < \alpha \leq 2m$  then  $O_m^\alpha$  contains two disjoint finite sets whence  $\neg \neg \leq_L O_m^\alpha$  by 3.2.

Henceforth we concentrate on the case  $1 < 2m < \alpha \leq \omega$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \alpha \leq \omega$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha < O_{m+1}^\alpha$  in  $M^*$ .*

**Proof.** For  $\leq$  we need a  $k$  such that for each  $A \in O_m^\alpha$  there is  $B \in O_{m+1}^\alpha$  with  $k \in B \rightarrow A$ ; but we can take  $\lambda x.x$  for  $k$ .

For  $O_{m+1}^\alpha \not\leq O_m^\alpha$ , suppose  $k$  is such that for each  $A \in O_{m+1}^\alpha$  there is  $B \in O_m^\alpha$  with  $k \in B \rightarrow A$ . Let  $\gamma$  be the restriction of the partial function  $\varphi_k$  to  $\alpha$  and let  $C = \gamma[\alpha] \cap \alpha$ . If  $|C| \leq m$  then since  $2m + 1 \leq \alpha$  we can find an  $A \in O_{m+1}^\alpha$  such that  $C \cap A = \emptyset$ , but then clearly there is no  $B \in O_m^\alpha$  with  $k \in B \rightarrow A$ . So pick  $m + 1$  distinct elements  $v_1, \dots, v_{m+1} \in C$ . By choice of  $k$  there is  $B \in O_m^\alpha$  such that  $k : B \rightarrow (\alpha - \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+1}\})$ . Then we must have  $\gamma[\alpha - B] = \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+1}\}$  but this is impossible, since  $|\gamma[\alpha - B]| \leq |\alpha - B| = m$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $1 \leq m < \omega$ . Then  $O_1^\omega \cong_L O_m^\omega$ .*

**Proof.** We have  $O_1^\omega \leq O_m^\omega$  in  $M^*$  hence  $O_1^\omega \leq_L O_m^\omega$ ; this is left to the reader.

For the converse inequality  $O_m^\omega \leq_L O_1^\omega$  we have to find (by 4.5 and 4.9) a number  $z$  and, for each  $A \in O_m^\omega$ , a  $(z, O_1^\omega, A)$ -supporting sight. In order to conform to Definition 4.8 we regard  $O_1^\omega$  as function  $\{0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$  with value  $O_1^\omega$ .

Given distinct  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{N}$  define

$$T_{a_1, \dots, a_m} = \{ \langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle \mid p \leq m \text{ and for all } i \leq p, c_i \neq (a_i)_i \}$$

and let  $S_{a_1, \dots, a_m}$  be the unique non-degenerate sight with  $\text{Tr}(S_{a_1, \dots, a_m}) = T_{a_1, \dots, a_m}$ .

Let  $z$  be such that for each coded sequence  $\langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle$ ,

$$z \langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle = \begin{cases} \langle 1, 0 \rangle & \text{if } p < m \\ \langle 0, \langle c_1, \dots, c_m \rangle \rangle & \text{if } p \geq m \end{cases}$$

We claim that  $S_{a_1, \dots, a_m}$  is  $(z, O_1^\omega, \mathbb{N} - \{a_1, \dots, a_m\})$ -supporting.

Note that for each  $\langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle \in \text{Tr}(T_{a_1, \dots, a_m})$  which is not a leaf, we have

$$\text{Out}(\langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle) = \{ c_{p+1} \mid c_{p+1} \neq (a_{p+1})_{p+1} \}$$

and this is an element of  $O_1^\omega$ . In this case,  $z \langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle = \langle 1, 0 \rangle$  as required. If  $\langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle \in \text{Tr}(T_{a_1, \dots, a_m})$  is a leaf, then  $p = m$ , so

$$z \langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle = \langle 0, \langle c_1, \dots, c_m \rangle \rangle$$

We need to see that  $\langle c_1, \dots, c_p \rangle$  is not an element of  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ ; but this follows readily from the definition of  $T_{a_1, \dots, a_m}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $1 \leq m < \alpha < \omega$ . Then  $\lceil \frac{\alpha}{m} \rceil$ , the least integer  $\geq \frac{\alpha}{m}$ , is the least number  $d$  for which there are  $d$  elements  $A_1, \dots, A_d$  of  $O_m^\alpha$  with  $\bigcap_{i=1}^d A_i = \emptyset$ .*

**Proof.** For any  $d \geq 1$  we have:  $\forall A_1, \dots, A_d \in O_m^\alpha (\bigcap_{i=1}^d A_i \neq \emptyset)$  if and only if  $\forall A_1, \dots, A_d \in O_{\alpha-m}^\alpha (\bigcup_{i=1}^d A_i \neq \alpha)$  if and only if  $dm < \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \alpha < \omega$ . Suppose  $\lceil \frac{\alpha}{m+1} \rceil < \lceil \frac{\alpha}{m} \rceil$ . Then  $O_{m+1}^\alpha \not\leq_L O_m^\alpha$ , so  $O_m^\alpha <_L O_{m+1}^\alpha$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $d = \lceil \frac{\alpha}{m+1} \rceil$ . Then  $O_{m+1}^\alpha$  contains  $d$  sets with empty intersection, whereas  $O_m^\alpha$  has the  $d$ -intersection property. The result follows from Proposition 4.17.  $\square$

**Open problem.** We have not been able to determine whether it can happen that  $O_{m+1}^\alpha \leq_L O_m^\alpha$  in the case that  $\lceil \frac{\alpha}{m+1} \rceil = \lceil \frac{\alpha}{m} \rceil$ .

The following proposition shows that, in the preorder of basic local operators (i.e., the preorder  $(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}), \leq_L)$ ),  $O_1^\omega$  is an atom and  $\neg\neg$  is a co-atom:

**Proposition 5.5.**

- (i)  $\text{id} <_L O_1^\omega$ .
- (ii) For every  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ , either  $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \text{id}$ , or  $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \top$  (the trivial local operator), or  $O_1^\omega \leq_L \mathcal{A} \leq_L \neg\neg$ .

**Proof.** Part (i) follows directly from 3.1(iii).

For (ii): again using 3.1(iii),  $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \text{id}$  if and only if  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\bigcap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$  then for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there is an  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $n \notin A$ , hence  $\lambda x.x \in [O_1^\omega \leq \mathcal{A}]$ .

From the same proposition, part (i), it follows that  $\mathcal{A} \cong_L \top$  if and only if  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ . If  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}$  then  $\mathcal{A} \leq \{p \subseteq \mathbb{N} \mid p \neq \emptyset\}$ , so  $\mathcal{A} \leq_L \neg\neg$ .  $\square$

**Remark.** Note that we do not have in  $M^*$  that if  $\text{id} < f$  then  $O_1^\omega \leq f$ , as 4.11 showed.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \beta \leq \alpha \leq \omega$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha \leq O_m^\beta$  in  $M^*$ .*

**Proof.** Realized by  $\lambda x.x$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \alpha < \omega$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha \not\leq_L O_1^\omega$ , hence  $O_1^\omega <_L O_m^\alpha$ .*

**Proof.** Immediate from 4.17 and 5.5.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $1 < 2m, \alpha < \omega$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha \not\leq_L O_m^{\alpha+m}$ , hence  $O_m^{\alpha+m} <_L O_m^\alpha$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $d = \lceil \frac{\alpha}{m} \rceil$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha$  contains  $d$  sets with empty intersection whereas  $O_m^{\alpha+m}$  has the  $d$ -intersection property ( $\lceil \frac{\alpha+m}{m} \rceil = d + 1$ ), so the first statement follows from 4.17. The second statement follows from 5.6.  $\square$

**Open problems.** 1. We do not know whether  $O_m^{\alpha+1} <_L O_m^\alpha$ .  
 2. How do, e.g.,  $O_m^{2m+1}$  and  $O_n^{2n+1}$  compare?

The following theorem shows that the local operators  $O_m^\alpha$  do not create any new functions  $N \rightarrow N$ . Equivalently, they do not force any subobjects of  $N$  to be decidable.

**Theorem 5.9.** *Let  $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 < 2m < \alpha \leq \omega$ . Let  $\chi_D$  be the characteristic function of  $D$  and let  $\rho_D(n) = \{\{\chi_D(n)\}\}$  (so  $L(\rho_D)$  is the least local operator forcing  $D$  to be decidable). We have: if  $\rho_D \leq_L O_m^\alpha$  then  $D$  is recursive.*

**Proof.** Note that  $\rho_D \leq_L O_m^\alpha$  if and only if there is a total recursive function  $\zeta$  such that for all  $n$  there is a  $(\zeta(n), O_m^\alpha, \{\chi_D(n)\})$ -dedicated sight.

So let  $\zeta$  be such a function. By the definition of ‘dedicated’ it follows that for all  $n$ ,  $\zeta(n)$  is of the form  $\langle i, x \rangle$  with  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ; and if  $i = 1$ , then  $x = \langle n, e \rangle$ .

By the recursion theorem, let  $f$  be an index such that:

- (i)  $f\langle 0, x \rangle = x$ ,
- (ii) for  $f\langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$ , search for the least computation witnessing that there are  $m + 1$  distinct elements  $a_1, \dots, a_{m+1} \in \alpha$  such that  $ea_1, \dots, ea_{m+1}$  are all defined and moreover,

$$f(ea_1) = \dots = f(ea_{m+1})$$

If this is found, put  $f\langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle = f(ea_1)$ ; if not,  $f\langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$  is undefined.

We claim that the index  $f$  has the following property:

(S) For every  $\langle i, x \rangle \in \mathbb{N}$  and every  $(\langle i, x \rangle, O_m^\alpha, \{\chi_D(n)\})$ -dedicated sight  $S$ ,  $f\langle i, x \rangle = \chi_D(n)$ .

Note that this implies the statement in the theorem: for all  $n$  we have  $f(\zeta(n)) = \chi_D(n)$ , which means that  $D$  is recursive.

So it suffices to prove the claim (S), which we do by induction on the sight  $S$ . If  $S = \text{NIL}$  and  $S$  is  $(\langle i, x \rangle, O_m^\alpha, \{\chi_D(n)\})$ -dedicated, then  $i = 0$  and  $x = \chi_D(n)$ ; and  $f\langle i, x \rangle = x = \chi_D(n)$ .

Suppose  $S = (A, \sigma)$  with  $A \in O_m^\alpha$ . Then  $\langle i, x \rangle = \langle 1, \langle n, e \rangle \rangle$ ,  $ea$  is defined for all  $a \in A$ , and  $\sigma(a)$  is  $(ea, O_m^\alpha, \{\chi_D(n)\})$ -dedicated. By induction hypothesis, for each  $a \in A$  we have  $f(ea) = \chi_D(n)$ . There are at least  $m + 1$  elements in  $A$  since  $2m < \alpha$ . So the search in part (ii) of the definition of the index  $f$  succeeds. And because every subset of  $\alpha$  of cardinality  $m + 1$  intersects  $A$  ( $A \in O_m^\alpha$ ), we have  $f\langle i, x \rangle = \chi_D(n)$ .

This proves the claim and finishes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

For our next array of results, we need some more definitions about sights.

**Definition 5.10.**

- (i) Given a sight  $S$ , a sector of  $S$  is a sight  $T$  such that:

(a) for some subset  $A$  of the set of leaves of  $\text{Tr}(S)$ ,

$$\text{Tr}(T) = \{s \in \text{Tr}(S) \mid s \text{ is an initial segment of some } t \in A\}$$

(b)  $s$  is a good leaf of  $T$  if and only if  $s$  is a good leaf of  $S$ .

(ii) We call a sight  $S$  *finitary* ( $n$ -ary, respectively) if  $\text{Tr}(S)$  is a finitely branching ( $n$ -ary branching) tree.

(iii) If  $z$  is  $r$ -defined on a sight  $S$  (see 4.15), we write  $z[S]$  for the set

$$\{y \mid \text{for some } s \in \text{Tr}(S), F(z)s = \langle 0, y \rangle\}$$

where  $F$  is the function from 4.9. So if  $S$  is  $(z, \theta, p)$ -dedicated, we have  $z[S] \subseteq p$ .

We are now going to have a closer look at Pitts' local operator: the operator induced by  $\{\{m \mid m \geq n\} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  given in 3.3. It is easy to see that this family of subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  is, in  $(\mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}), \leq)$ , isomorphic to the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of cofinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Proposition 5.11.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \alpha < \omega$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $O_m^\alpha$  are incomparable w.r.t. the order  $\leq_L$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{F} \not\leq_L O_1^\omega$ .*

Recall that for  $\alpha = \omega$  we have  $O_m^\omega \cong_L O_1^\omega \leq_L \mathcal{F}$  by 5.2 and 5.5.

**Proof.** Suppose  $\mathcal{F} \leq_L O_m^\alpha$  for  $1 < 2m < \alpha \leq \omega$ . Choose  $z$  such that for every cofinite  $X$  there is a  $(z, O_m^\alpha, X)$ -dedicated sight. Pick such a sight for  $X = \mathbb{N}$ , say  $S$ . Since every element of  $O_m^\alpha$  has at least  $m + 1$  elements,  $S$  has an  $(m + 1)$ -ary sector  $S'$ . Then  $S'$  is  $(z, \{\text{the } m + 1\text{-tons } \subset \alpha\}, \mathbb{N})$ -dedicated, and  $S'$  is finite by König's Lemma, so  $z[S']$  is finite.

Now choose a  $(z, O_m^\alpha, \mathbb{N} - z[S'])$ -dedicated sight  $T$ . Since:

- the sight  $S'$  is on  $\{\text{the } m + 1\text{-tons } \subset \alpha\}$ ,
- the sight  $T$  is on  $O_m^\alpha$ ,
- $\{\text{the } m + 1\text{-tons } \subset \alpha\}$  and  $O_m^\alpha$  have the joint intersection property

by 4.13 there is a coded sequence  $d$  which is an element of  $\text{Tr}(S') \cap \text{Tr}(T)$  and a good leaf of one of them; but since  $z$  is  $r$ -defined on both  $S'$  and  $T$ , by 4.16  $d$  is a good leaf of both of them. But now we get a contradiction:  $F(z)d \in z[S'] \cap z[T] \subseteq z[S'] \cap (\mathbb{N} - z[S'])$ .

For the converse inequality (in the case  $\alpha < \omega$ ) we simply note that  $\bigcap O_m^\alpha = \emptyset$  and that  $\mathcal{F}$  has the  $|O_m^\alpha|$ -intersection property. So  $O_m^\alpha \not\leq_L \mathcal{F}$  by 4.17.  $\square$

We now turn to joins in  $(M^*, \leq)$  and  $(M^*, \leq_L)$ . Joins in  $(M^*, \leq)$  are easy and follow from the discussion after 2.2 and Theorem 2.4: given  $\theta, \zeta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ , the join  $\theta \vee \zeta$  can be given as the map which sends  $2n$  to  $\theta(n)$  and  $2n + 1$  to  $\zeta(n)$ . Of course, the map  $L$ , being a left adjoint, preserves joins. However, for  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}^*(\mathbb{N})$  there is a simpler description of their join w.r.t.  $\leq_L$ , which also makes clear that the join is a basic local operator.

We shall write  $\vee_L$  for the join w.r.t.  $\leq_L$ . Define

$$\mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{B} = \{A \wedge B \mid A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}\}$$

**Proposition 5.12.** *For  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}^*(\mathbb{N})$ , the join  $\mathcal{A} \vee_L \mathcal{B}$  is given by  $\mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{B}$ .*

**Proof.** It is easy that  $\mathcal{A} \leq \mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{B}$  hence also  $\leq_L$ ; and, of course, the same for  $\mathcal{B}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \leq_L f$  so  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \leq L(f)$  we have  $a \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}} L(f)(A)$ ,  $b \in \bigcap_{B \in \mathcal{B}} L(f)(B)$  which, using that  $L(f)$  is a local operator, gives an element of

$$\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} L(f)(A \wedge B)$$

which means that  $\mathcal{A} \odot \mathcal{B} \leq L(f)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.13.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k \in \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}^*(\mathbb{N})$  such that each  $\mathcal{A}_i$  has the  $n_i$ -intersection property. Then  $\mathcal{A}_1 \odot \dots \odot \mathcal{A}_k$  has the  $m$ -intersection property if and only if  $m \leq \min\{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$ .*

**Proof.** In one direction, use induction on  $k$ ; in the other, observe that if some  $\mathcal{A}_i$  does not have the  $m$ -intersection property, then  $\mathcal{A}_1 \odot \dots \odot \mathcal{A}_k$  cannot have it.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.14.** *Let  $1 < 2m < \alpha \leq \omega$ . Then  $O_m^\alpha \vee_L \mathcal{F} <_L \neg\neg$ .*

**Proof.** It is left to the reader that  $O_m^\alpha \odot \mathcal{F} \leq \neg\neg$ . To prove that  $\neg\neg \not\leq_L O_m^\alpha \odot \mathcal{F}$ , observe that  $\neg\neg = L(\{\{0\}, \{1\}\})$  and that  $O_m^\alpha \odot \mathcal{F}$  has, by 5.13 the 2-intersection property; so 4.17 can be applied.  $\square$



**Proposition 5.15.** *Let  $1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $(\bigvee_{1 \leq m \leq k})_L O_m^{2m+1} <_L \neg\neg$ .*

**Proof.** By 5.13,  $\bigodot_{1 \leq m \leq k} O_m^{2m+1}$  has the 2-intersection property, so again by 4.17 we have  $\neg\neg \not\leq_L \bigodot_{1 \leq m \leq k} O_m^{2m+1}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.16.** *Let  $1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $(\bigvee_{1 \leq m \leq k})_L \not\leq \mathcal{F}$ .*

**Proof.**  $O_1^3$  does not have the 3-intersection property. Apply 5.13 and 4.17.  $\square$

**Open problem.** One might be able to mimic (the proof of) 5.11 to show that

$$\mathcal{F} \not\leq_L \bigodot_{1 \leq m \leq k} O_m^{2m+1}$$

We have not been able to carry this out, however.

We conclude with a theorem saying that Pitts' local operator  $L(\mathcal{F})$  forces every arithmetically definable set of numbers to be decidable. This implies that the subtopos of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  corresponding to this local operator, although not a Boolean topos, nevertheless satisfies true arithmetic, as will be proved in 6.4. First a lemma:

**Lemma 5.17.** *Let  $j$  be a local operator. Then for every recursive function  $F$ , acting on coded sequences, we have a partial recursive function  $G$  (obtained uniformly in  $F$ ) such that for each  $n$ , each coded sequence  $\sigma = \langle \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{n-1} \rangle$  and each tuple  $\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle$  such that  $a_i \in j(\{\sigma_i\})$  for each  $i$ , we have*

$$G(\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle) \in j(\{F(\sigma)\})$$

**Proof.** First we define a partial recursive function  $H$  such that for  $a_0 \in j(\{\sigma_0\}), \dots, a_{n-1} \in j(\{\sigma_{n-1}\})$  we have  $H(\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle) \in j(\{\sigma\})$ . Since  $F : \{\sigma\} \rightarrow \{F(\sigma)\}$  we have by monotony of  $j$  an element of  $\bigcap_{\sigma} [j(\{\sigma\}) \rightarrow j(\{F(\sigma)\})]$  so if we compose this with  $H$  we have our desired function  $G$ .

Since  $j$  is a local operator we have elements:

$$\begin{aligned} c &\in j(\{\langle \rangle\}) \\ \beta &\in \bigcap_{p,q} [j(p) \wedge j(q) \rightarrow j(p \wedge q)] \\ \gamma &\in \bigcap_{\sigma,a} [j(\{\sigma\} \wedge \{a\}) \rightarrow j(\{\sigma * \langle a \rangle\})] \end{aligned}$$

Define  $H$  by recursion on  $n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H(\langle \rangle) &= c \\ H(\langle a_0, \dots, a_n \rangle) &= \gamma(\beta(H(\langle a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \rangle), a_n)) \end{aligned}$$

The trivial verification is left to the reader.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.18.** *Pitts' local operator, the local operator from 3.3, forces every arithmetical set of natural numbers to be decidable.*

**Proof.** Let  $\chi_D$  denote the characteristic function of a set  $D$ ; to be specific let  $\chi_D(n) = 0$  if  $n \in D$ , and 1 otherwise. We write  $\uparrow n$  for  $\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \geq n\}$ .

Let  $g$  be the function which sends  $p \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  to  $\bigcup_n [(\uparrow n) \rightarrow p]$ , so Pitts' local operator is  $L(g)$ . Recall that  $L(g)$  forces a set  $D$  to be decidable if and only if there is a total recursive function which sends each  $n$  to an element of  $L(g)(\{\chi_D(n)\})$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the class of sets forced by  $L(g)$  to be decidable; then  $\mathcal{A}$  contains the recursive sets and is closed under complements, so it suffices to see that  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under existential quantification: if  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  then also  $\exists A \in \mathcal{A}$ , where

$$\exists A = \{x \mid \exists n (\langle x, n \rangle \in A)\}$$

Let  $F$  be the function which sends a sequence  $\sigma = \langle \sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{n-1} \rangle$  to 0 if at least for one  $i$ ,  $\sigma_i = 0$ , and to 1 otherwise. Let  $G$  be the partial recursive function obtained by Lemma 5.17, with  $L(g)$  for  $j$ .

Assuming  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  let  $F_A \in \bigcap_n [L(g)(\{\chi_A(n)\})]$ . For  $x$  and  $n$  consider the sequence

$$\langle F_A(\langle x, 0 \rangle), \dots, F_A(\langle x, n \rangle) \rangle$$



We have  $F_A(\langle x, i \rangle) \in L(g)(\{\chi_A(\langle x, i \rangle)\})$ . By using  $G$  we construct a total recursive function  $H$  such that for all  $x, n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H(x)n \in L(g)(\{0\}) & \text{ if for some } m \leq n, \langle x, m \rangle \in A \\ H(x)n \in L(g)(\{1\}) & \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

We see that if for some  $n, \langle x, n \rangle \in A$ , then  $H(x)k \in L(g)(\{0\})$  for all sufficiently large  $k$ ; if there is no  $n$  with  $\langle x, n \rangle \in A$  then  $H(x)k \in L(g)(\{1\})$  always. We conclude that

$$H(x) \in \bigcup_m [(\uparrow m) \rightarrow L(g)(\{\chi_{\exists A}(x)\})]$$

in other words,  $H(x) \in g(L(g)(\{\chi_{\exists A}(x)\}))$ .

From the proof of 2.2 we know that there is an element

$$b \in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} [g(L(g)(p)) \rightarrow L(g)(p)]$$

Composing with  $H(x)$  we get an element

$$\lambda x. b(H(x)) \in \bigcap_x [\{x\} \rightarrow L(g)(\{\chi_{\exists A}(x)\})]$$

which was what we had to find.  $\square$

**Remark, added in print.** In [22], it is shown that the sets forced to be decidable by Pitts' local operator, coincide with the hyperarithmetical  $(\Delta_1^1)$  sets.

## 6. $\theta$ -Realizability

In this section we give a concrete presentation of a truth definition for first-order arithmetic in the subtopos of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  determined by the local operator  $L(G_\theta)$ , where  $\theta : B \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ . For background on the theory of triposes, the reader is referred to [21].

In general, if  $R_X : P(X) \rightarrow P(X)$  is a local operator on a tripos  $P$ , the subtripos corresponding to  $R$  can be presented as follows: the underlying set of the fibre over a set  $X$  is just  $P(X)$ , and the order is given by the relation  $\leq_R$  where  $\phi \leq_R \psi$  if and only if  $\phi \leq R(\psi)$  in the tripos  $P$ . Denoting this tripos by  $(P, \leq_R)$ , the inclusion into  $(P, \leq)$  is given by the map  $R$ ; its left adjoint is the identity function. This last map preserves  $\wedge, \vee$  and  $\exists$ ; if we denote implication and universal quantification in the subtripos by  $\Rightarrow'$  and  $\forall'$  respectively (and those in the original tripos by  $\Rightarrow, \forall$ ), the relation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \Rightarrow' \psi & \cong \phi \Rightarrow R(\psi) \\ \forall' x \phi & \cong \forall x R(\phi) \end{aligned}$$

We can now give the truth definition in the form of a notion of realizability.

Recall from Definition 4.12 the notion 'sight  $S$  is on  $\theta$ '; from Definition 4.15 the notion ' $r$ -defined', and from 5.10 the notation  $z[S]$ .

**Definition 6.1** ( $\theta$ -realizability). Define a relation between numbers and sentences of arithmetic, pronounced ' $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi$ ', as follows, by induction on  $\phi$ :

- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $t = s$  if and only if the equation  $t = s$  is true;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi \wedge \psi$  if and only if  $n = \langle a, b \rangle$  and  $a$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi$  and  $b$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\psi$ ;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi \vee \psi$  if and only if either  $n = \langle 0, m \rangle$  and  $m$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi$ , or  $n = \langle 1, m \rangle$  and  $m$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\psi$ ;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi \rightarrow \psi$  if and only if for every  $m$  such that  $m$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi$ ,  $nm$  is defined and there is a sight  $S$  on  $\theta$  such that  $nm$  is  $r$ -defined on  $S$  and for every  $w \in (nm)[S]$ ,  $w$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\psi$ ;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\neg \phi$  if and only if no number  $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi$ ;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\exists x \phi(x)$  if and only if  $n = \langle a, b \rangle$  and  $b$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi(a)$ ;
- $n$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\forall x \phi(x)$  if and only if for all  $m$ ,  $nm$  is defined and there is a sight  $S$  on  $\theta$  such that  $nm$  is  $r$ -defined on  $S$  and for every  $w \in (nm)[S]$ ,  $w$   $\theta$ -realizes  $\phi(m)$ .

**Proposition 6.2.** Let  $\theta$  be such that the local operator  $L(G_\theta)$  is nontrivial. Then a sentence of first-order arithmetic is true in the subtopos of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  determined by  $L(G_\theta)$ , if and only if it has a  $\theta$ -realizer.

**Remark 6.3.** The nontriviality of  $L(G_\theta)$  is equivalent to the equality  $L(G_\theta)(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ ; this is why the clause for negation in Definition 6.1 is so much simpler than the one for implication.

**Theorem 6.4.** Let  $j$  be a local operator in  $\mathcal{E}ff$  such that  $j \leq \neg\neg$  and  $j$  forces every arithmetically definable subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  to be decidable. Then the subtopos  $\mathcal{E}ff_j$  of  $\mathcal{E}ff$  determined by  $j$  satisfies true arithmetic.

**Proof.** Truth of arithmetic in  $\mathcal{E}ff_j$  is given by a realizability as in Definition 6.1, which we call  $j$ -realizability in this proof. We shall not employ sights and simplify the clauses for  $\rightarrow$  and  $\forall$  to:

- $n$   $j$ -realizes  $\phi \rightarrow \psi$  if and only if for every  $m$  such that  $m$   $j$ -realizes  $\phi$ ,  $nm$  is defined and  $nm$  is an element of the set  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \psi\})$ ,
- $n$   $j$ -realizes  $\forall x\phi(x)$  if and only if for all  $m$ ,  $nm$  is defined and is an element of the set  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(m)\})$ .

Since  $j \leq \neg\neg$  we have  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  and therefore  $n$   $j$ -realizes  $\neg\phi$  if and only if no number  $j$ -realizes  $\phi$ ; and  $n$   $j$ -realizes  $\neg\neg\phi$  if and only if some number  $j$ -realizes  $\phi$ . As a further simplification, we modify the definition so that for a string of universal quantifiers we have:  $n$   $j$ -realizes  $\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n \phi$  if and only if for all  $k_1, \dots, k_n$ ,  $nk_1 \dots k_n$  (which we shall abbreviate as  $n\vec{k}$ ) is defined and an element of  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)\})$ .

Since  $j$  is a local operator we can fix numbers  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in \bigcap_{p, q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} (p \rightarrow q) \rightarrow (jp \rightarrow jq) \\ \beta &\in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} p \rightarrow jp \\ \gamma &\in \bigcap_{p \subseteq \mathbb{N}} jjp \rightarrow jp \\ \delta &\in \bigcap_{p, q \subseteq \mathbb{N}} jp \wedge jq \rightarrow j(p \wedge q) \end{aligned}$$

We shall now prove by simultaneous induction on the structure of an arithmetical formula  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  the following statements:

- (i) (a) For all  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ : if there is a  $j$ -realizer for  $\phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  then  $\phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  is true in the standard model  $\mathbb{N}$  in set;
- (b) There is a partial recursive function  $s_\phi$  of  $n$  arguments, such that for all  $k_1, \dots, k_n$ : if  $\phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  is true in  $\mathbb{N}$  then  $s_\phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)$  is defined and an element of  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(k_1, \dots, k_n)\})$ .
- (ii) There is a  $j$ -realizer for  $\forall \vec{x}(\phi(\vec{x}) \vee \neg\phi(\vec{x}))$ .

For atomic  $\phi$ , (i)(a) holds by definition of  $j$ -realizability; for (i)(b), let  $s_\phi$  be  $\lambda x_1 \dots \lambda x_n. \beta(0)$ . The statement is obvious. Statement (ii) is clear since in any topos, basic equations on the NNO are decidable.

Induction step (i)(a) for  $\rightarrow$ : suppose  $m$   $j$ -realizes  $\phi(\vec{k}) \rightarrow \psi(\vec{k})$  and  $\phi(\vec{k})$  is true in  $\mathbb{N}$ . By induction hypothesis (i)(b) for  $\phi$ ,  $s_\phi(\vec{k})$  is defined and in  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(\vec{k})\})$ . Then

$$\alpha m(s_\phi(\vec{k})) \in jj(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \psi(\vec{k})\})$$

so since  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  we see that there exists a  $j$ -realizer for  $\psi(\vec{k})$ ; hence by induction hypothesis (i)(a) for  $\psi$ ,  $\psi(\vec{k})$  is true.

Induction step (i)(b) for  $\rightarrow$ : define  $s_{\phi \rightarrow \psi}$  by

$$s_{\phi \rightarrow \psi}(\vec{k}) = \beta(\lambda m. s_\psi(\vec{k}))$$

The proof that this works is left to the reader.

Induction step (ii) for  $\rightarrow$  follows by logic from the induction hypotheses for  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ .

Induction step (i)(a) for  $\wedge$ : follows readily from the induction hypotheses. For (i)(b), define

$$s_{\phi \wedge \psi}(\vec{k}) = \delta(\langle s_\phi(\vec{k}), s_\psi(\vec{k}) \rangle)$$

Again, induction step (ii) follows by logic.

Induction step for  $\vee$ : (i)(a) follows easily from the induction hypotheses. For (i)(b), given  $\phi(\vec{k}) \vee \psi(\vec{k})$  let, by induction hypothesis (ii) for  $\phi$ ,  $m$  be a  $j$ -realizer of  $\forall \vec{x}(\phi(\vec{x}) \vee \neg\phi(\vec{x}))$ , so

$$m\vec{k} \in j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(\vec{k}) \vee \neg\phi(\vec{k})\})$$

Let  $a$  be such that for all  $\vec{k}, y$ :

$$a\vec{k}y \simeq \begin{cases} y & \text{if } (y)_0 = 0 \\ \langle 1, s_\psi(\vec{k}) \rangle & \text{if } (y)_0 \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Define  $s_{\phi \vee \psi}(\vec{k}) = \alpha(\vec{a}\vec{k})(m\vec{k})$ . This satisfies the induction step: assume  $\phi(\vec{k}) \vee \psi(\vec{k})$  is true. Then whenever  $y$   $j$ -realizes  $\phi(\vec{k}) \vee \neg\phi(\vec{k})$ , we have by induction hypothesis on  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , that  $\vec{a}\vec{k}y$   $j$ -realizes  $\phi(\vec{k}) \vee \psi(\vec{k})$ . Therefore  $\alpha(\vec{a}\vec{k})(m\vec{k})$  is an element of  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(\vec{k}) \vee \psi(\vec{k})\})$ , as desired.

Induction step (ii) for  $\vee$  again follows by logic.

Induction step for  $\forall$ : (i)(a) if  $m$   $j$ -realizes  $\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)$  then for all  $n$ ,  $mn$  is defined and an element of  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \phi(\vec{k}, n)\})$ ; since  $j(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ , by the induction hypothesis for  $\phi$  it follows that for all  $n$ ,  $\phi(\vec{k}, n)$  is true; hence  $\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)$  is true.

For (i)(b) define  $s_{\forall x\phi}(\vec{k}) = \beta(\lambda y.s_{\phi}(\vec{k}, y))$ . Verification is easy.

For (ii) let  $A$  be the arithmetical set

$$\{\vec{k} \mid \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{N}, \phi(\vec{k}, x) \text{ is true}\}$$

By assumption on  $j$ ,  $j$  forces this set to be decidable; let  $a$  be such that for all  $\vec{k}$ ,  $\vec{a}\vec{k} \in j(\{0\})$  if  $\vec{k} \in A$ , and  $\vec{a}\vec{k} \in j(\{1\})$  otherwise. Let  $b$  be such that for all  $\vec{k}$ ,  $v$ :

$$b\vec{k}v \simeq \begin{cases} \alpha(\lambda u.\langle 0, u \rangle)(s_{\forall x\phi}(\vec{k})) & \text{if } v = 0 \\ \alpha(\lambda u.\langle 1, u \rangle)(\beta(0)) & \text{if } v \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Then if  $v = 0$  and  $\vec{k} \in A$ , it follows by step (i)(b) just proved, that

$$b\vec{k}v \in j(\{\langle 0, s \rangle \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)\})$$

and if  $v = 1$  and  $\vec{k} \notin A$  then by step (i)(a) just proved it follows that

$$b\vec{k}v \in j(\{\langle 1, s \rangle \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \neg\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)\})$$

So when  $v \in \{\chi_A(\vec{k})\}$  (where  $\chi_A$  is the characteristic function of  $A$ ) then

$$b\vec{k}v \in j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x) \vee \neg\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)\})$$

Therefore, since  $\vec{a}\vec{k} \in j(\{\chi_A(\vec{k})\})$  we have

$$\alpha(b\vec{k})(\vec{a}\vec{k}) \in jj(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x) \vee \neg\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)\})$$

so

$$\gamma(\alpha(b\vec{k})(\vec{a}\vec{k})) \in j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x) \vee \neg\forall x\phi(\vec{k}, x)\})$$

and  $\lambda\vec{k}.\gamma(\alpha(b\vec{k})(\vec{a}\vec{k}))$  is thus a  $j$ -realizer for  $\forall\vec{y}(\forall x\phi(\vec{y}, x) \vee \neg\forall x\phi(\vec{y}, x))$ .

Induction step for  $\exists$ : (i)(a) follows at once from the induction hypothesis. We prove (i)(b) and (ii) simultaneously. Clearly, from the induction hypotheses on  $\phi$  it follows that  $\exists x\phi(\vec{k}, x)$  is true if and only if it has a  $j$ -realizer. So the set  $A = \{\vec{k} \mid \exists x\phi(\vec{k}, x) \text{ has a } j\text{-realizer}\} = \{\vec{k} \mid \exists x\phi(\vec{k}, x) \text{ is true}\}$  is arithmetical. By hypothesis on  $j$ , its characteristic function is forced to be total by  $j$ . Also, by induction hypothesis, the characteristic function of the set  $\{\vec{k}, v \mid \phi(\vec{k}, v) \text{ has a } j\text{-realizer}\}$  is forced to be total by  $j$ . Since by Hyland's Theorem 3.4 the set of functions which are forced to be total by  $j$  is closed under 'recursive in', the function

$$f(\vec{k}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if for no } v, \phi(\vec{k}, v) \text{ has a } j\text{-realizer} \\ m + 1 & \text{if } m \text{ is least such that } \phi(\vec{k}, m) \text{ has a } j\text{-realizer} \end{cases}$$

is forced to be total by  $j$ ; let  $a$  be such that for all  $\vec{k}$ ,  $\vec{a}\vec{k} \in j(\{f(\vec{k})\})$ .

If  $\exists v\phi(\vec{k}, v)$  is true hence  $f(\vec{k}) = m + 1$  for some  $m$ , then by induction hypothesis (i)(b) on  $\phi$ ,  $\delta((\beta(m), s_{\phi}(\vec{k}, m)))$  is an element of  $j(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \exists v\phi(\vec{k}, v)\})$ . It follows that

$$\alpha(\lambda n.\delta((\beta(n-1), s_{\phi}(\vec{k}, n-1))))(\vec{a}\vec{k})$$

is an element of  $jj(\{s \mid s \text{ } j\text{-realizes } \exists v\phi(\vec{k}, v)\})$ ; so if we define  $s_{\exists v\phi}(\vec{k})$  by

$$\gamma[\alpha(\lambda n.\delta((\beta(n-1), s_{\phi}(\vec{k}, n-1))))(\vec{a}\vec{k})]$$

then  $s_{\exists v\phi}$  has the required property.

The proof that  $\forall\vec{y}(\exists x\phi(\vec{y}, x) \vee \neg\exists x\phi(\vec{y}, x))$  has a  $j$ -realizer, is now straightforward (again, one uses the function  $f$ ), and left to the reader.  $\square$

## References

- [1] V. Brattka, G. Gherardi, Weihrauch degrees, omniscience principles and weak computability, *J. Symbolic Logic* 76 (1) (2011) 143–176.
- [2] J.M.E. Hyland, The effective topos, in: A.S. Troelstra, D. Van Dalen (Eds.), *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1982, pp. 165–216.
- [3] H. Ishihara, An omniscience principle, the König lemma and the Hahn–Banach theorem, *MLQ Math. Log. Q.* 36 (3) (1990) 237–240.
- [4] P.T. Johnstone, *Sketches of an Elephant* (2 vols.), Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 43, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [5] J. Lambek, P.J. Scott, *Introduction to Higher Order Categorical Logic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [6] S. Mac Lane, I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic*, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [7] Charles McCarty, Variations on a thesis: intuitionism and computability, *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.* 28 (4) (1987) 536–580.
- [8] Yu.T. Medvedev, Degrees of difficulty of the mass problems, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR* 140 (4) (1955) 501–504.
- [9] M. Menni, Closure operators in exact completions, *Theory Appl. Categ.* 8 (21) (2001) 522–540.
- [10] I. Moerdijk, A model for intuitionistic nonstandard arithmetic, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 73 (1995) 37–51.
- [11] I. Moerdijk, E. Palmgren, Minimal models of Heyting arithmetic, *J. Symbolic Logic* 62 (4) (1997) 1448–1460.
- [12] W. Phoa, Relative computability in the effective topos, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 106 (1989) 419–422.
- [13] A.M. Pitts, The theory of triposes, PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1981, available at: <http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~amp12/papers/thet/thet.pdf>.
- [14] Stephen G. Simpson, Mass problems, Slides of invited plenary talk given at Logic Colloquium, Bern 2008, available at: <http://www.math.psu.edu/simpson/talks/asl0807/talk.pdf>.
- [15] A. Sorbi, Some remarks on the structure of the Medvedev lattice, *J. Symbolic Logic* 55 (2) (1990) 831–853.
- [16] S. Terwijn, Constructive logic and the Medvedev lattice, *Notre Dame J. Form. Log.* 47 (1) (2006) 73–82.
- [17] S. Terwijn, The Medvedev lattice of computably closed sets, *Arch. Math. Logic* 45 (2) (2006) 179–190.
- [18] Benno van den Berg, Jaap van Oosten, Arithmetic is categorical, 2011, Note, available at: <http://www.staff.science.uu.nl/~ooste110/realizability/arithcat.pdf>.
- [19] J. van Oosten, Extension of Lifschitz' realizability to higher order arithmetic, and a solution to a problem of F. Richman, *J. Symbolic Logic* 56 (1991) 964–973.
- [20] J. van Oosten, Two remarks on the Lifschitz realizability topos, *J. Symbolic Logic* 61 (1996) 70–79.
- [21] J. van Oosten, *Realizability: An Introduction to its Categorical Side*, Stud. Log., vol. 152, North-Holland, 2008.
- [22] J. van Oosten, Realizability with a local operator of A.M. Pitts, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* (2013), in press, available electronically at: arXiv:1301.0735 [LO].