Under consideration for publication in Math. Struct. in Comp. Science

Krivine's Classical Realizability from a Categorical Perspective

THOMAS STREICHER

Fachbereich Mathematik, Technische Universität Darmstadt,
Schloßgartenstr. 7, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany.
email:streicher@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de

Received 10th November 2010; Revised 5th December 2011

In a sequence of papers (Krivine 2001; Krivine 2003; Krivine 2009) J.-L. Krivine has introduced his notion of *Classical Realizability* for classical second order logic and Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory. Moreover, in more recent work (Krivine 2008) he has considered forcing constructions on top of it with the ultimate aim of providing a realizability interpretation for the axiom of choice.
The aim of this paper is to show how Krivine's classical realizability can be understood as an instance of the categorical approach to realizability as started by Martin Hyland in (Hyland 1982) and described in detail in (van Oosten 2008). Moreover, we will give an intuitive explanation of the iteration of realizability as can be found in (Krivine 2008).

1. Introduction

It is more or less straightforward how to interpret intuitionistic second order logic in a realizability model based on closed λ-terms. This was studied in detail by J.-L. Krivine and M. Parigot in the late 1980s, see (Krivine & Parigot 1990; Krivine 1990a). Around 1990 due to the seminal paper (Griffin 1990) it got clear to many researchers how to give a proof term assignment for classical logic via a λ-calculus with control operators which serve as realizers for classical principles like *reductio ad absurdum* or *Peirce's law*, see e.g. (Streicher & Reus 1998). Krivine was one of the first taking up Griffin's suggestion in his work on so-called "storage operators" (Krivine 1990b). Then beginning with his address (Krivine 2001) to the Logic Colloquium 2000 in Paris in a sequence of papers (Krivine 2003; Krivine 2009) Krivine developed his theory of *Classical Realizability* for extensions of classical second order logic and Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory. In more recent yet unpublished work (Krivine 2008) Krivine has embarked on the long term project of providing a realizability interpretation for full ZFC, i.e. Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the full Axiom of Choice. This is to be achieved by considering forcing interpretations inside classical realizability models. In (Krivine 2008) he has shown how to contract this two step model construction into one single step.

Reading through Krivine's papers introducing classical realizability one gets the impression that his account is highly original (which it definitely is!) and does not see at all how it may fit into the structural semantic approach to realizability as initiated by M. Hyland in (Hyland 1982) and described in detail in the monograph (van Oosten 2008). In particular, it is most puzzling that Krivine considers his classical realizability as "generalised forcing" because toposes of the form $\mathsf{Sh}(B)$ for a complete boolean algebra B are cocomplete whereas cocomplete realizability toposes are necessarily equivalent to **Set**. In order to clear up this confusion we introduce a notion of "abstract Krivine structure" (aks) and show how to construct a classical realizability model for each such aks. Moreover, we characterise those aks's which correspond to forcing over meet semilattices with a distinguished set of truth values. Next we show how any aks $\mathbb{A}$ gives rise to an *order combinatory algebra* (oca) with a filter of distinguished truth values which induces a tripos (see (van Oosten 2008; Hofstra 2006) for explanation of these notions) which also gives rise to a model of ZF.

A pleasant aspect of triposes is that they give rise to a conceptually clear account of iteration of model constructions which is also explained in (van Oosten 2008). This framework we use for explaining the iterated model construction of (Krivine 2008).

2. A Recap of Krivine's Classical Realizability

In classical realizability as described e.g. in (Krivine 2009) one considers as realizers certain closed terms in an extension of the untyped λ-calculus. For realizing classical logic one needs at least the control operator cc.

Possibly open terms of this kind are given by the following grammar

$$t ::= x \mid \lambda x.t \mid ts \mid \mathsf{cc}\, t \mid \mathsf{k}_\pi$$

where π ranges over lists or stacks (fr. *pile*) of terms and k is a constant turning stacks π into terms k_π. We write Λ for the set of closed terms and Π for the set of stacks of closed terms. A *process* is a pair $t \star \pi$ of a term and a stack. We write $\Lambda \star \Pi$ for the set of processes. On processes the relation $\succ$ of *head reduction* is defined inductively as follows

(pop)	$\lambda x.t \star s.\pi$	$\succ$	$t[s/x] \star \pi$
(push)	$ts \star \pi$	$\succ$	$t \star s.\pi$
(store)	$\mathsf{cc}\, t \star \pi$	$\succ$	$t \star \mathsf{k}_\pi.\pi$
(restore)	$\mathsf{k}_\pi \star t.\pi'$	$\succ$	$t \star \pi$

We write $\succeq$ for the reflexive transitive closure of $\succ$. The first two clauses allow one to compute weak head normal forms of λ-terms and constitute the core of Krivine's abstract machine (see (Streicher & Reus 1998) for background information). The remaining rules tell how to evaluate calls of the control operator cc and terms of the form k_π. Obviously cc is the control operator "call with current continuation" since in order to evaluate $\mathsf{cc}\, t$ one applies t to k_π (the current continuation turned into a term via k) keeping the continuation π. When applying k_π to an argument t in context π' one evaluates t w.r.t. the restored context π throwing away the current context π'. Motivation and more explanations can be found in (Streicher & Reus 1998) which, however, is based on the alternative control operator $\mathcal{C}$ whose meaning is given by the rule

$$\mathcal{C}\, t \succ tt \star \mathsf{k}_\pi$$

where t is applied to the "current continuation" k_π but now in the empty context instead of the current context π.

All this is not a purely formal game since the above language can be interpreted in the recursively defined domain

$$D \cong \Sigma^{\mathsf{List}(D)} \cong \prod_{n\in\omega} \Sigma^{D^n}$$

where Σ is the two point lattice $\bot \sqsubset \top$. One can show that $D \cong \Sigma \times D^D$, i.e. D^D is a retract of D. In analogy[†] with (Streicher & Reus 1998) the semantic clauses are

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\![\lambda x.t]\!]_\rho \langle\rangle = \top \\
&[\![\lambda x.t]\!]_\rho \langle d, k\rangle = [\![t]\!]_\rho [d/x] k \\
&[\![ts]\!]_\rho k = [\![t]\!]_\rho \langle [\![s]\!]_\rho, k\rangle \\
&[\![\mathsf{cc}\, t]\!]_\rho k = [\![t]\!]_\rho \langle \mathsf{ret}(k), k\rangle \\
&[\![\mathsf{k}_\pi]\!]_\rho = \mathsf{ret}([\![\pi]\!]_\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{ret}(k)\langle\rangle = \top \\
&\mathsf{ret}(k)\langle d, k'\rangle = d(k)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\![\langle\rangle]\!]_\rho = \langle\rangle \\
&[\![t.\pi]\!]_\rho = \langle [\![t]\!]_\rho, [\![\pi]\!]_\rho\rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

It is tempting to define a relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp \subseteq D \times \mathsf{List}(D)$ as

$$d \perp\!\!\!\perp k \qquad \text{iff} \qquad d(k) = \top$$

which can be lifted to syntax by putting $t \perp\!\!\!\perp \pi$ iff $[\![t]\!] \perp\!\!\!\perp [\![\pi]\!]$. Thus $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ is a set of processes which is *saturated* in the sense that

$$p \succ q \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \text{implies} \qquad p \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

i.e. is closed under head expansion.[‡]

Saturated sets of processes are an essential ingredient for defining the classical realizability interpretation for second order logic as in (Krivine 2009). For a saturated set $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ and subsets X and Y of Π and Λ, respectively, we define

$$X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \{t \in \Lambda \mid \forall \pi \in X.\, t \perp\!\!\!\perp \pi\} \qquad Y^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \{\pi \in \Pi \mid \forall t \in Y.\, t \perp\!\!\!\perp \pi\}$$

[†] In (Streicher & Reus 1998) there was employed the recursively defined domain $D \cong \Sigma^{D^\omega}$ which is isomorphic to Σ_∞ and thus validates $D \cong D^D$.

[‡] Actually the relation $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ under consideration is also closed under head reduction and even semantic equality.

and call a set S (of terms or stacks) *biorthogonally closed* iff $S^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} = S$. We write $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ for the collections of biorthogonally closed sets of terms and stacks, respectively. In realizability models induced by $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ propositions A will be interpreted as $|A| \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda)$. However, it turns out as convenient to represent $|A|$ via a set $||A||$ of stacks with $|A| = ||A||^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ which, however, will in general be different from $|A|^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$.

For a saturated set $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ of processes second order logic over a (typically countable) set M of individuals is interpreted as follows: n-ary predicate variables range over functions $M^n \to \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$ and formulas A are interpreted as $||A||_\rho \subseteq \Pi$ according to the clauses

$$||X(t_1,\dots,t_n)||_\rho = \rho(X)([\![t_1]\!]_\rho,\dots,[\![t_1]\!]_\rho)$$

$$||A{\to}B||_\rho = |A|_\rho.||B||_\rho$$

$$||\forall x A(x)|| = \bigcup_{a\in M} ||A||_{\rho[a/x]}$$

$$||\forall X A[X]||_\rho = \bigcup_{R\in\mathcal{P}(\Pi)^{M^n}} ||A||_{\rho[R/X]}$$

where ρ is a valuation sending individual variables to elements of M and n-ary predicate variables to elements of $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)^{M^n}$ and $|A|_\rho = ||A||^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}_\rho$. If A is closed we write simply $|A|$ and $||A||$ instead of $|A|_\rho$ and $||A||_\rho$, respectively, since the interpretation of A does not depend on ρ.

Notice that we have

$$|\forall x A| = \bigcap_{a\in M} \big|A[a/x]\big|$$

$$|\forall X A| = \bigcap_{R\in\mathcal{P}(\Pi)^{M^n}} \big|A[R/X]\big|$$

since we have

$$\Big(\bigcup_{i\in I} X_i\Big)^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \bigcap_{i\in I} X_i^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$$

for arbitrary families $X : I \to \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$.

In general $|A{\to}B|$ is a **proper** subset of

$$|A|{\to}|B| = \{t{\in}\Lambda \mid \forall s{\in}|A|\ ts \in |B|\}$$

since in general

$$ts * \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \not\Rightarrow \quad t * s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

but one easily checks that for every $t \in |A|{\to}|B|$ its η-expansion $\lambda x.tx \in |A{\to}B|$. But, of course, we have $|A{\to}B| = |A|{\to}|B|$ whenever $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ is also *closed under head reduction*, i.e. $\perp\!\!\!\perp \ni p \succ q$ implies $q \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$.

In (Krivine 1990a) one finds a proof term assigment for intuitionistic second order logic which for sake of convenience we recall in in Fig. 1 where $A(F(\vec{x}))$ stands for the formula obtained from $A(X)$ by replacing every subformula of the form $X(\vec{t})$ by $F(\vec{t})$.

As proved in e.g. (Krivine 2009) the following soundness result holds: if one can derive $x_1{:}A_1,\dots,x_k{:}A_k \vdash u : B$ and $v_i \in |A_i|$ for $i = 1,\dots,k$ then $u[\vec{v}/\vec{x}] \in |B|$, i.e. proof terms are realizers. But, of course, there may be realizers which do not come from proofs in

Typing Rules for Intuitionistic Second Order Logic

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x{:}A, \Delta \vdash x : A}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x{:}A \vdash u : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.u : A \to B} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash u : A \to B \quad \Gamma \vdash v : A}{\Gamma \vdash uv : B}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash u : A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash u : \forall x A(x)} \ (x \text{ not free in } \Gamma) \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash u : \forall x A(x)}{\Gamma \vdash u : A(t)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash u : A(X)}{\Gamma \vdash u : \forall X A(X)} \ (X \text{ not free in } \Gamma) \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash u : \forall X A(X)}{\Gamma \vdash u : A(F(\vec{x}))}$$

Fig. 1. Typing Rules for Second Order Intuitionistic Logic

intuitionistic second order logic. For example $\lambda x.\mathsf{cc}\,x$ realizes Peirce's law $((A \to B) \to A) \to A$ which can be seen as follows. Suppose $t \in |(A \to B) \to A|$ and $\pi \in ||A||$. We have to show that $\lambda x.\mathsf{cc}\,x \star t.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. Since $\lambda x.\mathsf{cc}\,x \star t.\pi \succ \mathsf{cc}\,t \star \pi \succ t \star \mathsf{k}_\pi.\pi$ it suffices to show that $\mathsf{k}_\pi \in |A \to B|$. Suppose $s \in |A|$ and $\pi' \in ||B||$ then $\mathsf{k}_\pi \star s.\pi' \succ s \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ and thus $\mathsf{k}_\pi \star s.\pi' \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. Thus, in particular, the term $\lambda x.\mathsf{cc}\,x$ realizes $(\neg A \to A) \to A$ where $\neg A \equiv A \to \bot$ with $\bot \equiv \forall X\, X$. Accordingly, the term $\lambda f.(\lambda x.\mathsf{cc}\,x)(\lambda y.fy)$ realizes $\neg\neg A \to A$ since $\lambda y.fy$ realizes $\neg A \to A$ whenever f realizes $\neg A \to \bot$. Thus untyped λ-calculus extended by cc allows one to represent proofs of classical second order logic as terms.

Notice that in case $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ is empty for every proposition A the set $|A|$ is either empty (if $||A||$ is non-empty) or equals Λ (if $||A||$ is empty). Thus, in this case the notion of model coincides with the naive two valued one. However, if $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ is non-empty, i.e. contains an element $t \star \pi$, then $\mathsf{k}_\pi t \in |A|$ for all propositions A since for all $\pi' \in ||A||$ we have $\mathsf{k}_\pi t \star \pi' \succ t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ and thus $\mathsf{k}_\pi t \star \pi' \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. This has been observed in (Krivine 2009) though in *loc.cit.* it has not been discussed explicitly how to overcome the obvious problem that all propositions are realizable by some element of Λ. However, it is implicit in most of Krivine's writings and stated explicitly in (Krivine 2010) that a proposition A has to be considered as true in a model induced by a pole $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ if $t \in |A|$ for some $t \in \Lambda$ not containing the constant k. Such terms are called *quasi-proofs* and we denote the corresponding set by QP. Of course, for ensuring consistency the pole $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ has to be chosen in such a way that for every $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ there is a $\pi \in \Pi$ with $t \star \pi \notin \perp\!\!\!\perp$.

However, for realizing non-logical axioms beyond classical second order arithmetic by quasi-proof one may have to consider extensions by additional constants. For example in (Krivine 2003) in order to realize the axiom of *countable choice* Krivine has added a constant χ^* together with the reduction rule

$$\chi^* \star t.\pi \ \succ \ t \star n_t.\pi$$

where n_t is the Church numeral representation of a Gödel number for t.[§] This is an instance of Krivine's general point of view that new programming concepts should be motivated by their need to realize important non-logical axioms. In (Krivine 2008) for example (one cell) memory has been motivated by the need to realize Cohen forcing.

3. Abstract Krivine Structures

We have seen at the end of the previous section that one cannot work with one single language. For this reason it is necessary to axiomatize the kind of structure needed for performing Krivine's classical realizability interpretation. Such structures have been axiomatized in (Krivine 2008) including a form of λ-abstraction which is technically a bit cumbersome. Instead we here introduce a version based on combinators which we call *abstract Krivine structure* (aks) and which is inspired by the notion of partial combinatory algebra (pca) on which ordinary realizability is based as explained in detail in (van Oosten 2008).

Definition 3.1. (Abstract Krivine Structure)
An **abstract Krivine structure** (aks) is given by

— a set Λ of "terms" together with a binary application operation (written as juxtaposition) and distinguished elements $\mathsf{K}, \mathsf{S}, \mathsf{cc} \in \Lambda$
— a subset QP of Λ which is closed under application and contains the elements K, S and cc as elements; the elements of QP are called "quasi-proofs"
— a set Π of "stacks" together with a push operation (push) from $\Lambda \times \Pi$ to Π (written $t.\pi$) and a unary operation $\mathsf{k} : \Pi \to \Lambda$ (written as k_π)
— a saturated subset $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ of $\Lambda \times \Pi$

where *saturated* means that $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ satisfies the closure conditions

(S1)	$ts \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$
(S2)	$\mathsf{K} \star t.s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$
(S3)	$\mathsf{S} \star t.s.u.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$tu(su) \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$
(S4)	$\mathsf{cc} \star t.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t \star \mathsf{k}_\pi.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$
(S5)	$\mathsf{k}_\pi \star t.\pi' \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$.

A strong abstract Krivine structure (saks) is an aks where (S1) can be strengthened to

(SS1) $ts \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ iff $t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$.

Recall that a combinatory algebra is a set A with a binary application operation (denoted by juxtaposition) and distinguished elements k and s of A satisfying the equations $\mathsf{k}xy = x$ and $\mathsf{s}xyz = xz(yz)$. Notice that an aks is not equationally defined but instead

[§] One might consider the assignment $t \mapsto n_t$ as a kind of quote construct as one finds in LISP. Thus χ^* may be understood as the program $\lambda x.\, x(\mathsf{quote}(x))$.

the axioms (S1-5) state that $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ is "closed under head expansion". In other words the notion of an abstract Krivine structure is free from an equality given in advance. However, on Λ we could define a notion of observational equivalence $t \sim s$ as

$$\forall \pi \in \Pi.\ t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \Leftrightarrow s \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

Later in subsection 5.1 we will show how any aks can be organized into a so-called *order combinatory algebra* (oca). A further difference to combinatory algebras is that there is a distinguished subset of so-called "quasi-proofs". Terms which are not quasi-proofs have just an auxiliary status in the sense that they are needed for formulating the operational semantics of cc via conditions (S4) and (S5). There is always a minimal choice of QP but we have to admit more comprehensive choices of QP since we may want to realize axioms beyond classical second order arithmetic by elements of QP.[¶]

Next we will show how any aks gives rise to a model of classical second order logic in a way analogous to section 2.[‖] Again a proposition A will be interpreted as a subset $||A||$ of Π. The elements of

$$|A| = ||A||^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \{t \in \Lambda \mid \forall \pi \in ||A||.\ t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\}$$

are called "potential" realizers of A. The realizers of A are the elements of $|A| \cap \mathsf{QP}$. The interpretation of formulas is given by the following clauses

$$||R(\vec{t})|| = R(\llbracket \vec{t} \rrbracket)$$

$$||A \to B|| = |A|.||B|| = \{t.\pi \mid t \in |A|, \pi \in ||B||\}$$

$$||\forall x A(x)|| = \bigcup_{a \in M} ||A(a)||$$

$$||\forall X A(X)|| = \bigcup_{R \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi)^{M^n}} ||A(R)||$$

where M is the underlying set of the model and formulas are closed but may contain (constants for) elements of M or $\mathcal{P}(\Pi)^{M^n}$.

One could define propositions more restrictively as

$$\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi) = \{X \in \mathcal{P}(\Pi) \mid X = X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}\}$$

¶ For the domain $D \cong \Sigma^{\mathsf{List}(D)}$ with pole $\perp\!\!\!\perp = \{\langle d, k\rangle \mid d(k) = \top\}$ a natural choice for QP is the unique Scott closed subset F of D with

$$d \in F \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall k \in \mathsf{List}(F).d(k) = \bot$$

which intuitively consists of the "error-free" elements of D which raise an error $\top$ only if the input is not error-free. Uniqueness and existence of F follows from a well-known theorem of A. Pitts on recursively defined predicates on recursive domains. This also extends to other kinds of domains like Girard's coherence spaces or observably sequential algorithms. In the latter case QP is the set of stategies in D which don't contain a $\top$, i.e. are error-free.

‖ Notice that our choice of combinators does not allow one to implement functional abstraction in such a way that β-reduction holds in the sense of weak head reduction. This, however, has been achieved in recent papers by Krivine (Krivine 2010; Krivine 2011) by a different more complicated choice of combinators actually closer to Curry's original choice. Thus, we cannot interpret implication instruction directly via λ-abstraction but rather have to axiomatize it (à la Hilbert) via axiom schemes realized by K and S, respectively. This, however, does not affect validity with which we are mainly concerned in this paper.

and this would not change the meaning of $|A|$ for closed formulas though it would change the meaning of $||A||$. But like in section 2 it turns out as convenient to postpone the biorthogonal closure. Notice that $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ is in 1-1-correspondence with

$$\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda) = \{X \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \mid X = X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}\}$$

via $(-)^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$. Then in case the aks under consideration is strong we have

$$|R(\vec{t})| = R([\![\vec{t}]\!])$$

$$|A{\to}B| = |A|{\to}|B| = \{t \in \Lambda \mid \forall s \in |A|.\ ts \in |B|\}$$

$$|\forall x A(x)| = \bigcap_{a \in M} |A(a)|$$

$$|\forall X A(X)| = \bigcap_{R \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda)^{M^n}} |A(R)|$$

allowing one to redefine the realizability interpretation according to a more traditional pattern.

Again if the aks under consideration is not strong then in general we only have

$$|A{\to}B| \subseteq |A|{\to}|B| = \{t \in \Lambda \mid \forall s \in |A|.\ ts \in |B|\}$$

but elements of $|A|{\to}|B|$ can be uniformly transformed into elements of $|A{\to}B|$ via the combinator $\mathsf{E} = \mathsf{S}(\mathsf{K}\mathsf{I})$ where $\mathsf{I} = \mathsf{SKK}$.

Lemma 3.2. If $t \in |A|{\to}|B|$ then $\mathsf{E}t \in |A{\to}B|$.

Proof. One easily checks that

$$\mathsf{I} \star t.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \ \Leftarrow\ \ t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

and, therefore, we have

$$\mathsf{E}t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \ \Leftarrow\ \ \mathsf{KI}s(ts) \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \ \Leftarrow\ \ \mathsf{I} \star ts.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \ \Leftarrow\ \ ts \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

Then for $s \in |A|$, $\pi \in ||B||$ we have $\mathsf{E}t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ because $ts * \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ since $t \in |A|{\to}|B|$. Thus $\mathsf{E}t \in |A{\to}B|$ as desired. □

Thus $\mathsf{E}t$ is a combinator version of the η-expansion $\lambda x.tx$, i.e. E corresponds to the λ-term $\lambda y.\lambda x.yx$.

4. Cohen Forcing as an Instance of Abstract Krivine Structures

Already in (Krivine 2001) Krivine emphasizes that he considers classical realizability as a generalization of Cohen's forcing. We will make this precise by showing that Cohen forcing is the commutative case of classical realizability. Notice that in case of realizability induced by a partial combinatory algebra $\mathbb{A}$ this does not make sense since if in $\mathbb{A}$ application is commutative and associative we have $x = kxy = kyx = y$ and thus $\mathbb{A}$ is trivial.

Usually a notion of forcing is given by a conditional meet-semilattice, i.e. a poset with a greatest element 1 such that the infimum xy of x and y exists provided they have a lower bound. For our purposes we consider the at first sight more general situation of a meet-semilattice $\mathbb{P}$ together with a downward closed subset $\mathcal{D}$. Such a situation induces an aks as follows.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a meet-semilattice and $\mathcal{D}$ a downward closed subset of $\mathbb{P}$. This induces a saks where $\Lambda = \Pi = \mathbb{P}$, $\mathsf{QP} = \{1\}$, application and the push operation are given by the meet operation of $\mathbb{P}$, the constants are interpreted as 1 and $\perp\!\!\!\perp = \{(p,q) \in \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P} \mid pq \in \mathcal{D}\}$.

Now for such an aks the set $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ of propositions coincides with the set of all subsets of $\mathbb{P}$ of the form $X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \forall q \in X.\ pq \in \mathcal{D}\}$ for some $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}$. Notice that sets of the form $X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ are always downward closed and contain $\mathcal{D}$ as a subset. In case $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is already downward closed $X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ can be computed in the following way familiar from Cohen forcing.

Lemma 4.2. If $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ is downward closed $X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \forall q \leq p\ (q \in X \Rightarrow q \in \mathcal{D})\}$.

Proof. Suppose $p \in X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ and $q \in X$ with $q \leq p$. Then $q = qp \in \mathcal{D}$. For the converse direction suppose $p \in \mathbb{P}$ with $\forall q \leq p\ (q \in X \Rightarrow q \in \mathcal{D})$. Then for $q \in X$ we have $pq \in X$ since X is downward closed and so $pq \in \mathcal{D}$ by assumption on p. □

Moreover, it is an easy exercise to show that

Lemma 4.3. For downward closed $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ we have

$$X \to Y = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \forall q \in X.\ pq \in Y\} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid \forall q \leq p\ (q \in X \Rightarrow q \in Y)\}$$

and thus $Z \subseteq X \to Y$ iff $Z \cap X \subseteq Y$ for downward closed $Z \subseteq \mathbb{P}$.

Using Lemma 4.2 one easily sees that for downward closed $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ we have $X = X^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ iff $\mathcal{D} \subseteq X$ and $p \in X \setminus \mathcal{D}$ whenever for all $q \leq p$ with $q \notin \mathcal{D}$ there exists $r \leq q$ with $r \in X \setminus \mathcal{D}$. Thus $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ is via $(-) \setminus \mathcal{D}$ in 1-1-correspondence with those subsets A of the poset $\mathbb{P}_\uparrow = \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ that are *regular* in the sense that $p \in A$ whenever $\forall q{\leq}p\ \exists r{\leq}q\ r \in A$. Lemma 4.2 and 4.3 say that under this correspondence negation and implication are constructed as in Cohen forcing (or Kripke models).

It is immediate from Lemma 4.3 that $X \to Y$ contains a quasi-proof (i.e. 1) iff $X \subseteq Y$.

Now we can characterise those aks's which arise from Cohen forcing.

Theorem 4.4. An aks arises up to isomorphism from a downward closed subset of a meet-semilattice iff it is strong and satisfies the following requirements

(1) $\mathsf{k} : \Pi \to \Lambda$ is a bijection
(2) the application operation endows Λ with the structure of a commutative idempotent monoid where $\mathsf{QP} = \{1\}$
(3) application coincides with the push operation when identifying Λ and Π via k.

Proof. It is clear that all these conditions are necessary. Suppose we are given a saks satisfying the conditions above. By condition (2) application endows the set Λ with the strcuture of a meet-semilattice which we call $\mathbb{P}$. For $\mathcal{D}$ we take the subset $\{t \in \Lambda \mid (t,1) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\}$ of $\mathbb{P} = \Lambda$. Notice that $\mathcal{D}$ is downward closed due to condition (3). Since the aks is strong by assumption we have

$$ts \in \mathcal{D} \quad \text{iff} \quad (ts,1) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \text{iff} \quad (t,s1) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \text{iff} \quad (t,s) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

which finishes the argument. □

This explains in which sense Krivine considers forcing as "commutative realizability".

5. Classical Realizability Tripos and Topos

The aim of this section is to show that with any aks one may associate a tripos, the so-called **Krivine tripos**, giving rise to a model of higher order classical logic extending the model of second order classical logic of Section 3.

5.1. *Abstract Krivine Structures as Order Combinatory Algebras*

Hofstra and van Oosten's notion of order partial combinatory algebra (opca) (Hofstra & van Oosten 2003) generalizes both pca's and complete Heyting algebras (cHa's) as explained in (van Oosten 2008). For our purposes we just need the following non-partial version which also covers the case of complete Heyting algebras.

Definition 5.1. (Order Combinatory Algebra with a Filter)
An **order combinatory algebra** (oca) is a triple $(\mathbb{A}, \leq, \bullet)$ where $\leq$ is a partial order on $\mathbb{A}$ and $\bullet$ is a binary monotone operation on $\mathbb{A}$ such that there exist $k, s \in \mathbb{A}$ with

$$k \bullet a \bullet b \leq a \qquad s \bullet a \bullet b \bullet c \leq a \bullet c \bullet (b \bullet c)$$

for all $a, b, c \in \mathbb{A}$.

A **filter** on an oca $(\mathbb{A}, \leq, \bullet)$ is a subset Φ of $\mathbb{A}$ closed under $\bullet$ and containing (some choice of) k and s (for $\mathbb{A}$).

With every aks we associate an oca with a filter in the following way. The underlying set is $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ on which we define a partial order as $a \leq b$ iff $a \supseteq b$. Application is defined as

$$a \bullet b = \{\pi \in \Pi \mid \forall t \in |a|, s \in |b|.\ t * s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$$

where $|a| = a^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ and similarly for b. Obviously, we have $a \leq b$ iff $|a| \subseteq |b|$. Notice that in case the aks under consideration is strong we have

$$|a \bullet b| = \{ts \mid t \in |a|, s \in |b|\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$$

which explains how we have arrived at the definition of $\bullet$. The filter is defined as $\Phi = \{a \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi) \mid |a| \cap \mathsf{QP} \neq \emptyset\}$, i.e. a is in the filter iff $|a|$ contains a quasi-proof.

For showing that $\big(\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi), \leq, \bullet\big)$ is actually an oca we have to identify appropriate $k, s \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda)$ satisfying the conditions

(1) $k \bullet x \bullet y \leq x$
(2) $s \bullet x \bullet y \bullet z \leq x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z)$

for all $x, y, z \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$. The most immediate choice for k and s is $\{\mathsf{K}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ and $\{\mathsf{S}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$, respectively, because then $|k| = \{\mathsf{K}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ and $|s| = \{\mathsf{S}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$.

One could show by brute force that these choices of k and s validate the conditions (1) and (2). But instead we here give a more elegant argument suggested to us by Benno van den Berg. First we define

$$x \to y = \{t.\pi \mid t \in |x|, \pi \in y\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp}$$

for $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ and observe that

Lemma 5.2. From $x \leq y \to z$ it follows that $x \bullet y \leq z$.

Proof. Suppose $x \leq y \to z$. Then we have $\forall u \in |x|.\forall v \in |y|.\forall \pi \in z.\ u \star v.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ from which it follows that $z \subseteq x \bullet y$. Thus $x \bullet y \leq z$ as desired. □

Moreover, we have that

Lemma 5.3. If $u \in |x|$ and $v \in |y|$ then $uv \in |x \bullet y|$.

Proof. Suppose $u \in |x|$ and $v \in |y|$. Let $\pi \in x \bullet y$. Then $u \star v.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ and thus $uv * \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ by property (S1) of $\perp\!\!\!\perp$. □

For later use we observe that the converse of the implication of Lemma 5.2 holds in the following restricted sense.

Lemma 5.4. If $x \bullet y \leq z$ then for all $t \in |x|$ we have $\mathsf{E}t \in |y \to z|$.

Proof. Suppose $x \bullet y \leq z$, i.e. $\forall t \in |x \bullet y|.\forall \pi \in z. t \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. Thus, by Lemma 5.3 we have $\forall u \in |x|.\forall v \in |y|.\forall \pi \in z.\ uv \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. Since $uv \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ implies $\mathsf{E}u \star v.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ it follows that $\forall u \in |x|.\forall v \in |y|.\forall \pi \in z.\ \mathsf{E}u \star v.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. Thus $\forall t \in |x|.\ \mathsf{E}t \in |y \to z|$ as desired. □

Now we are ready to show that (1) and (2) hold for $k = \{\mathsf{K}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ and $s = \{\mathsf{S}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$.

ad (1) : For showing that $k \bullet x \bullet y \leq x$ it suffices by Lemma 5.2 (applied twice) to show that $k \leq x \to y \to x$. But, obviously, we have $\mathsf{K} \in |x \to y \to x|$ and thus $k = \{\mathsf{K}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} \subseteq |x \to y \to x|$.

ad (2) : For showing that $s \bullet x \bullet y \bullet z \leq x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z)$ it suffices by (multiple application of) Lemma 5.2 to show that $s \leq x \to y \to z \to (x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z))$. Thus it suffices to show that $\mathsf{S} \in |x \to y \to z \to (x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z))|$. For this purpose suppose $u \in |x|$, $v \in |y|$, $w \in |z|$ and $\pi \in x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z)$. Applying Lemma 5.3 iteratively we get $uw(vw) \in |x \bullet z \bullet (y \bullet z)|$ and thus $uw(vw) \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$. By property (S3) of $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ it follows that $\mathsf{S} * u.v.w.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$ as desired.

It remains to show that $\Phi = \{a \in \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi) \mid |a| \cap \mathsf{QP} \neq \emptyset\}$ is actually a filter on $(\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Pi), \leq, \bullet)$. Suppose a and b are in Φ. Then there exist $u \in |a| \cap \mathsf{QP}$ and $v \in |b| \cap \mathsf{QP}$. By Lemma 5.3 we have $uv \in |a \bullet b|$. Since QP is closed under application we have $uv \in \mathsf{QP}$. Thus $a \bullet b \in \Phi$. Since $\mathsf{S}, \mathsf{K} \in \mathsf{QP}$ and $\mathsf{K} \in \{\mathsf{K}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} = |k|$ and $\mathsf{S} \in \{\mathsf{S}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} = |s|$ it follows that $k, s \in \Phi$.

We now collect a few facts about oca's $\mathbb{A}$ endowed with a filter Φ from (van Oosten 2008; Hofstra 2006) which will be needed subsequently for verifying the construction of the Krivine tripos in subsection 5.2. For sake of convenience we often write xy instead of $x \bullet y$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{A}$. A *polynomial* over $\mathbb{A}$ is a term built from elements of $\mathbb{A}$ and a (countable) set of variables via the application operation $\bullet$.

If $\mathbb{A}$ is an oca then for every polynomial $t[\vec{x}, x]$ there exists a polynomial $\lambda^* x.t$ whose free variables are included in the list $\vec{x}$ such that

$$(\lambda^* x.t)a \leq t[\vec{x}, a]$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$. Moreover, if all constants of t are in Φ then $\lambda^* x.t \in \Phi$ provided all items of $\vec{x}$ are in Φ. For example $k' = \lambda^* x.\lambda^* y.y \in \Phi$.

Using these facts we can define in every oca $\mathbb{A}$ pairing and projection operations

$$p = \lambda^* x.\lambda^* y.\lambda^* z.zxy \quad p_1 = \lambda^* z.zk \quad p_2 = \lambda^* z.zk'$$

which are elements of Φ and validate the laws

$$p_1(pxy) \leq x \qquad p_2(pxy) \leq y$$

5.2. *The Krivine Tripos*

Given an oca $\mathbb{A} = (\mathbb{A}, \leq, \bullet)$ and a filter Φ on it one may associate with it the following **Set**-indexed preorder $[-, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$

— $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi = \mathbb{A}^I$ is the set of all functions from set I to $\mathbb{A}$

— endowed with the *entailment* relation

$$\phi \vdash_I \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists a \in \Phi \forall i \in I.\ a \bullet \phi_i \leq \psi_i$$

— for $u : J \to I$ the *reindexing map* $[u, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi = u^* : \mathbb{A}^I \to \mathbb{A}^J$ sends ϕ to $u^*\phi = (\phi_{u(j)})_{j \in J}$.

It is easy to see that $\vdash_I$ actually defines a preorder on $\mathbb{A}^I$. Let $e = \lambda^* x.x \in \Phi$. Then for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}^I$ we have $\forall i \in I.\ e \bullet \varphi_i \leq \varphi_i$ and thus $\varphi \vdash_I \varphi$. Suppose $\varphi \vdash_I \psi$ and $\psi \vdash_I \theta$. Then there exists $a, b \in \Phi$ such that $a \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$ and $b \bullet \psi_i \leq \theta_i$ for all $i \in I$. Then for $c = \lambda^* x.b \bullet (a \bullet x) \in \Phi$ we have

$$c \bullet \varphi_i \leq b \bullet (a \bullet \varphi_i) \leq b \bullet \psi_i \leq \theta_i$$

for all $i \in I$. Thus $\varphi \vdash_I \theta$.

Suppose $u : J \to I$ is a map in **Set** and $\varphi \vdash_I \psi$. Then there exists $a \in \Phi$ with $\forall i \in I.\ a \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$. Thus, *a fortiori* we have $\forall j \in J.\ a \bullet \varphi_{u(j)} \leq \psi_{u(j)}$, i.e. $u^*\varphi \vdash_J u^*\psi$. Thus u^* preserves entailment.

From now on we assume that $\mathbb{A}$ and the filter Φ on it is induced by an aks as described in the previous subsection 5.1. Under this assumption we can give the following characterization of entailment which will turn out as crucial for proving that $[-, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ is indeed a tripos.

Lemma 5.5. For all sets I we have

$$\varphi \vdash_I \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists t \in \mathsf{QP}.\forall i \in I.\ t \in |\varphi_i| {\to} |\psi_i| \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists t \in \mathsf{QP}.\forall i \in I.\ t \in |\varphi_i \to \psi_i|$$

for all $\varphi, \psi \in [I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi \vdash_I \psi$. Then there exists $a \in \Phi$ such that $\forall i \in I.\ a \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$. By Lemma 5.3 for all $i \in I$, $t \in |a|$ and $s \in |\varphi_i|$ we have $ts \in |a \bullet \phi_i| \subseteq |\psi_i|$. Let $t \in |a| \cap \mathsf{QP}$. Then for all $i \in I$ we have $t \in |\varphi_i| \to |\psi_i|$.

Suppose for some $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ we have $t \in |\varphi_i| \to |\psi_i|$ for all $i \in I$. Then by Lemma 5.4 we have $\mathsf{E}t \in |\varphi_i \to \psi_i|$ for all $i \in I$ and $\mathsf{E}t \in \mathsf{QP}$ since QP is closed under application and contains K and S as elements.

Suppose there exists a $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ such that $\forall i \in I.\ t \in |\varphi_i \to \psi_i|$. Then we have

$$\forall i \in I.\ \{t\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} \subseteq |\varphi_i \to \psi_i|$$

and thus for $a = \{t\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ we have

$$\forall i \in I. \forall u \in |a|. \forall v \in |\varphi_i|. \forall \pi \in \psi_i.\ u \star v.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

from which it follows that $\forall i \in I.\ a \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$ and thus $\varphi \vdash_I \psi$ since $a = \{t\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} \in \Phi$ (because $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ and $t \in \{t\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\!\perp} = |a|$). □

The following lemma will be useful in the proof of Theorem 5.9.

Lemma 5.6. Let I be set and $\varphi, \psi, \theta \in [I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. We write $\varphi{\to}\psi$ for the family $(\varphi_i{\to}\psi_i)_{i \in I}$. Then $\theta \vdash_I \varphi{\to}\psi$ iff there exists an $a \in \Phi$ such that $\forall i \in I.\, a \bullet \theta_i \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$.

Proof. Suppose $\theta \vdash_I \varphi \to \psi$. Then there is an $a \in \Phi$ such that $\forall i \in I.\, a \bullet \theta_i \leq \varphi_i{\to}\psi_i$. By Lemma 5.2 it follows that $\forall i \in I.\, a \bullet \theta_i \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$.

For the converse direction suppose $a \in \Phi$ with $\forall i \in I.\, a \bullet \theta_i \bullet \varphi_i \leq \psi_i$. Then by Lemma 5.3 we have

$$\forall i \in I. \forall t \in |a \bullet \theta_i|. \forall s \in |\varphi_i|.\, ts \in |a \bullet \theta_i \bullet \varphi_i| \subseteq |\psi_i|$$

and thus

$$\forall i \in I. \forall t \in |a \bullet \theta_i|.\, \mathsf{E}t \in |\varphi_i{\to}\psi_i|$$

by Lemma 5.4. Since $\mathsf{E} \in \mathsf{QP}$ by Lemma 5.5 there is a $b \in \Phi$ with

$$\forall i \in I.\, b \bullet (a \bullet \theta_i) \leq \varphi_i{\to}\psi_i$$

Let $c \in \Phi$ with $c \bullet x \leq b \bullet (a \bullet x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{A}$. Thus for all $i \in I$ we have

$$c \bullet \theta_i \leq b \bullet (a \bullet \theta_i) \leq \varphi_i{\to}\psi_i$$

from which it follows that $\theta \vdash_I \varphi{\to}\psi$ as desired. □

Furthermore for every set I we will need an "equality predicate" $\mathrm{eq}_I : I \times I \to \mathbb{A}$ on I defined as

$$\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) = \begin{cases} \{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp} & \text{if } i = j \\ \Pi & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i) \in \Phi$ since $\mathsf{I} \in \mathsf{QP}$. The equality predicate has the following remarkable properties.

Lemma 5.7. For every $i \in I$ we have $\mathsf{I} \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i)|$ and $eq_I(i,i) \bullet a \leq a$ for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$. If $i, j \in I$ with $i \neq j$ then $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) \bullet a \leq b$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$.

Proof. Obviously, we have $|\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i)| = \{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\perp}$. Thus $\mathsf{I} \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i)|$ since $\mathsf{I} \in \{\mathsf{I}\} \subseteq \{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\perp}$. Let $a \in \mathbb{A}$. By Lemma 5.2 for showing $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i) \bullet a \leq a$ it suffices to show that $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,i) \leq a{\to}a$ which holds since $\mathsf{I} \in |a{\to}a|$ and thus $\{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\perp} \subseteq |a{\to}a|$.

Suppose $i, j \in I$ with $i \neq j$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{A}$. Then $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) = \Pi \supseteq a{\to}b$ from which it follows that $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) \leq a{\to}b$ and thus $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) \bullet a \leq b$ by Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 5.8. Let $a \in \mathbb{A}$ and $t \in \left|\{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp}{\to}a\right|$. Then

i) $\mathsf{SI}t \in \left|\{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp}{\to}a\right|$ and
ii) $\mathsf{SI}t \in |\Pi{\to}b|$ for all $b \in \mathbb{A}$.

Proof. Suppose $t \in \left|\{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp}{\to}a\right|$.

For showing i) suppose $s \in \{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\perp}$ and $\pi \in a$. We have to show that $\mathsf{SI}t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\perp$. Since $t \star s.\pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$ we have $ts \star \pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$. Thus $\mathsf{I} \star ts.\pi \in \perp\!\!\perp$ and accordingly $ts.\pi \in \{\mathsf{I}\}^{\perp\!\!\perp}$. Thus $s \star ts.\pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$ and therefore also $\mathsf{I}s(ts) \star \pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$. Thus, by property (S3) of $\perp\!\!\perp$ we have $\mathsf{S} \star \mathsf{I}.t.s.\pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$ and therefore also $\mathsf{SI}t \star s.\pi$ as desired.

For showing ii) suppose $s \in \Pi^{\perp\!\!\perp}$ and $\pi \in b$. We have to show that $\mathsf{SI}t \star s.\pi \in\perp\!\!\perp$. Since $s \in \Pi^{\perp\!\!\perp}$ we have $s \star ts.\pi \in \perp\!\!\perp$. Thus also $\mathsf{I}s(ts) \star \pi \in \perp\!\!\perp$. By property (S3) of $\perp\!\!\perp$ we have also $\mathsf{S} \star \mathsf{I}.t.s \in \perp\!\!\perp$ from which it follows that $\mathsf{SI}t \star s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\perp$ as desired. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.9. If $\mathbb{A}$ and Φ arise from an aks the indexed preorder $[-, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ is a **tripos**, i.e. we have that

— all $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ are pre-Heyting-algebras whose structure is preserved by reindexing
— for every $u : J \to I$ in **Set** the reindexing map u^* has a left adjoint $\exists_u$ and a right adjoint $\forall_u$ satisfying the (Beck-)Chevalley condition
— there is a *generic predicate* $\mathsf{T} \in [\Sigma, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ such that all other predicates can be obtained from T by appropriate reindexing

which, moreover, is boolean in the sense that all $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ are pre-boolean-algebras.

Proof. Recall that we often denote application in the oca $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ by juxtaposition.

We first show that $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ has finite infima. Let $\top = \{\pi \in \Pi \mid \forall t \in \Lambda.\ t \star \pi \in\perp\!\!\perp\}$ which obviously is an element in $\mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\perp}(\Pi)$ and satisfies $a \leq \top$ for all $a \in \mathbb{A}$. Let $\top_I$ be the constant family in $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ with value $\top$. If $\varphi \in [I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ then for all $i \in I$ we have $(\lambda^* x.x)\varphi_i \leq |\top|$. Since $\lambda^* x.x \in \Phi$ we have $\varphi \vdash_I \top_I$. Thus $\top_I$ is a greatest element in $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. For showing that $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ has binary infima suppose $\varphi, \psi \in \mathbb{A}^I$. Let $\varphi \wedge \psi \in \mathbb{A}^I$ with $(\varphi \wedge \psi)_i = p\varphi_i\psi_i$ for all $i \in I$. Since $\forall i \in I.\, p_1(p\varphi_i\psi_i) \leq \varphi_i$ we have $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash_I \varphi$ and since $\forall i \in I.\, p_2(p\varphi_i\psi_i) \leq \psi_i$ we have $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash_I \psi$. Suppose $\theta \vdash_I \varphi, \psi$. Then there exist $a, b \in \Phi$ such that for all $i \in I$ we have $a\theta_i \leq \varphi_i$ and $b\theta_i \leq \psi_i$. For $c = \lambda^* x.p(ax)(bx) \in \Phi$ we have for all $i \in I$ that

$$c\theta_i \leq p(a\theta_i)(b\theta_i) \leq p\varphi_i\psi_i = (\varphi \wedge \psi)_i$$

and thus $\theta \vdash_I \varphi \wedge \psi$ as desired. Obviously, every reindexing u^* preserves $\top$ and $\wedge$.

Next we show that all $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ have implication. Suppose $\varphi, \psi \in [I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. We define $\varphi{\to}\psi$ as $(\varphi{\to}\psi)_i = \varphi_i{\to}\psi_i$ for $i \in I$. Suppose $\theta \vdash_I \varphi{\to}\psi$. Then there exists $a \in \Phi$ with

$a\theta_i \leq \varphi_i {\to} \psi_i$ for all $i \in I$. Then by Lemma 5.2 we have $a\theta_i\varphi_i \leq \psi_i$ for all $i \in I$. Thus we have

$$a(p_1(p\theta_i\varphi_i))(p_2(p\theta_i\varphi_i)) \leq a\theta_i\varphi_i \leq \psi_i$$

for all $i \in I$. Thus for $f = \lambda^* x.a(p_1 x)(p_2 x) \in \Phi$ we have

$$f(\theta_i \wedge \varphi_i) \leq \psi_i$$

for all $i \in I$, i.e. $\theta \wedge \varphi \vdash_I \psi$. For the converse direction suppose $\theta \wedge \varphi \vdash_I \psi$. Then there is an $a \in \Phi$ with $a(p\theta_i\varphi_i) \leq \psi_i$ for all $i \in I$. Then for $f = \lambda^* x.\lambda^* y.a(pxy) \in \Phi$ we have

$$f\theta_i\varphi_i \leq \psi_i$$

for all $i \in I$. Thus, by Lemma 5.6 it follows that $\theta \vdash_I \varphi {\to} \psi$. Thus we have shown that $\varphi {\to} \psi$ is actually the exponential in $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. It follows from $\varphi {\to} \psi \vdash_I \varphi {\to} \psi$ that $(\varphi {\to} \psi) \wedge \varphi \vdash_I \psi$. Since for $u : J \to I$ we have $u^*(\varphi {\to} \psi) = u^*\varphi {\to} u^*\psi$ and u^* preserves $\wedge$ it follows that $(u^*\varphi {\to} u^*\psi) \wedge u^*\varphi = u^*((\varphi {\to} \psi) \wedge \varphi) \vdash_J u^*\psi$. Thus reindexing preserves implication.

Next we show that $[-, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ has universal quantification. For $\alpha : J \to I$ and $\varphi \in [J, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ we define $\forall_u(\varphi)$ in $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ as

$$\forall_\alpha(\varphi)_i = \left(\bigcup_{j \in J} \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j \right)^{\perp\!\!\perp\perp\!\!\perp}$$

for all $i \in I$. Notice that

$$\left|\forall_\alpha(\varphi)_i\right| = \left(\bigcup_{j \in J} \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j \right)^{\perp\!\!\perp} = \bigcap_{j \in J} |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j|$$

Suppose $\psi \in [I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. We have to show that

$$\alpha^*\psi \vdash_J \varphi \qquad \text{iff} \qquad \psi \vdash_I \forall_\alpha(\varphi)$$

Suppose $\psi \vdash_I \forall_\alpha(\varphi)$. Then there is a $c \in \Phi$ with $c\psi_i \leq \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$. Thus, in particular, we have $c\psi_{\alpha(j)} \leq \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \alpha(j)) {\to} \varphi_j$ for all $j \in J$. Since $c \in \Phi$ we have $\psi_{\alpha(j)} \vdash_{j \in J} \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \alpha(j)) {\to} \varphi_j$ and accordingly $\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \alpha(j)) \vdash_{j \in J} \psi_{\alpha(j)} {\to} \varphi_j$ by that part of propositional logic we have already established for $[I, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. Thus, by Lemma 5.5 there is a $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ such that

$$\forall j \in J. \forall s \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \alpha(j))|.\, ts \in |\psi_{\alpha(j)} {\to} \varphi_j|$$

from which it follows that

$$\forall j \in J.\, t\mathsf{I} \in |\psi_{\alpha(j)} {\to} \varphi_j|$$

since by Lemma 5.7 we have $\mathsf{I} \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \alpha(j))|$ for all $j \in J$. Thus we have

$$\forall j \in J. \forall s \in |\psi_{\alpha(j)}|.\, t\mathsf{I}s \in |\psi_{\alpha(j)}| {\to} |\varphi_j|$$

from which it follows by Lemma 5.5 since $t\mathsf{I} \in \mathsf{QP}$ that $\alpha^*\psi \vdash_J \varphi$ as desired.

Suppose $\alpha^*\psi \vdash_J \varphi$. Then there exists an $a \in \Phi$ such that $\forall j \in J.\, a\psi_{\alpha(j)} \leq \varphi_j$. Then

$b = \lambda^* x.\lambda^* y.y(ax) \in \Phi$. Suppose $i \in I$ and $j \in J$. If $\alpha(j) = i$ then by Lemma 5.7

$$b\psi_i \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) \leq \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i)(a\psi_i) \leq a\psi_i \leq a\psi_{\alpha(j)} \leq \varphi_j$$

and otherwise we have

$$b\psi_i \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) \leq \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i)(a\psi_i) \leq \varphi_j$$

again by Lemma 5.7. Thus we have shown that

$$\forall i \in I, j \in J.\, b\psi_i \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) \leq \varphi_i$$

from which it follows by Lemma 5.6 that there is a $c \in \Phi$ with

$$\forall i \in I, j \in J.\, c\psi_i \leq \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j$$

Thus we have

$$\forall i \in I, j \in J.\, |c\psi_i| \subseteq |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j|$$

from which it follows that

$$\forall i \in I.\, |c\psi_i| \subseteq \bigcap_{j \in J} |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), i) {\to} \varphi_j| = |\forall_\alpha(\varphi)_i|$$

Thus, we have

$$\forall i \in I.\, c\psi_i \leq \forall_\alpha(\varphi)_i$$

and since $c \in \Phi$ it follows that $\psi \vdash_I \forall_\alpha(\varphi)$ as desired.

For showing that $\forall$ satisfies the (Beck-)Chevalley condition suppose

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{\;q\;} & J \\ {\scriptstyle p}\big\downarrow & & \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} \\ K & \xrightarrow[\;\beta\;]{} & I \end{array}$$

is a pullback in **Set** and $\varphi \in [J, \mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. We have to show that $\beta^* \forall_\alpha \varphi \cong \forall_p q^* \varphi$. Notice that $\beta^* \forall_\alpha \varphi \vdash_K \forall_p q^* \varphi$ does hold anyway by abstract nonsense. Thus it suffices to show that $\forall_p q^* \varphi \vdash_K \beta^* \forall_\alpha \varphi$. For this by Lemma 5.5 it suffices to show that for every $k \in K$ the term $\mathsf{SI} \in \mathsf{QP}$ sends elements of $|(\forall_p q^* \varphi)_k|$ to elements of $|(\beta^* \forall_\alpha \varphi)_k|$. Suppose $k \in K$. We have

$$|(\forall_p q^* \varphi)_k| = \bigcap_{z \in P} \left|\mathrm{eq}_K(p(z), k) {\to} \varphi_{q(z)}\right|$$

and

$$|(\beta^* \forall_\alpha \varphi)_k| = \bigcap_{j \in J} |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \beta(k)) {\to} \varphi_j|$$

Suppose $t \in \bigcap_{z \in P} \left|(\mathrm{eq}_K(p(z), k) {\to} \varphi_{q(z)}\right|$ and $j \in J$. Suppose $\alpha(j) = \beta(k)$. Then there is a $z \in P$ with $p(z) = k$ and $q(z) = j$. By assumption on t we have $t \in \left|(\mathrm{eq}_K(p(z), k) {\to} \varphi_{q(z)}\right|$ and thus $t \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \beta(k)) {\to} \varphi_j|$ since $\mathrm{eq}_K(p(z), k) = \mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \beta(k))$. Thus by Lemma 5.8 i) we have $\mathsf{SI}t \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \beta(k)) {\to} \varphi_j|$ since $\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j), \beta(k)) = \{\mathsf{I}\}^\perp$. Otherwise if

$\alpha(j) \neq \beta(k)$ then $\mathsf{SI}t \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j),\beta(k)){\to}\varphi_j|$ by Lemma 5.8 ii) since $\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j),\beta(k)) = \Pi$. Thus, in any case $\mathsf{SI}t \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(\alpha(j),\beta(k)){\to}\varphi_j|$.

Next we show that there exists a generic predicate T. Let $\Sigma = \mathbb{A}$ and $\mathsf{T} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{A}} \in [\mathbb{A},\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$. Then for $\varphi \in [I,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ we have $\varphi = \varphi^*\mathsf{T}$ as desired.

It is well known that the remaining logical structure can be obtained from the already established one by second order encoding à la Russell-Prawitz.

Since $\mathsf{cc} \in \mathsf{QP}$ realizes *reductio ad absurdum* it follows by Lemma 5.5 that all $[I,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ are actually pre-boolean-algebras. Thus the tripos $[-,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ is boolean. □

For every tripos the equality predicate on I is given by $\exists_{\delta_I}(\top_I)$ where $\delta_I = \langle \mathrm{id}_I, \mathrm{id}_I\rangle$ is the diagonal on I and $\exists_{\delta_I} \dashv \delta_I^*$. We observe that this notion of equality on I coincides with the one given by eq_I.

Lemma 5.10. For every set I and $\rho \in [I{\times}I,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ we have

$$\mathrm{eq}_I \vdash_{I\times I} \rho \quad \text{iff} \quad \top_I \vdash_I \delta_I^*\rho$$

and thus $\exists_{\delta_I}(\top_I) \cong \mathrm{eq}_I$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathrm{eq}_I \vdash_{I\times I} \delta_I^*\rho$. Then by Lemma 5.5 there is a $t \in \mathsf{QP}$ such that $\forall i,j \in I.\forall s \in |\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j)|.\, ts \in \rho(i,j)$. Then for all $i \in I$ the term $\mathsf{K}(t\mathsf{I}) \in \mathsf{QP}$ sends elements of $|\top|$ to elements of $|\rho(i,i)|$. Thus $\top_I \vdash_I \delta_I^*\rho$ by Lemma 5.5.

For the converse direction suppose $\top_I \vdash_I \delta_I^*\rho$. Then there exists $a \in \Phi$ such that $a\top \leq \rho(i,i)$ for all $i \in I$. Thus by Lemma 5.7 we have $\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j)(a\top) \leq \rho(i,j)$ for all $i,j \in I$. Let $b \in \Phi$ with $bxy \leq yx$ for all $x,y \in \mathbb{A}$. Then we have $b(a\top)\mathrm{eq}_I(i,j) \leq eq_I(i,j)(a\top) \leq \rho(i,j)$ for all $i,j \in I$. Accordingly, since $b(a\top) \in \Phi$ it follows by Lemma 5.5 that $\mathrm{eq}_I \vdash_{I\times I} \rho$ as desired. □

As described in (van Oosten 2008) the boolean tripos $[-,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi$ induces a boolean topos $\mathbf{Set}\big[[-,\mathbb{A}]_\Phi\big]$ which we may call the **classical realizability topos** induced by the abstract Krivine structure under consideration or simply **Krivine topos**.

As described in (van Oosten 2008) for any tripos P over a topos $\mathcal{S}$ there is a 'constant objects' functor ∇_P from $\mathcal{S}$ to the topos $\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}]$ induced by P. This functor sends $I \in \mathcal{S}$ to the object $\big(I, \exists_{\delta_I}(\top_I)\big)$. By Lemma 5.10 this gives rise to an embedding ∇ of **Set** into the classical realizability topos sending a set I to (I, eq_I).

6. Forcing within Classical Realizability

Let P be a meet-semilattice. We write pq as shorthand for $p \wedge q$. Let C be an upward closed subset of P. With every $X \subseteq P$ one associates††

$$|X| = \{p \in P \mid \forall q.\, (\mathsf{C}(pq) \to X(q))\}$$

Such subsets of P are called propositions. We say

$$p \text{ forces } X \qquad \text{iff} \qquad p \in |X|$$

†† Traditionally, one would associate with X the set $X^\perp = \{p \in P \mid \forall q \in X.\, \neg\mathsf{C}(pq)\}$. But, classically, we have $|X| = (P \setminus X)^\perp$.

and want

$$\begin{array}{lll} p \text{ forces } X \to Y & \text{iff} & \forall q.\, (|X|(q) \to |Y|(pq)) \\ p \text{ forces } \forall i \in I.X_i & \text{iff} & \forall i \in I.\, p \text{ forces } X_i \end{array}$$

to hold. Obviously, we have

$$\begin{array}{l} p \text{ forces } X \to Y \quad \text{iff} \\ \forall q.\, (|X|(q) \to |Y|(pq)) \;\; \text{iff} \\ \forall q.\, (|X|(q) \to \forall r.\, (\mathsf{C}(pqr) \to Y(r))) \quad \text{iff} \\ \forall q, r.\, (\mathsf{C}(pqr) \to |X|(q) \to Y(r)) \quad \text{iff} \\ p \in \big|\{qr \mid |X|(q) \to Y(r)\}\big| \end{array}$$

and

$$p \text{ forces } \forall i \in I.X_i \quad \text{iff} \quad p \in \big|\textstyle\bigcap_{i \in I} X_i\big|$$

As in (Krivine 2008) we want to consider this construction inside a classical realizability topos. That this gives a topos again follows from Pitts' *iteration theorem* explained in (van Oosten 2008) and in (Hofstra 2008). It says that for any tripos P over a topos $\mathcal{S}$ and any tripos Q over $\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}]$ the resulting topos $\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}][\mathsf{Q}]$ is again induced by a tripos provided the functor $\nabla_{\mathsf{Q}} : \mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}] \to \mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}][\mathsf{Q}]$ preserves epis, namely by the tripos $(\nabla_{\mathsf{Q}}\nabla_{\mathsf{P}})^*\mathsf{Sub}_{\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}][\mathsf{Q}]}$. The requirement on ∇_{Q} is certainly satisfied in our case because Q is localic over $\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}]$. Alas, it is not obvious by general reasons that the tripos $(\nabla_{\mathsf{Q}}\nabla_{\mathsf{P}})^*\mathsf{Sub}_{\mathcal{S}[\mathsf{P}][\mathsf{Q}]}$ is induced by an appropriate aks. That this is the case nevertheless has been shown in (Krivine 2008). Our aim now is to explain and reveal the intuition behind his construction.

Actually, in most cases P will not be a meet-semilattice inside a classical realizability topos **but** it will be so "from point of view" of $\mathsf{C} \subseteq P$. That means that as in (Krivine 2008) we are given an external[‡‡] set P, a distinguished element $1 \in P$, a binary operation on P (denoted by juxtaposition) and a predicate[§§] $\mathsf{C} : P \to \mathcal{P}_{\perp\!\!\!\perp}(\Lambda)$ such that the following conditions hold in the classical realizability topos

$$\mathsf{C}(p(qr)) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}((pq)r)$$

$$\mathsf{C}(pq) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}(qp)$$

$$\mathsf{C}(p) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}(pp)$$

$$\mathsf{C}(1p) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}(p)$$

$$\big(\mathsf{C}(p) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}(q)\big) \to \big(\mathsf{C}(pr) \leftrightarrow \mathsf{C}(qr)\big)$$

together with

$$\mathsf{C}(pq) \to \mathsf{C}(p)$$

expressing that C is upward closed. On P we may define a congruence

$$p \simeq q \equiv \forall r.\, (C(rp) \leftrightarrow C(rq))$$

‡‡ i.e. P is an object of **Set**

§§ which induces a predicate $\mathsf{C}^{\perp\!\!\!\perp}$ on P in the classical realizability topos w.r.t. which P is a commutative idempotent monoid, i.e. a meet-semilattice, inside the classical realizability topos of which C is an upward closed subset whose complement contains at most one element.

A term t realizes p forces $X \to Y$ iff

$$\forall q, r. \forall u {\in} \mathsf{C}(p(qr)). \forall s {\in} |X|(q). \forall \pi {\in} Y(r).\ t * u.s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

Thus, one may want to define a notion of a pair (t, p) realizing $X \to Y$. For this purpose one has to find a new aks whose term and stack part are $\Lambda \times P$ and $\Pi \times P$, respectively. The quasi-proofs of the new structure are the pairs of the form $(t, 1)$ with $t \in \mathsf{QP}$. The pole $\perp\!\!\!\perp\!\!\!\perp \subseteq (\Lambda \times P) * (\Pi \times P)$ on the new structure is given by

$$(t, p) * (\pi, q) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\!\!\!\perp \ \text{ iff } \ \forall u \in \mathsf{C}(pq)\ t * \pi^u \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

where π^u is obtained from π by inserting u at its bottom. The push operation on the new structure is given quite straightforwardly by $(t, p).(\pi, q) = (t.\pi, pq)$ whereas application is a bit more intricate for which reason we postpone its definition.

Propositions w.r.t. this new aks are now subsets $\Pi \times P$ understood as functions from $P \to \mathcal{P}(\Pi)$. Now given such propositions X and Y we have

$$(t, p) \in |X \to Y| \quad \text{iff}$$

$$\forall (s, q) \in |X|. \forall (r, \pi) \in Y.\ (t, p) * (s, q).(\pi, r) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \text{iff}$$

$$\forall (s, q) \in |X|. \forall (r, \pi) \in Y. \forall u \in \mathsf{C}(p(qr)).\ t * s.\pi^u \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

in accordance with the above explication of t realizes p forces $X \to Y$. The only difference is that the realizer u of $\mathsf{C}(p(qr))$ is now placed at a distinguished position, namely the bottom of the stack.

In order to jump back and forth between

$$t \text{ realizes } p \text{ forces } A \quad \text{and} \quad (t', p) \in |A|$$

in (Krivine 2008) there have been introduced "read" and "write" constructs in the original aks, namely commands χ and χ' whose operational semantics is given by

(read)	$\chi * t.\pi^s \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t * s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$
(write)	$\chi' * t.s.\pi \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$	whenever	$t * \pi^s \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$

Using these one can transform t into t' and *vice versa*. Krivine concludes from this that for **realizing forcing one needs global memory**.

Moreover, these two new commands allow us to give a correct definition of application. Let α be a uniform realizer of $\mathsf{C}((pq)r) \to \mathsf{C}(p(qr))$ and $\underline{\alpha}$ a term with

$$\underline{\alpha} * t.\pi^u \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \ \text{ whenever } t * \pi^{\alpha u} \in \perp\!\!\!\perp$$

which may be taken as $\lambda^* x.\chi(\lambda^* y.\chi' x(\alpha y))$. We now define application in the new aks as

$$(t, p)(s, q) \equiv (\underline{\alpha}(ts), pq)$$

for which it holds that

$$(t, p)(s, q) * (\pi, r) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\!\!\!\perp \qquad \text{iff}$$

$$\forall u \in \mathsf{C}((pq)r)\ \underline{\alpha}(ts) * \pi^u \in \perp\!\!\!\perp \quad \text{if}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\forall u \in \mathsf{C}((pq)r)\, ts * \pi^{\alpha u} \in \perp\!\!\!\perp && \text{if}\\
&\forall u \in \mathsf{C}((pq)r)\, t * s.\pi^{\alpha u} \in \perp\!\!\!\perp && \text{if}\\
&\forall u \in \mathsf{C}((p(qr))\, t * s.\pi^{u} \in \perp\!\!\!\perp && \text{iff}\\
&(t,p) * (s,q).(\pi,r) \in \perp\!\!\!\perp\!\!\!\perp
\end{aligned}
$$

as required by condition (S1).

7. Conclusion

We have identified a notion of abstract Krivine structure as an axiomatic account of Krivine's classical realizability. An important aspect of this notion is the explicitation of the role of the distinguished set QP of "quasi-proofs" without which all models with a non-empty pole $\perp\!\!\!\perp$ would be inconsistent. In most of Krivine's writings this point is not emphasized a notable exception being the recent (Krivine 2010).

Based on this notion of Abstract Krivine structure we have shown in which precise sense Cohen forcing is the commutative case of classical realizability.

We have shown how Krivine's work on classical realizability can be seen as an instance of the categorical approach to realizability as initiated by Martin Hyland. This has been achieved by associating with every abstract Krivine structure an order pca $\mathbb{A}$ of propositions together with a filter Φ of those propositions which we want to regard as "true". From $\mathbb{A}$ and Φ we have a constructed a boolean tripos giving rise to a categorical model of classical higher order logic. This tripos gives rise to the ensuing classical realizability topos. This view has been helpful for us to get a more structural understanding of forcing within classical realizability using Pitts' Iteration Theorem.

We leave it as an open question whether techniques of Algebraic Set Theory, see e.g. (van den Berg & Moerdijk 2009), can be used for showing that every abstract Krivine structure gives rise to a model for ZF.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Jean-Louis Krivine for patiently explaining to me the underlying intuitions of his work on Classical Realizability. I want to thank Benno van den Berg for discussions and suggesting Lemmata 5.2 and 5.3. Finally, I want to thank an anonymous referee for pointing out that in a previous version most models were inconsistent due to the absence of quasi-proofs.

References

B. van den Berg & I. Moerdijk *A unified approach to algebraic set theory* in Proc. of *Logic Colloquium 2006* pp. 18-37, Lect. Notes Log., Assoc. Symbol. Logic, Chicago, IL, 2009.

T. Griffin *A formulae-as-types notion of control.* Conf. record 17th ACM Symp. on Principles of Programming Languages, 1990.

P. Hofstra and J. van Oosten *Ordered partial combinatory algebras.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 134, no. 3, pp. 445-463, 2004.

P. Hofstra *All realizability is relative.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 141, no. 2, pp. 239-264, 2006.

P. Hofstra *Iterated realizability as a comma construction.* Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 144, no. 1, pp. 39-51, 2008.

J. M. E. Hyland *The effective topos* in Proc. of *The L. E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium* (Noordwijkerhout 1981) pp. 165-216, North Holland 1982.

J.-L. Krivine and M. Parigot *Programming with proofs.* J. Inf. Proc. Cybern. EIK 26, no. 3, pp. 149-167, 1990.

J.-L. Krivine *Lambda-calcul, types et modèles.* Masson 1990.

J.-L. Krivine *Opérateurs de mise en mémoire et traduction de Gödel* Arch. Math. Log. 30 no. 4, pp. 241-267, 1990.

J.-L. Krivine *Types lambda-calculus in classical Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory.* Arch. Math. Log. 40 no. 3, pp. 189-205, 2001.

J.-L. Krivine *Dependent choice, 'quote' and the clock.* Th. Comp. Sc. 308, pp. 259-276, 2003.

J.-L. Krivine *Structures de réalisabilité, RAM et ultrafiltre sur* $\mathbb{N}$. 2008. `http://www.pps.jussieu.fr/~krivine/Ultrafiltre.pdf`.

J.-L. Krivine *Realizability in classical logic* in *Interactive models of computation and program behaviour.* Panoramas et synthèses 27, SMF, 2009.

J.-L. Krivine *Realizability algebras : a program to well order* $\mathbb{R}$. Log. Meth. in Comp. Sc., Vol. 7, pp.1-47, 2011.

J.-L. Krivine *Realizability algebras II: new models for* ZF + DC. 2010. `http://www.pps.jussieu.fr/~krivine/articles/R_ZF.pdf`.

J. van Oosten *Realizability. An Introduction to its Categorical Side.* Elsevier 2008.

T. Streicher and B. Reus *Classical logic, continuation semantics and abstract machines.* J. Funct. Prog. 8, no. 6, pp. 543-572, 1998.