

The countable reals

Andrej Bauer (University of Ljubljana)

James E. Hanson (University of Maryland)

Topos Institute Colloquium, May 12th 2022

This is work in progress.

Talk overview

1. Uncountability and \mathbb{R}
2. Beating diagonalization
3. The parametric realizability topos

Talk overview

1. **Uncountability and \mathbb{R}**
2. Beating diagonalization
3. The parametric realizability topos

Definition

A set A is **countable** if there is a surjection $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow 1 + A$.
It is **uncountable** if it is not countable.

Remark

An inhabited set A is countable if, and only if, there is a surjection $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow A$.

The essence of diagonalization

Theorem

If there is a surjection $e : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow A^{\mathbb{N}}$ then every $f : A \rightarrow A$ has a fixed point.

Proof. There is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $e(n) = (k \mapsto f(e(k)(k)))$, therefore $e(n)(n) = f(e(n)(n))$. □

Corollary

If $f : A \rightarrow A$ does not have a fixed point then $A^{\mathbb{N}}$ is not countable.

Some uncountable sets

Let Ω be the set of truth values, i.e., the subobject classifier.

Let $2 = \{0, 1\}$ be the Booleans.

Some uncountable sets

Let Ω be the set of truth values, i.e., the subobject classifier.

Let $\mathcal{2} = \{0, 1\}$ be the Booleans.

The following sets are uncountable:

- ▶ $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $n \mapsto n + 1$ has no fixed points.
- ▶ $\mathcal{2}^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $\neg : \mathcal{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{2}$ has no fixed points.
- ▶ $\Omega^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $\neg : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ has no fixed points.

Some uncountable sets

Let Ω be the set of truth values, i.e., the subobject classifier.

Let $\mathbb{2} = \{0, 1\}$ be the Booleans.

The following sets are uncountable:

- ▶ $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $n \mapsto n + 1$ has no fixed points.
- ▶ $\mathbb{2}^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $\neg : \mathbb{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{2}$ has no fixed points.
- ▶ $\Omega^{\mathbb{N}}$ because $\neg : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ has no fixed points.

Observations:

- ▶ Ω^A is the powerset $\mathcal{P}A$.
- ▶ $\mathbb{2}^A$ is the set of *decidable* subsets of A .
- ▶ Constructive taboos:

$$\mathbb{2} \cong \Omega$$

$$\mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{2}^{\mathbb{N}}$$

$$\mathbb{R} \cong \Omega^{\mathbb{N}}$$

Diagonalization for \mathbb{R} – with excluded middle

Theorem (classical)

Every sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is avoided by some $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Define $[u_0, v_0] = [0, 1]$ and recursively

$$[u_{n+1}, v_{n+1}] = \begin{cases} [u_n, 4/5 \cdot u_n + 1/5 \cdot v_n] & \text{if } a_n > 1/2 \cdot u_n + 1/2 \cdot v_n \\ [1/5 \cdot u_n + 4/5 \cdot v_n, v_n] & \text{if } a_n \leq 1/2 \cdot u_n + 1/2 \cdot v_n. \end{cases}$$

Then take $x = \lim_n u_n = \lim_n v_n$. □

Diagonalization for \mathbb{R} – with Dependent Choice

Theorem (intuitionistic with Dependent Choice)

Every sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is avoided by some $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Define $[u_0, v_0] = [0, 1]$ and choose

$$[u_{n+1}, v_{n+1}] = \begin{cases} [u_n, 4/5 \cdot u_n + 1/5 \cdot v_n] & \text{if } a_n > 3/5 \cdot u_n + 2/5 \cdot v_n \\ [1/5 \cdot u_n + 4/5 \cdot v_n, v_n] & \text{if } a_n < 2/5 \cdot a_n + 3/2 \cdot v_n. \end{cases}$$

Then take $x = \lim_n u_n = \lim_n v_n$. □

The proof can be improved to use just Countable Choice.

Diagonalization breaks down intuitionistically

Theorem

The topos $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ does not validate the internal statement

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} . \exists x \in \mathbb{R} . \forall n \in \mathbb{N} . |a_n - x| > 0.$$

Proof. See “**Constructive algebraic integration theory without choice**” (Appendix A) by Bas Spitters. □

Diagonalization breaks down intuitionistically

Theorem

The topos $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ does not validate the internal statement

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} . \exists x \in \mathbb{R} . \forall n \in \mathbb{N} . |a_n - x| > 0.$$

Proof. See “**Constructive algebraic integration theory without choice**” (Appendix A) by Bas Spitters. □

However, $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathbb{R})$ validates $\neg \exists e \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} . \forall x \in \mathbb{R} . \exists n \in \mathbb{N} . e(n) = x$.

Uncountability of $[0, 1]$

Lemma (intuitionistic)

If $[0, 1]$ is countable then so is \mathbb{R} .

Proof. Given an enumeration $e : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we show surjectivity of $f : \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $f(k, n) = k + 2 \cdot e(n)$. Given any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there is $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k < x < k + 2$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $e(n) = 1/2 \cdot (x - k)$, hence $f(k, n) = x$. □

Subcountability of \mathbb{R}

Definition

A set S is

- ▶ **subcountable** if there is an injection $S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- ▶ **subquotient** of \mathbb{N} if it is a quotient of a subset of \mathbb{N} .

Subcountability of \mathbb{R}

Definition

A set S is

- ▶ **subcountable** if there is an injection $S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- ▶ **subquotient** of \mathbb{N} if it is a quotient of a subset of \mathbb{N} .

Theorem

In the effective topos \mathbb{R} is a subquotient of \mathbb{N} .

Subcountability of \mathbb{R}

Definition

A set S is

- ▶ **subcountable** if there is an injection $S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- ▶ **subquotient** of \mathbb{N} if it is a quotient of a subset of \mathbb{N} .

Theorem

In the effective topos \mathbb{R} is a subquotient of \mathbb{N} .

Theorem

In the realizability topos over infinite-time Turing machines \mathbb{R} is subcountable.

Subcountability of \mathbb{R}

Definition

A set S is

- ▶ **subcountable** if there is an injection $S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- ▶ **subquotient** of \mathbb{N} if it is a quotient of a subset of \mathbb{N} .

Theorem

In the effective topos \mathbb{R} is a subquotient of \mathbb{N} .

Theorem

In the realizability topos over infinite-time Turing machines \mathbb{R} is subcountable.

However, in both toposes \mathbb{R} is uncountable because realizability toposes validate Dependent choice.

Cauchy, Dedekind and MacNeille reals

Notions of completeness:

- ▶ Cauchy reals \mathbb{R}_C : Cauchy sequences have limits.
- ▶ Dedekind reals \mathbb{R}_D : Dedekind cuts straddle reals.
- ▶ MacNeille reals \mathbb{R}_M : bounded inhabited subsets have infima and suprema.

In general $\mathbb{R}_C \subseteq \mathbb{R}_D \subseteq \mathbb{R}_M$, and the inclusions may be proper.

MacNeille reals are uncountable, but ...

Theorem (intuitionistic)

The MacNeille reals \mathbb{R}_M are uncountable.

Proof. See “A constructive Knaster-Tarski proof of the uncountability of the reals” by Ingo Blechschmidt and Matthias Hutzler. □

MacNeille reals are uncountable, but ...

Theorem (intuitionistic)

The MacNeille reals \mathbb{R}_M are uncountable.

Proof. See “A constructive Knaster-Tarski proof of the uncountability of the reals” by Ingo Blechschmidt and Matthias Hutzler. □

Theorem (intuitionistic)

If MacNeille reals satisfy $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}_M . 0 < x \vee x < 1$ then excluded middle holds.

Proof. See **On complete ordered fields**, summarizing an argument by Toby Bartels. □

What about uncountability of \mathbb{R}_C and \mathbb{R}_D ?

Talk overview

1. Uncountability and \mathbb{R}
2. **Beating diagonalization**
3. The parametric realizability topos

Ideas that do not work

Find a magical sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that no Turing machine can diagonalize against it when given a as an oracle.

Ideas that do not work

Find a magical sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that no Turing machine can diagonalize against it when given a as an oracle.

How about a enumerating all computable reals?

- ▶ No, diagonalization relativizes to any oracle.

Ideas that do not work

Find a magical sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that no Turing machine can diagonalize against it when given a as an oracle.

How about a enumerating all computable reals?

- ▶ No, diagonalization relativizes to any oracle.

How about a enumerating all reals definable in some strong theory?

- ▶ No! Diagonalization relativizes to **any single oracle**.

Ideas that do not work

Find a magical sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that no Turing machine can diagonalize against it when given a as an oracle.

How about a enumerating all computable reals?

- ▶ No, diagonalization relativizes to any oracle.

How about a enumerating all reals definable in some strong theory?

- ▶ No! Diagonalization relativizes to **any single oracle**.

What if we design a special model of computation?

Ideas that do not work

Find a magical sequence $a : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that no Turing machine can diagonalize against it when given a as an oracle.

How about a enumerating all computable reals?

- ▶ No, diagonalization relativizes to any oracle.

How about a enumerating all reals definable in some strong theory?

- ▶ No! Diagonalization relativizes to **any single oracle**.

What if we design a special model of computation?

- ▶ No, every realizability topos validates Dependent choice.

Oracles for $x \in [0, 1]$

- ▶ There is a computable proper quotient map $q : \mathcal{2}^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$.
- ▶ Say that $\beta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{2}$ represents $x \in [0, 1]$ when $q(\beta) = x$.
- ▶ Let $\mathcal{O}_x = \{\beta \in \mathcal{2}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid q(\beta) = x\}$.

Think of $\beta \in \mathcal{O}_x$ as an *oracle* for x .

Note: $\mathcal{O}_x \subseteq \mathcal{2}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is compact because q is proper.

Oracles for $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$

- ▶ Let $\langle -, - \rangle : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a computable bijection.
- ▶ Define $r : 2^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ by $r(\alpha)(n) = q(k \mapsto \alpha(\langle n, k \rangle))$.
- ▶ Say that $\alpha : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow 2$ represents $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ when $r(\alpha) = a$.
- ▶ Let $\mathcal{O}_a = \{\alpha \in 2^{\mathbb{N}} \mid q(\alpha) = a\}$.

Think of $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_a$ as an *oracle* for a .

Note: $\mathcal{O}_a \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ is compact because r is proper.

Sequences that beat diagonalization

- ▶ Diagonalization works against any **single** $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_a$.
- ▶ But can it work against **many** oracles, parametrically?

Let φ_n^α be the partial map $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ computed by the n -th Turing machine with oracle α .

Definition

Given a set of oracles $S \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$, say that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is:

- ▶ an S -index for $x \in [0, 1]$ when $\varphi_n^\beta \in \mathcal{O}_x$ for all $\beta \in S$,
- ▶ an S -index for $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ when $\varphi_n^\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_a$ for all $\alpha \in S$.

A generalization of Brouwer's fixed point theorem

Let $\mathfrak{C}[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} = \{S \subseteq [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} \mid S \text{ is non-empty and convex}\}$.

Theorem

If the graph of $f : [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is closed then there is $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $a \in f(a)$.

Theorem (J. Miller, classical)

There is a sequence $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an \mathcal{O}_μ -index for x then $\mu(n) = x$.

Theorem (J. Miller, classical)

There is a sequence $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an \mathcal{O}_μ -index for x then $\mu(n) = x$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{I} = \{[u, v] \mid 0 \leq u \leq v \leq 1\}$ be the interval domain.

Steps of the construction:

1. Define $\Psi : [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if n is an \mathcal{O}_a -index for $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\Psi(a)(n) = \{x\}$.

Theorem (J. Miller, classical)

There is a sequence $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an \mathcal{O}_μ -index for x then $\mu(n) = x$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{I} = \{[u, v] \mid 0 \leq u \leq v \leq 1\}$ be the interval domain.

Steps of the construction:

1. Define $\Psi : [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if n is an \mathcal{O}_a -index for $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\Psi(a)(n) = \{x\}$.
2. Verify that Ψ has a closed graph and apply the fixed-point theorem to obtain $\mu \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mu \in \Psi(\mu)$.

Theorem (J. Miller, classical)

There is a sequence $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an \mathcal{O}_μ -index for x then $\mu(n) = x$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{I} = \{[u, v] \mid 0 \leq u \leq v \leq 1\}$ be the interval domain.

Steps of the construction:

1. Define $\Psi : [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}^{\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that, for all $a \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if n is an \mathcal{O}_a -index for $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\Psi(a)(n) = \{x\}$.
2. Verify that Ψ has a closed graph and apply the fixed-point theorem to obtain $\mu \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\mu \in \Psi(\mu)$.
3. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an \mathcal{O}_μ -index for $x \in [0, 1]$ then $\mu(n) \in \Psi(\mu)(n) = \{x\}$, therefore $\mu(n) = x$.

See “Degrees of unsolvability of continuous functions” by Joseph S. Miller for details. □

Talk overview

1. Uncountability and \mathbb{R}
2. Beating diagonalization
3. **The parametric realizability topos**

It is just a matter of technique

- ▶ Let μ be Miller's sequence.
- ▶ A tripos for \mathcal{O}_μ -computability.
- ▶ The tripos-to-topos construction yields a topos $\mathbf{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$.
- ▶ Show that $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is epi in $\mathbf{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$.

The parametric realizability tripos & topos

Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a non-empty set of oracles.

Define the tripos $\text{Pred}_{\mathcal{O}} : \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Heyt}$ by $\text{Pred}_{\mathcal{O}}(X) = (\mathcal{P}\mathbb{N}^X, \leq_X)$ where for $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{P}\mathbb{N}^X$

$$\phi \leq_X \psi \iff \exists e \in \mathbb{N}. \forall x \in X. \forall n \in \phi(x). \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{O}. \varphi_e^\alpha(n) \in \psi(x).$$

The parametric realizability tripos & topos

Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a non-empty set of oracles.

Define the tripos $\text{Pred}_{\mathcal{O}} : \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Heyt}$ by $\text{Pred}_{\mathcal{O}}(X) = (\mathcal{P}\mathbb{N}^X, \leq_X)$ where for $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{P}\mathbb{N}^X$

$$\phi \leq_X \psi \iff \exists e \in \mathbb{N}. \forall x \in X. \forall n \in \phi(x). \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{O}. \varphi_e^\alpha(n) \in \psi(x).$$

The **parametric realizability topos** $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O})$ is the topos arising from the tripos $\text{Pred}_{\mathcal{O}}$.

The Dedekind reals in $\mathbf{PRT}(\mathcal{O})$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in [0, 1]$, let

$$n \Vdash_I x \iff \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{O} . \varphi_n^\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_x.$$

Let $I = \{x \in [0, 1] \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N} . n \Vdash_I x\}$.

Theorem

(I, \Vdash_I) is the Dedekind unit interval $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}_D$ in $\mathbf{PRT}(\mathcal{O})$.

Theorem

$\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is epi in $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$.

Proof. Let $m \Vdash \mu \in [0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$, so that $\varphi_m^\alpha(k) \Vdash \mu(k) \in [0, 1]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_\mu$.

We seek a realizer $e \in \mathbb{N}$ for the statement

$$\forall x \in [0, 1]. \exists n \in \mathbb{N}. \mu(n) = x.$$

Take e such that $\varphi_e^\alpha(k) = \langle k, 0 \rangle$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_\mu$.

If $n \Vdash x \in [0, 1]$ then for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_\mu$ we have $\varphi_n^\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_x$, hence $\mu(n) = x$. It follows that $\varphi_e^\alpha(n) = \langle n, 0 \rangle$ realizes $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}. \mu(n) = x$, as required. \square

Concluding remarks

- ▶ In $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ the object $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is countable as well. Therefore Lawvere's fixed point theorem implies Brouwer's fixed point theorem in the form "Every $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ has a fixed point."

Concluding remarks

- ▶ In $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ the object $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is countable as well. Therefore Lawvere's fixed point theorem implies Brouwer's fixed point theorem in the form "Every $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ has a fixed point."
- ▶ It remains to explore $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ even further.

Concluding remarks

- ▶ In $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ the object $[0, 1]^{\mathbb{N}}$ is countable as well. Therefore Lawvere's fixed point theorem implies Brouwer's fixed point theorem in the form "Every $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow [0, 1]^n$ has a fixed point."
- ▶ It remains to explore $\text{PRT}(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ even further.
- ▶ We defined a notion of a **parameterized partial combinatory algebra** which generalizes Turing machines parameterized by a set of oracles \mathcal{O} . The tripos construction carries over.