CAHIERS DE
TOPOLOGIE ET GÉOMÉTRIE DIFFÉRENTIELLE
CATÉGORIQUES

KIMMO I. ROSENTHAL

Modules over a quantale and models for the operator ! in linear logic

Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques, tome 35, n° 4 (1994), p. 329-333

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CTGDC_1994__35_4_329_0>

© Andrée C. Ehresmann et les auteurs, 1994, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Cahiers de topologie et géométrie différentielle catégoriques » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

CAHIERS DE TOPOLOGIE ET GEOMETRIE DIFFERENTIELLE CATEGORIQUES

Volume XXXV-4 (1994)

MODULES OVER A QUANTALE AND MODELS FOR THE OPERATOR ! IN LINEAR LOGIC

by Kimmo I. ROSENTHAL

Résumé. On démontre que la catégorie *Mod*(**Q**) des modules sur un quantale **Q** (commutatif et unitaire) est un modèle de la logique linéaire pleine au sens de M. Barr. Ainsi, c'est une catégorie *-autonome équippée d'un cotriple ! satisfaisant !(A×B) ~ (!A)⊗(!B) et !1 ~ **Q**, où **Q** en tant que **Q**-module est l'unité pour ⊗ dans *Mod*(**Q**). Pour construire **Q**, on utilise le foncteur libre pour les **Q**-modules ainsi que des formules originellement données par R. Guitart.

INTRODUCTION

*-autonomous categories, originally investigated by Barr [2], have recently become the subject of much interest due to the fact that they provide categorical models for linear logic. Linear logic is a logic of resources developed by J.Y. Girard [6] which has potentially significant applications in theoretical computer science. The precise connection between *-autonomous categories and linear logic was first clarified by Seely [12]. (Also, see Barr [3] and Blute [4].)

One particular aspect of the development of linear logic was the existence of the modal operator 'of course' denoted by !. Seely discussed in [12] some of the categorical properties that ! should possess and ! has been analyzed further by Barr [3] in his recent article. Following Barr, we say that a model of 'full' linear logic is a *-autonomous category $\mathcal{L}$ with finite products together with a cotriple $(!, \epsilon, \delta)$ on $\mathcal{L}$ satisfying that $!(A \times B) \cong (!A) \otimes (!B)$ and $!1 \cong \tau$, where τ is the unit for $\otimes$ in $\mathcal{L}$.

Models for !, i.e. suitable cotriples on *-autonomous categories, have not been easy to find. Girard's original coherent spaces provide a model ([6], [12]) and in [3] Barr discussed modifying the so-called Chu construction to obtain a model for !. Another potentially very interesting model has been investigated by Blute, Panagaden and Seely [5], where ! is modelled by the Fock space construction in functional analysis.

In this article, we provide a new family of models of full linear logic by considering modules over a commutative, unital quantale. Commutative, unital quantales are the commutative monoid objects in the *-autonomous category $\mathcal{SL}$ of suplattices. These quantales and their modules were studied by Joyal and Tierney [8]. (For an overview of the theory of quantales, see [9].)

If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a commutative, unital quantale, the category $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$, of $\mathcal{Q}$-modules, is a *-autonomous category and we indicate how the free $\mathcal{Q}$-module functor from *Sets* to $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ extends to a cotriple $! : Mod(\mathcal{Q}) \longrightarrow Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ with the requisite structure to make $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ into a model of full linear logic. Our inspiration and calculations owe a debt to the early work of Guitart [7], where the free $\mathcal{Q}$-module construction is first described and the category $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ is analyzed in some detail. Guitart's theory of involutive monads deserves further study and may be relevant to developing other examples along these lines.

We begin by briefly describing a simple example, namely the category of sup-lattices. This examples serves to illuminate the more general construction in §2.

§1. An example: the case of sup-lattices

The category $\mathcal{S}l$ of sup-lattices is an example of a *-autonomous category. It was studied in detail by Joyal and Tierney [8] where the *- autonomous structure is described. The covariant power-set functor $\mathcal{P} : Sets \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}l$ is the free sup-lattice functor. It will give rise to a cotriple ! on $\mathcal{S}l$, which will make $\mathcal{S}l$ into a model of full linear logic, in the sense of Barr [3].

If M is a sup-lattice, define $! : \mathcal{S}l \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}l$ to be the covariant power-set functor. Thus, $!M = \mathcal{P}(M)$, the power set of M.

We have the following two maps:
$\epsilon_M : \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow M$ defined by $\epsilon_M(A) = supA$ for a subset $A \subseteq M$
$\delta_M : \mathcal{P}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(M))$ given by $\delta_M(A) = \{\{a\} | a \in A\}$.

Proposition: *$(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon, \delta)$ defines a cotriple on Sl. Furthermore, for all sup-lattices A, B, it satisfies that $\mathcal{P}(A \times B) \cong \mathcal{P}(A) \otimes \mathcal{P}(B)$.*

Proof: The fact that $(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon, \delta)$ satisfies the appropriate diagrams for a cotriple is a straightforward exercise. The isomorphism $\mathcal{P}(A \times B) \cong \mathcal{P}(A) \otimes \mathcal{P}(B)$ is discussed in [8] and follows directly from the fact that $\mathcal{P}$ is the free sup-lattice functor.

Corollary : *The category Sl of sup-lattices, together with the cotriple $(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon, \delta)$, is a model of full linear logic.*

§2. The general case: modules over a commutative unital quantale

A monoid in the category $\mathcal{S}l$ is a sup-lattice $\mathcal{Q}$ together with an associative binary operation o (with an identity element), which preserves sups in both variables. Such structures have been studied under the name *commutative unital quantale* (see [9] for an overview of quantale theory). Quantales are of interest in a variety of areas, in particular theoretical computer science (e.g. [1]) and linear logic ([9]).

Definition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a unital, commutative quantale. A $\mathcal{Q}$-module is a sup-lattice M together with a function $\cdot : \mathcal{Q} \times M \to M$ such that*
1) $e \cdot m = m$ for all $m \in M$, where e is the identity of $\mathcal{Q}$
2) $q \cdot (r \cdot m) = (q \circ r) \cdot m$ for all $q, r \in \mathcal{Q}, m \in M$
3) $(sup_\alpha q_\alpha) \cdot m = sup_\alpha (q_\alpha \cdot m)$ for all $\{q_\alpha\} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}, m \in M$.
4) $q \cdot (sup_\beta m_\beta) = sup_\beta (q \cdot m_\beta)$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}, \{m_\beta\} \subseteq M$.

A sup-lattice morphism $\psi : M \to N$ is a *$\mathcal{Q}$-module morphism* iff it satisfies $\psi(q \cdot m) = q \cdot \psi(m)$ for all $q \in \mathcal{Q}, m \in M$.

Let $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ denote the category of $\mathcal{Q}$-modules. This category was also studied in [8] by Joyal and Tierney, and we record the following result.

Theorem 2.1. *$Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ is a *-autonomous category.*

The tensor product $M \otimes_{\mathcal{Q}} N$ is the codomain of the universal bimorphism of modules $M \times N \to M \otimes_{\mathcal{Q}} N$, where a bimorphism is a $\mathcal{Q}$-module map in each variable separately. $\mathcal{Q}$ is the unit object for $\otimes_{\mathcal{Q}}$. $Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(M, N)$ is the module of $\mathcal{Q}$-module morphisms $M \to N$ with the obvious $\mathcal{Q}$-module structure.

We should point out that modules over quantales play a significant role in the categorical treatment of process semantics by Abramsky and Vickers [1].

When $\mathcal{Q} = \mathbf{2}$, (with $\mathbf{2}$ the two element Boolean algebra), then it follows that $Mod(\mathbf{2}) \cong Sl$. We would like to generalize the cotriple construction of §1 to this general setting of $\mathcal{Q}$-modules.

We first need to discuss the free $\mathcal{Q}$-module functor defined on *Sets*. The first details of this appear in the work of Guitart [7]. It is also discussed much more briefly in [8].

Let M be a set and let $[M, \mathcal{Q}]$ denote the set of all functions (in *Sets*) from M to $\mathcal{Q}$. $[M, \mathcal{Q}]$ becomes a $\mathcal{Q}$-module under the action $(q \cdot f)(m) = q \cdot f(m)$ for all $m \in M$. Define $! : Sets \longrightarrow Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ by $!(M) = [M, \mathcal{Q}]$. $!$ becomes a covariant functor as follows. If $F : M \to N$ is a function, then define $(!F) : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [N, \mathcal{Q}]$ by $(!F)(f)(n) = sup\{f(m) | F(m) = n\}$.

That !(F) is a $\mathcal{Q}$-module morphism follows directly from the fact that in a quantale $q \cdot (\,)$ preserves suprema. $!$ lifts to a functor $Mod(\mathcal{Q}) \longrightarrow Mod(\mathcal{Q})$.

We record the following result from Guitart [7].

Theorem 2.2 *$! : Sets \longrightarrow Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ is the free $\mathcal{Q}$-module functor.*

We now wish to endow $!$, viewed as a functor from $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$ to $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$, with the structure of a cotriple by generalizing the construction for sup-lattices (the case $\mathcal{Q} = \mathbf{2}$). We shall need to utilize the following functions in $[M, \mathcal{Q}]$.

If $m \in M$ and $e \in \mathcal{Q}$ is the identity, define $\eta_m : M \to \mathcal{Q}$ by $\eta_m(x) = e$ if $x = m$ and $\eta_m(x) = 0$ if $x \neq m$.

To obtain a cotriple structure on $!$, we need to define appropriate ϵ and δ.

Define $\epsilon_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to M$ by $\epsilon_M(f) = sup\{f(m) \cdot m | m \in M\}$.

Define $\delta_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}]$ by $\delta_M(f)(g) = f(m)$ if $g = \eta_m$ for some $m \in M$ and $\delta_M(f)(g) = 0$ otherwise.

Both ϵ_M and δ_M are easily seen to be $\mathcal{Q}$- module morphisms.

We record the following simple lemma, which we shall need.

Lemma 2.1 *(1) If M is a $\mathcal{Q}$-module and $m \in M$, then we have $\delta_M(\eta_m) = \eta_{\eta_m}$.*
(2) Given $g \in [M, \mathcal{Q}]$, we have $g = sup_m\{g(m) \cdot \eta_m\}$.

Theorem 2.3. *$(!, \epsilon, \delta)$ is a cotriple on $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$. Furthermore, we have for all $\mathcal{Q}$-modules M and N that $(!M) \otimes (!N) \cong !(M \times N)$, and $!1 \cong \mathcal{Q}$.*

Proof: First, to obtain a cotriple structure, we must verify that several equations hold. Given a $\mathcal{Q}$-module M, we first of all need to obtain the identity function on $[M, \mathcal{Q}]$ from the following two maps.
$\epsilon_{[M,\mathcal{Q}]} \circ \delta_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}] \to [M, \mathcal{Q}]$
$(!\epsilon_M) \circ \delta_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}] \to [M, \mathcal{Q}]$.

To see the first of these, $\epsilon_{[M,\mathcal{Q}]}(\delta_M)(g) = sup_f\{(\delta_M(g)(f) \cdot f\}$. But, if $f \neq \eta_m$ for some $m \in M$, then $(\delta_M(g)(f) = 0$. Therefore, our supremum now becomes $sup_m\{(\delta_M(g)(\eta_m) \cdot \eta_m\} = sup_m\{g(m) \cdot \eta_m\}$, by Lemma 2.1.

For the second equality, note that upon applying the functoriality of !, we obtain that $(!\epsilon_M)(\delta_M)(g)(m) = sup_f\{(\delta_M)(g)(f) | \epsilon_M(f) = m\}$. But, $(\delta_M)(g)(f)$ takes on the value 0 unless $f = \eta_m$, in which case we get $g(m)$. Since $\epsilon_M(\eta_m) = m$, it follows that $(!\epsilon_M)(\delta_M)(g)(m) = g(m)$, as desired.

The remaining conditions that need to be verified in checking that $(!, \epsilon, \delta)$ defines a cotriple is that the two composites

$!(\delta_M) \circ \delta_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}] \to [[[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}]$ and

$\delta_{[M,\mathcal{Q}]} \circ \delta_M : [M, \mathcal{Q}] \to [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}] \to [[[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}]$ are, in fact, equal.
The latter map is most easily analyzed. For a function $k \in [[M, \mathcal{Q}], \mathcal{Q}]$, we have that $(\delta_{[M,\mathcal{Q}]})(\delta_M)(g)(k) = (\delta_M)(g)(f)$ provided $k = \eta_f$ and is 0 otherwise. But, $(\delta_M)(g)(f) = g(m)$ if $f = \eta_m$ and is 0 otherwise. Piecing these facts together, $(\delta_M)(\delta_M)(g)(k) = g(m)$ provided that $k = \eta_{\eta_m}$ and is 0 otherwise.

We must now obtain this calculation for $!(\delta_M) \circ \delta_M$. By definition, we have that $!(\delta_M)(\delta_M)(g)(k) = sup_f\{(\delta_M)(g)(f) | (\delta_M)(f) = k\}$. Since $(\delta_M)(f) = 0$ unless $f = \eta_m$, this equals $sup_m\{g(m) | (\delta_m)(\eta_m) = k\}$. But, by Lemma 2.1., we have that $\delta_M(\eta_m) = \eta_{\eta_m}$ and if $k = \delta_M(\eta_m) = \eta_{\eta_m}$, it must be for a unique m. Thus, we have shown that $!(\delta_M)(\delta_M)(g)(k) = g(m)$ if $k = \eta_{\eta_m}$ and is 0 otherwise, proving that $!(\delta_M)(\delta_M)(g) = (\delta_{[M,\mathcal{Q}]})(\delta_M)(g)$ for all g, as desired. This finishes the verification that $(!, \epsilon, \delta)$ forms a cotriple on $Mod(\mathcal{Q})$.

The assertion $(!M) \otimes (!N) \cong !(M \times N)$ follows from the fact that ! is the free $\mathcal{Q}$-module functor and that $\otimes_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is left adjoint to $Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}$. For any $\mathcal{Q}$-module L, we have the following isomorphisms : $Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(!M \otimes_{\mathcal{Q}} !N, L) \cong Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(!M, Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(!N, L)) \cong$

$Sets(M, Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(!N, L))$. This , in turn, is isomorphic to $Sets(M, Sets(N, L)) \cong Sets(M \times N, L)) \cong Hom_{\mathcal{Q}}(1(M \times N), L)$. This proves that $(!M) \otimes (!N) \cong !(M \times N)$ and we are done

It may be possible to generalize this construction further as follows. By a *quantaloid* we mean a category $\mathcal{Q}$ enriched in $\mathcal{SI}$. These are a natural generalization of unital quantales, which are quantaloids with one object. Much of the theory of quantales generalizes to quantaloids (see [11]), and it was recently shown in [10] that the notion of $\mathcal{Q}$-bimodule leads to a cyclic (non-symmetric) *-autonomous category. A natural question to consider next is whether one can obtain a suitable model for ! on the category of $\mathcal{Q}$-bimodules, where $\mathcal{Q}$ is a quantaloid.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Abramsky and S. Vickers, Quantales,observational logic, and process semantics, Math. Structures in Comp. Sci., Vol.3, No. 2, 1993,161-228.

[2] M. Barr, **-Autonomous Categories*, Springer Lecture Notes in Math. No. 752, 1979.

[3] M. Barr, *-autonomous categories and linear logic, Math. Structures in Comp. Sci., Vol.1, No. 2, 1991, 159-178.

[4] R. Blute, Linear logic, coherence and dinaturality, Theor. Comp. Sci. 115, 1993, 3-41.

[5] R. Blute, P.Panangaden, and R. Seely, Holomorphic models of exponential types in linear logic, to appear in Proc. Math. Found. of Prog. Semantics, Springer Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci.

[6] J.Y. Girard, Linear logic, Theor. Comp. Sci. 50, 1987, 1-102.

[7] R. Guitart, Calcul des relations inverses, Cah. de Top. et Géom. Diff. Vol. XVII, No. 1, 1977, 67-100.

[8] A. Joyal and M. Tierney, *An Extension of the Galois Theory of Grothendieck*, AMS Memoirs No. 309, Amer. Math. Soc., 1984.

[9] K. I. Rosenthal, *Quantales and their Applications*, Pitman Research Notes in Math. No. 234, Longman, Scientific and Technical, 1990.

[10] K. I. Rosenthal, *-autonomous categories of bimodules, to appear in Jour. Pure Appl. Alg.

[11] K. I. Rosenthal *The Theory of Quantaloids*, in preparation

[12] R. Seely, Linear logic, *-autonomous categories, and cofree algebras, in *Categories in Computer Science and Logic*, Cont. Math. Vol. 92, Amer. Math. Soc., 1989, 371-382.

Department of Mathematics
Union College
Schenectady, New York 12308.
U.S.A.