Math. Struct. in Comp. Science (2010), *vol.* 20, *pp.* 239–265. © Cambridge University Press 2010
doi:10.1017/S0960129509990375

Some reasons for generalising domain theory

MARTIN HYLAND

Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, CMS, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 OWB, UK
Email: m.hyland@dpmms.cam.ac.uk

Received 16 March 2009; revised 9 October 2009

One natural way to generalise domain theory is to replace partially ordered sets by categories. This kind of generalisation has recently found application in the study of concurrency. An outline is given of the elegant mathematical foundations that have been developed. This is specialised to give a construction of cartesian closed categories of domains, which throws light on standard presentations of domain theory.

1. Introduction

This paper is one of what I hope will be a series written in conscious homage to Kreisel's paper Kreisel (1971). That paper was prepared for the European Meeting of the ASL in Manchester 1969, was widely aired at the time, and was finally published in the proceedings in 1971. It formed a survey of the state of recursion theory and its generalisations around 1970. At one level it was a remarkable attempt to influence the development of logic, providing concrete proposals and problems as well as more general reflections on future directions. At times, for example in connection with the theory of admissible sets, the discussion foreshadowed developments whose significance was only later fully appreciated. At other points, for example in connection with axiomatics, an approach was promoted that has been explored extensively, but has in my view been less successful. (It is, of course, a positive feature that suggestions can even now be regarded as contentious.) However, one can read the paper on another level as providing a case study into the value of generalisation in a specific area of mathematics. This reading was the inspiration for the talk that I gave in the Domains IX Workshop at the University of Sussex.

1.1. *Aims of generalisation*

The intellectual range of Kreisel's paper is such that any overview is out of the question. However, in addition to a wealth of technical observations and suggestions, the paper contains a series of compelling reflections on the value of generalisation based on the then available experience with generalised recursion theory.

Kreisel distinguished the following four main aims of the generalisation of recursion theory, each loosely associated with specific generalisations:

(a) *Advancing other parts of logic and mathematics.*
Today this seems to be the most successful of the aims. The associated generalisations are those inspired by the model theoretic ideas of explicit and implicit definability.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here one finds Kreisal's key idea, that in certain generalisations one generalises not only the obvious notions (recursive, semi-recursive) but also the notion of finiteness (which is typically replaced by a notion of definability). This played out to good effect in what were then the developing theories of admissible sets and inductive definitions. Generalisations in which the idea of finiteness was itself generalised have worn well. Moreover, the basic insight has wider application. Finiteness manifested in compact spaces and proper maps plays an analogous role in algebraic geometry and in various natural formulations of constructive topology.

(b) *Understanding the mathematical character of ordinary recursion theory.*
This aim seems to me to have been less successful than the first, but it is hard to explain why. The theories first considered under this heading are higher type recursion theories. Kleene's recursion theory on total functionals of finite type has perhaps become a minority interest, notwithstanding some recent work by John Longley (Longley 2007). But Kreisel starts with Platek's recursion theory on partial functionals of finite type (Platek 1966), and this is close to being a study of PCF in a now less familiar context. Since continuous (or perhaps better, finitely based) models of PCF are an established part of the computer science culture, one can see that this line of enquiry has proved valuable. However, it does not seem to have provided much fresh insight into ordinary recursion theory. The same could be said about axiomatic recursion theory, which Kreisel considered both in this context and in the context of theories of self-application (see below).

(c) *Analysis of the general concept of computation.*
This is a lively area today, and those involved one way or another in the current hot topic of quantum computation might profit from reading Kreisel's cool observations on the general notion of computation and its relation to the physical. Alongside considerations of this by now familiar kind, there is a discussion of the idea of extensions of Church's thesis to arbitrary structures. I suppose the connection is intentional, but the issues of explicit and invariant definability that Kreisel considered may not be so familiar. I think that a pity.

(d) *Other uses.*
This is not as it appears a catch-all category. The thought seems to be that there are uses that emerge from reflection on recursion theory in a general sense. Kreisel talks also of incidental uses. He picks out two:

(i) *A formal theory of self application.*
Kreisel focuses on logical systems that permit self-application. This general line has been pursued energetically by others, though not with outcomes envisaged by Kreisel. Curiously, one section on incidental uses closes with a very brief discussion of Scott's then recently introduced D_∞ model of the lambda calculus. Thus Kreisel's paper contains a glimpse of domain theory, which is a topic that has, arguably, proved more widely influential than anything else in the paper. Kreisel is particularly struck by what he takes to be the genuinely mathematical nature of the theory, the issue addressed in this paper.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(ii) *Axiomatic analysis of kinds of evidence.*
This is accompanied by reflections on generalisations of recursion theory to various (typically enumerated) structures. Here I sense a prejudice of the time. Kreisel was himself acutely aware of the issues concerning the choice of data that are needed to make sense of and then exploit a constructive point of view. But there is absolutely no encouragement to think about kinds of evidence in that spirit. I am naturally sensitive to this. In Hyland (1982) I hoped, *inter alia*, to promulgate the view that recursive mathematics and, in particular, recursive analysis has a natural home in the effective topos. The book van Oosten (2008) contains a more extensive account.

It would not be sensible to write a survey of generalisations of domain theory as Kreisel did for recursion theory. That would be an enormous task. However, I believe that Kreisel's idea to reflect on lessons learnt from generalisations is very pertinent to domain theory. When I gave the talk on which this paper is based, I envisaged at most the contents of this paper, but I have since come to see a number of further issues that are illuminated by recent experience. So I have taken the risk of announcing this as one of a series. It may help put this in context if I briefly try to match Kreisel's aims with some aims for the generalisation of domain theory in computer science:

(a) *Advancing other parts of computer science.*
The primary or original aim of domain theory was to provide semantics for higher-order functional programming languages, and some generalisations are driven by that. However, the categorical generalisations from which I start are in themselves motivated by another area of computer science *viz* the study of concurrent systems. Cattani and Winskel (2005) gives both the basic idea and technical developments. So with domain theory it has been easier to succeed in the aim of advancing other parts of the subject than it was for recursion theory.

(b) *Understanding the mathematical character of Scott's domain theory.*
Ideas about domains were originally presented in terms of topology or lattices: which is the starting point of the classic paper on Scott's continuous lattices (Scott 1976). So the mathematical character of domain theory seems evident, to the extent that one important focus of research since the early days has been to reduce the mathematical requirements of the theory. (A delightful new approach was presented by Dana Scott at the Domains IX Workshop, and I hope that it will be made readily available soon.) However, recent experience with generalisations suggests a different way into the traditional theory and its applications. I will sketch this unashamedly mathematical point of view in Section 5.

(c) *Analysis of a general notion of approximation.*
Domain theory can be based on a notion of approximation of information. The information systems approach to the subject makes this explicit. However, generalisations of the notion of a domain show clearly that there are a number of interesting notions of approximation, but I shall not be pursuing this here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(d) *Other uses.*

Domain theory has stimulated various incidental lines of enquiry. I will just mention two:

(i) *Models of the lambda calculus.*

The main modern tools are the filter models. The classic papers are Barendregt *et al.* (1983) and Coppo *et al.* (1984). See Berline (2000) for a survey of models of this general kind. Filter models are related to domains, but the connections are not spelt out in the literature. Hyland *et al.* (2006) claims that Engeler models should not be considered as domains, and initiates a programme to explore the nature of filter models – I hope to return to this.

(ii) *Analysis.*

Prima facie, domain theory deals with issues of approximation, the territory of analysis. There is a tradition of work in this direction (Edalat 1997) under the banner of Exact Real Analysis, and Abstract Stone Duality has recently provided another approach: Bauer and Taylor (2009) contains a detailed account of recent thinking. However, the impact of these ideas on the theory and practice of computational or numerical analysis has up to now been disappointing.

There is a good deal of material here that should illuminate the mathematical background to domain theory. In this paper I hope to show that one style of generalisation leads naturally to a new understanding of the basic theory. But I see opportunities to push this moral further.

1.2. *Generalising domains*

When we speak of a domain, at least in the context of the series of Domains Workshops, we generally mean a Scott domain, that is, an algebraic, bounded complete cpo (recall that by an accident of terminology, a cpo is a directed complete partial order with least element). The category of Scott domains and (Scott) continuous or directed-sup preserving maps is a convenient setting for a considerable range of semantic purposes. Scott domains are closely related to algebraic lattices: any Scott closed subset of an algebraic lattice is a Scott domain, while adding a necessarily open point as top element to a Scott domain gives an algebraic lattice. For mathematical simplicity, I shall concentrate on algebraic lattices and leave the question of extending the ideas to incorporate Scott domains for another occasion.

The standard notion of a Scott domain can be generalised in many ways:

— One can keep the same topological or ordered setting, and extend the objects to be considered. The best-known example is the category of SFP domains first introduced in Plotkin (1976).

— There are notions of domain in which the order is not one of an increase of extensional information. Examples are stable domains and strongly stable domains. The idea originated with Berry (Berry 1979). People sometimes talk of refinements of the notion of domain. Linear logic (Girard 1987) has its roots in a model of this kind. As

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

explained in Taylor (1990), Stable Domain Theory has interesting connections with the work of Diers (Diers 1980) in categorical algebra.

— There are notions of domain with more than one order, typically both a Scott order and a stable order. This idea also appears in Berry's thesis (Berry 1979), and was then analysed in terms of event structures by Winskel (Winskel 1980). The subject was explored further in Winskel (1994), and the connection with linear logic was spelled out in Plotkin and Winskel (1994) and then in greater detail in Curien *et al.* (2000).

— Axiomatic Domain Theory provides axiomatisations of categories of domains. Fiore *et al.* (1997) gives a non-standard example of a category satisfying a sensible axiomatization. The subject is related to Synthetic Domain Theory (Hyland 1991; Taylor 1991; Reus and Streicher 1999) – Fiore and Plotkin (1997) gives one angle on the connection. These approaches have to some extent been subsumed by Paul Taylor's Abstract Stone Duality (Taylor 2000; Taylor 2002a; Taylor 2002b), which is a further generalisation.

There is a good deal to be learnt from each of these generalisations. However, in this paper I shall consider generalisations in a different spirit from any of the above: *viz* the generalisation from domains as posets to domains as categories. This is a very natural generalisation, and one with a long history. The first person to have taken the idea seriously seems to have been Daniel Lehmann, who gave a categorical version of the Smyth power domain (Lehmann 1976). Some time after Lehmann's work, and independently of it, a number of people looked at generalisations of domains for their own sake. The most systematic was Paul Taylor, who in the late 1980s gave categorical generalisations of much of the material of his thesis, Taylor (1986), and also of much analogous Stable Domain Theory. This work is largely unpublished, but some draft papers are available on Taylor's website. Other work of this period includes Coquand *et al.* (1989) in the stable tradition and Hyland and Pitts (1989) for the categorification of algebraic lattices.

More recently, Glynn Winskel has been promoting the use of categorifications of domain theory and, in particular, the use of presheaf categories in the study of concurrency. There is a tenuous link with Lehmann's original idea. Abramsky (Abramsky 1983) shows that Lehmann's categorified (Smyth) powerdomain is a completion under indexed products, while presheaves are completions under colimits. For an extensive treatment of Winskel's general ideas and some deep results on bisimulation, see Cattani and Winskel (2005). The mathematical background to that paper is explained in the paper Fiore *et al.* (in preparation), and it is that background that inspires this paper.

1.3. *Mathematical understanding*

Fifty years on, Kreisel's sections on the mathematical understanding of recursion theory no longer appear as compelling as they once did. But the idea that one plausible aim of generalisation is that it can lead to an improvement of mathematical understanding still seems right. In this paper, I outline a case study.

What is domain theory? Or perhaps a better question is, what are domains and what is the best way to treat them? I do not intend these questions in the epistemological

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sense – what is the best way to teach domain theory to beginning computer scientists? Rather, I intend the logical or, better, conceptual sense – what is the best way to view domains within the wider mathematical universe? This is not a new question: in the early days, one wondered whether it was best to think of domains as particular kinds of lattice or particular kinds of space. My aim is to address from one particular direction the general question of where (categories of) domains come from.

Outline of the paper

The main content of this paper is contained in Section 5, in which I sketch the approach to domain theory that results from reflection on recent experience with categorical generalisations. For simplicity, I will just treat the case of algebraic lattices, but I put that theory in a general categorical context. I will only treat traditional issues (cartesian closure and fixed points), and ignore recent developments (differential structure).

I start by giving some categorical background in Section 2. Then, by way of a warm-up, Section 3 gives a sketch of the main features of the relational model for linear logic from a categorical point of view. One can regard recent work giving higher dimensional generalisations of domain theory as coming from a categorification of the relational model, and Section 3 describes some of this work. It is only a sketch, and is intended simply to make plausible the claim that the new mathematical analysis of domain theory was itself inspired by the recent generalisations. Hence, I have tried to keep my main contribution, contained in Section 5, independent of higher-dimensional category theory. I conclude the paper with some suggestions as to lessons to be learnt.

2. Categorical background

In this paper I am going to give a rational reconstruction of domain theory from what is, I believe, an unfamiliar point of view, but one in which I hope to interest those concerned with the theory and applications of domains. As a result, I have been exercised as to what to expect from the reader. It seems reasonable to assume that any reader of this paper will know the basics of the classical treatment of domain theory, if not from original papers, then from some textbook such as Winskel's attractive and accessible account in Winskel (1993). So it is very likely that readers will know enough category theory to understand what is meant by a category of domains being cartesian closed, but it does not seem wise to rely on much more.

I cannot provide a complete background for beginners in category theory – they should find the introductory text Awodey (2006) helpful, and it will get them as far as the treatment of algebra via monads. Mac Lane's book Mac Lane (1971) remains a standard reference, and gives relevant material not only on monads but also on monoidal categories. One can also find there the basic fact that filtered colimits commute with finite limits in the category **Set** of sets and functions. Other material that is needed for the story seems to be less easily accessible and less familiar, so I will give some sketches in this section.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2.1. *Distributive laws*

This paper rests in the first place on standard observations about distributive laws between monads. For a fuller account and general background on monads, see Barr and Wells (1984).

Theorem 2.1. Let P and M be monads on a category $\mathbf{C}$. Then the following data are equivalent:

1 A lifting of the monad P to the category M-**Alg** of M-algebras.
2 A distributive law $\lambda : MP \to PM$ in the sense of Beck (Beck 1967).
3 An extension of M to the Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(P)$ of P.

The significance of this theorem is the following. Suppose one wishes to extend a monad M to a Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(P)$. That seems complicated, but a lift of the monad P to the category M-**Alg** can be found by routine considerations, and one can then apply the theorem.

The equivalence of 1 and 2 above is standard (it appears in Barr and Wells (1984), for example) and the full result must in some sense be folklore. However, its significance does not seem to be well known, and the best I can do by way of a reference is Hyland *et al.* (2006).

2.2. *Commutative and monoidal monads*

I will make use of some facts about commutative monads that are not readily available. Most of what I need is in the original series of papers Kock (1970; 1971a; 1971b; 1972) by Anders Kock. I am not aware of the material being presented as a whole. A 2-dimensional version of the theory is given in Hyland and Power (2002). It raises serious questions of coherence, but the order-enriched version that I focus on later in the paper is much easier.

Take a symmetric monoidal category $\mathscr{L}$. I shall write $\times$ for the monoidal structure with unit 1, as I only use the notions below for the case where the base category is cartesian closed. I write t and t^* as in Hyland and Power (2002) for versions of the strength of a strong monad T on $\mathscr{L}$. A *commutative monad* T on $\mathscr{L}$ is a strong monad such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} TA \times TB & \xrightarrow{t^*} & T(TA \times B) & \xrightarrow{T(t)} & T^2(A \times B) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle t} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mu_{A\times B}} \\ T(A \times TB) & \xrightarrow[Tt^*]{} & T^2(A \times B) & \xrightarrow[\mu_{A\times B}]{} & T(A \times B) \end{array}$$

commutes. This commutative diagram expresses the property that the algebraic operations of T commute with each other. With T commutative, we have a unique choice of natural map $TA \times TB \to T(A \times B)$, and it is easy to see that it, together with the evident map $1 \to T1$, gives T the structure of a monoidal monad. Conversely, given a monoidal monad, it is easy to recover a strength making the monad commutative.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If T is a commutative monad on a symmetric monoidal closed category with equalisers, it is easy to equip the category T-Alg with a (symmetric) closed structure in the sense of Eilenberg and Kelly (Eilenberg and Kelly 1966). (In my view, the natural formulation is that T-Alg is a closed symmetric multicategory. The significance of this notion is indicated in Hyland and Power (2002), but it was not made fully explicit there.) I will now briefly explain how to obtain the closed structure. For T-algebras $\mathscr{A} = (a : TA \to A)$ and $\mathscr{B} = (b : TB \to B)$, the function space $[\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B}]$ is given by a T-algebra structure on the equaliser of maps $[a, B]$ and $[TA, b].T_{A,B}$ from $[A, B]$ to $[TA, B]$. It is then easy to check that raising to the power of the algebra $\mathscr{A}$ preserves limits so that in good cases one gets a corresponding symmetric monoidal structure. I only need the simplest case.

Proposition 2.2. If $\mathscr{L}$ is locally finitely presentable and T is a finitary commutative monad, then T-Alg is symmetric monoidal closed.

Proof. The category T-Alg is complete and the closed structure can be constructed easily from equalisers as above. But T-Alg is also cocomplete (see, for example, Adámek and Rosický (1994)), so one can take coequalisers in T-Alg to get a good universal notion of tensor product. □

Remark. It is easy to extract from Adámek and Rosický (1994) the fact that the same result applies for any accessible monad on a locally presentable category. In fact, we need much less: $\mathscr{L}$ is finitely complete suffices for the closed structure, while for the tensor product we need finite colimits and some directed colimits that the commutative monad T preserves. (I do not know sensible minimal conditions for the tensor product.)

As I said above, I shall use this theory in the case when the base category is cartesian closed. Generally, we have a monoidal but not cartesian closed structure on the category T-Alg of T-algebras, but the case when T-Alg is cartesian closed is also part of the story. A commutative monad on a category with products is cartesian closed just when T preserves products in the sense that the evident map $T(A \times B) \to TA \times TB$ is inverse to the monoidal structure $TA \times TB \to T(A \times B)$, and the unique map $T1 \to 1$ is inverse to the monoidal structure $1 \to T1$. The following proposition is very easy.

Proposition 2.3. If T is a cartesian closed monad on a cartesian closed category with equalisers, then T-Alg is itself cartesian closed.

2.3. *Categorical models of linear logic*

I shall give a brief outline of the basic categorical perspective on models of Girard's linear logic (Girard 1987). Categorical models are models in the spirit of categorical proof theory. (See Hyland (2002) for other aspects of the subject.) Early treatments of the notion of a categorical model stressing computational aspects can be found in Benton *et al.* (1993a) and Benton *et al.* (1993b). Categorical models are studied further in Hyland and Schalk (2003), and I use the perspective of that paper here.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Definition 2.4. A *(categorical) model of intuitionistic linear logic* consists of a category $\mathscr{L}$ that:

(i) is equipped with symmetric monoidal closed structure;
(ii) has finite products; and
(iii) is equipped with a linear exponential comonad $(!, \varepsilon, \delta)$.

I adopt the usual linear logic notation, writing $\otimes$ for the tensor of the monoidal structure and $\multimap$ for the linear function space. Details of the notion of a linear exponential comonad can be found in Hyland and Schalk (2003). The main point of the definition comes from the fact that the Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(!)$ for the comonad $!$ is cartesian closed. It is worth recalling the proof, as follows.

Proposition 2.5. Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a model of intuitionistic linear logic. Then the Kleisli category $\mathscr{C} = \mathbf{Kl}(!)$ is cartesian closed.

Proof. It is clear that products in $\mathscr{L}$ give products in $\mathscr{C}$. The existence of an adjoint to product follows from the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{C}(X \times Y, Z) &= \mathscr{L}(!(X \times Y), Z) \\ &\cong \mathscr{L}(!X \otimes !Y, Z) \\ &\cong \mathscr{L}(!X, !Y \multimap Z) \\ &= \mathscr{C}(X, !Y \multimap Z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to get a function space $A \Rightarrow B$ in $\mathscr{C}$, it suffices to take $(A \Rightarrow B) = (!A \multimap B)$. □

The equation $(A \Rightarrow B) = (!A \multimap B)$, which is often called the Girard translation from its first appearance in Girard (1987), analyses intuitionistic implication into a combination of a resource modality $!$ and a linear (resource-sensitive) implication. This view is the root of linear logic.

2.4. *Linear logic and domain theory*

In view of the enormous impact of linear logic in the last twenty years, I want to warn against a too facile use of it in the context of domain theory, and with this in mind, I make the following observations.

Observation 1. *Any cartesian closed category $\mathscr{C}$ can be obtained from a model of classical linear logic by means of the Girard translation.*

This follows from the fact that there is a well-known $*$-autonomous structure on $\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{C} \times \mathscr{C}^{op}$, see Hyland and Schalk (2003), and that there is a simple comonad $!$ on $\mathscr{L}$ taking (U, X) to $(U, 1)$. (This comonad lies behind modified realisability.) Then, since $\mathscr{L}((U,1),(V.Y)) \cong \mathscr{C}(U, V)$, it is immediate that $\mathbf{Kl}(!)$ is equivalent to $\mathscr{C}$.

Observation 2. *Let* **Dom** *be the category of Scott domains and Scott continuous maps, and* **SDom** *be the category of Scott domains and strict maps. Then* **SDom** *is a symmetric monoidal closed category that, equipped with a lift comonad, gives a model of intuitionistic linear logic. The Kleisli category is isomorphic to* **Dom**.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This follows from the fact that lifting gives a commutative monoid on the category **Dom** of Scott domains and all objects are uniquely algebras for the monad. (Categorically, the uniqueness comes from the fact that the lifting monad is lax idempotent.) Now **SDom** is the category of algebras for the monad and hence is symmetric monoidal closed by Section 2.2. The standard adjunction produces a comonad on **SDom** and the identification of the Kleisli category is immediate.

Observation 3. *Let* **Dom** *be the category of Scott domains and Scott continuous maps, and* **LDom** *be the category of Scott domains and linear maps (that is, maps preserving all sups). Then there is a comonad on* **LDom** *with* **Dom** *as Kleisli category. But* **LDom** *is not a model of linear logic.*

A Scott domain A has a subposet A_0 of compact elements; and A is the directed completion $D(A_0)$ of A_0. Let $S(A_0)$ be the free completion of A_0 by finite bounded sups. We see that linear maps $D(S(A_0)) \to B$ correspond to Scott continuous maps $A \to B$. So we appear to have a case of the Girard translation. However, there is a real problem with the linear function space. For an algebraic lattice A, the space $A \multimap 2$ of sup-preserving maps will be A^{op}. But that need not be a domain. So function spaces do not exist in general, and the Girard translation cannot be used. (For completeness, I give the following concrete example where A^{op} is not a domain. Take A to be the lattice of open sets of $2^{\mathbb{N}}$, that is of Cantor space. The compact open sets form a basis for the topology, so A is algebraic. But in A^{op}, the lattice of closed sets, the points are minimal elements above $\perp$; and they are evidently not compact elements of that lattice.)

There are moral lessons in these observations. The first suggests that one should look critically at any attempt to derive any particular cartesian closed category from a model of linear logic. The attempt looks peculiarly idiotic in the case of the cartesian closed category **Set** of sets and functions. The second shows that the mere fact that a cartesian closed category arises from a useful model of linear logic does not in itself provide an understanding of that category since, with lifting, the model of linear logic seems to be derived from the category of domains. The third observation is tantalising. In the absence of the Girard translation, there is no particular advantage to an approach to Scott continuous maps via linear maps. Rather, it is the existence of **LDom** and of the comonad on it that themselves need explaining.

3. The relational model

I start this section by reviewing some ideas that I first presented at the Workshop on Domain Theory for Dana Scott's 70th Birthday in Copenhagen in July 2002. In the early 1970s it seemed as if domain theory had been invented primarily in order to enable one to construct genuinely mathematical models of the pure lambda calculus. But knowing what we do now, domain theory is not at all the most natural and obvious place to find such models. Rather, the easiest construction takes place using the relational model, which is the fundamental degenerate model for linear logic. I give a brief account in the following section.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.1. *The model of linear logic*

To understand the categorical generalisations, it is good to place the relational model in a mathematical context.

Multiplicative and additive structure. The category **Rel** of sets and relations is the Kleisli category of the power set monad P on the category **Set** of sets and functions. We can identify P-algebras as $\bigvee$-complete lattices. P is manifestly commutative and thus (as mentioned above) a monoidal monad.

In view of Kock (1971a) and the Remark in Section 2.2, one hopes that the category P-**Alg** of P-algebras has a monoidal structure (which it does) and that it restricts to give a monoidal structure given by product on the Kleisli category **Rel**. With this structure, **Rel** is compact closed and thus $*$-autonomous in a degenerate fashion. Also, **Rel** has finite biproducts given by the coproduct of sets. (This is inevitable – **Set**, and thus the Kleisli category **Rel**, has products, and, by an observation of Robin Houston (Housten 2008), products in compact closed categories are automatically biproducts.)

Exponential structure. There is a simple way to equip **Rel** with a linear exponential comonad. We take the multiset monad M on **Set** whose algebras are commutative monoids, extend it to a monad on **Rel** and then use the (degenerate) duality on **Rel** to obtain a comonad. A brief explanation of the extension is in order here. Observe again that P is a commutative monad. Any commutative monad lifts easily to the category of commutative monoids, that is, to M-**Alg**. (There is an important reason behind this: the notion of a commutative monoid is what we would now usually call operadic as it is the monad generated by a symmetric operad.) From the basic facts about distributive laws, we get an extension of M to a monad, which we still call M, on $\mathbf{Rel} = \mathbf{Kl}(P)$. (This observation is old – it was a throw-away remark in Eilenberg and Wright (1967), where operadic theories were reasonably enough called linear.) Finally, to get the comonad M^* (here it does seem worth avoiding confusion), we dualise using the opposite in the sense of relations: if $r : A \nrightarrow B$, then $r^* : B \nrightarrow A$. On objects and maps, $M^* = M$, and the comonad structure in **Rel** is the opposite of the monad structure.

3.2. *The Kleisli category*

From a model of linear logic we get a cartesian closed category by taking the Kleisli category of the linear exponential comonad. So we have a category $\mathbf{Kl}(M^*)$. The maps $r : A \multimap B$ in it are relations $r : M(A) \nrightarrow B$. One way to think of such a relation is that if xrb, the tokens in the multiset x trigger the token b. Here I use a language suggestive of the idea of a Petri net. Since composition of maps reflects this natural intuition, I like to think of this further Kleisli category as the category of Petri relations and shall write $\mathbf{PRel} = \mathbf{Kl}(M^*)$. I will give a brief account of the properties of **PRel**, the category of Petri relations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cartesian closure and points.

Proposition 3.1. The category **PRel** is cartesian closed: the terminal object is 0, the product of A and B is $A + B$, and the space $B \Rightarrow C$ of functions is $M(B) \times C$.

Proof. Cartesian closure is a direct consequence of the Girard translation (Proposition 2.5). □

Since $M(0) \cong 1$ in **Set**, the collection $\mathbf{PRel}(0, A)$ of points of A can be identified with the power set $P(A)$. It is easy to check that if $r : MA \nrightarrow B$ is a map $A \multimap B$ in **Prel** then $r_* = \mathbf{PRel}(0, r) : P(A) \to P(B)$ acts on $x \in P(A)$ as follows:

$$r_*(x) = \{b \in B \mid \exists \mathbf{a} \in Mx.\, \mathbf{a} r b\}.$$

It is immediate that r_* preserves directed sups, that is, it is Scott continuous. All Scott continuous maps occur. If $f : P(A) \to P(B)$ is Scott continuous, there is a unique maximal but many minimal relations $r : MA \nrightarrow B$ such that $r_* = f$.

Proposition 3.2. The category **PRel** does not have enough points.

Proof. Observe that $\mathbf{PRel}(0, 1) \cong P(1) \cong 2$. For finite posets, order-preserving maps are automatically Scott continuous, and there are just three order-preserving maps $2 \to 2$. On the other hand, $M(1) \cong \mathbb{N}$ in **Set**. Thus $\mathbf{PRel}(1, 1) \cong \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{N}, 1) \cong P(\mathbb{N})$ is infinite. □

The fact that a category does not have enough points causes unnecessary anxiety to many experts in lambda calculus. I shall try to dispel these concerns in a companion paper.

Fixed points. I will now give a crude hands-on account of fixed points of maps. We are given a parametrised map $A + C \multimap A$ in **PRel** and seek a parametrised fixed point $C \multimap A$. That is, given $M(A) \times M(C) \nrightarrow A$, we seek a suitable $M(C) \nrightarrow A$. This will be determined elementwise over $M(C)$, so it suffices to take $f : M(A) \nrightarrow A$ and find a fixed point $x : 1 \nrightarrow A$. But $\mathbf{PRel}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{f}) : \mathbf{PRel}(0, A) \to \mathbf{PRel}(0, A)$ is a Scott continuous map $P(A) \to P(A)$ on the power set of A, so it suffices to take the least fixed point. The standard good properties of this fixed point are immediate.

Proposition 3.3. The category **PRel** has parametrised fixed points.

An even more significant feature of domain theory for programming language semantics is the possibility of finding fixed points for a wide range of operators on domains themselves. For Scott's 70th birthday I illustrated this for the relational model by describing how to find models of the lambda calculus in $\mathbf{Kl}(\hat{M})$. The function space $A \Rightarrow B$ is given by $M(A) \times B$. So the task is to find a set D with a retraction to $M(D) \times D$ in $\mathbf{Kl}(\hat{M})$. Now, any injective map $C \to D$ in **Set** induces an evident retraction from D to C in **Rel** and hence, *a fortiori*, in $\mathbf{Kl}(\hat{M})$. But the problem in **Set** is trivial: for any countable set D, the set $M(D) \times D$ is countable so one easily obtains models of the lambda calculus, indeed, models of the $\beta\eta$ calculus if one takes a bijection. Of course, this crude approach gives no control over the equalities between lambda terms in the model, but one can remedy that. For example, one has the obvious analogue of Engeler

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

models (Engeler 1981). Old tools from Hyland (1976) can be readily adapted to analyse the equality in the naturally occuring examples – I hope to explain this in a further paper.

Conclusions. It is clear that the relational model **Rel** and its induced cartesian closed category **PRel** have very rich structure. In particular, **PRel** has all the structure one usually requires for basic domain theoretic programming semantics. One should not flinch at its failing to have enough points. (Indeed, game semantics makes a virtue of this aspect of its modelling of programming languages.) However, notwithstanding the fact that the action of maps in **PRel** on points is Scott continuous, what one has in the relational model is not a form of domain theory. Perhaps more significantly, it does not look at all like a substitute for domain theory: the simple explanation of an information ordering present in domain theory is lacking. It may be hard to pin down what all this amounts to, but it seems that there must be more to domain theory than simply providing cartesian closed categories with good fixed point properties.

4. Kleisli bicategories

In this section I sketch some material from Fiore *et al.* (in preparation), which will be sufficient to provide a background to recent generalisations of domain theory, and, in particular, to Winskel's approach (Cattani and Winskel 2005) to concurrency. One angle on this material is that it is a generalisation to the 2-dimensional level of the analysis just given for the relational model.

4.1. *Profunctors*

Fiore *et al.* (in preparation) introduces the notion of a Kleisli structure. This is essentially a slight generalisation of the 2-dimensional notion of a pseudo-monad, which is sensitive to issues of size. The most familiar example of a Kleisli structure is the *presheaf Kleisli structure* arising from the presheaf construction. The data for this Kleisli structure is as follows:

— One takes $\mathbf{Cat} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{CAT}$, the inclusion of the 2-category of small categories into that of locally small categories. To a small category A, assign $\mathscr{P}(A) =_{\mathrm{def}} [A^{op}, \mathbf{Set}]$, the locally small category of presheaves over A, and for each A, take the usual Yoneda embedding $y_A : A \to \mathscr{P}(A)$.

— For each functor $f : A \to \mathscr{P}(B)$, take $f^\sharp : \mathscr{P}(A) \to \mathscr{P}(B)$ to be its left Kan extension along the Yoneda embedding (Mac Lane 1971). This data is structured by families of invertible 2-cells

$$\eta_f : f \to f^\sharp y_A \qquad \kappa_A : (y_A)^\sharp \to 1_{TA} \qquad \kappa_{g,f} : (g^\sharp f)^\sharp \to g^\sharp f^\sharp,$$

which I do not make explicit here. The 2-cells satisfy natural unit and pentagon coherence conditions as explained in Fiore *et al.* (in preparation).

The existence of this Kleisli structure follows from the classic identification of the presheaf category $\mathscr{P}(A)$ as the free closure of A under small colimits (Im and Kelly 1986). This too is explained in Fiore *et al.* (in preparation).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The notion of a Kleisli structure is a variant of the notion of a monad for which the Kleisli construction of a bicategory of free algebras makes immediate sense. The Kleisli bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathscr{P})$ obtained from the presheaf Kleisli structure $\mathscr{P}$ can be identified with the standard bicategory **Prof** of profunctors. The 0-cells are the small categories. For small categories A and B, the Kleisli construction gives

$$\mathbf{Kl}(\mathscr{P})[A,B] = \mathbf{CAT}[A,\mathscr{P}(B)],$$

and since $\mathscr{P}(B) =_{\text{def}} [B^{op},\mathbf{Set}]$, this is isomorphic by exponential transpose to

$$\mathbf{Prof}\,[A,B] = \mathbf{CAT}[B^{op}\times A,\mathbf{Set}]\,.$$

With these conventions, a profunctor from A to B is a functor $f : B^{op}\times A \to \mathbf{Set}$, which I write $f(b,a)$. There is an evident analogy with the relational model where elements of $\mathbf{Rel}(A,B)$ can be identified with maps $f : B\times A \to 2$. One should think of $\mathbf{Prof}\,[A,B]$ as the category of set-valued relations between the categories A and B.

The identity profunctor from A to A is the hom-functor $A(-,-) : A^{op}\times A \to \mathbf{Set}$, the exponential transpose of the Yoneda embedding y_A. Composition of profunctors is given by a coend formula: for profunctors $f : B^{op}\times A \to \mathbf{Set}$ and $g : C^{op}\times B \to \mathbf{Set}$, the composite profunctor $g\cdot f : C^{op}\times A \to \mathbf{Set}$ is given by the formula

$$(g\cdot f)(c,a) = \int^{b} g(c,b)\times f(b,a)\,.$$

This identifies **Prof** with $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathscr{P})$ the Kleisli bictategory of the presheaf Kleisli structure, and, in particular, gives a full proof of the basic fact.

Theorem 4.1. **Prof** carries the structure of a bicategory.

Fiore *et al.* (in preparation) claims that the approach via Kleisli structures is a good way to establish the existence of this leading example of a bicategory.

4.2. *Distributivity*

Fiore *et al.* (in preparation) provides a theory of liftings and extensions in the bicategorical context that is a kind of categorification of what we explained in Section 2.1. The generalisations of domain theory exploited by Winskel stem from special cases of this general theory, and I will give a brief overview of them.

4.2.1. *Filtered and finite colimits.* In a suitable sense, $\mathscr{P}(A)$ is the closure of the small category A under small colimits. Another classic construction is the closure of a small category under filtered colimits, which is often called the Ind-completion. This again gives a Kleisli structure on $\mathbf{Cat}\hookrightarrow\mathbf{CAT}$. To a small category A, now assign $\mathscr{D}(A)$, which one can take to be the full subcategory of $\mathscr{P}(A)$ on filtered colimits of representables. The Yoneda embedding factors through the inclusion of $\mathscr{D}(A)$ in $\mathscr{P}(A)$ to give a Yoneda embedding $y_A : A \to \mathscr{D}(A)$. Also, $\mathscr{D}(B)$ is *Ind-complete* in the sense that it is closed under filtered colimits. Hence, for $f : A \to \mathscr{D}(B)$, one can take $f^{\sharp} : \mathscr{D}(A) \to \mathscr{D}(B)$ to be a standard choice of left Kan extension of f along the Yoneda embedding. There is again a 2-dimensional

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

structure to explain, but that restricts from the structure in the presheaf Kleisli structure in a straightforward fashion. The result is the *Ind-completion Kleisli structure*.

Alongside the Ind-completion Kleisli structure, it is also natural to consider the 2-monad $\mathscr{C}$ for categories with finite colimits. (As a 2-monad on **CAT**, it restricts to a 2-monad on **Cat**.) One can freely add all colimits to a small category by first adding finite colimits and then filtered colimits. So it is natural to suppose that the presheaf Kleisli structure $\mathscr{P}$ is the composite $\mathscr{D}\mathscr{C}$. So one hopes that the Kleisli structure $\mathscr{D}$ lifts to C-Alg or, equivalently, that the 2-monad C extends to the Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(\mathscr{D})$.

Arguments establishing the hoped for distributivity are already in the original treatment (Grothendieck *et al.* 1972). An accessible account can be found in Johnstone (1982), and I will give a quick sketch here. First, if $\mathbf{A}$ is a category with finite colimits, then $D(\mathbf{A})$ has finite colimits (and so is cocomplete), and, moreover, the Yoneda functor $\mathbf{A} \to \mathscr{D}(\mathbf{A})$ preserves finite colimits. Furthermore, if $f : \mathbf{A} \to \mathscr{X}$ is a colimit preserving functor to a cocomplete category $\mathscr{X}$, the left Kan extension $f^\sharp : \mathscr{D}(\mathbf{A}) \to \mathscr{X}$ also preserves them. This shows that $\mathscr{D}$ lifts to $\mathscr{C}$-Alg, and thus, *inter alia*, it gives us a composite Kleisli structure $\mathscr{D}\mathscr{C}$. The identification of that with the presheaf structure $\mathscr{P}$ is straightforward.

There is another aspect of the Ind-completion that is important for domain theory. Filtered colimits are exactly the small colimits that commute with all finite limits in the category **Set** of sets. This classic result again goes back to the preliminary generalities in SGA 4 (Grothendieck *et al.* 1972). It is treated fully in Mac Lane (1971). It follows from this characterisation that when a category A has finite colimits, the Ind-completion $\mathscr{D}(A)$ can be identified as the full subcategory $\mathbf{Lex}(A^{op}, \mathbf{Set})$ of the presheaf category $\mathscr{P}(A)$ consisting of the finite limit preserving functors.

4.2.2. *Symmetric monoidal categories.* The presheaf Kleisli structure is a 2-dimensional analogue of the power set monad on **Set**, and the corresponding Kleisli bicategory **Prof** is an analogue of the Kleisli category **Rel**. There are many monads that extend from **Cat** to **Prof**, but the closest analogue to the multiset monad that we extended from **Set** to **Rel** is the 2-monad Σ for symmetric (strict) monoidal categories. The multiset monad is the monad for commutative monoids, and symmetric monoidal categories are weak commutative monoids in the 2-category of categories. (As an aside, one may observe that this is more than a simple categorification. The set of finite multisets on a set A can be obtained by taking the free symmetric monoidal category on A as a discrete category, and then taking its set of connected components. This is the basis for an illuminating approach to finitary polynomial functors.) The extension of the 2-monad Σ for symmetric monoidal categories to **Prof** follows from the lifting of the Kleisli structure $\mathscr{P}$ to Σ-Alg. The fundamental technical fact is the lifting to monoidal categories using the Day tensor product. This is the essential content of Im and Kelly (1986). (Of course, the case of symmetric monoidal categories follows easily since symmetry is inherited by the Day tensor product.)

The extension of Σ to **Prof** is a pseudo-monad, and, just as in the case of M on **Rel**, one can dualise now to get a pseudo-comonad $\Sigma^\star$ on **Prof**. As explained in Fiore *et al.* (2008), the Kleisli bicategory **Esp** (for 'espèces de structures') of this pseudo-comonad

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is the bicategory in which Joyal's theory of species has a natural home: the category of general species, without finiteness restriction, is **Esp**(1, 1), where 1 is the terminal category.

Cartesian closure and points. **PRel** is cartesian closed by a direct application of the Girard translation of linear logic. To handle the bicategorical situation, one needs a 2-dimensional version of this, but the general theory is unexciting, and the result can be extracted easily enough. The following fact is explained in detail in Fiore *et al.* (2008).

Proposition 4.2. The bicategory **Esp** is cartesian closed.

The question of points in the bicategory **Esp** is curious, and the difficulty does not parallel that in **PRel**.

Proposition 4.3. The bicategory **Esp** does not generally have enough points. However, if one restricts the objects from small categories to groupoids one does have enough points.

Proof. A single non-invertible arrow creates a problem for points. But if one deals only with groupoids, the maps are the determined by analytic functors in the obvious sense extending the notion in Joyal (1981). □

Fixed points. The situation is very similar to that for **PRel**, with easy 2-dimensional modifications. It has been considered by Ryu Hasegawa (Hasegawa 2002).

Proposition 4.4. The bicategory **Esp** has parametrised fixed points (in the obvious up-to-isomorphism sense).

Hasegawa (2002) makes a connection between these fixed points and the bicategorical trace on **Prof** arising from the compact closed structure, but his analysis of the Lagrange–Good inversion formula is not well understood.

In addition, one can solve a wide range of domain equations within **Esp**. This is also considered in Hasegawa (2002) for straightforward (functorial) domain equations. But one can do more, and as was the case for **PRel**, the situation is very similar to that for domain theory.

4.2.3. *Categories with finite limits.* Finally in this section, I will describe the example that, when specialised from categories to posets, provides the approach to domain theory given in the next section.

Let L be the 2-monad on **CAT** restricting to **Cat** for categories with finite limits. The following observations explain why the Kleisli structure $\mathscr{P}$ lifts to the 2-category L-Alg of L-algebras:

— Any presheaf category $\mathscr{P}(A)$ has finite limits, and if A has finite limits, the Yoneda $y_A : A \to \mathscr{P}(A)$ preserves finite limits.
— If A and B have finite limits and the functor $f : A \to \mathscr{P}(B)$ preserves finite limits, the left Kan extension $f^\sharp : \mathscr{P}(A) \to \mathscr{P}(B)$ preserves finite limits.

This immediately gives a lift of the presheaf Kleisli structure $\mathscr{P}$ to L-Alg, and hence an extension of L to a pseudo-monad on **Prof**.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Again one can dualise to get a pseudo-comonad L^* on **Prof**. It does not seem worth naming the resulting Kleisli bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$, though an order-enriched version of it plays a big role in the next section.

Cartesian closure and points. As before, cartesian closure follows readily from a 2-dimensional version of the Girard translation.

Proposition 4.5. The bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$ is cartesian closed.

The question of points in the bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$ is relatively straighforward. A profunctor $L^*(A) \nrightarrow B$ corresponds to a functor $L^*(A) \to \mathscr{P}(B)$. But $L^*(A)$ is the closure of A under finite colimits. So, by Section 4.2.1, such a functor corresponds to a filtered colimit preserving functor $\mathscr{P}(A) \to \mathscr{P}(B)$. This gives the action on points of a map in $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$, and the following is then obvious

Proposition 4.6. The bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$ does have enough points.

Fixed points. For fixed points, the situation is very similar to that for **PRel** and **Esp**.

Proposition 4.7. The bicategory $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$ has parametrised fixed points (in the obvious up-to-isomorphism sense).

Again one can also solve a wide range of domain equations within $\mathbf{Kl}(L^*)$ and the situation is similar to that for domain theory.

5. Ordered sets

The background to the generalised domain theory sketched in the previous section requires some non-trivial higher dimensional category theory, and will not be to the taste of all readers. However, restricting back from categories to posets gives a version that can be understood at the level of ordinary categories – I will present this version in this section. For this paper one can think of the results as using the experience of a generalisation to provide a fresh approach to traditional domain theory. This in turn should inform developments in the higher dimensional setting, but that is for another time.

5.1. *Posets and linear systems*

We start with the category **Pos** of posets and order preserving maps. For X a poset, let $P(X) = [X^{op}, 2]$ be the poset of down-closed subsets of X ordered by inclusion. We have a Yoneda embedding $y : X \to P(X)$ in **Pos** given by

$$y(a) = \downarrow(a) = \{b \mid b \leqslant a\}\,.$$

$P(X)$ is the free $\bigvee$-complete poset generated by the poset X in the obvious sense that any functor $f : X \to C$ where C is $\bigvee$-complete factors uniquely through the Yoneda as

$$X \xrightarrow{\ y_X\ } P(X) \xrightarrow{\ f^\sharp\ } C$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where the left Kan extension $f^\sharp$ is defined for $r \in P(X)$ by

$$f^\sharp(r) = \bigvee \{f(a) | a \in r\}\,.$$

It follows that P has the structure of a monad on **Pos** with unit the Yoneda embedding $y : X \to P(X)$, and multiplication $P(P(X)) \to P(X)$ given by union. This corresponds to the presheaf Kleisli structure of the previous section.

Now consider what corresponds to the bicategory of profunctors. It will be the Kleisli category of P. I adopt Glynn Winskel's nomenclature as used, for example, in Winskel and Zappa Nardelli (2004), and call this category **Lin** the category of linear systems. A map from X to Y in **Lin** is a functor $X \to P(Y)$ in **Pos**, so it can be represented via the transpose $X \times Y^{op} \to 2$ as a relation $r : X \nrightarrow Y$ such that

$$a' \geqslant a \text{ and } a\, r\, b \text{ and } b \geqslant b' \text{ implies } a'\, r\, b'\,.$$

For clarity, I have written r as an infix relation here.

5.2. *Directed and finite sups*

Consider the analogue of the decomposition of the presheaf Kleisli structure. Let D be the monad for directed completion and S be the monad for $\vee$-semilattices (that is, for finite sup completion). The following observations are all easy. First, if A is a $\vee$-semilattice, then so is $D(A)$ (and hence, in fact, we have $D(A)$ is $\bigvee$-complete). Second, the Yoneda embedding $A \to D(A)$ preserves finite sups. Finally, if $f : A \to L$ is a finite sup preserving map from a $\vee$-semilattice A to a suplattice L, then the left Kan extension $D(A) \to L$ also preserves finite sups.

It follows that the monad D on **Pos** lifts to one on S-Alg, the category of $\vee$-semilattices, so S extends from **Pos** to the Kleisli category **Kl**(D). There is a distributive law $SD \to DS$, and DS is a monad that one can readily identify with the monad P from the previous section.

5.3. *Extending a monad*

I turn now to the question of when one can extend a monad on **Pos** to one on **Lin**. With the simplest form of domain theory in view, I concentrate on the monad M for meet semi-lattices. As a functor M is given by the collection of finitely generated up-closed subsets, ordered by $\supseteq$, that is, by the opposite of inclusion. A routine simplification of the arguments of Fiore *et al.* (in preparation) shows that this monad extends. For the benefit of those ill at ease with the relevant category theory, it seems worth going through what this amounts to in this easy special case.

By the general theory of distributive laws, to give an extension of M to the Kleisli category **Lin** is to give a lifting of the monad P to the category M-Alg of M-algebras or meet semilattices. I will follow the line of analysis in Fiore *et al.* (in preparation), and then explain why it follows that one does indeed get the required lifting. The analysis involves the following points:

(1) If X is a $\wedge$-semilattice, then so is $P(X)$. This is evident: since $P(X)$ is $\bigvee$-complete, it is $\bigwedge$-complete and thus $\wedge$-complete. Moreover, if X is a $\wedge$-semilattice, the Yoneda

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$y : X \to P(X)$ preserves the $\wedge$-semilattice structure. This is a straighforward check:

$$y(T) = \downarrow (T) = X = T \quad \text{the top element in } PX$$

$$y(a \wedge b) = \downarrow (a \wedge b) = \downarrow (a) \cap \downarrow (b) = y(a) \cap y(b) \quad \text{in } PX.$$

(2) For X and Y $\wedge$-semilattices and $f : X \to P(Y)$ a map of $\wedge$-semilattices, the left Kan extension $f^\sharp : P(X) \to P(Y)$ is also a map of $\wedge$-semilattices. Recall that for $r \in P(X)$, one has $f^\sharp(r) = \bigcup\{f(a) | a \in r\}$. To see that $f^\sharp$ preserves $\top$, observe that

$$f^\sharp(\top) = f^\sharp(X) = \bigcup\{f(a) | a \in X\} = f(\top) = \top.$$

To see that $f^\sharp$ preserves $\cap$, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sharp(r) \cap f^\sharp(s) &= \bigcup\{f(a) | a \in r\} \cap \bigcup\{f(b) | b \in s\} \\ &= \bigcup\{f(a) \cap f(b) | a \in r,\ b \in s\} \\ &= \bigvee\{f(a \cap b) | a \in r,\ b \in s\} \\ &= \bigvee\{f(c) | c \in r \cap s\} \\ &= f^\sharp(r \cap s). \end{aligned}$$

These points are enough to provide a lift of P to a monad $\tilde{P}$ say on M-Alg. The action of $\tilde{P}$ on objects is given by point (1) above: we take A to $P(A)$. We get the action on maps $f : A \to B$ as the left Kan extension $(y_B.f)^\sharp$, which is an M-algebra map by point (2). The unit $y : A \to P(A)$ is an M-algebra map by point (1), and the naturality of this is immediate. The multiplication of the monad is given as the left Kan extension $(1_{PA})^\sharp$ of the identity, and that is again an M-algebra map by point (2).

5.4. *From monad to comonad*

In the previous section I explained why the monad M for $\wedge$-semilattices extends from **Pos** to **Lin**. Now **Lin** is compact closed: the tensor product is given by the product of posets and the dual of a poset A is A^{op}, the opposite poset with the order reversed. Hence we can dualise the monad M on **Lin** to give a comonad $S = M^*$, which is defined as a functor by

$$S(A) = M^*(A) = (M(A^{op}))^{op}.$$

On objects, $S(A)$ is the free $\vee$-semilattice on A.

Each $M(A)$ is a commutative monoid in **Pos** and thus in **Lin**. Also, maps $M(A) \to M(B)$ of free M-algebras in **Pos** preserve the monoid structure, and (there is something to check here) this extends to **Lin**. It follows that $S(A)$ is a commutative comonoid in **Lin** and that maps $S(A) \to S(B)$ of free S-algebras in **Lin** preserve the comonoid structure. Finally, one can show that S is a monoidal comonoid in **Lin**. Thus, S is a linear exponential comonad and **Lin** is a model for linear logic.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.5. *The Kleisli category for the comonad*

One can identify the Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(S)$ for the comonad S as a category of domains as follows. By definition, the objects are posets and the maps $A \multimap B$ are maps of linear systems $SA \nrightarrow B$, that is, maps of posets $SA \to PB$. Now consider that $PB \cong DSB$, so one has maps of posets $SA \to DSB$ and thus directed sup preserving (that is, Scott continuous) maps $DSA \to DSB$ or, equivalently, $PA \to PB$.

The whole discussion of this section is based on the category **Pos**: everything is at least enriched there. In this context it seems appropriate to say that an algebraic lattice is *free* just if it is of the form PA for a poset A, that is, when it is a free $\bigvee$-lattice on a poset. Equivalently, an algebraic lattice is free just if it is the result of taking a poset A, forming the free $\vee$-semilattice SA, and then taking the directed completion DSA. Thus one can identify $\mathbf{Kl}(S)$ with the category **FAlglatt** of free algebraic lattices.

Since one has a model for linear logic, the discussion in Section 2 applies, and one derives the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. The Kleisli category $\mathbf{Kl}(S)$, equivalently, the category **FAlglatt** of free algebraic lattices and Scott continuous maps, is cartesian closed.

This is all one gets by simple application of ideas coming from linear logic. To get a handle on domain theory, one needs to go further and explain the cartesian closure of the category **Alglatt**, of all algebraic lattices and Scott continuous maps.

5.6. *Cpos*

To explain domains, one has to go beyond the category of free algebraic lattices. But it is easy to go too far, and instructive to see why. Let **Dcpo** be the category of directed complete partial orders and Scott continuous maps. Then **Dcpo** is clearly the category D-Alg of algebras for the directed completion monad D. Now D is a commutative monad. (This holds either concretely because directed limits commute with directed limits, or because D is lax idempotent and thus commutative by an easy special case of Lopez Franco (2008, Section 6.7).) But D is very special, indeed it is the main example of a cartesian closed monad given by Kock (Kock 1971b), that is, one in which the evident map

$$D(A \times B) \to DA \times DB$$

is inverse to the monoidal structure

$$DA \times DB \to D(A \times B).$$

So, applying the main result of Kock (1971b), we get the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. The category **Dcpo**, of directed complete partial orders and Scott continuous maps, is cartesian closed.

This result is too easy, so it seems to me unhelpful to think of the cartesian closure of **Alglatt** as a matter of finding some cartesian closed subcategory of **Dcpo**.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.7. *Algebraic lattices*

It is now time to understand the category **Alglatt** in terms of the theory developed above. I first take another look at the category **FAlglatt** of free algebraic lattices. There are the following equivalent perspectives:

— The Kleisli category of the comonad S on **Lin**. The objects are posets A, B, C, say, and the maps $A \to B$ are maps $SA \nrightarrow B$ in **Lin**, that is, maps $SA \to PB$ in **Pos**.
— The category of free D-algebras on the underlying posets of free $\vee$-semilattices. The objects are free $\vee$-semilattices, SA, SB, SC, say, and the maps $SA \to SB$ are maps $DSA \to DSB$ in **Dcpo**, that is, poset maps $SA \to DSB$.

Following the second view, the category **Alglatt** can be presented as follows. The objects are (arbitrary) $\vee$-semilattices $\mathscr{A} = (SA \to A)$, $\mathscr{B} = (SB \to B)$, $\mathscr{C} = (SC \to C)$, say, and maps $\mathscr{A}$ to $\mathscr{B}$ are D-algebra maps from the free D-algebra on the underlying poset A to that on B. I will now explain why **Alglatt** is cartesian closed.

Products in **Alglatt** are straightforward. The category S-Alg of $\vee$-semilattices is complete, indeed, the forgetful functor creates limits. So, in particular, there is a product $\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}$ given by the evident composite $S(A \times B) \to SA \times SB \to A \times B$. Then one can check

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}) &\cong D\text{-Alg}(DC, D(A \times B)) \\
&\cong D\text{-Alg}(DC, DA \times DB) \\
&\cong D\text{-Alg}(DC, DA) \times D\text{-Alg}(DC, DB) \\
&\cong \mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{A}) \times \mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{C}, \mathscr{B}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, at the level of the generating $\vee$-semilattices, products are given by products in S-Alg.

The question of function spaces in the category of algebraic lattices is very much more subtle. I will begin by explaining the issue. Suppose again that $\mathscr{A} = (a : SA \to A)$, $\mathscr{B} = (b : SB \to B)$ and $\mathscr{C} = (c : SC \to C)$ are $\vee$-semilattices. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}, \mathscr{C}) &\cong D\text{-Alg}(D(A \times B), DC) \\
&\cong \mathbf{Pos}(A \times B, DC) \\
&\cong \mathbf{Pos}(A, B \Rightarrow DC).
\end{aligned}$$

To continue, one clearly needs to show that $B \Rightarrow DC$ is of the form $D(E(B, C))$ for some $\vee$-semilattice $E(B, C)$. Now why is that? The first thing to note is that when

$$\mathscr{C} = FX = (\mu_X : S^2X \to SX)$$

is a free $\vee$-semilattice FX on a poset X, the matter is essentially no different from the construction in the category of all such **FAlglatt**. This is because

$$(B \Rightarrow DSX) \cong (B \Rightarrow PX) \cong P(B^{op} \times X) \cong DS(B^{op} \times X).$$

So for $\mathscr{C} = FX$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}, \mathscr{C}) &\cong \mathbf{Pos}(A, DS(B^{op} \times X)) \\
&\cong D\text{-Alg}(DA, DS(B^{op} \times X)) \\
&\cong \mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C})
\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $\mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C} = F(B^{op} \times X)$ is itself a free algebraic lattice. Note that the traditional approach to function spaces via step functions hides the fact that the space of functions into a free algebraic lattice is free. Though it is straightforward to confirm the observation by direct calculation, I do not recall it appearing in the literature. So even at this point, one may have gained some mathematical understanding.

Treating the space of functions $\mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C}$ for a general $\mathscr{C}$ requires more work. The argument just given depends essentially on the fact that $PX \cong (X^{op} \Rightarrow 2)$ in **Pos** so that

$$(B \Rightarrow PX) \cong (B \Rightarrow (X^{op} \Rightarrow 2)) \cong ((B \times X^{op}) \Rightarrow 2) \cong P(B^{op} \times X).$$

So I need a substitute for this fact.

The substitute depends on the fact that the categories of $\wedge$-semilattices and of $\vee$-semilattices are symmetric monoidal closed. This is immediate by Proposition 2.2, but is also very easy to prove directly. Now consider a special case of the characterisation of the Ind-completion. For C a $\vee$-semilattice, the directed completion can be identified with $C^{op} \multimap 2$, the (complete) poset of $\wedge$-semilattice maps from C^{op} to 2. (Here $\multimap$ is the closed structure in $\wedge$-semilattices.) There are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} B \Rightarrow (C^{op} \multimap 2) &\cong MB \multimap (C^{op} \multimap 2) \\ &\cong MB \otimes C^{op} \multimap 2. \end{aligned}$$

Now $(MB \otimes C^{op})^{op} \cong SB^{op} \otimes C$, where context determines that on the left-hand side the tensor is on $\wedge$-semilattices while on the right-hand side it is on $\vee$-semilattices. Thus for general algebraic lattices $\mathscr{A}$, $\mathscr{B}$, $\mathscr{C}$, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{B}, \mathscr{C}) \cong \mathbf{Alglatt}(\mathscr{A}, \mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C})$$

where $(\mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C}) = D(S(B^{op}) \otimes C)$ is determined as an algebraic lattice by its finite elements $(S(B^{op}) \otimes C)$.

This explanation of the cartesian closure of **Alglatt** may appear to give an explanation of the function space $\mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C}$ that is less concrete than the usual one in terms of finite sups of step functions. But that is illusory since work is required to get a concrete handle on the formal relation between finite sups of step functions. And the description of the finite elements of $\mathscr{B} \Rightarrow \mathscr{C}$ as $SB^{op} \otimes C$ readily gives a description by generators and relations in the sense of order-enriched algebra. I will explain this in the following remarks

Remark 1. If X is a poset, SX is isomorphic to the $\vee$-semilattice of finitely generated downsets of X, that is, to the finitary elements of PX. A presentation can be given as follows. For a and b arbitrary finite subest of X, define a preorder $a \leqslant b$ by

$$a \leqslant b \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \forall x \in a. \exists y \in b. x \leqslant y.$$

In terms of generators and relations, take elements $x \in X$ and form terms in $\perp$ and $\vee$ subject to the laws for a commutative idempotent monoid together with $x \vee y = y$ whenever $x \leqslant y$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 2. If A and B are $\vee$-semilattices, $A \otimes B$ is generated as a $\vee$-semilattice from the product poset $A \times B$ with elements $a \otimes b$ subject to

$$(a \vee a') \otimes b = a \otimes b \vee a' \otimes b \qquad \bot \otimes b = \bot$$
$$a \otimes (b \vee b') = a \otimes b \vee a \otimes b' \qquad a \otimes \bot = \bot$$

as additional equations.

Remark 3. If X is a poset and B a $\vee$-semilattice, the presentation of $S(X) \otimes B$ obtained by the previous remarks can be simplified. It is then generated as a $\vee$-semilattice from the poset $X \times B$ with elements $x \otimes b$ subject to

$$x \otimes (b \vee b') = x \otimes b \vee x \otimes b' \qquad x \otimes \bot = \bot$$

as additional equations.

Remark 4. If we apply Remark 3 to the case of $S(B^{op}) \otimes C$, we get a presentation based on the poset $B^{op} \times C$ whose elements I now write as $[b, c]$ with

$$[b, (c \vee c')] = [b, c] \vee [b, c'] \qquad [b, \bot] = \bot$$

as additional equations. These are exactly the relations between the basic step functions

$$[b, c] = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } a \geqslant b, \\ \bot & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

that appear in the standard treatments.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have concentrated on algebraic lattices because the story for them is straightforward and immediately appealing. It is possible to treat Scott domains in a similar spirit, but I leave that for another occasion. What I am keen to stress here is a simple story. The starting point, the relational model of linear logic, is very natural. Generalising from sets to categories gives a range of models based on the bicategory of profunctors. Specialising one of these from categories to posets gives a model leading to the cartesian closed category of free algebraic lattices. One uses absolutely basic abstract mathematics to move from that to the cartesian closed category of algebraic lattices.

Some proponents of Stable Domain Theory and its many relations castigate the theory of Scott domains as somehow trivial. I suppose that a number of thoughts lie behind this, most obviously:

— Scott domains are a rather boring kind of topological space.
— The properties of Scott domains, including the cartesian closure of the category, are mathematically uninteresting.
— There is no useful connection between Scott domains and linear logic.

I believe the abstract approach in this paper provides responses at various levels:

— Algebraic lattices are only accidentally spaces. They naturally arise by specialising ideas from the theory of Ind-completion to the poset case.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

— That the category of algebraic lattices is cartesian closed depends on some elegant abstract mathematics.
— There is a connection with linear logic, but considerations beyond the standard Girard construction are needed to account for the category and its properties.

The reconstruction of domain theory given in this paper is inspired by categorical generalisations, and the work of Winskel (Cattani and Winskel 2005) in particular. I hope that readers will feel that it does support Kreisel's idea that one justification for generalisation is that it leads to an increase in mathematical understanding.

Acknowledgements

I formulated the material on the relational model for the Workshop on Domain Theory held to mark Dana Scott's 70th Birthday in Copenhagen in July 2002. I am grateful to the organisers, Lars Birkedal and Giuseppe Rosolini, for initial stimulation. Then I tried to place Engeler models in an appropriate mathematical context. I hope soon to return to that and the more general issue of filter models for the lambda calculus, and so complete the project initiated in Hyland *et al.* (2006); but I would like to take the opportunity here to thank my coauthors on that paper.

I am grateful to Bernhard Reus, both generally as the organiser of the stimulating Domains IX Workshop, and specifically for suggesting that I use recent experience with higher dimensional models (as represented by Fiore *et al.* (2008) and Fiore *et al.* (in preparation)) as the basis for a talk. This paper is the result of his suggestion. I am further grateful to the referees for perceptive comments and useful suggestions, and for their tolerance of a poorly prepared first draft.

Finally, I have already drawn attention to Paul Taylor's substantial research on domain theory and its categorification, but I would also like to acknowledge here the use of his diagram macros.

References

Abramsky, S. (1983) Semantic Foundations for Applicative Multiprogramming. In: Diaz, J. (ed.) Automata, Languages and Programming, Procedings of ICALP'83. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **154** 1–14.

Adámek, J. and Rosický, J. (1994) Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories. *LMS Lecture Notes Series* **189**.

Awodey, S. (2006) *Category Theory*, Oxford Logic Guides **49**, Clarendon Press.

Barendregt, H., Coppo, M. and Dezani-Ciancaglini, M. (1983) A Filter Lambda Model and the Completeness of Type Assignment. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* **48** 931–940.

Barr, M. and Wells, C. (1984) *Toposes, Triples and Theories*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **278**, Springer-Verlag.

Bauer, A. and Taylor, P. (2009) The Dedekind Reals in Abstract Stone Duality. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **19** 757–838.

Beck, J. M. (1967) *Triples, Algebras and Cohomology*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Benton, N., Bierman, G., de Paiva, V. and Hyland, M. (1993a) A Term Calculus for Intuitionistic Linear Logic. In: Bezem, M. and Groote, J. F. (eds.) Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **664** 75–90.

Benton, N., Bierman, G., de Paiva, V. and Hyland, M. (1993b) Linear lambda-calculus and categorical models revisited. In: Börger, E., Jäger, G., Büning, H. K., Martini, S. and Richter, M. M. (eds.) Proceedings of Computer Science Logic Conference in San Miniato (September 1992). *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **702** 61–84.

Berline, C. (2000) From Computation to Foundations via Functions and Application: the Lambda-calculus and its Webbed Models. *Theoretical Computer Science* **249** 81–161.

Berry, G. (1979) *Modèles completement adéquats et stables des lambda-calculs typés*, Thèse de Doctorat d'Etat, Université de Paris VII.

Cattani, G. L. and Winskel, G. (2005) Profunctors, open maps and bisimulation. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **15** 553–614.

Coppo, M., Dezani-Ciancaglini, M., Honsell, F. and Longo, G. (1984) Extended Type Structures and Filter Lambda Models. In: Lolli, G., Longo, G. and Marcja, A. (eds.) *Logic Colloquium 82*, North-Holland 241–262.

Coquand, T., Gunter, C. A. and Winskel, G. (1989) Domain Theoretic Models of Polymorphism. *Information and Computation* **81** 123–167.

Curien, P.-L., Plotkin, G. D. and Winskel, G. (2000) Bistructures, Bidomains and Linear Logic. In: Plotkin, G., Stirling, C. and Tofte, M. (eds.) *Proof, Language, and Interaction. Essays in Honour of Robin Milner*, MIT Press 21–54.

Diers, Y. (1980) Multimonads and Multimonadic Categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **17** 153–170.

Edalat, A. (1997) Domains for Computation in Mathematics, Physics and Exact Real Arithmetic. *Bulletin of Symbolic Logic* **3** 401–452.

Eilenberg, S. and Kelly, G. M. (1966) Closed Categories. In: *Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra, La Jolla 1965* 421–562.

Eilenberg, S. and Wright, J. B. (1967) Automata in general algebras. *Information and Control* **11** 452–470.

Engeler, E. (1981) Algebras and Combinators. *Algebra Universalis* **13** 389–392.

Fiore, M. P., Plotkin, G. D. and Power, J. (1997) Complete cuboidal sets in axiomatic domain theory. In: *Proceedings of the 12th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, IEEE Computer Society Press 268–279.

Fiore, M. P. and Plotkin, G. D. (1997) An extension of models of axiomatic domain theory to models of synthetic domain theory. In: van Dalen, D. and Bezem, M. (eds.) Computer Science Logic, Proceedings of 10th International Workshop, CSL'96. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **1258** 129–149.

Fiore, M., Gambino, N., Hyland, M. and Winskel, G. (2008) The cartesian closed bicategory of generalised species of structures. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **77** 203–220.

Fiore, M., Gambino, N., Hyland, M. and Winskel, G. (in preparation) Kleisli bicategories.

Girard, J.-Y. (1987) Linear Logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **50** 1–102.

Artin, A. G. M. and Verdier, J. L. (1972) Théorie des Topos et Cohomologie Étale des Schemas. SGA 4, vol. 1. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **269**.

Hasegawa, R. (2002) Two applications of analytic functors. *Theoretical Computer Science* **272** 113–175.

Houston, R. (2008) Finite products are biproducts in a compact closed category. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **212** 394–400.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hyland, J. M. E. (1976) A syntactic characterization of the Equality in some Models for the Lambda Calculus. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **12** 361–370.

Hyland, J. M. E. (1982) The effective topos. In: Troelstra, A. S. and van Dalen, D. (eds.) *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, North-Holland 165–216.

Hyland, J. M. E. (1991) First steps in synthetic domain theory. In: Carboni, I. A., Pedicchio, M.-C. and Rosolini, G. (eds.) Category Theory. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1488** 280–301.

Hyland, J. M. E. (2002) Proof Theory in the Abstract. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **114** 43–78.

Hyland, J. M. E. and Pitts, A. M. (1989) The Theory of Constructions: Categorical Semantics and Topos Theoretic Models. In: Gray, J. W. and Scedrov, A. (eds.) Categories in Computer Science and Logic. *Contemporary Mathematics* **92** 137–199.

Hyland, M. and Power, J. (2002) Pseudo-commutative monads and pseudo-closed 2-categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **175** 141–185.

Hyland, M. and Schalk, A. (2003) Glueing and Orthogonality for Models of Linear Logic. *Theoretical Computer Science* **294** 183–231.

Hyland, M., Nagayama, M., Power, J. and Rosolini, G. (2006) A Category-Theoretic Formulation for Engeler-style Models of the Untyped lambda-Calculus. Proc MFCSIT 2004. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **161** 43–57.

Im, G. B. and Kelly, G. M. (1986) A universal property of the convolution monoidal structure. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **43** 75–88.

Johnstone, P. T. (1982) *Stone Spaces*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **3**, Cambridge University Press.

Joyal, A. (1981) Une théorie combinatoire des séries formelles. *Advances in Mathematics* **42** 1–82.

Kelly, G. M. (1980) Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory. *LMS Lecture Note Series* **64**, Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, G. M. and Laplaza, M. (1990) Coherence for compact closed categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **19** 193–213.

Kock, A. (1970) Monads on Symmetric Monoidal Closed Categories. *Archiv der Mathematik* **21** 1–10.

Kock, A. (1971a) Closed categories generated by Commutative Monads. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society* **12** 405–424.

Kock, A. (1971b) Bilinearity and Cartesian Closed Monads. *Mathematica Scandinavica* **29** 161–174.

Kock, A. (1972) Strong Functors and Monoidal Monads. *Archiv der Mathematik* **23** 113–120.

Kreisel, G. (1971) Some reasons for generalizing recusion theory. In: Gandy, R. O. and Yates, C. E. M. (eds.) *Logic Colloquium '69, Proceedings of the summer school and colloquium in Mathematical Logic*, North-Holland 139–198.

Lambek, J. and Scott, P. J. (1986) *Introduction to higher order categorical logic*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **7**, Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, D. J. (1976) Categories for fixed point semantics. In: *Proceedings of the 17th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* 122–126.

Longley, J. R. (2007) On the ubiquity of certain total type structures. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **17** 841–953.

Lopez Franco, I. (2008) *Autonomous pseudo-monoids*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Mac Lane, S. (1971) *Categories for the working mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **5**, Springer-Verlag.

Platek, R. A. (1966) *Foundations of Recursion Theory*, Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Plotkin, G. D. (1976) A Power Domain Construction. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **5** 452–487.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Plotkin, G. D. and Winskel, G. (1994) Bistructures, Bidomains and Linear Logic. In: *Proceedings of ICALP* 352–363.

Reus, B. and Streicher, T. (1999) General synthetic domain theory – a logical approach. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **9** 177–223.

Scott, D. S. (1976) Continuous lattices. In: Lawvere, F. W. (ed.) Toposes, Algebraic Geometry and Logic. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **274** 97–136.

Taylor, P. (1986) *Recursive Domains, Indexed Category Theory and Polymorphism*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Taylor, P. (1990) An Algebraic Approach to Stable Domains. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **64** 171–203.

Taylor, P. (1991) The fixed point property in synthetic domain theory. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, IEEE Computer Society Press 152–160.

Taylor, P. (2000) Geometric and Higher Order Logic in terms of ASD. *Theory and Applications of Categories* **7** 284–338.

Taylor, P. (2002a) Sober Spaces and Continuations. *Theory and Applications of Categories* **10** 248–299.

Taylor, P. (2002b) Subspaces in ASD. *Theory and Applications of Categories* **10** 300–366.

van Oosten, J. (2008) *Realizability: An Introduction to its Categorical Side*, Studies in Logic and The Foundations of Mathematics **152**, Elsevier.

Winskel, G. (1980) *Events in Computation*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.

Winskel, G. (1993) *The formal semantics of programming languages, an introduction*, MIT Press.

Winskel, G. (1994) Stable Bistructure Models of PCF. In: Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science. *Springer-Verlag Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **841** 177–197.

Winskel, G. and Zappa Nardelli, F. (2004) NEW-HOPLA a higher-order process language with name generation. In: *Proceedings of TCS 2004, Third IFIP International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science* 521–534.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0960129509990375 Published online by Cambridge University Press