

Ultrasheaves and Double Negation

Steve Awodey and Jonas Eliasson

Abstract Moerdijk has introduced a topos of sheaves on a category of filters. Following his suggestion, we prove that its double negation subtopos is the topos of sheaves on the subcategory of ultrafilters—the *ultrasheaves*. We then use this result to establish a double negation translation of results between the topos of ultrasheaves and the topos on filters.

1 Introduction

In 1993, Moerdijk [10] introduced a model of constructive nonstandard arithmetic, in the topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$, of sheaves on a category of filters for a certain Grothendieck topology J . Further contributions to this model were made by Moerdijk and Palmgren [11] and Palmgren [13, 14, 15, 16]. A previous work [4] by the second author studies the sheaves on the full subcategory of ultrafilters \mathbb{U} , henceforth called *ultrasheaves*. The resulting topos is Boolean so its internal logic is no longer intuitionistic, but it is a model of nonstandard set theory. In fact it is a model of Nelson’s internal set theory (see Nelson [12]), an axiomatization of nonstandard set theory.

The question arises what the exact relationship is between the topos of ultrasheaves, $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$. The subcategory \mathbb{U} is “large” in \mathbb{F} in the sense that it is a generating family for \mathbb{F} . We also know that “many” sheaves (namely, the representable ones) on \mathbb{F} are still sheaves when restricted to \mathbb{U} . Moerdijk conjectured that $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ is the double negation subtopos of $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ and in this paper we show that this is true.

Given a (intuitionistic) logic one can force it to become classical by adding the law of excluded middle to the assumptions. For a topos of sheaves there is a corresponding transformation, namely, adding the double negation topology to the underlying site. Not all of the original sheaves will be sheaves with respect to the new topology, but the internal logic in the resulting topos of sheaves will be classical.

Received April 3, 2003; accepted September 23, 2003; printed October 26, 2004

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary, 03G30

Keywords: ultrapower, Moerdijk’s Topos, double negation subtopos, sheaf theory

©2004 University of Notre Dame

Some previous work has been done on sheaves on filters. In [6], Ellerman treated ultraproducts as sheaves on the Stone space of ultrafilters and generalized the construction to other topological spaces. The exact relationship between his work and ours will be investigated elsewhere; briefly, there is a connected covering of Ellerman's topos by a slice of the topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$. Other work on filter categories has been done by Makkai [9], Pitts [17, 18, 19], and Butz [2]. Pitts uses the filter construction on coherent categories to prove completeness and interpolation results. Makkai's topos of types is related to the prime filters in Pitts's construction. The precise relation between the two toposes is considered by Butz, who uses filters to construct generic saturated models of intuitionistic first-order theories.

In Section 2 of this paper we collect some definitions and results we will need subsequently. Then, in Section 3, we prove that the topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ is equivalent to a topos of sheaves on \mathbb{F} for a finer topology than J , thereby showing that $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ is in fact a subtopos of $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$. This is, of course, also useful in a setting (e.g., constructive mathematics) where you want to avoid using ultrafilters.

In Section 4 we prove that this smaller topos on \mathbb{F} is in fact equivalent to the double negation subtopos of $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$. Finally, in Section 5, we establish a double negation translation of results between $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$.

2 Preliminary Definitions and Results

Definition 2.1 The category \mathbb{F} has as *objects* pairs (A, \mathcal{F}) , where A is a set and \mathcal{F} a filter on A . The *morphisms* $\alpha : (A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (B, \mathcal{G})$ are equivalence classes of partial functions $\alpha : A \rightarrow B$ such that

- (i) α is defined on some $F \in \mathcal{F}$,
- (ii) $\alpha^{-1}(G) \in \mathcal{F}$, for all $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

Two such partial functions $\alpha : F \rightarrow B$ and $\alpha' : F' \rightarrow B$ are equivalent if there is $E \subseteq F \cap F'$ in \mathcal{F} such that $\alpha|_E = \alpha'|_E$.

A *filter* \mathcal{F} on a set A is a nonempty collection of subsets of A which is closed under intersections and supersets. A maximal filter is called an *ultrafilter*; these filters \mathcal{F} are distinguished by the property that, for any subset B of A , either B or the complement of B is in \mathcal{F} . This category of filters \mathbb{F} was introduced by Koubek and Reiterman [7] and studied further by Blass [1].

Note that for almost all equivalence classes $\alpha : (A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (B, \mathcal{G})$ there is a total continuous function $f : A \rightarrow B$ representing α . The only exception is if B is the empty set. Then there is a morphism $\alpha : (A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (\emptyset, \{\emptyset\})$ only if the filter \mathcal{F} contains \emptyset (i.e., if \mathcal{F} is improper). In this case, α is the unique such morphism and an isomorphism $\mathcal{F} \cong (\emptyset, \{\emptyset\})$. The filter on the empty set $(\emptyset, \{\emptyset\})$ is the initial object 0 in \mathbb{F} . Terminal object 1 is $(\{0\}, \{\{0\}\})$.

From Koubek and Reiterman [7] we have the following useful characterizations.

Proposition 2.2 For morphisms $\alpha : (A, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (B, \mathcal{G})$ we have

- (i) α is monic if and only if there is an $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that α is injective on F ,
- (ii) α is epic if and only if $\alpha(F) \in \mathcal{G}$, for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

These characterizations hold true also in \mathbb{U} , but the situation is further simplified by the fact that all morphisms in \mathbb{U} are epi, as the reader can check.

Moerdijk (in [10]) defined a subcanonical Grothendieck topology J on \mathbb{F} as follows.

Definition 2.3 A finite family $\{\alpha_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\}_{i=1}^n$ is a *J-covering* if the induced map

$$\mathcal{G}_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

is an epimorphism.

Over the resulting site he studied, in particular, the representable sheaves of the form $*S = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}(-, (S, \{S\}))$. At any filter \mathcal{F} , $*S(\mathcal{F})$ is the reduced power of S over \mathcal{F} (for more on reduced powers and their use in model theory see, for instance, Chang and Keisler [3]). Thus restricting the underlying category to the full subcategory \mathbb{U} one can study ultrapowers as sheaves.

For the ultrafilters in \mathbb{F} we have the following result from Palmgren [14].

Theorem 2.4

1. Any morphism from a proper filter to an ultrafilter is a covering map.
2. Any cover of an ultrafilter contains a single map covering the ultrafilter.

The topology induced on \mathbb{U} by (\mathbb{F}, J) is the atomic topology. In [4] it is proved that all representable sheaves on \mathbb{F} are still sheaves when restricted to \mathbb{U} . Thus the atomic topology is subcanonical.

We now turn our interest to the internal logics of the toposes $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$. Since we want $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ to really be toposes, we have to make the category \mathbb{F} into a set. Formally, this is done by introducing a universe of sets into set theory, for example, V_κ , where κ is an inaccessible cardinal. We will write product and coproduct in Sets instead of small product and small coproduct in V_κ . For more details see [14] and [4].

Let \mathcal{L} be a first-order language and $I = \langle S, R_1, R_2, \dots, f_1, \dots, c_1, \dots \rangle$, an \mathcal{L} -structure. Let $*I$, the $*$ -transform of I , be the \mathcal{L} -structure in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ defined as follows:

1. Set S : $*S$ the representable sheaf previously defined.
2. Constant $s \in S$: $*s$ constant function

$$\lambda x. s \in *S(\mathcal{U}).$$

3. Relation $R \subseteq S$: $*R$ subsheaf of $*S$ given at \mathcal{U} by

$$\alpha \in *R(\mathcal{U}) \iff (\exists U \in \mathcal{U})(\forall x \in U)\alpha(x) \in R.$$

4. Function $f : T \rightarrow S$: $*f$ representable natural transformation from $*T$ to $*S$ given at \mathcal{U} by

$$*f_{\mathcal{U}}(\alpha) = \lambda x. f(\alpha(x)).$$

We also define what it means to be *standard* for a $\gamma \in *S(\mathcal{U})$:

5. $\text{St}(\gamma)$ if and only if γ is constant on some $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Thus every \mathcal{L} -structure I (in Sets) gives rise to an $\mathcal{L} \cup \{\text{St}\}$ -structure $*I$ in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$. With the standard predicate we can use $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ to model nonstandard theories such as Nelson's [12] (see [4]).

We have the usual interpretation of the the logical symbols in the two Grothendieck toposes. Below we give the sheaf semantics for $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ in full detail. For the more complicated case $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ we refer the reader to [14].

Theorem 2.5 *Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter, Φ and Ψ arbitrary formulas, and $\alpha \in {}^*T(\mathcal{U})$. Then*

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \wedge \Psi(\alpha) & \text{iff } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \text{ and } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Psi(\alpha), \\
\mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \vee \Psi(\alpha) & \text{iff } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \text{ or } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Psi(\alpha), \\
\mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \rightarrow \Psi(\alpha) & \text{iff } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha) \text{ implies } \mathcal{U} \Vdash \Psi(\alpha), \\
\mathcal{U} \Vdash \neg\Phi(\alpha) & \text{iff } \mathcal{U} \not\Vdash \Phi(\alpha), \\
\mathcal{U} \Vdash (\exists x \in {}^*S)\Phi(\alpha, x) & \text{iff for some } \beta : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \text{ and } \delta \in {}^*S(\mathcal{V}) \\
& \mathcal{V} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha \circ \beta, \delta), \\
\mathcal{U} \Vdash (\forall x \in {}^*S)\Phi(\alpha, x) & \text{iff for all } \beta : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{U} \text{ and } \delta \in {}^*S(\mathcal{V}) \\
& \mathcal{V} \Vdash \Phi(\alpha \circ \beta, \delta).
\end{array}$$

As is evident in the theorem above, the internal logic in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ is classical, that is, the topos is Boolean.

We think of the ultrasheaves as generalized ultrapowers. This is justified by the following generalization to ultrasheaves of Łoś's theorem for ultrapowers.

Theorem 2.6 (Moerdijk) *Let \mathcal{F} be a filter, Θ an \mathcal{L} -formula, and $\alpha \in {}^*S(\mathcal{F})$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F} \Vdash {}^*\Theta(\alpha) \text{ if and only if } (\exists F \in \mathcal{F})(\forall x \in F)\Theta(\alpha(x)).$$

This result is proved by Moerdijk in [10] for $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ and by the second author in [4] for $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$. That Łoś's theorem follows from it is proved in Eliasson [5].

3 $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ is Equivalent to a Topos of Sheaves on \mathbb{F}

We will study the topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ of ultrasheaves and its relation to sheaves on the category \mathbb{F} of filters. For clarity let A be the atomic topology on \mathbb{U} . We first define a new topology J_∞ on \mathbb{F} .

Definition 3.1 A basis for the J_∞ -topology is small families $\{\alpha_i : \mathcal{F}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\}_{i \in I}$ (for any set I) such that the induced morphism

$$\coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$$

is epic.

Note that from Blass [1] we know that the category \mathbb{F} has all coproducts. Now the following theorem holds.

Theorem 3.2 $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U}, A) \cong \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$.

To prove the theorem we will need three lemmas.

Lemma 3.3 (\mathbb{F}, J_∞) is a subcanonical site.

Proof Any epi in \mathbb{F} is regular ([10], Lemma 1.2). Hence the covering map $\coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{F}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is regular and the topology subcanonical. \square

Lemma 3.4 The collection of ultrafilters in \mathbb{F} generates \mathbb{F} .

See [4], Proposition 2.2, for a proof, the details of which also imply the following.

Lemma 3.5 Every object in \mathbb{F} is covered (in the sense of J_∞) by objects in \mathbb{U} .

Now the theorem follows by the *Comparison Lemma* (see, for instance, Mac Lane and Moerdijk [8]). It gives that the restriction $\mathbf{Sets}^{\mathbb{F}^{\text{op}}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}^{\mathbb{U}^{\text{op}}}$ induces an equivalence of categories $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U}, A) \cong \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$.

4 Sh(\mathbb{U}) is the Double Negation Subtopos of Sh(\mathbb{F}, J)

In this section we prove that Sh(\mathbb{U}) is the double negation subtopos of Sh(\mathbb{F}, J). Instead of working with sheaves for the Grothendieck topology J we will work with the (equivalent) Lawvere-Tierney topology j on $\mathbf{Sets}^{\mathbb{F}^{\text{op}}}$.

A presheaf F in $\mathbf{Sets}^{\mathbb{F}^{\text{op}}}$ is a j -sheaf with respect to a topology j , if for every dense monomorphism $m : A \rightarrow E$ in $\mathbf{Sets}^{\mathbb{F}^{\text{op}}}$, every map $A \rightarrow F$ extends uniquely along m to a map $E \rightarrow F$.

We will prove in two steps that the $j_{\neg\neg}$ -sheaves are the same as the j_{∞} -sheaves. First we prove that a subpresheaf of a representable sheaf is dense with respect to the topology $j_{\neg\neg}$ if and only if the $\neg\neg$ -closure of it is j -dense. Then we prove that the latter are exactly the dense subobjects with respect to j_{∞} . Note that it is enough to prove this for subobjects of representable sheaves.

We will prove both lemmas working with sieves on a filter rather than in the Heyting algebra of subobjects. So we will list some sieve formulations of topological and algebraical concepts.

1. A sieve on \mathcal{F} is a subpresheaf $A \rightarrow \mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$.
2. The j -closure of A , which is the sheafification of A , is the set

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{A}^j &= \{h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \mid h^*A \in J(\mathcal{G})\} \\ &= \{h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \mid \exists \{g_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\}_{i=1}^n \in J(\mathcal{G}) \\ &\quad \text{such that } h \circ g_i \in A, i = 1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

3. A is j -dense if and only if A is a J -covering sieve of \mathcal{F} .
4. If B is also a sieve on \mathcal{F} then

$$\begin{aligned} A \Rightarrow B &= \{h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \mid \forall g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \\ &\quad h \circ g \in A \Rightarrow h \circ g \in B\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a sieve on \mathcal{F} .

We know that the double negation closure of a subpresheaf A , $\neg\neg A$, is $(A \Rightarrow 0) \Rightarrow 0$ and this can be calculated as

$$\neg\neg A = \{h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \mid \forall g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \exists f : \mathcal{H}' \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \text{ such that } h \circ g \circ f \in A\}.$$

Moreover, from [8] (VI, Lemma 1.2), we have that the double negation (in Sh(\mathbb{F}, J)) of a j -sheaf E is $(E \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j) \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j$.

Here $\overline{0}^j$ is the sheafification of the empty presheaf which is isomorphic to $\mathbf{y}(0)$, the initial object in Sh(\mathbb{F}, J). To be precise, as a subobject of $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$

$$\overline{0}^j(\mathcal{G}) = \begin{cases} \{\!|\mathcal{F} \circ f\!\} & \text{if } \mathcal{G} \text{ is improper (i.e., isomorphic to } 0\text{),} \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \mathcal{G} \text{ is proper.} \end{cases}$$

Here $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ is an isomorphism.

We will prove that, for a subpresheaf $A \rightarrow \mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ of a j -sheaf $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ we have

$$(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j) \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j = 1_{\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})} \text{ if and only if } \overline{(A \Rightarrow 0)} \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j = 1_{\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})}.$$

Assume that \mathcal{F} is proper.

The right-hand side then says that for all $h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ we have $h \in \overline{(A \Rightarrow 0)} \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j$. Hence $\forall h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \exists \{g_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\}_{i=1}^n \in J(\mathcal{G})$ such that $h \circ g_i \in \neg\neg A$ for all

$i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence we get the following condition:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \exists \{g_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\}_{i=1}^n \in J(\mathcal{G}) \text{ such that, for any } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ \forall f_i : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_i \exists e_i : \mathcal{H}'_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_i \text{ such that } h \circ g_i \circ f_i \circ e_i \in A. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

We illustrate this in a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{H}'_i & & \\ & & \downarrow \exists e_i & \swarrow \dots \in A & \\ & & \mathcal{H}_i & & \\ & & \downarrow \forall f_i & \searrow \dots & \\ \mathcal{G}_i & \xrightarrow{\exists g_i} & \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{\forall h} & \mathcal{F} \end{array}$$

Remember that $\{g_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\}_{i=1}^n$ is a J -cover of \mathcal{G} and that \mathcal{F} is proper.

If \mathcal{F} is proper the left-hand side is equivalent to $\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j \leq \overline{0}^j$. We will study it pointwise, at a filter \mathcal{G} , that is, $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G}) \leq \overline{0}^j(\mathcal{G})$. We see that $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G}) = \{h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \mid \forall g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} h \circ g \in \overline{A}^j(\mathcal{H}) \Rightarrow h \circ g \in \overline{0}^j(\mathcal{H})\}$. If the filter \mathcal{G} is proper, then $\overline{0}^j(\mathcal{G})$ is empty, and hence $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G})$ is also empty.

For proper \mathcal{G} we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \exists g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } h \circ g \notin \overline{0}^j(\mathcal{H}) \\ \text{and } \exists \{f_i : \mathcal{H}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{H}\}_{i=1}^n \in J(\mathcal{H}) \text{ such that,} \\ \text{for any } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, h \circ g \circ f_i \in A. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We illustrate this case too, with a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{H}_i & & \\ & & \downarrow \exists f_i & \swarrow \dots \in A & \\ & & \mathcal{H} & \xrightarrow{\exists g} & \mathcal{G} & \xrightarrow{\forall h} & \mathcal{F} \end{array}$$

Here we assume that \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} are proper.

Lemma 4.1 *For a subpresheaf $A \rightarrow \mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ of a j -sheaf $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ we have*

$$(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j) \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j = 1_{\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})} \text{ if and only if } \overline{(A \Rightarrow 0)} \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j = 1_{\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})}.$$

Proof If the filter \mathcal{F} is improper then $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ is isomorphic to its subsheaf $\overline{0}^j$. But both $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j) \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j$ and $\overline{(A \Rightarrow 0)} \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j$ are j -sheaves and, thus, greater than or equal to $\overline{0}^j$. Hence both sides of the equation are true and, therefore, equivalent.

Now assume \mathcal{F} is proper. Then we have the descriptions ((1) and (2) above) of the left- and right-hand sides of the relation, and the scene is set for proving the equivalence.

(\implies) Note that it is enough to find a cover on \mathcal{F} (because of the stability of the topology J). Let \mathcal{F} be covered by the identity $1_{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. Take any $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ and prove that there is an $e : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ such that $1_{\mathcal{F}} \circ f \circ e \in A$.

If \mathcal{G} is improper then $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is already in A , and you can take e to be the identity. If \mathcal{G} is proper then by assumption, given $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, there is $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $f_1 : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $f \circ g \circ f_1 \in A$. Hence, let $e = g \circ f_1$.

(\impliedby) Take any $h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. If \mathcal{G} is improper prove that $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G}) \leq \overline{0}^j(\mathcal{G})$. Note that $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G})$ contains at most one map since there is only one map $h : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$. But this map $!_{\mathcal{F}} \circ f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ (where $f : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow 0$ isomorphism) is in $(\overline{A}^j \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j)(\mathcal{G})$ since, for any $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$, $(!_{\mathcal{F}} \circ f) \circ g = !_{\mathcal{F}} \circ (f \circ g) \in \overline{0}^j(\mathcal{H})$.

If \mathcal{G} is proper then find a $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and a cover $\{f_i\}$ of \mathcal{H} such that $h \circ g \circ f_i \in A$. By assumption there are $g_1 : \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ and $e_1 : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_1$ such that $h \circ g_1 \circ 1_{\mathcal{G}_1} \circ e_1 \in A$. Let $g = g_1 \circ e_1$ and the identity $1_{\mathcal{H}_1} : \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be a covering. Then we have $h \circ g \circ 1_{\mathcal{H}_1} \in A$. \square

Our second lemma proves that the right-hand side in Lemma 4.1 is equivalent to being j_{∞} -dense.

Lemma 4.2 *A subpresheaf A of a j -sheaf $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ is j_{∞} -dense if and only if $\neg\neg A$ is j -dense.*

Proof If the filter \mathcal{F} is improper then $\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{F})$ is isomorphic to its subsheaf $\overline{0}^j$. But both $\overline{A}^{j_{\infty}}$ and $(A \Rightarrow 0) \Rightarrow \overline{0}^j$ are j -sheaves and, thus, greater than or equal to $\overline{0}^j$. Hence both conditions stated in the lemma are true and, therefore, equivalent. Now assume \mathcal{F} is proper.

(\implies) Take $\{\alpha_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\}_{i \in I}$, a J_{∞} -covering in A . Prove that the induced map $f : \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is in $\neg\neg A$. Take any $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$. Consider $\iota : \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$ (observe that we have $f \circ \iota = \alpha_1$).

Next take the pullback of $g : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$ and $\iota : \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i$. Call the pullback \mathcal{H}' and the projection on \mathcal{H} , $h : \mathcal{H}' \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ as indicated in the diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{H}' & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \mathcal{G}_1 & & \\
 \downarrow h & & \downarrow \iota & \searrow \alpha_1 & \\
 \mathcal{H} & \xrightarrow{g} & \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{F}
 \end{array}$$

Then we have $f \circ (g \circ h) = (f \circ \iota) \circ \pi_1 = \alpha_1 \circ \pi_1 \in A$ since A is a sieve and $\alpha_1 \in A$. But $f : \coprod_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is an epimorphism, and hence a J -covering of \mathcal{F} .

(\impliedby) Take $\{f_i : \mathcal{G}_i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\}_{i=1}^n$, a J -covering in $\neg\neg A$. We know that for every \mathcal{G}_i there is a J_{∞} -covering of ultrafilters $\{g_j^i : \mathcal{U}_j^i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_i\}_{j \in I_i}$ (Lemma 3.5).

Now since f_i is in $\neg\neg A$ there are $h_j^i : \mathcal{H}_j^i \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_j^i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j \in I_i$, such that $f_i \circ g_j^i \circ h_j^i \in A$. But the families $\{f_i\}$ and $\{g_j^i\}$ are jointly epimorphic and the h_j^i s are epimorphisms (since \mathcal{U}_j^i is an ultrafilter) and, hence, the family $\{f_i \circ g_j^i \circ h_j^i : \mathcal{H}_j^i \rightarrow \mathcal{F}\}$ is jointly epimorphic and a J_∞ -covering of \mathcal{F} .

The proof is illustrated in this commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathcal{H}_1^1 & & \mathcal{H}_2^1 & \dots & \mathcal{H}_2^1 & & \mathcal{H}_2^2 & \dots \\
 \downarrow h_1^1 & & \downarrow h_2^1 & & \downarrow h_2^1 & & \downarrow h_2^2 & \\
 \mathcal{U}_1^1 & & \mathcal{U}_2^1 & \dots & \mathcal{U}_1^2 & & \mathcal{U}_2^2 & \dots \\
 \searrow g_1^1 & & \searrow g_2^1 & & \searrow g_1^2 & & \searrow g_2^2 & \\
 & & \mathcal{G}_1 & & \mathcal{G}_2 & & \dots & \\
 & & \searrow f_1 & & \searrow f_2 & & & \\
 & & & & \mathcal{F} & & &
 \end{array}$$

□

By Lemma 4.2 we have that a subpresheaf A of a representable sheaf is j_∞ -dense if and only if its $\neg\neg$ -closure is j -dense. By Lemma 4.1 we have that the $\neg\neg$ -closure is j -dense if and only if the j -closure of A is $\neg\neg$ -dense (in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J)$). Hence, maps from j_∞ -dense subobjects of a sheaf extend to F if and only if maps from $j_{\neg\neg}$ -dense subobjects extend to F . This gives that $\text{Sh}_{\neg\neg}(\mathbb{F}, J) \cong \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$. Together with the result from Section 3 we get the desired result.

Theorem 4.3 *A presheaf F is in $\text{Sh}_{\neg\neg}(\mathbb{F}, J)$ if and only if it is in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$, and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$ is equivalent to $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$, thus*

$$\text{Sh}_{\neg\neg}(\mathbb{F}, J) \cong \text{Sh}(\mathbb{U}).$$

As was pointed out to us by an anonymous referee, there is the following elegant conceptual alternative to the foregoing pedestrian proof. The topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty)$ is Boolean since it is equivalent to the Boolean topos $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ by Theorem 3.2. It thus suffices to show that the inclusion $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J_\infty) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}, J)$ is dense, that is, that the direct image functor preserves the initial object 0 . But this can be checked directly from the definitions of the topologies J and J_∞ .

5 The Double Negation Translation

In this section we show how the previous result can be used to transfer the truth of formulas between the toposes $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ of ultrasheaves and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ of sheaves on filters. Since the methods are standard we will omit the proofs.

Between $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ and $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ there is a geometric morphism

$$\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U}) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{a} \\ \xrightarrow{i} \end{array} \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$$

consisting of the factors sheafification (with respect to the topology $\dashv\vdash$) $a : \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$ and inclusion $i : \text{Sh}(\mathbb{U}) \rightarrow \text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$.

For any ultrasheaf F in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ we then have the corresponding maps

$$\text{Sub}_{\dashv\vdash}(F) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{a} \\ \xrightarrow{i} \end{array} \text{Sub}(F).$$

The sheafification of such subobjects now corresponds to closure with respect to the double negation topology, previously written $\dashv\vdash(\cdot) : \text{Sub}(F) \rightarrow \text{Sub}_{\dashv\vdash}(F)$. The inclusion map of course acts as the identity on the closed subobjects of F .

Given a first-order formula $\Theta(\alpha)$ with a free variable α of a sort (interpreted as the ultrasheaf F), the interpretations of $\Theta(\alpha)$ in $\text{Sub}_{\dashv\vdash}(F)$ and $\text{Sub}(F)$ will in general be different since the interpretations of the logical symbols are different in the two toposes.

The first translation is from classical to intuitionistic logic, and it takes the form of a double negation translation. Let superscript $(\cdot)'$ denote the usual double negation translation (see, for instance, Troelstra and van Dalen [20]). Then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1 *Let $\Theta(\alpha)$ be a first-order formula with a free variable of a sort interpreted as an ultrasheaf F . Then if $\Theta(\alpha)$ is true in ultrasheaves $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$, its double negation translation $\Theta'(\alpha)$ is true in sheaves on filters $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$.*

In the other direction we have the following result.

Theorem 5.2 *Let $\Theta(\alpha)$ be a first-order formula with a free variable of a sort interpreted as an ultrasheaf F . Assume, moreover, that $\Theta(\alpha)$ is without universal quantifiers and has double negation stable predicates. Then, if $\Theta(\alpha)$ is true in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$, $\Theta(\alpha)$ is also true in ultrasheaves $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$.*

Of course, classically any formula is equivalent to a formula without universal quantifiers, so we have as an easy corollary the following.

Corollary 5.3 *For every first-order formula $\Theta(\alpha)$ with a free variable of a sort interpreted as an ultrasheaf F and with double negation stable predicates, there is a classically equivalent formula $\Theta^+(\alpha)$ such that if $\Theta^+(\alpha)$ is true in $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F})$ then $\Theta(\alpha)$ is true in ultrasheaves $\text{Sh}(\mathbb{U})$.*

Theorem 5.2 cannot be extended to include universal quantifiers, as can be seen by considering the following fact. In [10] it is shown that

$$\text{Sh}(\mathbb{F}) \models \neg(\forall x \in {}^*\mathbb{N})[\text{St}(x) \vee \neg\text{St}(x)].$$

Note that ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ is an ultrasheaf, and the standard predicate St is double negation stable.

References

- [1] Blass, A., “Two closed categories of filters,” *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, vol. 94 (1977), pp. 129–43. [Zbl 0357.18004](#). [MR 56:3083](#). [236](#), [238](#)
- [2] Butz, C., “Saturated Models of Intuitionistic Theories,” unpublished manuscript. [236](#)
- [3] Chang, C. C., and H. J. Keisler, *Model Theory*, 3d edition, vol. 73 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990. [Zbl 0697.03022](#). [MR 91c:03026](#). [237](#)
- [4] Eliasson, J., “Ultrapowers as sheaves on a category of ultrafilters,” *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, vol. 43 (2004), pp. 825–843. [235](#), [237](#), [238](#)
- [5] Eliasson, J., “Ultrasheaves and Ultrapowers,” in preparation. [238](#)
- [6] Ellerman, D. P., “Sheaves of structures and generalized ultraproducts,” *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, vol. 7 (1974), pp. 163–95. [Zbl 0295.02031](#). [MR 51:12516](#). [236](#)
- [7] Koubek, V., and J. Reiterman, “On the category of filters,” *Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, vol. 11 (1970), pp. 19–29. [Zbl 0199.33102](#). [MR 41:6751](#). [236](#)
- [8] Mac Lane, S., and I. Moerdijk, *Sheaves in Geometry and Logic. A First Introduction to Topos Theory*, Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1992 edition. [Zbl 0822.18001](#). [MR 96c:03119](#). [238](#), [239](#)
- [9] Makkai, M., “The topos of types,” pp. 157–201 in *Logic Year 1979–80 (Proceedings of Seminars and Conferences in Mathematical Logic, Storrs, 1979/80)*, vol. 859 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Springer, Berlin, 1981. [Zbl 0527.03042](#). [MR 82k:03103](#). [236](#)
- [10] Moerdijk, I., “A model for intuitionistic non-standard arithmetic. A tribute to Dirk van Dalen,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 73 (1995), pp. 37–51. [Zbl 0829.03040](#). [MR 96k:03145](#). [235](#), [236](#), [238](#), [243](#)
- [11] Moerdijk, I., and E. Palmgren, “Minimal models of Heyting arithmetic,” *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 62 (1997), pp. 1448–60. [Zbl 0899.03044](#). [MR 99i:03074](#). [235](#)
- [12] Nelson, E., “Internal set theory: A new approach to nonstandard analysis,” *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 83 (1977), pp. 1165–98. [Zbl 0373.02040](#). [MR 57:9544](#). [235](#), [237](#)
- [13] Palmgren, E., “A sheaf-theoretic foundation for nonstandard analysis,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 85 (1997), pp. 69–86. [Zbl 0880.03032](#). [MR 97m:03098](#). [235](#)
- [14] Palmgren, E., “Developments in constructive nonstandard analysis,” *The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic*, vol. 4 (1998), pp. 233–72. [Zbl 0920.03063](#). [MR 2000b:03218](#). [235](#), [237](#)
- [15] Palmgren, E., “Real numbers in the topos of sheaves over the category of filters,” *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, vol. 160 (2001), pp. 275–84. [Zbl 0976.03068](#). [MR 2002h:03137](#). [235](#)

- [16] Palmgren, E., “Unifying constructive and nonstandard analysis,” pp. 167–83 in *Reuniting the Antipodes—Constructive and Nonstandard Views of the Continuum (Venice, 1999)*, vol. 306 of *Synthese Library*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001. [Zbl 1010.03058](#). [MR 2003b:03088](#). [235](#)
- [17] Pitts, A. M., “Amalgamation and interpolation in the category of Heyting algebras,” *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, vol. 29 (1983), pp. 155–65. [Zbl 0517.1800](#). [MR 85c:03024](#). [236](#)
- [18] Pitts, A. M., “An application of open maps to categorical logic,” *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, vol. 29 (1983), pp. 313–26. [MR 85c:03025](#). [236](#)
- [19] Pitts, A. M., “Conceptual completeness for first-order intuitionistic logic: An application of categorical logic,” *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, vol. 41 (1989), pp. 33–81. [Zbl 0665.03048](#). [MR 90c:03065](#). [236](#)
- [20] Troelstra, A. S., and D. van Dalen, *Constructivism in Mathematics. An Introduction. Vol. I*, vol. 121 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988. [Zbl 0653.03040](#). [MR 90e:03002a](#). [243](#)

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Jeremy Avigad at Carnegie Mellon University for his interesting suggestions. The second author would also like to thank everyone at Carnegie Mellon University for making his stay there so pleasant. The second author was partially supported by a grant from the Lennander Foundation.

Department of Philosophy
Carnegie Mellon University
5000 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh PA 15213
awodey@cmu.edu

Department of Mathematics
University of Uppsala
PO Box 480
S-751 06 Uppsala
SWEDEN
jonase@math.uu.se