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ABSTRACT

A topos is a cartesian-closed category with a subobject classifier. A topos is Boolean if its subobject classifier has a Boolean algebra structure. Boolean-valued models of set theory are examples of Boolean topoi. The main result characterizes those Boolean topoi which are Boolean-valued models of ZFC. In order that the work be fairly self contained, introductory chapters on category theory and the model theory of ZFC are included. Also included is an introductory account of the elementary theory of topoi up to the proof that in any topos the subobject classifier has a Heyting algebra structure.
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Much work has been done on the use of categorical algebra in the foundations of foundations of mathematics (e.g. Lawvere [11]-[14] and MacLane [16] and [17]). The first attempt at a category theoretic characterization of sets was Lawvere [10]. Mitchell in [19] showed that categories satisfying Lawvere's axioms were models for a finitely axiomatizable set theory $Z_1$ which is strictly weaker than ZFC (Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice) in that the full axiom scheme of Replacement does not hold.

Following the suggestion of my supervisor, Dr. Harvey Gerber, I have tried to make this thesis as self contained as possible. It is assumed that the reader is familiar with first-order theories and their models (e.g. Shoenfield [25, Chapters 1-5]). Also some acquaintance with basic terminology concerning lattices and Boolean algebras is desirable for §1.5, the examples of Chapter II, and §III.6.

Chapter I presents the usual axiomatization of ZFC and demonstrates the equivalence of another axiomatization which is technically useful in Chapter IV. Terminology concerning models of ZFC is introduced in §I.4. In §1.5 the concept of a Boolean-valued model is defined. The treatment of Boolean-valued models of ZFC is taken from Jech [7], Rosser [24], and Solovay and Tennenbaum [26].
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and Takeuti and Zaring [28]) can be done category theoretically in Lawvere's
Elementary Theory of the Category of Sets [10], by using a category of
sheaves construction. The last part of this construction shows that, as
might be suspected by analogy with Boolean-valued models (see Solovay and
Tennenbaum [26] for instance), one can collapse the appropriate Boolean
topos to a two-valued topos via a category of fractions construction (see
Gabriel and Zisman [6]).
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CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MODEL THEORY OF ZFC

1.1 The axioms of ZFC

The formal language $\mathcal{L}$ of ZFC is the first-order language with equality whose only nonlogical symbol is the binary relation symbol $\in$, which we shall always write between its arguments, e.g. $x \in y$ (read $x$ is an element of $y$). We suppose $\mathcal{L}$ to be formulated so that its primitive logical symbols are $\neg$ (not), $\lor$ (or), $\exists$ (there exists), and $=$ (equals). We use both subscripted and unsubscripted lower case Latin letters $x, y, z, u, v, x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$ to denote variables of $\mathcal{L}$. Terms, atomic formulas, and formulas of $\mathcal{L}$ are defined in the usual way. Lower case Greek letters with or without subscripts $\phi, \psi, \theta, \phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \ldots$ are used as metavariables ranging over formulas of $\mathcal{L}$.

The notation $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ implicitly denotes the fact that the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ occur free in $\phi$. $\phi_{x_1, \ldots, x_n}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is used to denote the formula obtained by simultaneously substituting the terms $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ for the free occurrences of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. When no possibility for confusion arises we may write $\phi(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ for $\phi_{x_1, \ldots, x_n}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. We use the symbols $\equiv_{df}$ (is defined to be equal to) and $\sim_{df}$ (is defined to be equivalent to) as metalogical connectives introducing abbreviations for terms and formulas, e.g. see (1.1)–(1.7) below.
\[ \phi \land \psi \equiv_{df} \sim (\sim \phi \lor \sim \psi) \quad (\phi \text{ and } \psi) \tag{1.1} \]
\[ \phi \rightarrow \psi \equiv_{df} \sim \phi \lor \psi \quad (\phi \text{ implies } \psi) \tag{1.2} \]
\[ \phi \leftrightarrow \psi \equiv_{df} (\phi \rightarrow \psi) \land (\psi \rightarrow \phi) \quad (\phi \text{ is equivalent to } \psi) \tag{1.3} \]
\[ \forall x \phi \equiv_{df} \sim \exists x \sim \phi \quad (\text{for all } x \phi \text{ holds}) \tag{1.4} \]
\[ x \not \in y \equiv_{df} \sim (x \in y) \quad (x \text{ is not an element of } y) \tag{1.5} \]
\[ x \neq y \equiv_{df} \sim (x = y) \quad (x \text{ does not equal } y) \tag{1.6} \]
\[ \exists x \phi(x) \equiv_{df} \exists x \forall y (\phi(y) \rightarrow x = y) \quad (\text{there exists at most one } x \text{ such that } \phi(x)) \tag{1.7} \]

(where \( y \) does not occur in \( \phi(x) \))

The logical axioms and rules of inference of the first-order theory of \( \mathcal{L} \) we shall take to be those of Shoenfield [25, pp. 20-21] or any equivalent formulation. The nonlogical axioms of ZFC are listed and explained below.

**AXIOM 1** - The Axiom of Extensionality (abbreviated \( \text{AxExt} \))

\[ \forall x \forall y (x = y \iff \forall z (x \leftrightarrow z(y))) \]

\( \text{AxExt} \) specifies the relationship between the symbols = and \( \epsilon \) by asserting that the equality relation is completely determined by the element relation.

**AXIOM 2** - The Axiom of the Null Set (abbreviated \( \text{AxNull} \))

\[ \exists x \forall y (y \not \in x) \]

\( \text{AxNull} \) asserts the existence of an elementless set. By \( \text{AxExt} \) there can be only one such set, hence we may introduce a constant symbol \( \emptyset \) to stand for it.

\[ x = \emptyset \equiv_{df} \forall y (y \not \in x) \quad (x \text{ is the null set}) \tag{1.8} \]
AXIOM 3 - The Axiom of Unordered Pairs (abbreviated AxPair)

\( \forall x \forall y \exists z \forall t (t \in z \iff (t = x \lor t = y)) \)

AxPair says that given any two sets \( x \) and \( y \) there is a third set \( z \) whose only elements are \( x \) and \( y \). By AxExt for given \( x \) and \( y \) such a \( z \) is unique, hence the following definitions make sense:

\[ z = \{x, y\} \overset{\text{df}}{=} \forall t (t \in z \iff (t = x \lor t = y)) \quad (z \text{ is the unordered pair of } x \text{ and } y) \]  
(1.9)

\[ \{x\} \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{x, x\} \quad (\text{singleton } x) \]  
(1.10)

\[ \langle x, y \rangle \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{x, \{x, y\}\} \quad (\text{the ordered pair of } x \text{ and } y) \]  
(1.11)

\[ \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle \overset{\text{df}}{=} \langle \langle x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, x_n \rangle \rangle \quad (\text{the ordered } n\text{-tuple of } x_1, \ldots, x_n) \]  
(1.12)

AXIOM 4 - The Axiom of Union (abbreviated AxUnion)

\( \forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \iff \exists t (t \in x \land z \in t)) \)

AxUnion says that given a set \( x \) the collection of elements of elements of \( x \) forms a set \( y \). By AxExt for a given \( x \) such a \( y \) is unique, hence the following definitions make sense:

\[ y = \forall x \overset{\text{df}}{=} \forall z (z \in y \iff \exists t (t \in x \land z \in t)) \quad (y \text{ is the union of } x) \]  
(1.13)

\[ x \cup y = \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{x, y\} \quad (\text{the union of } x \text{ and } y) \]  
(1.14)

\[ \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} = \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}\} \cup \{x_n\} \quad (\text{the unordered } n\text{-tuple of } x_1, \ldots, x_n) \]  
(1.15)

AXIOM 5 - The Axiom of Infinity (abbreviated AxInf)

\( \exists x (\varnothing \in x \land \forall y (y \in x \iff y \cup \{y\} \in x)) \)
We define subset relations as follows:

\[ y \subseteq x \equiv_{df} \forall z (z \in y \rightarrow z \in x) \quad \text{(y is a subset of x)} \quad (1.16) \]

\[ y \subset x \equiv_{df} y \subseteq x \land y \neq x \quad \text{(y is a proper subset of x)} \quad (1.17) \]

**AXIOM 6** - The Axiom of the Power Set (abbreviated \textit{AxPower})

\[ \forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \subseteq x) \]

\textit{AxPower} says that given a set \(x\), the collection of all subsets of \(x\) forms a set \(y\). By \textit{AxExt} for given \(x\) this \(y\) is unique. Hence we define

\[ y = \mathcal{P}(x) \equiv_{df} \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \subseteq x) \quad \text{(y is the power-set of x)} \quad (1.18) \]

**AXIOM 7** - The Axiom Scheme of Replacement (abbreviated \textit{AxRepl})

For each formula \(\phi(x, y, t_1, \ldots, t_k)\) of \(\mathcal{L}\) having exactly \(k+2\) free variables the following formula, which will be referred to as \(\textit{AxRepl}^\phi\), is a non-logical axiom.

\[ \forall t_1 \ldots t_k [\forall x \exists y \phi(x, y, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \rightarrow \forall u \exists \forall \tau (\tau \in v \leftrightarrow \exists s (s \in u \land \phi(s, x, t_1, \ldots, t_k)))] \]

\(\textit{AxRepl}^\phi\) says that if for fixed \(t_1, \ldots, t_k\) the formula \(\phi\) determines a partial functional relation then the image of any set \(u\) under the partial function determined by \(\phi\) is also a set \(v\).

**AXIOM 8** - The Axiom of Foundation (abbreviated \textit{AxFound})

\[ \forall x (x \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists y (y \in x \land \forall z (z \in y \land z \not\in x))) \]

The purpose of \textit{AxFound} is to prevent the existence of sets containing \(\in\)-cycles or infinite descending \(\in\)-chains. This then allows us to describe
the universe of all sets as a hierarchy of sets built up from the null set \( \emptyset \) by the operations of power-set and union (see Theorem II, p.16).

**AXIOM 9 - The Axiom of Choice (abbreviated AC)**

\[
\forall x \exists f \forall z (z \in x \land z \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists u \exists y (u \in f \land u = \langle z, y \rangle \land y \in z \land \forall u_1 \forall y_1 (u_1 \in f \land u_1 = \langle z, y_1 \rangle \rightarrow y = y_1))
\]

This formulation of AC says that for every set \( x \) there is a choice function \( f \) which picks out one member \( y \) from each nonempty \( z \in x \).

This completes the list of nonlogical axioms of ZFC. It should be noted that the above is not a minimal set of axioms; \( \text{AxNull, AxPair} \) and \( \text{AxUnion} \) are redundant, being easily proved from \( \text{AxRep} \).

We shall sometimes need to consider systems weaker than ZFC; two such systems are \( \text{ZF} \) and \( \text{ZF}^0 \) which are obtained by deleting respectively from the above list (i.) \( \text{AC} \) and (ii.) both \( \text{AxFound} \) and \( \text{AC} \). A theorem scheme which is often added as an axiom scheme in place of \( \text{AxRep} \) to yield still weaker systems is given by the following.

**THEOREM I (Aussonderung):** Let \( \psi(x, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \) be any formula of \( \mathcal{L} \) having exactly \( k+1 \) free variables (where \( k \geq 0 \)). Then

\[
\text{ZF}^0 \forall t_1 \ldots \forall t_k \forall x \exists y \forall z (z \in y \leftrightarrow z \in x \land \psi(z, t_1, \ldots, t_k)).
\]

**Proof:** This is immediate from \( \text{AxRep}^\phi \) where \( \phi(x, y, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \) is the formula \( x = y \land \psi(x, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \).

We next define the notion of a **bounded quantifier** as a sequence of symbols of the from \( \exists z \in x \) or \( \forall z \in x \) where

\[
\exists z \in x \phi(z) \equiv \exists z (z \in x \land \phi(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad (1.19)
\]

\[
\forall z \in x \phi(z) \equiv \forall z (z \in x \rightarrow \phi(z)) \quad \text{and} \quad (1.20)
\]
A formula of \( \mathcal{L} \) is said to be **limited** if it can be written so that all its quantifiers are bounded.

Two systems which are weaker than \( ZF \) are \( Z \) and \( Z^{\text{lim}} \) which are obtained from \( ZF \) by deleting \( \text{AxRep}l \) and adding respectively

(i.) **Aussonderung** for every formula \( \psi(x,t_1,\ldots,t_k) \) having \( k+1 \) free variables and

(ii.) **Aussonderung** for every limited formula \( \psi(x,t_1,\ldots,t_k) \) having \( k+1 \) free variables.

### I.2 Basic definitions

In Cantor's original conception of set theory it was an accepted principle that the collection of all objects having a certain property was a set. However Russell's paradox demonstrated that this viewpoint was rather too naive. It has since been recognized that an adequate set theory must provide a means of talking about two different kinds of collections: sets and classes, a class being a collection of objects satisfying a certain property. Hence we would like to define in our language \( \mathcal{L} \) an abstraction operator \( \{x| \phi\} \) operating on formulas, where \( \{x| \phi\} \) is to be read "the class of \( x \) such that \( \phi \)".

Occurrences of the variable \( x \) in \( \{x| \phi\} \) are treated as being bound. In particular if \( x \) does not occur free in \( \phi \) the notation is regarded as denoting \( \emptyset \). We make the following definitions:

\[
a \in \{x| \phi(x)\} \overset{\text{df}}{=} \phi(a)
\]

(2.1)
In the above, and in general in the following, we usually assume that variables not mentioned in subformulas such as \( \phi, \psi, \ldots \), and which occur in other parts of a definition involving these subformulas, do not occur in these subformulas. For example in (2.2) it is understood that \( y \) and \( z \) do not occur in \( \phi(x) \).

Formulas involving occurrences of the abstraction operator are really just abbreviations for formulas of \( \mathcal{L} \). An explicit procedure for reducing a formula \( \phi \) of the language having the operator \( \{ \mid \} \) to a formula \( \phi^* \) of \( \mathcal{L} \) is given below.

\[
\{x \mid \phi(x)\} \epsilon b \equiv_{df} \exists y \epsilon b \forall z (z \epsilon y \leftrightarrow \phi(z)) \tag{2.2}
\]

\[
\{x \mid \phi(x)\} \epsilon \{x \mid \psi(x)\} \equiv_{df} \exists y (y \epsilon \{x \mid \psi(x)\} \land \forall z (z \epsilon y \leftrightarrow \phi(z))) \tag{2.3}
\]

\[
\{x \mid \phi(x)\} = a \equiv_{df} \{x \mid \phi(x)\} \equiv_{df} \forall z (z \epsilon a \leftrightarrow \phi(z)) \tag{2.4}
\]

\[
\{x \mid \phi(x)\} = \{x \mid \psi(x)\} \equiv_{df} \forall z (z \epsilon \{x \mid \phi(x)\} \leftrightarrow z \epsilon \{x \mid \psi(x)\}) \tag{2.5}
\]
A detailed proof that this reduction procedure actually determines a unique $\phi^*$ may be found in Takeuti and Zaring [28, p.11].

When it is reasonably clear that a certain class described by an abstraction operator is actually a set, we may make use of this fact without explicit mention.

By a class term we mean either an individual variable symbol or a class symbol of the form $\{x \mid \phi\}$ where $\phi$ is a formula of $\mathcal{L}$.

Metavariables ranging over class terms will be denoted by upper case Latin letters $A, B, C, \ldots$.

Below we list a number of formal definition schemes for some convenient abbreviations of expressions in $\mathcal{L}$. For the most part the notation is either fairly standard or mnemonic. The list is intended mainly as a reference; for the most part our definitions in the rest of this work will tend to be more informal, although we will always try to indicate enough so that it will be clear that our discussion is explicitly formalizable.

\[
(A \subseteq B) \equiv_{df} \forall x (x \in A \iff x \in B) \quad \text{(A is a subclass of B)}
\]
\( A \subset B \equiv_{df} A \subseteq B \land A \neq B \)  

(\textit{A is a proper subclass of B}) \ (2.17)

\( U =_{df} \{ x \mid x = x \} \)  

(\textit{the class of all sets}) \ (2.18)

\( A \times B =_{df} \{ x \mid \exists a \exists b (a \in A \land b \in B \land x = \langle a, b \rangle) \} \)  

(\textit{the cartesian product of A and B}) \ (2.19)

\( A^{-1} =_{df} \{ u \mid \exists x \exists y (u = \langle x, y \rangle \land \langle y, x \rangle \in A) \} \)  

(\textit{the inverse of A}) \ (2.20)

\( U_A =_{df} \{ x \mid \exists y (y \in A \land x \in y) \} \)  

(\textit{the union of A}) \ (2.21)

\( A \cup B =_{df} \{ x \mid x \in A \lor x \in B \} \)  

(\textit{the union of A and B}) \ (2.22)

\( A \cap B =_{df} \{ x \mid x \in A \land x \in B \} \)  

(\textit{the intersection of A and B}) \ (2.23)

\( A \downarrow B =_{df} A \cap (B \times U) \)  

(A restricted to B) \ (2.24)

\( Rel(R) =_{df} R \subseteq U \times U \)  

(R is a relation) \ (2.25)

\( Rel(R, A) =_{df} R \subseteq A \times A \)  

(R is a relation on A) \ (2.26)

\( x R y =_{df} \langle x, y \rangle \in R \)  

(x is R to y) \ (2.27)

\( Rel(R) =_{df} \forall x (x R x) \)  

(R is reflexive) \ (2.28)

\( Rel(R, A) =_{df} \forall x (x \in A \land x R x) \)  

(R is reflexive on A) \ (2.29)

\( x \not R y =_{df} \langle x, y \rangle \notin R \)  

(x is not R to y) \ (2.30)
\text{Irref}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \forall x (x \not\mathrel{R} x) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is irreflexive}) \hspace{1cm} (2.32)

\text{Irref}_\text{df}(R, A) \equiv \forall x (x \not\mathrel{R} A \rightarrow x \not\mathrel{R} x) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is irreflexive on } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.33)

\text{Symm}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \mathrel{R} y \rightarrow y \mathrel{R} x \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is symmetric}) \hspace{1cm} (2.34)

\text{Symm}_\text{df}(R, A) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \in A \land y \in A \land x \mathrel{R} y \rightarrow y \mathrel{R} x \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is symmetric on } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.35)

\text{Antisymm}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \mathrel{R} y \land y \mathrel{R} x \rightarrow x = y \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is antisymmetric}) \hspace{1cm} (2.36)

\text{Antisymm}_\text{df}(R, A) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \in A \land y \in A \land x \mathrel{R} y \land y \mathrel{R} x \rightarrow x = y \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is antisymmetric on } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.37)

\text{RTrans}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \forall x \forall y \forall z \left( x \mathrel{R} y \land y \mathrel{R} z \rightarrow x \mathrel{R} z \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is relationally transitive}) \hspace{1cm} (2.38)

\text{RTrans}_\text{df}(R, A) \equiv \forall x \forall y \forall z \left( x \in A \land y \in A \land z \in A \land x \mathrel{R} y \land y \mathrel{R} z \rightarrow x \mathrel{R} z \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is relationally transitive on } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.39)

\text{Trich}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \mathrel{R} y \lor x = y \lor y \mathrel{R} x \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ satisfies the law of trichotomy}) \hspace{1cm} (2.40)

\text{Trich}_\text{df}(R, A) \equiv \forall x \forall y \left( x \in A \land y \in A \rightarrow x \mathrel{R} y \lor x = y \lor y \mathrel{R} x \right) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ satisfies the law of trichotomy on } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.41)

\text{PreOrd}_\text{df}(R) \equiv \text{Rel}_\text{df}(R) \land \text{Ref}_\text{df}(R) \land \text{RTrans}_\text{df}(R) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is a preordering}) \hspace{1cm} (2.42)
\[ \text{PreOrd}(R, A) \equiv \text{Rel}(R, A) \land \text{Ref}(R, A) \land \text{RTrans}(R, A) \]  
(\(R\) is a preordering on \(A\))  
(2.43)

\[ \text{Equiv}(R) \equiv \text{PreOrd}(R) \land \text{Symm}(R) \]  
(\(R\) is an equivalence relation)  
(2.44)

\[ \text{Equiv}(R, A) \equiv \text{PreOrd}(R, A) \land \text{Symm}(R, A) \]  
(\(R\) is an equivalence relation on \(A\))  
(2.45)

\[ \text{ParOrd}(R) \equiv \text{PreOrd}(R) \land \text{Antisymm}(R) \]  
(\(R\) is a partial ordering)  
(2.46)

\[ \text{ParOrd}(R, A) \equiv \text{PreOrd}(R, A) \land \text{Antisymm}(R, A) \]  
(\(R\) is a partial ordering on \(A\))  
(2.47)

\[ \text{LinOrd}(R) \equiv \text{ParOrd}(R) \land \text{Trich}(R) \]  
(\(R\) is a linear ordering)  
(2.48)

\[ \text{LinOrd}(R, A) \equiv \text{ParOrd}(R, A) \land \text{Trich}(R, A) \]  
(\(R\) is a linear ordering on \(A\))  
(2.49)

\[ \text{Minimal}(x, R) \equiv \neg \exists y (y \neq x \land y R x) \]  
(\(x\) is \(R\)-minimal)  
(2.50)

\[ \text{Minimal}(x, R, A) \equiv \neg \exists y (y \in A \land y \neq x \land y R x) \]  
(\(x\) is \(R\)-minimal on \(A\))  
(2.51)

\[ \text{Maximal}(x, R) \equiv \neg \exists y (y \neq x \land x R y) \]  
(\(x\) is \(R\)-maximal)  
(2.52)

\[ \text{Maximal}(x, R, A) \equiv \neg \exists y (y \in A \land y \neq x \land x R y) \]  
(\(x\) is \(R\)-maximal on \(A\))  
(2.53)
\[ \text{Least}(x, R) \equiv \text{df } \forall y (x \neq y \rightarrow x R y) \quad (x \text{ is } R\text{-least}) \hspace{1cm} (2.54) \]

\[ \text{Least}(x, R, A) \equiv \text{df } x \in A \land \forall y (y \in A \land x \neq y \rightarrow x R y) \quad (x \text{ is } R\text{-least in } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.55) \]

\[ \text{Greatest}(x, R) \equiv \text{df } \forall y (x \neq y \rightarrow y R x) \quad (x \text{ is } R\text{-greatest}) \hspace{1cm} (2.56) \]

\[ \text{Greatest}(x, R, A) \equiv \text{df } x \in A \land \forall y (y \in A \land x \neq y \rightarrow y R x) \quad (x \text{ is } R\text{-greatest in } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.57) \]

\[ \text{WellOrd}(R) \equiv \text{df } \text{LinOrd}(R) \land \forall x (x \neq \emptyset \land \exists y (\text{Least}(y, R \mid x, x))) \quad (R \text{ is a well-ordering}) \hspace{1cm} (2.58) \]

\[ \text{WellOrd}(R, A) \equiv \text{df } \text{LinOrd}(R, A) \land \forall x (x \neq \emptyset \land x \in A \rightarrow \exists y (\text{Least}(y, R \mid x, x))) \hspace{1cm} (R \text{ is a well-ordering of } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.59) \]

\[ \text{Unary}(A) \equiv \text{df } \forall x \forall y \forall z (<x, y> \in A \land <x, z> \in A \rightarrow y = z) \quad (A \text{ is unary}) \hspace{1cm} (2.60) \]

\[ \text{Biunary}(A) \equiv \text{df } \text{Unary}(A) \land \text{Unary}(A^{-1}) \quad (A \text{ is biunary}) \hspace{1cm} (2.61) \]

\[ \text{Fnc}(A) \equiv \text{df } \text{Rel}(A) \land \text{Unary}(A) \quad (A \text{ is a function}) \hspace{1cm} (2.62) \]

\[ \text{One-one}(A) \equiv \text{df } \text{Rel}(A) \land \text{Biunary}(A) \quad (A \text{ is a one-one function}) \hspace{1cm} (2.63) \]

\[ \text{Dom}(A) = \text{df } \{ x \mid \exists y (<x, y> \in A) \} \quad (\text{the domain of } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.64) \]

\[ \text{Rng}(A) = \text{df } \{ y \mid \exists x (<x, y> \in A) \} \quad (\text{the range of } A) \hspace{1cm} (2.65) \]
\[ A \supseteq B = \text{df } \overline{\text{rg}}(A|B) \]  
(\text{the image of } B \text{ under } A) \hfill (2.66)

\[ A \circ B = \text{df } \{ u | \exists x \exists y \exists z (u = \langle x, z \rangle \land \langle x, y \rangle \in A \land \langle y, z \rangle \in B) \} \]  
(A composed with B) \hfill (2.67)

\[ F : A \longrightarrow B = \text{df } \overline{\text{Fnc}}(F) \land \overline{\text{Dom}}(F) = A \land \overline{\text{rg}}(F) \subseteq B \]  
(\text{F maps } A \text{ into } B) \hfill (2.68)

\[ F : A \longrightarrow B = \text{df } \overline{\text{Fnc}}(F) \land \overline{\text{Dom}}(F) = A \land \overline{\text{rg}}(F) = B \]  
(\text{F maps } A \text{ onto } B) \hfill (2.69)

\[ F : A \overset{1-1}{\longrightarrow} B = \text{df } F : A \longrightarrow B \land \text{One-one}(F) \]  
(\text{F maps } A \text{ one-one into } B) \hfill (2.70)

\[ F : A \overset{1-1}{\longrightarrow} B = \text{df } F : A \overset{1-1}{\longrightarrow} B \land F : A \overset{\text{onto}}{\longrightarrow} B \]  
(\text{F maps } A \text{ one-one onto } B) \hfill (2.71)

\[ y = F(x) = \text{df } \langle x, y \rangle \in F \]  
(\text{y is } F \text{ of } x) \hfill (2.72)

\[ X_y = \text{df } \{ f | f : x \longrightarrow y \} \]  
(the set of all functions from \(x\) into \(y\)) \hfill (2.73)

\[ E = \text{df } \{ u | \exists x \exists y (u = \langle x, y \rangle \land x \in y) \} \]  
(the element relation) \hfill (2.74)

\[ \overline{\text{Trans}}(A) = \text{df } \forall x \forall y (x \in A \land y \in x \rightarrow y \in A) \]  
(A is transitive) \hfill (2.75)

\[ \overline{\text{On}}(x) = \text{df } \overline{\text{Trans}}(x) \land \overline{\text{Wellord}}(E|x, x) \]  
(\text{x is an ordinal}) \hfill (2.76)

\[ x + 1 = \text{df } x \cup \{x\} \]  
(\text{x plus one}) \hfill (2.77)
\text{SuccOn}(x) \equiv \text{df } \overline{\text{On}}(x) \land \exists y (\overline{\text{On}}(y) \land x = y + 1) \tag{2.78}
\text{(x is a successor ordinal)}

\text{LimOn}(x) \equiv \text{df } \overline{\text{On}}(x) \land x \notin \emptyset \land \sim \text{SuccOn}(x) \tag{2.79}
\text{(x is a limit ordinal)}

\overline{x} = \overline{y} \equiv \text{df } \exists f : x \overset{1-1}{\rightarrow} y \tag{2.80}
\text{(x and y are equipollent)}

\text{Card}(x) \equiv \text{df } \overline{\text{On}}(x) \land \forall y (\overline{\text{On}}(y) \land \overline{x} = \overline{y} \land x \neq y \rightarrow x \in y) \tag{2.81}
\text{(x is a cardinal)}

x = \omega \equiv \text{df } \overline{\text{LimOn}}(x) \land \forall y (\overline{\text{LimOn}}(y) \land x \neq y \rightarrow x \in y) \tag{2.82}
\text{(x is } \omega \text{)}

From now on we will try to present most of our definitions more informally, leaving it to the reader to satisfy himself that our definitions are actually explicitly formalizable in \( \mathcal{L} \).

Having defined ordinal and cardinal numbers, we will assume, as needed, that the reader is familiar with some of their elementary properties: e.g. simple ordinal and cardinal arithmetic, transfinite induction, transfinite recursion, the Schröder-Bernstein Theorem, Cantor's Theorem, etc. We shall usually denote ordinals by lower case Greek letters \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots \), relying on the context to prevent confusion between these and metavariables for formulas of \( \mathcal{L} \).

Below we simultaneously define the sequences of \( \aleph \) and \( \omega \) numbers by transfinite recursion over the ordinals.
i.) $\mathcal{R}_0 = \text{df} \omega_0 = \text{df} \omega$

ii.) $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha+1} = \text{df} \omega_{\alpha+1} = \text{df} \left[ \text{the least ordinal } \gamma \text{ such that } \exists f : \gamma \overset{\text{onto}}{\longrightarrow} \omega_{\alpha} \right]$

iii.) $\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \text{df} \omega_\lambda = \text{df} \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda} \omega_\beta$ for $\lambda$ a limit.

In the above we write $\beta < \lambda$ for $\beta \in \lambda$ and assume that the reader can figure out an indexed union. If $\lambda$ is a limit ordinal then the cofinality of $\lambda$, $\text{cf}(\lambda)$, is defined by

$$\text{cf}(\lambda) = \text{df} \left[ \text{the least ordinal } \beta \text{ such that } \exists f : \beta \rightarrow \lambda \wedge \bigcup \mathcal{R}(f) = \lambda \right].$$

(2.84)

A cardinal $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ is said to be regular if $\text{cf}(\omega_\alpha) = \omega_\alpha$. $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ is said to be singular if $\text{cf}(\omega_\alpha) < \omega_\alpha$.

Next we wish to show that Axiom $\text{Found}$ actually allows us to describe the universe of all sets $\mathcal{U}$ as a hierarchy built up from the null set $\emptyset$ by power-set and union operations.

For each ordinal $\alpha$ we define a set $V_\alpha$ as follows:

i.) $V_\emptyset = \text{df} \emptyset$

ii.) $V_{\beta+1} = \text{df} \mathcal{P}(V_\beta)$

iii.) $V_\lambda = \text{df} \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda} V_\beta$ for $\lambda$ a limit ordinal.

Finally, let

$$V = \text{df} \left\{ x \mid \exists \alpha (\mathcal{R}_\alpha \wedge x \in V_\alpha) \right\}.$$
The following propositions about $V$ are easy to prove.

**PROPOSITION 1:** For each ordinal $\alpha$, $V_\alpha$ is transitive. □

**PROPOSITION 2:** If $\alpha < \beta$ then $V_\alpha \subseteq V_\beta$. □

**PROPOSITION 3:** If $\alpha \leq \beta$ then $V_\alpha \subseteq V_\beta$. □

Next we define a rank function, $\text{rank} : V \to \mathcal{O}_\omega$ by

$$\text{rank}(x) = \text{df} \ [\text{least ordinal } \alpha \text{ such that } x \in V_\alpha].$$ (2.87)

The following propositions about $\text{rank}(x)$ are easy to prove.

**PROPOSITION 4:** If $x \subseteq y$ then $\text{rank}(x) < \text{rank}(y)$. □

**PROPOSITION 5:** If $x \subseteq y$ then $\text{rank}(x) \leq \text{rank}(y)$. □

**PROPOSITION 6:** If $\alpha$ is an ordinal then $\text{rank}(\alpha) = \alpha$. □

**THEOREM II:** $\text{ZF} \vdash V = \mathcal{U}$.

**Proof:** The proof is by reductio ad absurdum. Suppose there exists a set $x \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $x \notin V$. The first claim is that by AxFound we may assume without loss of generality that every element of $x$ is in $V$. To see this define the transitive closure of $x$, $\text{TransCl}(x)$, as follows:

i.) $T_0(x) = \text{df} \ \{x\}$

ii.) $T_{n+1}(x) = \text{df} \ \bigcup T_n(x)$

iii.) $\text{TransCl}(x) = \text{df} \ \bigcup_{n \in \omega} T_n(x)$.

By Aussonderung $\{y \mid y \in \text{TransCl}(x) \land y \notin V\}$ is a set and by AxFound it has an $\epsilon$-minimal element which has the property that all of its elements are in $V$ while it is not. Hence we could have taken $x$ to be this element to begin with.
Now \( \text{rank} \ x : x \rightarrow \varnothing \) and by AxRepl, \( \text{rank} \ x \) is a set. Hence \( \rho = \text{rank} \ x \) is an ordinal greater than or equal to the rank of any element of \( x \). As \( V_{\rho} \) is transitive this means that for all \( y \in x \), \( y \in V_{\rho} \). Therefore \( x \notin V_{\rho} \) and \( x \notin V_{\rho+1} \), which is a contradiction. \( \Box \)

I.3 Other axiomatizations of ZFC

The purpose of this section is to introduce some other axiomatizations of ZFC which will prove to be technically useful in Chapter IV.

First we wish to define what we mean by the relativization of a formula. Let \( \theta(x) \) be a formula of \( \mathcal{L} \) with exactly one free variable and let \( A = \{x \mid \theta(x)\} \). In (3.1)-(3.5) we define \( \phi^A \), the relativization of the formula \( \phi \) to the class \( A \), by induction over formulas \( \phi \) of \( \mathcal{L} \).

\[
(y \in z)^A \equiv_{df} y \in z \quad (3.1)
\]

\[
(y = z)^A \equiv_{df} y = z \quad (3.2)
\]

\[
(\neg \psi)^A \equiv_{df} \neg \psi^A \quad (3.3)
\]

\[
(\psi_1 \lor \psi_2)^A \equiv_{df} \psi_1^A \lor \psi_2^A \quad (3.4)
\]

\[
(\exists y \psi)^A \equiv_{df} \exists y (y \in A \land \psi^A) \quad (3.5)
\]

Next, let \( \phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) be a formula of \( \mathcal{L} \) with exactly \( n \) free variables. Let \( W \) be a class and let \( w_0 \in W \). We say that \( w_0 \) mirrors \( \phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) in \( W \) if (3.6) is provable.
Finally, if $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are any two formulas of $\mathcal{L}$ in prenex normal form, we say that $\phi_1$ is a truncation of $\phi_2$ if $\phi_1$ can be obtained from $\phi_2$ by deleting some initial segment of the prefix of $\phi_2$.

**Theorem III** (The Generalized Reflection Principle):

Suppose that for every ordinal $\alpha$ we have defined a set $W_\alpha$ such that

1. if $\beta \leq \gamma$ then $W_\beta \subseteq W_\gamma$ and
2. if $\lambda$ is a limit ordinal then $W_\lambda = \bigcup_{\beta < \lambda} W_\beta$.

Let $W = \{x \mid \exists \alpha (On(\alpha) \land x \in W_\alpha)\}$ and let $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be any formula of $\mathcal{L}$ with exactly $n$ free variables, which is in prenex normal form. Then it is provable in ZF that given any ordinal $\alpha$, there exists a limit ordinal $\lambda > \alpha$ such that $W_\lambda$ mirrors $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and all of its truncations in $W$.

**Proof:** The proof is by induction over formulas $\phi$ of $\mathcal{L}$.

**Case 1:** $\phi$ is quantifier free. In this case $\phi^A$ is $\phi$ for any class term $A$; hence we take $\lambda$ to be the first limit ordinal above $\alpha$.

**Case 2:** $\phi$ is $\neg \psi$. By the induction hypothesis we can find a limit ordinal $\lambda > \alpha$ such that $W_\lambda$ mirrors $\psi$ and all its truncations in $W$. But for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in W_\lambda$, $\psi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \iff \psi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is provable if and only if $\neg \psi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \iff \neg \psi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is provable.

**Case 3:** $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is $\exists x\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$

Define the functional relation $\text{wrank} : W \rightarrow On$ by

$$\forall x_1 \in W \cdots \forall x_n \in W (\phi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \iff \phi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \quad (3.6)$$
Let $F$ be the $n$-place function defined by

$$\forall x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{W} \exists \alpha \in \mathbb{W}_{\alpha+1} \wedge \forall \beta \in \mathbb{W}_{\beta+1} (x \in \mathbb{W}_{\beta+1})$$

(3.7)

for all $w \in \mathbb{W}$.

We next define a sequence of ordinal $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \omega}$ as follows:

$$\lambda_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{W} \wedge \psi^W(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \wedge \forall \beta \in \text{wrank}(x) \forall z \in \mathbb{W}_\beta (\neg \psi^W(z, x_1, \ldots, x_n))\}$$

(3.8)

for all $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{W}$.

From (3.8) it is clear that

$$\exists x \in \mathbb{W} \psi^W(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \iff \exists x \in \mathbb{W}^W(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \psi^W(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

(3.9)

We next define a sequence of ordinal $\{\lambda_k\}_{k \in \omega}$ as follows:

$$\lambda_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{W} \wedge \psi^W(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \wedge \forall \beta \in \text{wrank}(x) \forall z \in \mathbb{W}_\beta (\neg \psi^W(z, x_1, \ldots, x_n))\}$$

(3.10)

Let $\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ be any truncation of $\phi$ beginning with an existential quantifier and suppose $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ to be an exhaustive list of the free variables of $\theta$.

$$\lambda_{2k+1, \theta} = \{x \in \mathbb{W} \wedge \psi^W(x, a_1, \ldots, a_m) \wedge \forall \beta \in \mathbb{W}_{\beta+1} (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \subseteq \mathbb{W}_{\lambda_{2k+1, \theta}}\}$$

(3.11)
and

$$\lambda_{2k+1} = \text{df } U\{\lambda_{2k+1}, \theta \mid \theta \text{ is a truncation of } \phi \text{ beginning with an existential quantifier}\} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\lambda_{2k+2} = \text{df } [\text{the least ordinal above } \lambda_{2k+1} \text{ such that } W_{\lambda_{2k+2}} \text{ mirrors } \psi(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \text{ and all its truncations}] \quad (3.13)$$

$$\lambda_0 \text{ and } \lambda_{2k+2} \text{ are well defined by our induction hypothesis.}$$

$$\lambda_{2k+1, \theta} \text{ is well defined for each } \theta \text{ a truncation of } \phi \text{ beginning with an existential quantifier, for if we let}$$

$$m \times y = \text{df } \{z \mid \exists y_1 \epsilon y \ldots \exists y_m \epsilon y (z = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_m \rangle)\} \quad (3.14)$$

then \( \text{rank}_{\lambda_{2k}} \theta^n \times W_\lambda \) is a set by \( \text{AxRep}_\ell \). Since there are only a finite number of \( \theta \)'s satisfying the conditions posited, \( \lambda_{2k+1} \) is obviously well defined.

Let \( \lambda = \text{df } U \lambda_k = U \lambda_{2k} \). \( \lambda \) is obviously a limit ordinal, so by the continuity hypothesis about \( W \), \( \lambda \_k = U \lambda_k = U \lambda_{2k} \). We now claim that \( W_\lambda \) mirrors \( \phi \) and all its truncations in \( W \). We prove this claim by induction over all truncations \( \theta \) of \( \phi \).

**Subcase 1:** \( \theta \) is quantifier free. Same as Case 1.

**Subcase 2:** \( \theta \) is \( \neg \xi \). Same as Case 2.

**Subcase 3:** \( \theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) is \( \exists \xi(x, x_1, \ldots, x_n) \). Suppose that \( a_1, \ldots, a_m \in W_\lambda \). Choose \( k < \omega \) large enough so that \( a_1, \ldots, a_m \in W_{\lambda_{2k}} \).
Then

\[ \theta^W(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \Leftrightarrow \exists x (x \in W \land \xi^W(x, a_1, \ldots, a_m)) \]

Conversely, if \( \exists x \in W \land \xi^W(x, a_1, \ldots, a_m) \) holds, there is an \( a \in W \) such that \( \xi^W(a, a_1, \ldots, a_m) \) holds. By the induction hypothesis this implies \( \xi^W(a, a_1, \ldots, a_m) \) holds. Therefore \( \exists x (x \in W \land \xi^W(x, a_1, \ldots, a_m)) \) holds.

This then completes both inductions. \( \Box \)

**COROLLARY III.1** (The Reflection Principle, abbreviated RP)

If \( \phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) is any formula in \( \mathcal{L} \) in prenex normal form with exactly n free variables then given any ordinal \( \alpha \) there exists a limit ordinal \( \lambda > \alpha \) such that \( V_\lambda \) mirrors \( \phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) and all of its truncations in \( V_\alpha \).

By the **Bounding Principle** (abbreviated BP) we mean the formula scheme (3.16)

\[ \forall t_1 \ldots \forall t_k \forall x (\forall u \in x \exists v \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \rightarrow \exists y \forall u \in x \exists v \exists y \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \] (3.16)

where \( \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \) is any formula in \( \mathcal{L} \) with exactly \( k+2 \) free variables.
THEOREM IV: For all formulas $\phi$ in $\mathcal{L}$, $\lim_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{ZFC}} \vdash \phi$ if and only if $\mathbf{ZFC} \vdash \phi$.

Proof: $(\Leftarrow)$ It is enough to show that $\mathbf{ZFC} \vdash \mathbf{BP}$. We show in fact something which is seemingly stronger.

**LEMMA 1:** $\lim_{\alpha}^{\mathbf{ZFC}} \vdash \mathbf{BP}$.

**Proof:** Fix $t_1, \ldots, t_k$ and $x$. Let $\alpha = \bigcup \{ \text{rank}(x), \text{rank}(t_1), \ldots, \text{rank}(t_k) \}$.

By $\mathbf{RP}$ there is a limit ordinal $\lambda > \alpha$ such that $V_\lambda$ mirrors

$$\forall u \in x \exists \forall (u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)$$

and all its truncations.

In particular $V_\lambda$ mirrors (3.18).

$$u \in x \rightarrow \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)$$

(3.18)

So we have (3.19)

$$(u \in x \rightarrow \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)) \iff (u \in x \rightarrow \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k))^{V_\lambda} \iff (u \in x \rightarrow \phi^{V_\lambda}(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k))$$

(3.19)

Hence (3.20) holds.

$$(u \in x \rightarrow (\phi^{V_\lambda}(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \iff \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)))$$

(3.20)

From the fact that $V_\lambda$ mirrors (3.17) we have (3.21)

$$\forall u \in x \exists \forall \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \iff \forall u \in x \exists \forall \phi^{V_\lambda}(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)$$

(3.21)

which by (3.20) is equivalent to (3.22).

$$\forall u \in x \exists \forall \phi(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \iff \forall u \in x \exists \forall \phi^{V_\lambda}(u, v, t_1, \ldots, t_k)$$

(3.22)
This completes the proof of Lemma 1.0.

(⇐) To show the converse we have to prove that $2^{\lim+BP} \iff AxRepl$.

Informally we can see this by noting that any instance of $AxRepl$ may be replaced by use of $BP$, to get a bound on the image we want, followed by a use of $Aussonderung$, to carve out the exact set we want. The content of $RP$ is that our use of $Aussonderung$ may be replaced by a limited instance of $Aussonderung$. To be strictly more formal requires showing that we can actually prove $RP$ in $2^{\lim+BP}$, since $AxRepl$ was used in proving $RP$.

**Lemma 2:** $2^{\lim+BP} \in RP$.

**Proof:** The proof simply requires a careful look at the proof of Theorem III in the case $W = V$. Our key use of $AxRepl$ there was in (3.11), in which we needed to get a bound on $\lambda_{2k+1,0}$. But $BP$ is all we really need there. This then proves Lemma 2.0.

Our proof of Theorem IV is now complete.

We may make use of $AC$ and its equivalents without comment in the following. The most frequently employed equivalent of $AC$ of which we make use is Cantor's law of trichotomy, which is expressed by (3.23)

$$\forall x \exists y \left( y = \bar{x} \right)$$ (3.23)

For other equivalents of $AC$ the reader is referred to Cohen [2], Felgner [3], Jech [7], Krivine [9], Mostowski [20], Shoenfield [25], and Takeuti and Zaring [28].
A (classical) model of ZFC is a structure $\mathcal{U} = \langle A, e \rangle$, where $A$ is a set and $e \subseteq A \times A$, which is a model of the first-order theory ZFC in the usual sense. For the definition of a model of a first-order theory the reader is referred to Shoenfield [25].

We do not allow the universe $A$ of the structure $\mathcal{U}$ to be a proper class because if we did we would not be able to express the fact that $\mathcal{U} \models \text{ZFC}$ in a single sentence of $L$. This is a consequence of the fact that ZFC is not finitely axiomatizable. However, when we insist that $A$ be a set we can say that $\mathcal{U}$ satisfies the infinite axiom scheme $\text{AxRep}^L$ by saying that $A$ is closed under a finite number of operations, e.g. Gödel's $\mathcal{F}_1$-$\mathcal{F}_8$. See Cohen [2], Felgner [3], Jech [7], Mostowski [20], Shoenfield [25], or Takeuti and Zaring [28].

A model $\mathcal{U} = \langle A, e \rangle$ of ZFC is said to be a standard model if $e = \mathcal{E}^A$; otherwise it is said to be nonstandard. A standard model is called transitive if its universe is a transitive set. Since this work is concerned with models of ZFC, the following axioms concerning the existence of models are of considerable interest to us.

The Model Axiom (abbreviated $M$)

$\exists x (x \text{ is a model of ZFC})$

The Standard Model Axiom (abbreviated $SM$)

$\exists x (x \text{ is a standard model of ZFC})$
The Standard Transitive Model Axiom (abbreviated STM)

\[ \exists x (x \text{ is a standard transitive model of ZFC}) \]

We have already seen that these axioms are formalizable in \( \mathcal{L} \).

The following relationship between the axioms is evident

\[ \text{ZFC} \vdash \text{STM} \rightarrow \text{SM} \rightarrow M \rightarrow [ \text{ZFC is consistent}]. \quad (4.1) \]

Hence by Gödel's completeness theorem, if ZFC is consistent then the addition of any of the axioms \( M \), \( SM \), or \( STM \) yields a set theory strictly stronger than ZFC. Also by Gödel's completeness theorem we know that

\[ \text{ZFC} \vdash [ \text{ZFC is consistent} ] \leftrightarrow M \quad (4.2) \]

Also

\[ \text{ZFC} \vdash \text{SM} \leftrightarrow \text{STM} \quad (4.3) \]

See Corollary V.2. However

\[ \text{ZFC} \vdash \sim (M \rightarrow SM). \quad (4.4) \]

A proof of this may be found in Takeuti and Zaring [28, p.243] and Cohen [2, p.104].

A structure \( \langle x, B \rangle \) is said to be \textit{B-extensional} if (4.5) holds.

\[ \text{Ref}(B, x) \land \forall p \forall q (p \in x \land q \in x \land p \neq q \rightarrow \exists r (r \in x \land ((r B p \land \sim r B q) \lor (r B q \land \sim r B p)))) \quad (4.5) \]
The structure \(<x,B>\) is said to be B-well-founded if (4.6) holds.

\[\mathrel{Rel}(B,x) \land \forall z(z \subseteq x \land z \not\subseteq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists p(p \in z \land \forall q(q \in x \land qBp \rightarrow qBz)))\]  

(4.6)

THEOREM V (Mostowski's Transitive Collapse Theorem):

Suppose \(<x,B>\) is B-extensional and B-well-founded. Then there exists a unique transitive set \(t\) and a unique function \(f : x \rightarrow t\) such that for all \(y, z \in x\), \(yBz\) if and only if \(f(y)\ell f(z)\).

Proof: Let \(\emptyset <x,B>\) denote the B-minimal element of \(x\), which exists by B-well-foundedness and is unique by B-extensionality. Define a hierarchy of pseudo-ranks in \(x\) as follows by induction on the ordinals:

\[p_0 = \emptyset <x,B>\]  

(4.7)

\[p_{\alpha + 1} = \set{z \in x | \forall q(q \in x \land qBz \land q \in p_{\alpha})}\]  

(4.8)

\[p_{\lambda} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} p_{\alpha}\] for \(\lambda\) a limit ordinal.  

(4.9)

Define a pseudo-rank function \(\text{prank} : x \rightarrow On\) by

\[\text{prank}(z) = \text{the least ordinal } \alpha \text{ such that } z \in p_{\alpha + 1}\]  

(4.10)

LEMMA 1: There exists an ordinal \(\alpha\) such that for all ordinals \(\beta > \alpha\),

\[p_{\beta \setminus \alpha} = \emptyset.\]

Proof: Suppose not, i.e. suppose that \(\forall \alpha(\emptyset \alpha(\alpha) + \neg x \subseteq p_{\alpha})\). By B-well-foundedness we may assume without loss of generality that \(x\) is B-minimal with this property. But by AxRepl, \(\text{prank}''x\) is a set, hence \(\rho = \bigcup \text{prank}''x\) is an ordinal which is greater than or equal to the
pseudo-rank of every element of \( x \). Thus \( x \subseteq \rho_{i+1} \) which contradicts our hypothesis. This proves Lemma 1.

Define the function \( f : x \rightarrow V \) by

\[
f(\emptyset_{<x,B^+}) = \emptyset \\
f(y) = \{ f(z) \mid z \in x \land \text{prank}(z) \prec \text{prank}(y) \land z \in B \}
\]

**LEMMA 2:** \( f \) is injective.

**Proof:** Suppose \( z_1 \neq z_2 \). We want to show that this implies that \( f(z_1) \neq f(z_2) \). The proof is by induction on \( \text{max} (\text{prank}(z_1), \text{prank}(z_2)) \).

By \( B \)-extensionality \( z_1 \neq z_2 \) implies \( \exists z_0 \in x((z_0 \in B_{z_1} \land \sim z_0 \in B_{z_2}) \lor \)

\( (z_0 \in B_{z_2} \land \sim z_0 \in B_{z_1})) \). Suppose we have that \( z_0 \in B_{z_1} \land \sim z_0 \in B_{z_2} \). As

\( \text{prank}(z_0) \prec \text{prank}(z_1) \) we have by our induction hypothesis that

\[
f(z_1) = \{ f(z) \mid z \in x \land \text{prank}(z) \prec \text{prank}(z_1) \land z \in B_{z_1} \} \neq \}

\[
\neq \{ f(z) \mid z \in x \land \text{prank}(z) \prec \text{prank}(z_2) \land z \in B_{z_2} \} = f(z_2)
\]

since \( f(z_0) \notin f(z_1) \), whereas \( f(z_0) \neq f(z_2) \). This proves Lemma 2.

Let \( t = df^n x \).

**LEMMA 3:** \( t \) is transitive.

**Proof:** If \( u \in v \) and \( v \in f(z) \) for some \( z \in x \), then \( v = f(y) \) for some \( y \in x \). But then \( u = f(q) \) for some \( q \in x \). This proves Lemma 3.

**LEMMA 4:** \( z_1 \in B_{z_2} \) if and only if \( f(z_1) \in f(z_2) \).

**Proof:** By the definition of \( f \), \( z_1 \in B_{z_2} \) implies that \( f(z_1) \in f(z_2) \). Conversely, \( f(z_1) \in f(z_2) \) implies that \( f(z_1) = f(y) \) for some \( y \in B_{z_2} \). By Lemma 2 this implies \( z_1 = y \). Hence \( z_1 \in B_{z_2} \). This proves Lemma 4.
LEMMA 5: f is unique.

Proof: The obvious induction on \( \text{prank} \) suffices to prove Lemma 5.0

This completes the proof of Theorem V.0

COROLLARY V.1: If \( B = F | x \) and \( z \subseteq x \) is transitive then \( f \upharpoonright z \) is the identity function of \( z \).

Proof: Follows from the uniqueness part of Theorem V.0

We will refer to \( f : x \longrightarrow t \) as the collapsing function of \( \langle x, B \rangle \) and to \( t \) as the transitive collapse of \( \langle x, B \rangle \).

COROLLARY V.2: \( \text{ZFC} \vdash \text{SM} \iff \text{STM} \).

Remark: Theorem V cannot be used to show that \( M \models \text{STM} \) because the assertion that \( \langle x, B \rangle \) is \( B \)-well-founded is strictly stronger than the assertion that \( \langle x, B \rangle \) satisfies AxFound.

A regular cardinal \( \aleph_\alpha \) is said to be (strongly) inaccessible if \( \alpha \) is a limit ordinal and \( \forall x ( \bar{\alpha} < \aleph_\alpha \rightarrow \text{PS} (x) < \aleph_\alpha ) \).

The following axiom will often be useful:

The Axiom of Inaccessible Cardinals (abbreviated \( I \))

\[ \exists \alpha ( \text{On}(\alpha) \land [\aleph_\alpha \text{ is strongly inaccessible}] ) \]

We will usually use \( I \) to represent an inaccessible cardinal.

PROPOSITION 7: It is provable in ZFC that if \( I \) is a strongly inaccessible cardinal then \( V_I \) forms a standard transitive model of ZFC. Thus \( \text{ZFC} + I \models \text{STM} \).

Proof: See Takeuti and Zaring [28, p.131].

We will denote the system \( \text{ZFC} + I \) by \( \text{ZFCI} \).
I.5 Boolean valued models of ZFC

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a complete Boolean algebra which will remain fixed throughout this section.

A $\mathcal{B}$-valued interpretation of $\mathcal{L}$ consists of the following:

1.) a set $u$, called the **universe** for the interpretation and

2.) two functions $R_0 : u \times u \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $R_1 : u \times u \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ which satisfy Condition (*) below.

For every closed formula $\sigma$ of $\mathcal{L}(u)$ (the language $\mathcal{L}$ with constant symbols for elements of $u$ adjoined) we define a **truth value** in $\mathcal{B}$, $[\sigma]$, by recursion as follows:

\[
[a_1 = a_2] = _{df} R_0(a_1, a_2) \text{ for all } a_1, a_2 \in u
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.1)

\[
[a_1 \in a_2] = _{df} R_1(a_1, a_2) \text{ for all } a_1, a_2 \in u
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.2)

\[
[\neg \phi] = _{df} \neg [\phi]
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.3)

\[
[\phi \lor \psi] = _{df} [\phi] \lor [\psi]
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.4)

\[
[\exists x \phi(x)] = _{df} \sup_{\mathcal{B}} \{[\phi(a)] | a \in u\}
\]  \hspace{1cm} (5.5)

We say that a sentence $\sigma$ of $\mathcal{L}(u)$ is **$\mathcal{B}$-valid** if $[\phi] = j^B(\mathcal{B})$, the greatest element of $\mathcal{B}$.

For $R_0$ and $R_1$ to be part of a $\mathcal{B}$-valued interpretation of $\mathcal{L}$ we also require that they satisfy

**Condition (\#)**: the sentences of $\mathcal{L}$ asserting that $=$ is an equivalence relation and $\in$ is substitutive with respect to $=$ are $\mathcal{B}$-valid.
Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a model of ZFC. In the rest of this section all of our considerations will be carried out in $\mathcal{M}$ unless indicated otherwise.

We define the $\mathcal{B}$-valued universe for $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B})$, by induction as follows:

i.) $\mathcal{M}_0(\mathcal{B}) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \emptyset$

ii.) $\mathcal{M}_{\beta+1}(\mathcal{B}) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{ f \mid \text{Func}(f) \land \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\beta}(\mathcal{B}) \land \text{Rng}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{B} \}$ (5.6)

iii.) $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda}(\mathcal{B}) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \bigcup_{\beta<\lambda} \mathcal{M}_{\beta}(\mathcal{B})$ for $\lambda$ a limit ordinal.

Finally let

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}) \overset{\text{df}}{=} \{ x \mid \exists \alpha (\text{On}(\alpha) \land x \in \mathcal{M}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{B}) \} \}.$$ (5.7)

There is a natural embedding of the universe $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ into the $\mathcal{B}$-valued universe $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B})$. We denote this embedding by $\bar{\gamma} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B})$ which we define by $\bar{\epsilon}$-recursion as follows:

$$\bar{\gamma} = \emptyset \overset{\text{df}}{=} \mathcal{M}_0(\mathcal{B})$$

$$\bar{\gamma} = \{ \text{the unique constant function } \{ y \mid y \in x \} \rightarrow \{ \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \} \}$$

We now construct a $\mathcal{B}$-valued interpretation of $\mathcal{L}$ with universe $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B})$. Let $\text{Brank} : \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{On}$ be the function defined by

$$\text{Brank}(x) = \{ \text{least ordinal } \alpha \text{ such } x \in \mathcal{M}_{\alpha+1}(\mathcal{B}) \}. (5.9)$$

We now define $[x=y]$ and $[x \in y]$ by recursion on $\langle \text{Brank}(x), \text{Brank}(y) \rangle$, in the canonical well ordering of $\text{On} \times \text{On}$. 

where

\[ u = v = \text{df } \neg u \lor v \quad (5.11) \]

for all \( u, v \in B \) and

\[ [x = y] = \text{df } \inf_B \{ x(z) = [z = x] \mid z \in \text{Dom}(x) \} \land \]
\[ \land \inf_B \{ y(z) = [z = x] \mid z \in \text{Dom}(y) \} \]

(5.10)

\[ [x \in y] = \text{df } \sup_B \{ y(z) \land [z = x] \mid z \in \text{Dom}(y) \} \]

(5.12)

Proofs that these interpretations satisfy Condition (\( \star \)) are straightforward and may be found in Rosser [24].

We will denote by \( M^B \) the \( B \)-valued structure with universe \( M^B \) and interpretations of \( = \) and \( \in \) given by (5.10) and (5.12) above.

**Theorem VI:** If \( \phi \) is provable in the first-order theory of \( L \) then \( \phi \) is \( B \)-valid in \( M^B \).

**Proof:** This is proved in Rasiowa and Sikorski [22] and in Rosser [24], using the formulation of the first order predicate calculus given in Rosser [23].

In \( M \) we cannot actually prove that \( M^B \) satisfies all the axioms of \( \text{ZFC} \) without contradicting Gödel's incompleteness theorem. However, in \( M \) we can check that \( M^B \) satisfies each axiom of \( \text{ZFC} \). If we work in \( \text{ZFCI} \) and assume that \( M \subseteq V_\lambda \), where \( \lambda \) is an inaccessible cardinal, we are able to look at \( M^B \) "from the outside" and see that the following theorem is true.
**THEOREM VII**: All the axioms of ZFC are $\mathcal{B}$-valid in $M^{(B)}$.


We say that $M^{(B)}$ is **separated** if and only if for all $x, y \in M^{(B)}$, $[x = y] = 1^{(B)}$ implies $x = y$. The reader should note that $M^{(B)}$ as we have defined it is not necessarily separated. We would like to construct a separated version of $M^{(B)}$, $M_s^{(B)}$, in $M$. However there is a difficulty, namely that the equivalence classes in the equivalence relation $[\_ = \_] = 1^{(B)}$ are proper classes in $M$. To get around this we use the following trick of Scott's.

Let

$$[x]_s = \text{df} \{ y \in M^{(B)} \mid [x = y] = 1^{(B)} \land$$

$$\land \forall z \in M^{(B)} ([x = z] = 1^{(B)} \rightarrow \text{rank}(y) \leq \text{rank}(z)) \} \quad (5.13)$$

$[x]_s$ is then a set in $M$, called the **Scott equivalence class** of $x$. Further $[x]_s = [y]_s$ if and only if $[x = y] = 1^{(B)}$. Hence there is a quotient map

$$\pi : M^{(B)} \rightarrow M_s^{(B)}$$

defined by

$$\pi(x) = [x]_s \quad (5.14)$$

which satisfies

$$[[\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)] = [[\phi(\pi(x_1), \ldots, \pi(x_n))] \quad (5.15)$$

for all closed formulas $\phi$ with parameters $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M^{(B)}$. 
CHAPTER II
AN INTRODUCTION TO CATEGORY THEORY

II.1 Categories and metacategories

In this section we shall describe the notion of a category informally by means of axioms, without recourse to any set theory. Objects of our intuition which obey the axioms we shall call "metacategories". The term "category" we shall reserve for realizations of metacategories within set theory. We shall always be working with categories in order to make our discussions more concrete to those readers who favor set theory as a foundation of mathematics, however, it is important to realize that our set theoretic discussions using categories are logically unnecessary and that perfectly abstract discussions using metacategories are possible, and perhaps even preferable to those who favor category theory as a foundation of mathematics.

It is assumed that the following concepts are intuitively meaningful:

i.) the notion of an object and
ii.) the notion of an arrow from an object to an object.

Regarding the notion of an arrow, it is assumed that we are able to distinguish which particular object lies at the head and which particular object lies at the tail of a given arrow.

We shall usually use upper case Latin letters A, B, C, ... to label objects and lower case Latin letters preceded by a dot .a, .b, .c, ... to label arrows, though we reserve the right to explicitly deviate from this notation whenever it is convenient.

We say that two object labels A and B are equal, which we denote by
A = B, if A and B are both labels for the same object. Similarly, we say that two arrow labels .a and .b are equal, written .a = .b, if they are both labels for the same arrow.

A metagraph consists of objects A, B, C, ...; arrows between these objects .a, .b, .c, ...; and two operators, Domain and Codomain, assigning objects to arrows as follows:

i.) the operator Domain assigns to each arrow .a as in Figure 2.1 the object Domain (.a) = A lying at its tail; and

ii.) the operator Codomain assigns to each arrow .a as in Figure 2.1 the object Codomain (.a) = B lying at its head.

![Figure 2.1](image)

We often abbreviate the assertion ".a is an arrow such that Domain (.a) = A and Codomain (.a) = B" by either "\( \cdot a : A \rightarrow B \)" or "\( A \xrightarrow{.a} B \)"

A metacategory is a metagraph with two additional operators, Identity and Composition, which are described below and which satisfy Axioms I and II:

i.) Identity is an operator which assigns to each object A an arrow

\[ \text{Identity (A)} = \text{df} \cdot 1_A : A \rightarrow A; \text{ and} \]

\[ \text{(1.1)} \]

ii.) Composition is a partial operator from pairs of arrows to arrows which assigns to every pair of arrows (.a,.b) such that Codomain (.a) = Domain (.b) an arrow

\[ \text{Composition (.a,.b)} = \text{df} \cdot a \circ b = \text{df} \cdot a \cdot b = \text{df} \cdot a \cdot b = \text{df} \cdot ab : \text{Domain (.a)} \rightarrow \text{Codomain (.b)}. \]

\[ \text{(1.2)} \]
Axiom I (Associativity) For any collection of objects and arrows in the configuration of Figure 2.2 it is the case that

\[ \text{Composition}(\text{Composition}(a,b),c) = \text{Composition}(a,\text{Composition}(b,c)) \]

![Figure 2.2](image)

Axiom II (Unit Law) For any \(a: A \rightarrow B\) it is the case that

\(1_A \cdot a = a\) and \(a \cdot 1_B = a\).

The above definitions and axioms can be expressed in the language of set theory. By a category we shall mean an interpretation of the category axioms in ZFC or ZFCI. We indicate how such an interpretation is to be carried out in the following.

By a graph we mean an ordered four-tuple \(<\text{Obj}, \text{Arr}, \text{dom}, \text{cod}>\) such that \(\text{Obj}\) and \(\text{Arr}\) are sets and \(\text{dom}\) and \(\text{cod}\) are functions such that \(\text{dom} : \text{Arr} \rightarrow \text{Obj}\) and \(\text{cod} : \text{Arr} \rightarrow \text{Obj}\). For any graph \(g = <\text{Obj}, \text{Arr}, \text{dom}, \text{cod}>\) we define the set of composable pairs of arrows of \(g\), denoted by \(\text{Arr}^g\text{Arr}\), by the following:

\[
\text{Arr}^g\text{Arr} = \{<a,b> | (a,b) \in \text{Arr} \times \text{Arr} \land \text{dom}(b) = \text{cod}(a)\}
\]

Finally a category \(\mathcal{C}\) (over a graph \(g\)) is an ordered six-tuple \(\mathcal{C} = <\text{Obj}, \text{Arr}, \text{dom}, \text{cod}, \text{id}, \text{comp}>\) such that

i.) \(g = <\text{Obj}, \text{Arr}, \text{dom}, \text{cod}>\) is a graph;

ii.) \(\text{id} : \text{Obj} \rightarrow \text{Arr}\) is a function such that for all \(A \in \text{Obj},\)

\[
\text{dom}(\text{id}(A)) = \text{cod}(\text{id}(A)) = A;
\]
iii.) \( \text{comp} : \text{Arr} \to \text{Arr} \) is a function such that for all \(<.a,.b> \in \text{Arr} \to \text{Arr}\) we have that \(\text{dom}(\text{comp}(<.a,.b>)) = \text{dom}(.a)\) and \(\text{cod}(\text{comp}(<.a,.b>)) = \text{cod}(.b)\);

iv.) Axiom I holds in \(\mathcal{A}\); i.e. for all \(<.a,.b>, <.b,.c> \in \text{Arr} \to \text{Arr}\) we have that \(\text{comp}(<\text{comp}(<.a,.b>),.c>) = \text{comp}(<.a,.\text{comp}(<.b,.c>))\); and

v.) Axiom II holds in \(\mathcal{A}\), i.e. for all \(.a \in \text{Arr}\) we have that
\[
\text{comp}(<.a,.\text{id}(\text{cod}(.a))) = .a \quad \text{and} \quad \text{comp}(<.\text{id}(\text{dom}(.a)),.a>) = .a.
\]

Categories will usually be denoted by upper case English script letters \(A, B, C, D, E, F, \ldots\). If \(\mathcal{A} = \langle \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}, \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}, \text{dom}_\mathcal{A}, \text{cod}_\mathcal{A}, \text{id}_\mathcal{A}, \text{comp}_\mathcal{A} \rangle\) is a category then

i.) the elements of \(\text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}\) will be called objects (in \(\mathcal{A}\)) and denoted by upper case Latin letters \(A, B, C, \ldots\);

ii.) the elements of \(\text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}\) will be called arrows, morphisms, or maps (in \(\mathcal{A}\)) and denoted by lower case Latin letters preceded by a dot \(.a, .b, .c, \ldots\);

iii.) if \(.a \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}\) then the object \(\text{dom}_\mathcal{A}(.a)\) will be called the domain of \(.a\) and will also be denoted by \(\text{dom}_\mathcal{A}(.a)\);

iv.) if \(.a \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}\) then the object \(\text{cod}_\mathcal{A}(.a)\) will be called the codomain of \(.a\) and will also be denoted by \(\text{cod}_\mathcal{A}(.a)\);

v.) if \(A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}\) then the morphism \(\text{id}_\mathcal{A}(A)\) will be called the identity morphism (arrow or map) on \(A\) and will also be denoted by \(\text{1}_A\);

vi.) if \(<.a,.b> \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A} \to \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}\) we will say that \(<.a,.b>\) is a composable pair of morphisms (arrows or maps) in \(\mathcal{A}\) and \(\text{comp}_\mathcal{A}(<.a,.b>)\) will be called the composition of \(.a\) and \(.b\) and will also be denoted by \(.a \circ .b, .a \cdot .b, .a.b, \) or \(.ab\); and
vii.) if $A, B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ then the set

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B) = \{ a \in \text{Arr}_{\mathcal{A}} \mid \text{dom}_{\mathcal{A}}(a) = A \land \text{cod}_{\mathcal{A}}(a) = B \} \quad (1.4)$$

Of course we may deviate somewhat from the above notations when we find it convenient. We shall usually be quite explicit when we introduce new notations, however we will not always call attention to obvious simplifications such as the dropping of dots or parentheses in complicated expressions.

In the following we shall frequently employ diagrams whose vertices consist of labels for objects and whose directed edges consist of labels for arrows and pictures of arrows. We say that such a diagram is commutative (or commutes) if for each pair of vertices $c_1$ and $c_2$, any two paths formed by following directed edges from $c_1$ to $c_2$ yield, via composition of arrow labels, "equal arrows" (i.e. equal arrow labels).

For example we may rewrite Axioms I and II as follows:

**Axiom I:** For all $A \xrightarrow{a} B \xrightarrow{b} C \xrightarrow{c} D$, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a b} & C \\
| & \downarrow a & \downarrow c \\
B & \xrightarrow{b c} & D
\end{array}
\]

commutes.

**Axiom II:** For all $A \xrightarrow{a} B$, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{1_A} & A \\
| & \downarrow a & \downarrow a \\
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{1_B} & B \\
| & \downarrow a & \downarrow a \\
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B
\end{array}
\]

commutes.
Examples of categories:

1.) In ZFCI we will denote the inaccessible cardinal by \( \iota \) (iota). \( \mathcal{V}_\iota \) is a standard transitive model of ZFC. The category whose objects are the elements of \( \mathcal{V}_\iota \), whose morphisms are ordered triples \( <x,f,y> \in \mathcal{V}_\iota \) such that \( f: x \rightarrow y \), and whose notions of domain, codomain, identity, and composition are defined in the obvious manner, is called the category of sets and is denoted by \( \mathcal{S} \).

Note that we now have two different notations for functions in set theory. First there is the ordinary set theoretic notation in which functions are written on the left and compositions are written from the right to the left. Second, there is the category theoretic notation in \( \mathcal{S} \) in which functions are denoted \( .a, .b, .c, ... \) and written and composed on the right. The presence or absence of dots on the function symbols should indicate which notation is being used for any given expression.

2.) It will be noted that our definition of category may be carried out in ZFCI or relativized to \( \mathcal{V}_\iota \). This then gives us two notions of category. A category in the sense of \( \mathcal{V}_\iota \) will be called a small category. Categories in ZFCI which are not small will be called large categories.

3.) Any partially ordered set (or poset) \( <x,\leq> \) may be made into a category \( \mathcal{C}(x,\leq) \) by letting

\[
\text{Obj} \mathcal{C}(x,\leq) = x \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(x,\leq)}(z_1, z_2) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } z_1 \leq z_2 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \tag{1.7}
\]

for all \( z_1, z_2 \in x \). Define domain, codomain, identity and composition the obvious manner. Such a category will be called a partially ordered category or pocategory.
4.) Let $\mathcal{C} = \langle \text{obj}_\mathcal{C}, \text{Arr}_\mathcal{C}, \text{dom}_\mathcal{C}, \text{cod}_\mathcal{C}, \text{id}_\mathcal{C}, \text{comp}_\mathcal{C} \rangle$ be any category. The dual category of $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$, is the category obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by reversing all the arrows, i.e. formally $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} = \langle \text{obj}_\mathcal{C}, \text{Arr}_\mathcal{C}, \text{cod}_\mathcal{C}, \text{dom}_\mathcal{C}, \text{id}_\mathcal{C}, \text{comp}_\mathcal{C} \rangle$.

5.) Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ is a category and $B \in \text{obj}_\mathcal{C}$. Then the category of arrows in $\mathcal{C}$ over $B$ (or the comma category of $\mathcal{C}$ over $B$) is the category denoted by $\mathcal{C}@B$ whose objects are arrows in $\mathcal{C}$ of the form $A \xrightarrow{b} B$ and whose arrows are described by the requirement that the elements of

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}@B}(A_1 \xrightarrow{b_1} B, A_2 \xrightarrow{b_2} B)$$

are all commutative triangles in $\mathcal{C}$ of the form

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A_1 \\
\downarrow b_1 \\
B
\end{array}
\xymatrix{
A_1 \ar[r]^a & A_2 \\
\downarrow b_1 & B \\
A_2 \ar[ru]^{b_2}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{(1.6)}\]

**Types of morphisms:**

1.) A morphism $\cdot m : A \to B$ is said to be a **monomorphism** (or **monic**) if for every pair of morphisms $L \xrightarrow{L_1} A, L_1m = L_2m$ implies $L_1 = L_2$. We will also write "$.m : A \rightarrow B" or "A \rightarrow B" for "$.m : A \rightarrow B$ is a monomorphism".

2.) A morphism $\cdot e : A \to B$ is said to be an **epimorphism** (or **epic**) if for every pair of morphisms $B \xrightarrow{R} R, \cdot er_1 = \cdot er_2$ implies $r_1 = r_2$. We will also write "$.e : A \rightarrow B" or "A \rightarrow B" for "$.e : A \rightarrow B$ is an epimorphism".

3.) A morphism $\cdot i : A \to B$ is said to be an **isomorphism** (or **iso** or **invertible**) if there exists a morphism $\cdot j : B \to A$ such that $\cdot ij = 1_A$.
and \( ji = 1_B \). We will also write "\( i : A \rightarrow B \)" or "\( A^i \rightarrow B \)" for "\( i : A \rightarrow B \) is an isomorphism". We say that two objects \( A \) and \( B \) are isomorphic, denoted by \( A \cong B \), if there exists an \( i : A \rightarrow B \).

4.) A morphism \( f : A \rightarrow A \), whose domain and codomain are the same object, is said to be an endomorphism (or endo).

5.) An endomorphism which is also an isomorphism is said to be an automorphism (or auto).

6.) Let \( .a_1 : A_1 \rightarrow B \) and \( .a_2 : A_2 \rightarrow B \) be two morphisms with common codomain \( B \). We say \( .a_2 \) factors through \( .a_1 \) if there exists a morphism \( .f : A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A_1 \\
\downarrow .a_1 \\
\downarrow \downarrow .f \\
\downarrow .a_2 \\
A_2 \\
\end{array} 
\]

(1.9)

commutes.

Dually, let \( .b_1 : A \rightarrow B_1 \) and \( .b_2 : A \rightarrow B_2 \) be two morphisms with common domain \( A \). We say that \( .b_2 \) factors through \( .b_1 \) if there exists a morphism \( .g : B_1 \rightarrow B_2 \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow .b_1 \\
\downarrow .f \\
\downarrow .b_2 \\
B_2 \\
\end{array} 
\]

(1.10)

commutes.
7.) An epimorphism \( h : A \rightarrow B \) is said to be a split epimorphism (or a split epic or simply to split) if \( \lambda_B \) factors through \( h \), i.e. if there exists a map \( \lambda : B \rightarrow A \), called a section of \( h \), such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{h} & B \\
\downarrow{\lambda} & & \downarrow{\lambda_B} \\
B & \xrightarrow{1_B} & B
\end{array}
\]

(1.11) commutes.

8.) A monomorphism \( h : A \rightarrow B \) is said to be a split monomorphism (or a split monic or simply to split) if \( \lambda_A \) factors through \( h \), i.e. if there exists a map \( \lambda : B \rightarrow A \), called a retraction of \( h \), such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{h} & A \\
\downarrow{r} & & \downarrow{1_A} \\
A & \xleftarrow{\lambda} & A
\end{array}
\]

(1.12) commutes.

9.) An endomorphism \( f : A \rightarrow A \) is said to be an idempotent if \( ff = f \).

10.) An idempotent \( f : A \rightarrow A \) splits if there exists an object \( B \) and morphisms \( A \xleftarrow{g} B \) such that the diagram
11.) Let $a_1 : A_1 \to B$ and $a : A \to B$ be two monics with common codomain $B$. We write $a_2 \leq a_1$ if $a_2$ factors through $a_1$, i.e. if there exists a map $e : A_2 \to A_1$ such that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A_1 \\
\downarrow e \\
B \\
\downarrow a_2 \\
A_2
\end{array}
\]

commutes.

We write $a_1 \sim a_2$ if $a_1 \leq a_2$ and $a_2 \leq a_1$. "$\sim"$ is then an equivalence relation on monics with codomain $B$. The corresponding equivalence classes of monics are called the subobjects of $B$. The collection of subobjects of $B$ also has a natural ordering, the one induced on it by $\leq$ above, which we shall also denote by $\leq$. It is often convenient to abuse our language by calling a monic with codomain $B$ a subobject of $B$ and writing $A \overset{a}{\to} B$ with the intention that it be read "$a$ is a subobject of $B$" (or even "$A$ is a subobject of $B$").
II.2 Functors and natural transformations

Let $\mathcal{A}_1 = <\text{Obj}_1, \text{Arr}_1, \text{dom}_1, \text{cod}_1, \text{id}_1, \text{comp}_1>$ be a category for $i = 1, 2$.

A (covariant) functor $:F: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is an ordered pair of functions $:F = <F_{\text{obj}}, F_{\text{arr}}>$ such that

i.) $F_{\text{obj}}: \text{Obj}_1 \rightarrow \text{Obj}_2$;

ii.) $F_{\text{arr}}: \text{Arr}_1 \rightarrow \text{Arr}_2$;

iii.) for all $a \in \text{Arr}_1$, $\text{dom}_2(F_{\text{arr}}(a)) = F_{\text{obj}}(\text{dom}_1(a))$ and $\text{cod}_2(F_{\text{arr}}(a)) = F_{\text{obj}}(\text{cod}_1(a))$; and

iv.) for all $\langle a, b \rangle \in \text{Arr}_1 \circ \text{Arr}_1$, $F_{\text{arr}}(\text{comp}_1(a, b)) = \text{comp}_2(F_{\text{arr}}(a), F_{\text{arr}}(b))$.

A contravariant functor $:G: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is a covariant functor $:G^{\text{op}}: \mathcal{A}_1^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$.

Functors will usually be denoted by upper case script Latin letters preceded by two dots $:A, :B, :C, \ldots$, although we shall occasionally explicitly deviate from this convention. If $:F = <F_{\text{obj}}, F_{\text{arr}}>$ is a functor as above, we shall normally write $A:F$ for $F_{\text{obj}}(A)$ where $A \in \text{Obj}_1$ and $a:F$ for $F_{\text{arr}}(a)$ where $a \in \text{Arr}_1$.

The identity functor $:I_\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{A}$ on any category $\mathcal{A}$ is the ordered pair $:I_\mathcal{A} = \text{df} <I_1, I_2>$ where $I_1$ is the identity function on $\text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $I_2$ is the identity function on $\text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}$.

If $:F: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is a functor then $\mathcal{A}_1$ is called the domain of $:F$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ is called the codomain of $:F$. However we will usually write simply $:F: \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ or $\mathcal{A}_1 :F : \mathcal{A}_2$. 
Finally if $F = \langle F_{\text{obj}}, F_{\text{Arr}} \rangle : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ and $G = \langle G_{\text{obj}}, G_{\text{Arr}} \rangle : \mathcal{A}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_3$, we define the composition of $F$ and $G$ to be the functor

$$
\langle G_{\text{obj}}, F_{\text{obj}}, G_{\text{Arr}} * F_{\text{Arr}} \rangle = \text{df} : F \circ G = \text{df} : F : G = \text{df} : F * G = \text{df} : FG.
$$

(2.1)

Note that the functions on the far left hand side of the above equation are written in the set theoretic notation with the functions on the left.

A functor $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is called a constant functor if there exists an $A_2 \in \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_2$ such that for all $A_1 \in \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_1$, $A_1 : F = A_2$ and for all $a \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}_1$, $a : F = .1_{A_2}$. $F$ is then called the constant functor on $A_2$ from $\mathcal{A}_1$ and denoted by $: A_2$.

A functor $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is said to be full if for all $A, B \in \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_1$ and all $a_2 \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_2}(A : F, B : F)$, there exists an $a_1 \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}_1}(A, B)$ such that $a_1 : F = a_2$.

A functor $F : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is said to be faithful if for all $a_1, a_2 \in \text{Arr}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$, $a_1 \neq a_2$ implies $a_1 : F \neq a_2 : F$.

A functor $F = \langle F_{\text{obj}}, F_{\text{Arr}} \rangle : \mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ is said to be an isomorphism of categories if $F_{\text{obj}}$ and $F_{\text{Arr}}$ are both bijections.

We say that a category $\mathcal{A}_1$ is a subcategory of the category $\mathcal{A}_2$, denoted $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$ if

i.) $\text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_2$ (we denote the inclusion function by $i_{\text{Ob}} : \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \text{Ob}_\mathcal{A}_2$)

ii.) $\text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}_2$ (we denote the inclusion function by $i_{\text{Arr}} : \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}_1 \rightarrow \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A}_2$)
The functor \( :I_{a_1}a_2 \leftarrow \text{incl} \) is called the inclusion functor and it is obviously faithful. If \( :I_{a_1}a_2 \) is also full then we say that \( a_1 \) is a full subcategory of \( a_2 \).

Note that there are other definitions of subcategory in the literature. The definition above coincides with that of MacLane [18, p.15].

Examples: 1.) Let \( <x, \leq_x> \) and \( <y, \leq_y> \) be any two posets and let \( f : x \rightarrow y \) be any order preserving function. Then \( f \) induces in the obvious way a functor \( :P_f : \mathcal{O}(x, \leq_x) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(y, \leq_y) \) between the corresponding pocategories.

2.) Let \( \mathcal{O}_S \) denote the subcategory of \( \mathcal{S} \) whose objects are partially ordered sets and whose morphisms are order preserving maps.

Let \( \mathcal{O}_C \) denote the category whose objects are small pocategories and whose morphisms are the functors between them. Note that both \( \mathcal{O}_S \) and \( \mathcal{O}_C \) are large categories. From the definition of pocategory it is obvious that there is a functor \( :J : \mathcal{O}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \) that is an isomorphism of categories.

Let \( :F \) and \( :G \) be functors from \( a_1 \) to \( a_2 \), i.e. \( a_1 \xrightarrow{F} a_2 \). A natural transformation from \( :F \) to \( :G : \eta : F \rightarrow G \) is a set of arrows in \( a_2 \) indexed by objects of \( a_1 \), \( :\eta = \{ \eta_A \in \text{Arr}_{a_2} | A \in \text{Ob}_{a_1} \} \) such that

\[ \text{i.) for all } A \in \text{Ob}_{a_1}, \quad \text{dom}_{a_2}(\eta_A) = A : F \text{ and cod}_{a_2}(\eta_A) = A : G \]
\[ \text{ii.) for all } A, B \in \text{Ob}_{a_1} \text{ and all } A \in \text{Hom}_{a_1}(A, B), \text{ the diagram} \]
The elements of \( :\eta = \{ \eta_A \mid A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A} \} \) are called the components of the natural transformation \( :\eta \). The element \( \eta_A \) is called the \( A \)-component of \( :\eta \) and may also be denoted by \( \cdot A :\eta \).

If \( :F \) and \( :G \) are contravariant functors, a natural transformation from \( :F \) to \( :G \) \( :\eta : :F \longrightarrow :G \) is a natural transformation \( :\eta^{\text{op}} : :F^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow :G^{\text{op}} \).

In general we will denote natural transformations by lower case Greek letters preceded by two dots \( :\alpha, :\beta, :\gamma, \ldots \).

A natural isomorphism (or natural equivalence) is a natural transformation whose components are all isomorphisms.

Let \( :F : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B} \) be a functor and let \( B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{B} \). Then \( :B \) denotes the constant functor on \( B \) from \( \mathcal{A} \). A natural transformation \( :\eta : :B \longrightarrow :F \) is called a cone on \( :F \) from \( B \). \( B \) is called the vertex of the cone and \( :F \) is called the base. We also use the notation \( :\eta : :B \rightarrowrightarrow :F \) to abbreviate "\( :\eta : :B \rightarrowrightarrow :F \) is a cone on \( :F \) from \( B \)". Dually, a natural transformation \( :\varepsilon : :F \longrightarrow :B \) is called a cocone on \( :F \) to \( B \). \( B \) is called the vertex of the cocone and \( :F \) is called the base. We also use the notation
If $a_1$ and $a_2$ are categories we define the product category $a_1 \times a_2$ in the obvious manner:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item $\text{Obj}_{a_1 \times a_2} = \text{Obj}_{a_1} \times \text{Obj}_{a_2}$;
  \item $\text{Arr}_{a_1 \times a_2} = U\{\text{Hom}_{a_1}(A_1, B_1) \times \text{Hom}_{a_2}(A_2, B_2) \mid \langle A_1, A_2 >, \langle B_1, B_2 > \in \text{Obj}_{a_1 \times a_2} \};$
  \item $\text{dom}_{a_1 \times a_2} = (\text{dom}_{a_1} \times \text{dom}_{a_2}) \text{Arr}_{a_1 \times a_2}$;
  \item $\text{cod}_{a_1 \times a_2} = (\text{cod}_{a_1} \times \text{cod}_{a_2}) \text{Arr}_{a_1 \times a_2}$;
  \item $\text{id}_{a_1 \times a_2} = \text{id}_{a_1} \times \text{id}_{a_2}$; and
  \item $\text{comp}_{a_1 \times a_2} = (\text{comp}_{a_1} \times \text{comp}_{a_2}) \text{Arr}_{a_1 \times a_2}$.
\end{enumerate}

It is a simple matter to verify that $a_1 \times a_2$ satisfies the definition of a category. By the simple iteration of the above construction we may define the product of the $n$ categories $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, which we will denote by $a_1 \times \ldots \times a_n$ or $\prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i$.

A functor from a product of $n$ categories is called a multifunctor (with $n$-arguments). By looking at dual categories for certain arguments it is possible to speak of multifunctors being contravariant in certain arguments and covariant in others.

If $a_1 \times \ldots \times a_n$ is a product of $n$ categories, there exist $n$ special multifunctors $\text{Pr}_i : a_1 \times \ldots \times a_n \rightarrow a_i$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$. These multifunctors $\text{Pr}_n$ will be called projection functors and they are defined in the obvious manner. We may consider any multifunctor of $n$-argument to give rise to functors and multifunctors of less than arguments by holding certain arguments fixed.
Example: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be any small category. Then $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(\_,\_): \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{S}$ is a multifunctor with two arguments or a bifunctor.

Note that $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(\_,\_)$ is contravariant in the first argument and covariant in the second. To see this let us suppose that $A_1,A_2,B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $f: A_1 \to A_2$. Then $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(f,B): \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A_2,B) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A_1,B)$ is the set theoretic function which sends $A_2 \cdot a \to B$ to $A_1 \cdot f \cdot A_2 \cdot a \to B$.

Similarly, if $A,B_1,B_2 \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $g: B_1 \to B_2$ then $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A,g): \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A,B_1) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A,B_2)$ is the set theoretic function which sends $A \cdot b \to B_1$ to $A \cdot b \to B_1 \cdot g \to B_2$.

For each $A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ we obtain the two functors $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A,\_)$ and $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(\_,A)$ by holding $A$ fixed. The functor $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A,\_)$ is called the covariant Hom-functor (with $A$ fixed) and $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(\_,A)$ is called the contravariant Hom-functor (with $A$ fixed). A covariant (resp. contravariant) functor $F: \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{S}$ is said to be representable with $A$ as its representing object if $F$ is naturally isomorphic to the covariant (resp. contravariant) Hom-functor with $A$ fixed. It is easy to see that naturally isomorphic representable functors must have isomorphic representing objects.

A natural transformation of multifunctors is in a sense already defined since a multifunctor is a special kind of functor. Notice that a natural transformation of multifunctors is a natural transformation in each argument.

Let $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ be categories. We define the category of functors from $\mathcal{A}_1$ to $\mathcal{A}_2$, $\text{Func}(\mathcal{A}_1,\mathcal{A}_2)$, to be the category whose objects are functors $F: \mathcal{A}_1 \to \mathcal{A}_2$ and whose morphisms are natural transformations between
such functors. The domain, codomain, identity and composition functions are defined in the obvious manner. It is a simple matter to check that \( \text{Func}(\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2) \) satisfies the category axioms.

**Examples of functor categories:** Let \( \\mathbb{1} \) denote the category with one object and one arrow. Let \( \\mathbb{2} \) denote the category with two objects having just one arrow between them and whose only endomorphisms are identity maps. If \( \mathcal{C} \) is any category then \( \text{Func}(\\mathbb{1}, \mathcal{C}) \) is isomorphic to \( \mathcal{C} \). \( \text{Func}(\\mathbb{2}, \mathcal{C}) \) is called the **category of arrows in \( \mathcal{C} \)** and it is isomorphic to the category whose objects are arrows \( \cdot a : A_1 \to A_2 \) in \( \mathcal{C} \) and whose morphisms \( \cdot f : a_1 \to a_2 \), where \( \cdot a_1 : A_{11} \to A_{12} \) and \( \cdot a_2 : A_{21} \to A_{22} \) are arrows in \( \mathcal{C} \), are ordered pairs of arrows in \( \mathcal{C} \), \( \cdot f = \langle \cdot h, \cdot k \rangle \), such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A_{11} & \xrightarrow{\cdot a_1} & A_{12} \\
\downarrow {\cdot h} & & \downarrow {\cdot k} \\
A_{21} & \xrightarrow{\cdot a_2} & A_{22}
\end{array}
\]

commutes.
II.3 Limits and colimits

We now formalize our notion of a diagram more precisely; a diagram in a category $\mathcal{C}$ is a functor $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is a small category called the shape (or index category) of the diagram $\mathcal{D}$. We think of each of the elements of $\text{Obj} \mathcal{J}$ and $\text{Arr} \mathcal{J}$ as being a label for its image under $\mathcal{D}$. Generally we will denote objects in an index category $\mathcal{J}$ by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ and arrows in $\mathcal{J}$ by $i, j, k, \ldots$ We will often write $\mathcal{D}_\alpha$ for $\alpha : \mathcal{D}$ and $d_i$ for $i : \mathcal{D}$.

Let $a_1 : \mathcal{D}_\alpha \rightarrow B$ and $a_2 : \mathcal{D}_\beta \rightarrow B$ be arrows in $\mathcal{A}$ with common codomain $B$. We say that $a_2$ factors uniquely through $a_1$ in the diagram $\mathcal{D}$ if there exists a unique arrow $i : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ in $\mathcal{J}$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_\alpha \\
\downarrow a_1 \\
D \downarrow \\
\mathcal{D}_\beta \\
\downarrow a_2 \\
\downarrow d_i \\
\end{array}
$$

(3.1)

commutes.

Dually, if $b_1 : A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\alpha$ and $b_2 : A \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\beta$ are arrows in $\mathcal{A}$ with common domain $A$ then we say that $b_2$ factors uniquely through $b_1$ in the diagram $\mathcal{D}$ if there exists a unique arrow $i : \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ in $\mathcal{J}$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{D}_\beta \\
\downarrow a_2 \\
D \downarrow \\
\mathcal{D}_\alpha \\
\downarrow a_1 \\
\downarrow d_i \\
\end{array}
$$

commutes.
If \( \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) is a diagram in \( \mathcal{A} \) and \( \mathcal{B} \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \), then a universal arrow from \( \mathcal{D} \) to \( \mathcal{B} \) is an ordered pair \( \langle \alpha, \cdot \alpha \rangle \) where \( \alpha \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \) and \( \cdot \alpha : \mathcal{D}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) is an arrow in \( \mathcal{A} \) such that for all \( \beta \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \) and all arrows \( \cdot \beta : \mathcal{D}_\beta \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) in \( \mathcal{A} \), \( \cdot \beta \) factors uniquely through \( \cdot \alpha \) in \( \mathcal{D} \). Dually, a universal arrow from \( \mathcal{B} \) to \( \mathcal{D} \) is an ordered pair \( \langle \alpha, \cdot \alpha \rangle \) where \( \alpha \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \) and \( \cdot \alpha : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\alpha \) is an arrow in \( \mathcal{A} \) such that for all \( \beta \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \) and all arrows \( \cdot \beta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\beta \) in \( \mathcal{A} \), \( \cdot \beta \) factors uniquely through \( \cdot \alpha \) in \( \mathcal{D} \).

Let \( \text{Diag}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) = \text{Func}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) \) be the category of diagrams in \( \mathcal{A} \) of shape \( \mathcal{J} \). Define that generalized diagonal functor \( \mathcal{V} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Diag}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) \) to be the functor which

i.) sends each \( \mathcal{B} \in \text{ob} \mathcal{J} \) to the constant functor from \( \mathcal{J} \) to \( \mathcal{A} \),

\[ \cdot \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \]

and

ii.) sends each arrow \( \cdot \mathcal{A} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) in \( \mathcal{A} \) to the natural transformation

\[ \cdot \eta : \cdot \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \] whose components are all equal to \( \cdot \alpha \).

If \( \mathcal{D} \in \text{ob} \text{Diag}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) \), then a limit of the diagram \( \mathcal{D} \) in \( \mathcal{A} \) is a universal arrow from \( \mathcal{D} \) to \( \mathcal{V} \) in \( \text{Diag}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) \) and a colimit of the diagram \( \mathcal{D} \) in \( \mathcal{A} \) is a universal arrow from \( \mathcal{V} \) to \( \mathcal{D} \) in \( \text{Diag}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{A}) \).

Below we give another characterization of limits and colimits in order to unravel the above definitions slightly.
Let \[ \text{Cone}_A(a, D) = \text{def} \ Hom_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Diag}}(a, V, D) \] (3.3)

and

\[ \text{Cocone}_A(D, a) = \text{def} \ Hom_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{Diag}}(D, a, V) \] (3.4)

where \( A \in \text{Obj}_A \) and \( : D : \rightarrow A \).

If \( A_1, A_2 \in \text{Obj}_A \), we say that \( : y_2 \in \text{Cone}_A(a_2, D) \) factors uniquely through \( : y_1 \in \text{Cone}_A(a_1, D) \) if there exists an unique arrow \( f : A_2 \rightarrow A_1 \) in \( A \) such that

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
A_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & A_2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
D & \xrightarrow{y_1} & D \\
\end{array} \] (3.5)

commutes.

i.e.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
A_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & A_2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
D & \xrightarrow{y_1} & \alpha \\
\end{array} \] (3.6)

commutes for all \( \alpha \in \text{Obj}_A \).

Dually, we say that \( : y_2 \in \text{Cocone}_A(D, a_2) \) factors uniquely through \( : y_1 \in \text{Cocone}_A(D, a_1) \) if there exists an unique \( g : A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \) in \( A \) such that

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
D & \xrightarrow{y_2} & A_1 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\gamma_2 & \xrightarrow{y_1} & A_2 \\
\end{array} \] (3.7)

commutes.
A universal cone on $\mathcal{D} : I \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is an ordered pair $< L, :\pi >$ where $L \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $:\pi \in \text{Cone}_\mathcal{A}(L, \mathcal{D})$ such that for every $A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and every $:\alpha \in \text{Cone}_\mathcal{A}(A, \mathcal{D})$, $:\alpha$ factors uniquely through $:\pi$.

Dually, a universal cocone on $\mathcal{D} : I \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is an ordered pair $< C, :\lambda >$ where $C \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $:\lambda \in \text{Cone}_\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, C)$ such that for every $B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and every $:\beta \in \text{Cone}_\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{D}, B)$, $:\beta$ factors uniquely through $:\lambda$.

**Proposition 1:** $< L, :\pi >$ is a limit of $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if $< L, :\pi >$ is a universal cone on $\mathcal{D}$.

**Proposition 2:** $< C, :\lambda >$ is a colimit of $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if $< C, :\lambda >$ is a universal cocone on $\mathcal{D}$.

**Proposition 3:** Limits are unique up to isomorphism.

Proof: Let $< L_1, :\pi_1 >$ and $< L_2, :\pi_2 >$ be two limits of $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Then $:\pi_1$ factors uniquely through $:\pi_2$ and vice versa, so there exist maps $l_1 : L_1 \longrightarrow L_2$ and $l_2 : L_2 \longrightarrow L_1$ such that $:\pi_1 = :l_1 :\pi_2$ and $:\pi_2 = :l_1 :\pi_1$ in the diagram below:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L}_1 \\
| \downarrow l_1 |
\text{L}_2
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
| \downarrow \pi_2 |
\text{L}_1
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{L}_2 \\
| \downarrow l_2 |
\text{L}_1
\end{array}
$$

(3.8)

The claim is that $l_1 l_2 = l_1$ and $l_2 l_1 = l_2$. To see this observe that $l_1 l_2 :\pi_1 = :l_1 :\pi_2 = :\pi_1$, but $:\pi_1$ factors uniquely through itself as $:\pi_1 = :l_1 :\pi_1$, whence $l_1 l_2 = l_1$. Similarly, $l_2 l_1 = l_2$.

**Proposition 4:** Colimits are unique up to isomorphism.
Notation and terminology:

Let \( \langle L, \Pi \rangle \) be a limit of the diagram \( D \) in \( \mathcal{A} \). We call \( L \) the limit object and denote it by \( \operatorname{Lim} D \); we call \( \Pi \) the limit transformation and refer to its components as projections. If \( \langle A, \alpha \rangle \) is any pair such that \( A \in \operatorname{Obj} \mathcal{A} \) and \( \alpha \in \operatorname{Con} \mathcal{A}(A, D) \) then the unique \( \ell : A \to L \) such that \( \alpha = \ell \Pi \) is called the limit morphism for \( \alpha \) and is denoted by \( \operatorname{lim}_D \alpha \) or simply \( \operatorname{lim}(\alpha) \).

Similarly, should \( \langle C, \iota \rangle \) be a colimit of the diagram \( D \) in \( \mathcal{A} \), we call \( C \) the colimit object and denote it by \( \operatorname{Colim} D \); \( \iota \) the colimit transformation and refer to its components as injections. If \( \langle B, \beta \rangle \) is any pair such that \( B \in \operatorname{Obj} \mathcal{A} \) and \( \beta \in \operatorname{Coc} \mathcal{A}(D, B) \) then the unique \( \iota : C \to B \) such that \( \iota \iota = \beta \) is called the colimit morphism and is denoted by \( \operatorname{colim}_D \beta \) or simply \( \operatorname{colim}(\beta) \).

Types of limits and colimits:

1.) By the empty diagram in a category \( \mathcal{A} \) we mean the diagram in \( \mathcal{A} \) whose shape is the empty category.

If a limit of the empty diagram exists in \( \mathcal{A} \), we call its limit object a terminal object in \( \mathcal{A} \). We use the symbol \( 1 \) to denote a terminal object.

If a colimit of the empty diagram exists in \( \mathcal{A} \), we call its colimit object an initial object in \( \mathcal{A} \). We use the symbol \( 0 \) to denote an initial object.

The following two propositions are immediate from the above definitions:

**PROPOSITION 5:** \( 1 \) is a terminal object of \( \mathcal{A} \) if and only if \( \operatorname{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(A, 1) = 1 \) for all \( A \in \operatorname{Obj} \mathcal{A} \).
PROPOSITION 6: \( 0 \) is an initial object of \( \mathcal{A} \) if and only if \( \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(0, B) = 1 \) for all \( B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A} \).

Examples of initial and terminal objects:

1.1) In \( \mathcal{S} \), \( \emptyset \) is an initial object and any singleton is a terminal object.

1.2) In any lattice \( \langle L, \leq \rangle \) regarded as a pocategory \( \mathcal{O}(L, \leq) \), the least element \( 0 \) and the greatest element \( 1 \) are initial and terminal objects respectively.

2.) A category \( \mathcal{J} \) is said to be discrete if all its arrows are identity arrows. A diagram \( :D : \mathcal{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) is said to be discrete if its shape \( \mathcal{J} \) is discrete.

Limits and colimits of discrete diagrams are called products and coproducts respectively. We shall denote the product of \( :D \) by \( \bigotimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\alpha \) or by \( D_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes D_n \) if \( \mathcal{J} \) is a discrete category with \( n \) elements. Similarly we shall denote the coproduct of \( :D \) by \( \bigoplus_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\alpha \) or by \( D_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus D_n \) if \( \mathcal{J} \) is a discrete category with \( n \) elements. The limit and colimit natural transformations for \( \bigotimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\alpha \) and \( \bigoplus_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{P}_\alpha \) are denoted by \( :\pi \) and \( :\iota \) and their components are called projections and injections respectively.

Examples of products and coproducts:

2.1) In \( \mathcal{S} \) the cartesian product is a product and the disjoint union is a coproduct.

2.2) In any lattice \( \langle L, \leq \rangle \) regarded as a pocategory \( \mathcal{O}(L, \leq) \), the meet \( \wedge \) and the join \( \vee \) correspond to the notions of product and coproduct respectively.
3.) A limit of a diagram of the shape $\alpha \xrightarrow{i} \beta$ is called an **equalizer** and is denoted by $\langle Eqz(d_i, d_j), :eqz(d_i, d_j) \rangle$. The object $Eqz(d_i, d_j)$ is called the **equalizer object**, while the morphism $\alpha :eqz(d_i, d_j)$ is called the **equalizer morphism** and is denoted by $eqz(d_i, d_j)$.

A colimit of a diagram of the shape $\alpha \xrightarrow{i} \beta$ is called a **coequalizer** and is denoted by $\langle Coeqz(d_i, d_j), :coeqz(d_i, d_j) \rangle$. The object $Coeqz(d_i, d_j)$ is called the **coequalizer object**, while the morphism $\beta :coeqz(d_i, d_j)$ is called the **coequalizer morphism** and is denoted by $coeqz(d_i, d_j)$.

The following two propositions are easily established:

**PROPOSITION 7:** Equalizers are monic. □

**PROPOSITION 8:** Coequalizers are epic. □

This may all be summarized by the following commutative diagram:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
Eqz(d_i, d_j) & \xrightarrow{eqz(d_i, d_j)} & D \\
\alpha & \xrightarrow{\alpha_j} & \beta \\
\end{array}
$$

(3.9)

4.) A limit of a diagram of the shape

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\beta & \xrightarrow{j} & \gamma \\
\alpha & \xrightarrow{i} & \\
\end{array}
$$

(3.10)

is called a **pullback**. Often we shall simply write:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow g \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \\
\end{array}
$$

(3.11)

is a pullback.
$\bar{P}_{f,g}$ is called the pullback object of $f$ and $g$ or just the pullback of $f$ and $g$. $\bar{r}_g$ is called the pullback of $f$ along $g$ and $\bar{g}_f$ is called the pullback of $g$ along $f$.

Dually, a colimit of a diagram of the shape

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\alpha & \overset{i}{\longrightarrow} & \beta \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\gamma & \overset{j}{\longrightarrow} & \delta
\end{array}
\]

(3.12)

is called a pushout. Often we shall simply write:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
C & \overset{g}{\longrightarrow} & \bar{P}_{f,g}
\end{array}
\]

(3.13)

is a pushout.

$\bar{P}_{f,g}$ is called the pushout object of $f$ and $g$ or just the pushout of $f$ and $g$. $\bar{f}_g$ is called the pushout of $f$ along $g$ and $\bar{g}_f$ is called the pushout of $g$ along $f$.

**PROPOSITION 9:** Pullbacks of monics are monic.

**Proof:** Let

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{P}_{f,g} & \overset{\bar{r}_g}{\longrightarrow} & B \\
\bar{f}_g & \longrightarrow & Y \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} & C
\end{array}
\]

(3.14)

be a pullback where $g$ is a monic.

We want to show that $\bar{g}_f$ is monic, i.e. we want to show that given
any two maps

\[ \begin{array}{c}
E & \xrightarrow{\ell_1} & P_{f,g} \\
\downarrow \ell_2 & & \downarrow \ell_2 \\
\end{array} \]

such that \( \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f \), \( \ell_1 = \ell_2 \). Consider the diagram

\[ \begin{array}{c}
E & \xrightarrow{\ell_1} & P_{f,g} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}, g} & B \\
\downarrow \ell_2 & & \downarrow g \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \\
\end{array} \]  \quad (3.15)

If \( \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f \) then

\[ \ell_1 g f g = \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f = \ell_2 g f g \]  \quad (3.16)

and, since \( g \) is monic \( \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f \). So \( \{ \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f, \ell_1 g f = \ell_2 g f \} \)
determines a cone \( : \pi \) from \( E \) to the diagram

\[ \begin{array}{c}
B & \xrightarrow{g} & \\
\downarrow g & & \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \\
\end{array} \]  \quad (3.17)

using (3.16) and \( \ell_1 \) and \( \ell_2 \) both play the role of \( \text{lim}(\pi) \). But \( \text{lim}(\pi) \)
is unique. So \( \ell_1 = \ell_2. \square \)

**Proposition 10:** Pushouts of epics are epic.

**Proof:** Dual to that of Proposition 9 above. \( \square \)
5.) A pullback of the form

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K & \overset{k_1}{\to} & A \\
\downarrow{k_2} & & \downarrow{f} \\
A & \underset{f}{\to} & B
\end{array}
\]

(3.18)

is called a \textit{kernel pair}.

We may also refer to the pair \(\langle k_1, k_2 \rangle\) as a \textit{kernel pair for} \(f\).

Dually, a pushout of the form

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \overset{f}{\to} & B \\
\downarrow{f} & & \downarrow{c_2} \\
B & \underset{c_1}{\to} & C
\end{array}
\]

(3.19)

is called a \textit{cokernel pair} and \(\langle c_1, c_2 \rangle\) is called a \textit{cokernel pair for} \(f\).

In different categories limits and colimits of various types may or may not exist. A category \(\mathcal{A}\) is said to be \textit{(finitely) complete} if every (finite) diagram \(D : \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{A}\) has a limit in \(\mathcal{A}\). \(\mathcal{A}\) is said to be \textit{(finitely) cocomplete} if every (finite) diagram \(D : \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{A}\) has a colimit in \(\mathcal{A}\). \(\mathcal{A}\) is \textit{(finitely) bicomplete} if it is both (finitely) complete and (finitely) cocomplete.

Proofs of the following two propositions may be found in MacLane \[18, \text{pp.}108-109\], Pareigis \[21, \text{p.}85\], and Stone \[27, \text{pp.}11-12\].

**PROPOSITION 11:** A category \(\mathcal{A}\) is (finitely) complete if and only if it has (finite) products and equalizers. \(\Box\)

**PROPOSITION 12:** A category \(\mathcal{A}\) is (finitely) cocomplete if and only if it has (finite) coproducts and coequalizers. \(\Box\)
II.4 Adjoint pairs and continuous functors

Let $F : A \rightarrow B$ and $G : B \rightarrow A$ be a pair of covariant functors. Such a pair is said to be an adjoint pair, $F$ being the left adjoint and $G$ being the right adjoint of the pair, denoted $F \dashv G$, if any of the four following equivalent conditions are satisfied:

i.) there exist a pair of natural transformations $\eta : 1_A \rightarrow FG$ and $\varepsilon : GF \rightarrow 1_B$, (4.1)
called respectively the unit and counit of the pair, such that $\eta F \circ F \varepsilon = 1_F$ and $G \eta \circ \varepsilon G = 1_G$;

ii.) there exists a natural transformation $\eta : 1_A \rightarrow FG$, called the unit of the pair, such that for all $A \in \text{ob} A$, $B \in \text{ob} B$, and $a \in \text{Hom}_A(A, B ; G)$ there exists a unique $b \in \text{Hom}_B(A ; F, B)$ such that $A : \eta \circ b : G = a$;

iii.) there exists a natural transformation $\varepsilon : GF \rightarrow 1_B$, called the counit of the pair, such that for all $A \in \text{ob} A$, $B \in \text{ob} B$, and $b \in \text{Hom}_B(A ; F, B)$ there exists a unique $a \in \text{Hom}_A(A, B ; G)$ such that $a \circ G^\circ B : \varepsilon = b$;
and iv.) there exists a natural isomorphism \( \theta \), called the **adjunction isomorphism**, such that

\[
\theta_{A,B} : \text{Hom}_B(A:F,B) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_A(A,B:G).
\]  

(4.4)

for all \( A \in \text{Ob}_A \) and \( B \in \text{Ob}_B \).

By an **adjunction** we mean an adjoint pair together with a specified adjunction isomorphism. Proofs that the four definitions of adjoint pair are equivalent and that an adjunction may be specified by specifying either the unit or counit may be found in MacLane [18, Chapter IV], Pareigis [21, Chapter 2], and Stone [27].

Suppose \( :F : A \to B \) and \( :G : B \to A \) are a pair of contravariant functors. We say that \( :F \) and \( :G \) are adjoint on the **left** if there exists a natural isomorphism \( \theta \) such that

\[
\theta_{A,B} : \text{Hom}_B(A:F,B) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_A(B,G,A)
\]  

(4.5)

for all \( A \in \text{Ob}_A \) and \( B \in \text{Ob}_B \). We say that \( :F \) and \( :G \) are adjoint on the **right** if there exists a natural isomorphism \( \theta \) such that

\[
\theta_{A,B} : \text{Hom}_B(B:F,A) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_A(A,B:G)
\]  

(4.6)
for all \( A \in \text{Obj}_A \) and \( B \in \text{Obj}_B \).

Proofs of the following two propositions may be found in Freyd [4], MacLane [18], Pareigis [21], and Stone [27].

**Proposition 13:** Left adjoints and right adjoints (adjoints on the left and adjoints on the right) to a given covariant (contravariant) functor are unique to within natural isomorphism when they exist.\(\Box\)

**Proposition 14:** Suppose \( \mathcal{A}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}_1} \mathcal{A}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}_2} \mathcal{A}_3 \) and \( \mathcal{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_1} \mathcal{G}_2 \) and \( \mathcal{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_1} \mathcal{G}_1 \). Then \( \mathcal{F}_1 \mathcal{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}_1 \mathcal{G}_2} \mathcal{G}_1 \).

The following theorem specifies four special cases of Freyd's Adjoint Functor Theorem which we shall use frequently.

**Theorem 1:** Let \( \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) be a covariant functor and \( \mathcal{G} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) be a contravariant functor. Then

i.) if \( \mathcal{F} \) has a left adjoint then \( \mathcal{F} \) is continuous;

ii.) if \( \mathcal{F} \) has a right adjoint then \( \mathcal{F} \) is cocontinuous;

iii.) if \( \mathcal{G} \) has an adjoint on the left then \( \mathcal{G} \) is contracontinuous; and

iv.) if \( \mathcal{G} \) has an adjoint on the right then \( \mathcal{G} \) is contracontinuous.

**Proof:** See Freyd [4], MacLane [18], Pareigis [21], or Stone [27].\(\Box\)

A subcategory \( \mathcal{A} \) of \( \mathcal{B} \) is called a **reflective subcategory** if the inclusion functor has a left adjoint \( \mathcal{R} \). Such an \( \mathcal{R} \) is called a **reflector**. Dually, \( \mathcal{A} \) is a **coreflective subcategory** if the inclusion functor has a right adjoint \( \mathcal{C} \). Such a \( \mathcal{C} \) is called a **coreflector**.
CHAPTER III

CARTESIAN-CLOSED CATEGORIES AND TOPOI

III.1 Cartesian closed categories

A category \( C \) is said to be \emph{cartesian-closed} if

i.) it is finitely bicomplete and

ii.) for every \( A \in \text{Ob}_C \) the functor \( (\bigodot A) \) has a right adjoint, which
we will denote by \( (A^+) \).

The counit of the adjunction is called the evaluation natural

transformation and it is denoted by \( \epsilon : (A^+) \cdot (\bigodot A) \rightarrow 1_C \).

There exists a natural isomorphism \( \phi : \text{Hom}_C(\bigodot A, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(C, A^B) \)
for each \( A, B \in \text{Ob}_C \), hence the set-valued functor \( \text{Hom}_C(\bigodot A, B) : C \rightarrow \mathbb{S} \) is
representable with \( A^B \) as its representing object. If \( C \in \text{Ob}_C \) and
\( f \in \text{Hom}_C(\bigodot A, B) \) then \( f \cdot \phi_C \in \text{Hom}_C(C, A^B) \) is called the \emph{cartesian adjoint}
of \( f \).

Similarly if \( g \in \text{Hom}_C(C, A^B) \) then \( \phi_C^{-1} g \in \text{Hom}_C(\bigodot A, B) \) is called the \emph{cartesian adjoint}
of \( g \). We denote passage either way along the adjunction isomorphism
by a superscript "\(*\)". e.g. \( f \cdot \phi_C = f^* \) and \( g \cdot \phi_C^{-1} = g^* \).

**Proposition 1:** Let \( C \) be a cartesian-closed category; \( A, B, C \in \text{Ob}_C \) and
\( 0 \) and \( 1 \), initial and terminal objects respectively. Then the following
are naturally isomorphic:

i.) \( 0 \cong \bigodot A \)

ii.) \( (A \bigodot B) \otimes C \cong (A \otimes C) \oplus (B \otimes C) \)

iii.) \( A^+ 1 \cong 1 \)

iv.) \( C^+(A \bigodot B) \cong (C^+ A) \otimes (C^+ B) \)
v.) \( 0^+A \cong 1 \)

vi.) \((B\otimes C)^+A \cong (B^+A)\otimes (C^+A)\)

vii.) \(A \cong 1^+A\)

viii.) \((C\otimes B)^+A \cong C^+(B^+A)\)

**Proof:**

i.) Since \(0\) is an initial object and for all \(X \in \text{Obj}_C\),

\[
\text{Hom}_C(0\otimes A, X) \cong \text{Hom}_C(0, A^+X),
\]

we have that

\[
\text{Hom}_C(0\otimes A, X) = \text{Hom}_C(0, A^+X) = 1 \quad \text{for all } X \in \text{Obj}_C
\]  \quad (1.1)

Therefore \(0\otimes A\) is an initial object.

ii.) Since \(\langle -\rangle\) has a right adjoint, it must be cocontinuous. In particular \(\langle -\rangle\) preserves coproducts so that

\[
(A\otimes B)\otimes C = (A\otimes B)\langle C\rangle \cong A\langle C\rangle \otimes B\langle C\rangle = (A\otimes C)\otimes (B\otimes C).
\]  \quad (1.2)

iii.) Since \(1\) is a terminal object,

\[
\text{Hom}_C(X, A^+1) = \text{Hom}_C(X\otimes 1, 1) = 1
\]  \quad (1.3)

for all \(X \in \text{Obj}_C\), hence \(A^+1\) is a terminal object.

iv.) Since \(\langle C^\_\rangle\) has a left adjoint, it must be continuous. In particular \(\langle C^\_\rangle\) preserves products so that

\[
C^\+(A\otimes B) = \langle A\rangle \otimes B\langle C^\_\rangle = (C^+A)\otimes (C^+B)
\]  \quad (1.4)

v.) For all \(X \in \text{Obj}_C\)

\[
\text{Hom}_C(X, 0^+A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(X\otimes A, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(0\otimes X, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(0, A),
\]  \quad (1.5)
and the latter is a singleton, hence the former is also. Thus $0^{\uparrow}A$
is a terminal object.

vi.) Observe that the contravariant functor $\vdash(\_^{\uparrow}A)$ is its own
adjoint on the right, for if $X_1, X_2 \in \text{Obj}$, then

$$\text{Hom}_C(X_1, X_2^{\uparrow}A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(X_1 \otimes X_2, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(X_2 \otimes X_1, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(X_2, X_1^{\uparrow}A) \quad (1.6)$$

Hence $\vdash(\_^{\uparrow}A)$ is contracontinuous. In particular $\vdash(\_^{\uparrow}A)$ carries coproducts
to products so that

$$(B \otimes C)^{\uparrow}A = (B \otimes C) \vdash (\_^{\uparrow}A) \cong B \vdash (\_^{\uparrow}A) \otimes C \vdash (\_^{\uparrow}A) = (B^{\uparrow}A) \otimes (C^{\uparrow}A). \quad (1.7)$$

vii.) It is easy to see that there is an isomorphism $i_A : A \otimes \_ \rightarrow A$
natural in $A$; its cartesian adjoint $i_A^\star : A \rightarrow \_ \uparrow A$ is also an isomorphism
natural in $A$.

viii.) The functor $\text{Hom}_C(\_ \otimes B, A) : C \rightarrow S$ is representable in two ways

$$\text{Hom}_C(\_ \otimes B, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(\_, (\_ \otimes B)^{\uparrow}A) \quad (1.8)$$

$$\text{Hom}_C(\_ \otimes B, A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(\_, (B \otimes \_)^{\uparrow}A) \cong \text{Hom}_C(\_, (C \uparrow (B \uparrow A)). \quad (1.9)$$

Since $(\_ \otimes B)^{\uparrow}A$ and $(C \uparrow (B \uparrow A)$ both function as representing objects
for the same functor, it follows that they must be isomorphic.\text{□}

**PROPOSITION 2:** If there exists a map $f : A \rightarrow 0$ in a cartesian-
closed category $C$ then $A \otimes 0$.

**Proof:**

$$A \xrightarrow{f} 0 \xrightarrow{\cdot l_A} A \otimes 0 \xrightarrow{\cdot l_A} A = l_A \quad (1.10)$$
and

\[
0 \xrightarrow{\cdot} A \xrightarrow{\cdot} 0 = 1_0 \cdot 0
\]  

PROPOSITION 3: A cartesian-closed category \(\mathcal{C}\) is isomorphic to the category \(\mathbb{1}\) if and only if there exist a map \(1 \xrightarrow{\cdot} 0\) in \(\mathcal{C}\).

PROPOSITION 4: Let \(\mathcal{A}\) be any small category and \(\mathcal{C}\) be any cartesian-closed category. Then \(\text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})\) is a cartesian-closed category.

Proof: First we want to show that \(\text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})\) is finitely bicomplete.

Let \(\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{J} \to \text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})\) be a finite diagram in \(\text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})\). For each \(A \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{A}}\), let \(D^A : \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{C}\) be the diagram in \(\mathcal{C}\) defined by

\[
D^A_{\alpha} = \text{df } A : D_{\alpha} \quad \text{for each } \alpha \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{J}},
\]

\[
D^A_i = \text{df } A : D_i \quad \text{for each } i \in \text{Arr}_{\mathcal{J}}.
\]

For each \(a \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)\) let \(D^a : D^{A_1} \to D^{A_2}\) be the natural transformation defined by \(a : D^a = \text{df } a : D_{\alpha} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{J}}\). We construct the limit \(<L, \pi>\) of \(D\) as follows:

\[\text{i.} \quad L : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{C}\] is the functor defined by

\[
D^A = \text{df } \text{Lim}_{\mathcal{C}} D^A \quad \text{for each } A \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{A}}
\]

and if \(a : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)\) and if \(<A_1 : L, \pi^{A_1}>\) and \(<A_2 : L, \pi^{A_2}>\) are limits of \(D^{A_1}\) and \(D^{A_2}\) respectively in \(\mathcal{C}\) then

\[
a : L = \text{df } \text{Lim}_{\mathcal{C}} \pi^{A_2} (\pi^{A_1} \cdot D^a),
\]
i.e. \( a: L \) is the unique map making

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi^A_1 & \xrightarrow{a: L} & \pi^A_2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
D^A_1 & \xrightarrow{D^A} & D^A_2
\end{array}
\]

(1.16)

commute; and

ii.) \( \pi : L \rightarrow D \) is the natural transformation whose components \( \pi_a \) are natural transformations \( \pi_a : L \rightarrow D_a \) defined for each \( a \in \text{obj} \) by \( A: \pi_a = df \alpha: \pi^A \) for each \( A: \text{obj}_\mathcal{A} \) where \( \pi^A : A: L \rightarrow D^A \) is the limit transformation.

It is easy to see that \( \langle L, \pi \rangle \) is a limit of \( D \) in \( \text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \). We construct the colimit of \( D \) by the obvious dual construction.

Product and hom relations are obtained on \( \text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) \) by letting \( : F \otimes G \) be the functor from \( \mathcal{A} \) to \( \mathcal{C} \) defined by

\[ A:F \otimes G = df A:F \otimes A:G \]  
and

\[ a:F \otimes G = df a:F \otimes a:G. \]  

and letting \( : F \ast G \) be the functor defined by

\[ A:F \ast G = df A:F \ast A:G \]  
and

\[ a:F \ast G = df a:F \ast a:G. \]  

where \( : F \) and \( : G \) are functors from \( \mathcal{A} \) to \( \mathcal{C} \), \( A: \text{obj}_\mathcal{A} \), and \( : a: \text{Arr}_\mathcal{A} \). It is
easy to see that these definitions yield the required pairs of adjoints needed to make $\text{Func}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C})$ cartesian-closed.\[1\]

Remark: (The "Kelly view" of full reflective subcategories.)

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a full reflective subcategory of $\mathcal{B}$ and let $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{B} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the reflector. Since $\mathcal{R}$ is the left adjoint of the inclusion functor for all $A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{B}$ there is an isomorphism $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(B : R, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{B}(B, A)$ (we omit writing applications of the inclusion functor). But since $\mathcal{A}$ is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{B}$ we have that $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(B : R, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{B}(B, A)$. This says that up to natural isomorphism we may identify $\mathcal{A}$ with the full subcategory of $\mathcal{B}$ whose objects are the elements of $\{A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{B} \mid \forall B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{B} \{\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(B : R, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{B}(B, A)\}\}$. In the following we shall make such identifications without further comment.

PROPOSITION 5: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a full reflective subcategory of the cartesian-closed category $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the reflector. Then $\mathcal{R}$ preserves products if and only if for all $A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$ and all $C \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{C}$, $C + A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$.

\textbf{Proof:} ($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ preserves products, i.e. for all $D \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{C}$, $C \otimes D : R \cong C \otimes D : R$. By the above remark it is enough to show that

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D : R, C + A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D, C + A) \quad (1.21)$$

But we have the following chain of isomorphisms:

$$\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D : R, C + A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D : R \otimes C, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}((D : R \otimes C) : R, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D : R \otimes C : R, A) \cong$$

$$\cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}((D \otimes C) : R, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D \otimes C, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(D, C + A).$$
 Conversely, suppose we have that for all $A \in \text{Obj}_a$ and $C \in \text{Obj}_c$ we have that $C \cdot A \in \text{Obj}_a$. We want to show that for all $D \in \text{Obj}_c$, $C \otimes D : R \cong C : R \otimes : R$.

It is enough to show that

$$\mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C \otimes D : R, \_ ) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C : R \otimes : R, \_ )$$

for then the representing objects must be isomorphic. But we have the following chain of isomorphisms natural in $\mathcal{A}$:

$$\mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C \otimes D : R, A) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C \otimes D, A) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(D \otimes C, A) \cong$$

$$\cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(D, C \cdot A) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(D : R, C \cdot A) \cong$$

$$\cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(D : R \otimes C, A) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(\otimes(D : R), A) \cong$$

$$\cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C, D : R \cdot A) \cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C : R, D : R \cdot A) \cong$$

$$\cong \mathcal{C} : \text{Hom}_c(C : R \otimes D : R, A)$$. \(\Box\)

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a category and $B \in \text{Obj}_d$. We are next going to define three functors.

(1) $\Sigma_B : \mathcal{A} \downarrow B \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, which is defined for all $\mathcal{A}$;

(2) $\chi_B : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A} \downarrow B$, which is defined for all $\mathcal{A}$ having finite products; and

(3) $\Pi_B : \mathcal{A} \downarrow B \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, which is defined for all cartesian-closed $\mathcal{A}$.

(1) $\Sigma_B : \mathcal{A} \downarrow B \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the forgetful functor defined in the obvious manner by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow b \\ B \end{pmatrix} : \Sigma_B = \text{df} A \text{ for all } \begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow b \\ B \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{A} \downarrow B}$$. \(\Box\)
and

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A_1 & \overset{a}{\rightarrow} & A_2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
B & \overset{\downarrow x}{\rightarrow} & B
\end{array}
\]

(2) \( \chi_B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\perp}B \) is defined by

\[
A : \chi_B = df \left( \begin{array}{c}
A \otimes B \\
B
\end{array} \right) \text{ for all } A \in \text{Ob}_A
\]

(3) \( \Pi_B : \mathcal{A}^{\perp}B \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) is defined by

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow b \\
B
\end{array}
\quad \text{such that } \quad \Pi_B = df \quad \bar{P}_{1_b, 1_b}^* \text{ for all } \quad a \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)
\]

where \( 1_b^* : 1 \rightarrow B + B \) is the cartesian adjoint of \( 1 \otimes B \rightarrow B \) and

\[
\bar{P}_{1_b, 1_b}^* \quad \text{denotes the pullback of } \quad 1_b^* : B + B \rightarrow B + B \text{ and } 1_b^*
\]
where \( \lambda \) is the limit morphism in (1.32), in which the front and bottom faces are pullbacks

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\bar{P}_2 & \rightarrow & B^\Delta A_2 \\
\downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \lambda \circ \delta \\
\bar{P}_1 & \rightarrow & B^\Delta A_1 \\
\downarrow \lambda \circ \delta & & \downarrow \lambda \circ \delta \\
1 & \rightarrow & B^\Delta B
\end{array}
\]

(1.32)

PROPOSITION 6: Let \( \mathcal{A} \) be any category and \( B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{A} \). Then

i.) \( :\Sigma_B : \mathcal{A}^\Delta B \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) preserves and reflects colimits, equalizers, pullbacks and monomorphisms when they exist;

ii.) if \( \mathcal{A} \) is finitely bicomplete then \( :\Sigma_B : \mathcal{A}^\Delta B \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) and furthermore if there exists a functor \( \tilde{\Pi}_B : \mathcal{A}^\Delta B \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) such that \( :\chi_B \rightarrow :\tilde{\Pi}_B \) for all \( B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{A} \) then \( \mathcal{A} \) is cartesian-closed; and

iii.) if \( \mathcal{A} \) is cartesian-closed then \( :\Sigma_B \rightarrow :\chi_B \rightarrow :\tilde{\Pi}_B \) for all \( B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{A} \).

Proof: i.) This part of the Proposition is evident from (1.33)-(1.36) below, where the whole diagrams are in \( \mathcal{A}^\Delta B \) and removing the portion with the dotted arrows (\( \ldots \rightarrow \)) is intended to illustrate the action of \( :\Sigma_B \).
colimits:

(1.33)

equalizers:

(1.34)
pullbacks:

(1.35)

monomorphisms:

(1.36)
ii.) First we need to show that

\[ \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma_B, C \right) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^{\perp}B} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}, C : \chi_B \right) \]  

(1.37)

The required natural bijection is that which associates the map

\[ c : A \rightarrow C \text{ in } \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \Sigma_B, C \right) \text{ with the map} \]

\[ \text{in } \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^{\perp}B} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}, C : \chi \right). \]  

(1.38)

Secondly we note that if \( \chi_B \) has a right adjoint \( \tilde{\Pi}_B \) then

\[ \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} (\emptyset B, A) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} (\emptyset B: \chi_B \Sigma_B, A) \cong \]  

\[ \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^{\perp}B} (- : \chi_B, A : \chi_B) \cong \]  

\[ \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} (- : \chi_B, \tilde{\Pi}_B). \]  

(1.39)

Hence we can take \( B A \) to be \( A : \chi_B \tilde{\Pi}_B \), so that \( \mathcal{A} \) must be cartesian-closed.

iii.) Observe that \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A} (C, -) \) is continuous since it preserves products and equalizers. Hence the pullback diagram (1.30) used to define \( \tilde{\Pi}_B \) gives rise to the pullback diagram (1.40) in \( \mathcal{S} \)
which is isomorphic to the diagram

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, (A \downarrow b)) : & \Pi_B \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, 1) & \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, B \downarrow B)
\end{align*}
\]

which is isomorphic to the diagram

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, (A \downarrow b)) : & \Pi_B \\
\downarrow & \\
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, (C \otimes B, A)) & \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C \otimes B, B)
\end{align*}
\]

where .x is the injection taking 1 to .\text{pr}_2 : C \otimes B \rightarrow B.

If we view \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, (A \downarrow b)) : \Pi_B\) as a subset of \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C \otimes B, A)\) we have that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C, (A \downarrow b)) : \Pi_B & = \\
& = \left\{ g \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C \otimes B, A) \mid \text{commutes} \right\} = \\
& = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C \otimes B, (A \downarrow b)) = \\
& = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(C : \chi_B, (A \downarrow b)) \\
& \therefore : \chi_B : \Pi_B \square
\end{align*}
\]
Now let $\mathcal{C}$ be any finitely complete category and let $f : B_1 \longrightarrow B_2$ be an arrow in $\mathcal{C}$. Define the functor $f^\# : \mathcal{C}^\perp B_2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}^\perp B_1$ by

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
A \\
\downarrow b \\
B_2
\end{pmatrix}: f^\# = \frac{P_{f,b}}{P_{f,b}^{\infty}} \quad \text{in the pullback (1.44)}
$$

and

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
A_1 \\
\downarrow a_1 \\
B_2
\end{pmatrix}: f_1 = \frac{P_{f_1}}{P_{f_1}^{\infty}} \quad \text{in (1.46)}
$$

where the front and bottom faces are pullbacks and $\lambda$ is the indicated limit morphism.
Also define the functor $\Sigma_f : \mathcal{A}^+B_1 \to \mathcal{A}^+B_2$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A \\ .b \\ \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix} : \Sigma_f = df \
\begin{pmatrix} A \\ .b \\ \\ B_1 \\ .f \\ \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 \to a \\ .b_1 \\ \\ B_1 \end{pmatrix} : \Sigma_f = df \
\begin{pmatrix} A_1 \to a \\ .b_1 \\ .b_2 \\ \\ B_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

**PROPOSITION 7:** Let $\mathcal{A}$ be any finitely bicomplete category. Then

i.) $f^\# : \Sigma_f \to f^\#$ for all $f : \text{Arr} \mathcal{A}$ and

ii.) $f^\#$ has a right adjoint $\Pi_f$ for all $f : \text{Arr} \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}^+B$ is cartesian-closed for all $B \in \text{Obj} \mathcal{A}$.

**Proof:** Consider $f : B_1 \to B_2$ as an object in $\mathcal{A}^+B_2$. We may define the functors

$$\Sigma_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2} : (\mathcal{A}^+B_2)^\uparrow (B_1 \to f) : B_2 \to \mathcal{A}^+B_2$$

$$\chi_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2} : \mathcal{A}^+B_2 \to (\mathcal{A}^+B_2)^\uparrow (B_1 \to f) : B_2$$

$$\Pi_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2} : (\mathcal{A}^+B_2)^\uparrow (B_1 \to f) : B_2 \to \mathcal{A}^+B_2$$

But $(\mathcal{A}^+B_2)^\uparrow (B_1 \to f) : B_2 \cong \mathcal{A}^+B_1$. Thus $\Sigma_f \cong \Sigma_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2}$.

$f^\# \cong \chi_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2}$ and we may take $\Pi_f = \text{df} : \Pi_{(B_1 \to f) : B_1 \to B_2}$. In this way Proposition 7 reduces to Proposition 6.0.
III.2 Elementary topoi

An (elementary) topos $\mathcal{E}$ is a cartesian-closed category with a subobject classifier, i.e. with an object $\Omega \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{E}$ and a monomorphism $\text{true} : 1 \to \Omega$ such that for every subobject $\cdot m : B \to A$ in $\mathcal{E}$ there exists a unique morphism $\chi(m) : A \to \Omega$, called the characteristic function of $\cdot m$, making (2.1) into a pullback.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\downarrow \cdot \text{m}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\cdot \text{m} \\
\downarrow \cdot \chi(m)
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{A} \\
\downarrow \cdot \text{true}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1} \\
\downarrow \cdot \text{a}
\end{array}
\quad (2.1)
\]

If $\cdot a : A \to \Omega$ is an arrow in $\mathcal{E}$ we let $[\cdot a]$ denote the pullback of $\cdot \text{true}$ along $\cdot a$, i.e.

\[ [\cdot a] = \text{true}_a \] (2.2)

Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is any category with pullbacks. Define the set valued contravariant functor $\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{E}$ by

i.) $A : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{A} = \text{df} \{ x \mid x \text{ is a subobject of } A \}$ for all $A \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{A}$.

ii.) if $\cdot a \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(B, A)$ we define $\cdot a : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{A} : A : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{A} \to B : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{A}$ to be the function which sends each subobject $\cdot m : A' \to A$ to its pullback along $\cdot a$, i.e.

\[ \cdot m : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{A} = \text{df} \cdot \overline{m}_a \] (2.3)
PROPOSITION 8: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cartesian-closed category. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a topos if and only if $\text{Sub}_\mathcal{C}$ is representable.

Proof: $(\Rightarrow)$ If $\mathcal{C}$ is a topos, we want to show that there exists a natural isomorphism $\eta : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{C} \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\_, \Omega)$. Define $\eta$ component-wise by

$$m.A: \eta = \text{df } \cdot \text{ch}(m) \quad m \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{C}, \quad A \in \text{Ob}_\mathcal{C}$$

$(\forall)$ is easily seen to be a bijection. To show that it is natural we need to show that given any $a : B \to A$ in $\mathcal{C}$

$$A : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{A: \eta} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\_, \Omega)$$

$$B : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{B: \eta} \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\_, \Omega)$$

commutes.

Let $m.A : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{C}$. Then

$$m.A : \eta \circ a : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(\_, \Omega) = \cdot a \cdot \text{ch}(m)$$

and $m.A : \text{Sub}_\mathcal{C}, B : \eta = \cdot \text{ch}(m_a)$

so that we must show that $\cdot a \cdot \text{ch}(m) = \cdot \text{ch}(m_a)$.
Consider the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{P} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{a}} & \text{B} \\
\downarrow{\mathbf{m}} & & \downarrow{\mathbf{gh} (\mathbf{m})} \\
\text{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{1}} & \text{A} \\
\downarrow{\mathbf{f}} & & \downarrow{\mathbf{a}} \\
\Omega & & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(2.7)

We know that the two inner trapezoids are pullbacks, as is the outside rectangle, and the left hand triangle commutes. But then \( \mathbf{m}_a \) is the pullback of \( \mathbf{true} \) along \( \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{ch}(\mathbf{m}) \) as pullbacks of pullbacks are pullbacks. But \( \mathbf{ch}(\mathbf{m}_a) \) is unique so \( \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{ch}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{ch}(\mathbf{m}_a) \).

(\( \ast \)) Conversely, suppose there exists a natural isomorphism

\[ \eta : \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}} (\_ , \Omega). \]

As for each \( \mathbf{a} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathcal{A} , \Omega) \), \( \mathbf{a} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Omega \) is the unique map such that \( 1_\Omega \cdot \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}} (\mathbf{a} , \Omega) = \mathbf{a} \) and since \( \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{O}} \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}} (\_ , \Omega) \) it follows that for each \( \mathbf{m} \in \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{O}} \) there exists a unique \( \mathbf{a} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Omega \) such that

\[ (1_\Omega \cdot \Omega : \eta^{-1}) \cdot \mathbf{a} \cdot \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbf{m} \]  

(2.8)

Thus \( 1_\Omega \cdot \Omega : \eta^{-1} \) plays the role of \( \mathbf{true} \) and the unique \( \mathbf{a} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Omega \) specified by (2.8) above plays the role of the characteristic function of \( \mathbf{m} \). By (2.8) \( \mathbf{t} = \text{df} 1_\Omega : \Omega : \Omega' \rightarrow \Omega \) has the property that for all \( \mathbf{m} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \) there exists a unique \( \mathbf{a} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Omega \) such that there exists an \( \mathbf{x} : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \Omega' \) making (2.9) into a pullback

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{A}' & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} & \mathcal{A} \\
\downarrow{\mathbf{x}} & & \downarrow{\mathbf{a}} \\
\Omega' & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(2.9)
In particular if \( a \) factors through \( t \) then (2.10) is a pullback and the uniqueness condition on \( a \) implies that there can be only one map from \( A \to \Omega' \). Therefore \( \Omega' \cong 1 \) and we are done.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{1_A} & A \\
\downarrow{a} & & \downarrow{a} \\
\Omega' & \xrightarrow{t} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]  

(2.10)

Remark: Note that in any topos \( \mathcal{E} \) the usual ordering of subobjects of \( A \in \text{Obj} \mathcal{E} \) induces an ordering of \( \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, \Omega) \). Further note that if \( f, g \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}(A, \Omega) \) then \( f \leq g \) if and only if for all \( x \in \text{Obj} \mathcal{E} \) and \( x \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}(x, A) \) (2.11) commutes implies that (2.12) commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{x} & A \\
\downarrow{f} & & \downarrow{f} \\
1 & \xrightarrow{t \circ x} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]  

(2.11)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{x} & A \\
\downarrow{g} & & \downarrow{g} \\
1 & \xrightarrow{t \circ x} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]  

(2.12)

to see this consider the diagram (2.13)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{x} & A \\
\downarrow{f} & & \downarrow{f} \\
A & \xrightarrow{[f]} & A \\
\downarrow{[g]} & & \downarrow{[g]} \\
1 & \xrightarrow{t \circ x} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]  

(2.13)
III.3 The representability of relations and partial maps

Throughout this section let $\mathcal{E}$ be a topos, $A, B, C, \ldots \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{E}$ and $a, b, c, \ldots \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{E}$.

A relation between $A$ and $B$ is a subobject of $A \times B$.

We define the set valued contravariant functor $\text{Rel}(\_, B)$ by

$$\text{Rel}_\mathcal{E}(\_, B) = \text{def} (\_ \times B) \circ \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

**PROPOSITION 9:** $\text{Rel}_\mathcal{E}(\_, B)$ is representable.

**Proof:**

$$\text{Rel}_\mathcal{E}(\_, B) = (\_ \times B) \circ \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$$

$$\cong (\_ \times B) \circ \text{Hom}_\mathcal{E}(\_, \Omega) \cong$$

$$\cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{E}(\_, B \times \Omega) \cong \text{Hom}_\mathcal{E}(\_, B \to \Omega)$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

A partial map $\cdot \delta$ from $A$ to $B$ is a map from a subobject of $A$ to $B$.

More formally it is a pair of arrows of the form

$$A' \xrightarrow{\cdot \delta'} B$$

$$\downarrow \cdot \delta''$$

$$A$$

We will denote partial maps by lower case script Latin letters preceded by a dot $\cdot \delta, \cdot g, \cdot h, \ldots$. The subobject component of $\cdot \delta$ will be denoted by $\cdot \delta'$ and the other component by $\cdot \delta''$. Composition of partial maps is defined by pulling back i.e. if
then

\[ \delta = \begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow \delta' \\
A
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\delta''} B \] (3.4)

and

\[ \gamma = \begin{array}{c}
B' \\
\downarrow \gamma' \\
B
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\gamma''} C \] (3.5)

then

\[ \delta \gamma = \begin{array}{c}
A'' \\
\downarrow \delta'' \\
A'
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\delta''} \begin{array}{c}
B' \\
\downarrow \gamma' \\
B
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\gamma''} C \] (3.6)

where the top left hand rectangle in (3.6) is a pull back.

Two partial maps \( \delta \) and \( \gamma \) as in (3.7) and (3.8)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow \delta' \\
A
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\delta''} B \] (3.7)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
A'' \\
\downarrow \gamma' \\
A
\end{array} \xrightarrow{\gamma''} B \] (3.8)
are said to be equivalent, written \( \phi \sim \psi \), if there exists an isomorphism \( i : A'' \rightarrow A' \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A'' \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
A' \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
A
\end{array}
\]

\( \psi' = \psi \circ i \quad \text{and} \quad \phi' = \phi \circ i \)

which commutes.

Let \( \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(A, B) \) denote the set of equivalence classes of partial maps from \( A \) to \( B \) under the equivalence relation "\( \sim \)" above.

By identifying the morphism \( a \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{S}(A, B) \) with the partial map

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
B \quad B
\end{array}
\]

we may view \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{S}(A, B) \) as a subset of \( \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(A, B) \). This identification determines a natural transformation

\[
\alpha : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{S}(\_ , B) \rightarrow \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(\_ , B)
\]

Define the set-valued contravariant functor \( \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(\_ , B) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \) by

\[
A : \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(\_ , B) = \text{df} \; \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(A, B)
\]

and if \( a \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{S}(A_1, A_2) \) then

\[
a : \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(\_ , B) : \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(A_2, B) \rightarrow \text{Par}_\mathcal{S}(A_1, B)
\]
is the set theoretic functions which sends \( f \in \text{Par}_\Delta(A_2, B) \) to \( a \in \text{Par}_\Delta(A_1, B) \).

For every partial map \( f \in \text{Par}_\Delta(A, B) \) there is an associated relation between \( A \) and \( B \), namely

\[
\Gamma_f = \text{df} \langle f', f'' \rangle : A' \rightarrow A \otimes B.
\]

\( \Gamma_f \) is a subobject of \( A \otimes B \) because \( f' \) is a subobject of \( A \).

Thus there is a natural transformation

\[
: \gamma : : \text{Par}_\Delta(-, B) \rightarrow : \text{Rel}_\Delta(-, B) \cong : \text{Hom}_\Delta(-, B^\Omega) :
\]

By composing \( \alpha \) with \( \gamma \) we get a natural transformation

\[
: \alpha \circ \gamma : : \text{Hom}_\Delta(-, B) \rightarrow : \text{Hom}_\Delta(-, B^\Omega).
\]

The map inducing \( \alpha \circ \gamma \) is called the **singleton map** and it is denoted by \( \{ - \} : B \rightarrow B^\Omega \). It is easily checked that it is a monomorphism.

\( \{ - \} \) may also be described as follows.

The **diagonal subobject** \( \Delta \) of \( B \otimes B \) is the subobject

\[
\Delta = \text{df} \langle 1_B, 1_B \rangle : B \rightarrow B \otimes B.
\]

The **Kronecker-delta** \( \delta \) is the characteristic function of \( \Delta \), i.e.

\[
\delta = \text{df} \text{ch}(\Delta) : B \otimes B \rightarrow \Omega.
\]

\( \{ - \} : B \rightarrow B^\Omega \) is the cartesian-adjoint of \( \delta \), i.e. \( \{ - \} = \delta^* \).
PROPOSITION 10: (Unique existention)  

Let \( a : C \to A \) be given. Then there exists a \( q : Q \to A \) which factors through \( a \) and such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xleftarrow{\cdot q} & Q \\
\downarrow{\cdot c} & & \downarrow{\cdot q} \\
C & \xrightarrow{\cdot a} & A
\end{array}
\]

(3.18)

is a pullback

and such that given any \( f : X \to A \) which factors through \( a \) and such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xleftarrow{\cdot f} & X \\
\downarrow{\cdot f} & & \downarrow{\cdot f} \\
C & \xrightarrow{\cdot a} & A
\end{array}
\]

(3.19)

is a pullback,

it is the case \( f \) factors uniquely through \( q \).

**Proof:** Define the natural transformation \( \sigma : \text{Hom}_\mathcal{Z}(\_\_A) \to \text{Rel}_\mathcal{Z}(\_\_C) \) by letting \( X;\sigma \) be the set theoretic function which takes each \( y \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{Z}(X,A) \) to the relation

\[
r = \text{def} \cdot \text{eqz}(\cdot p^1_1y, \cdot p^2_1a) : R \to X \otimes C \xrightarrow{\cdot p^1_2} A
\]

(3.20)

\( \sigma \) may also be thought of as a natural transformation from \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{Z}(\_\_A) \) to \( \text{Hom}_\mathcal{Z}(\_\_C\hat{\Omega}) \), and as such it is induced by the map \( A \xrightarrow{\cdot} A\hat{\Omega} \xrightarrow{\cdot a\hat{\Omega}} C\hat{\Omega} \).

Let \( q : Q \to A \) be the pullback of \( \{\_\} : C \to C\hat{\Omega} \) along \( \{\_\}_* : A \to C\hat{\Omega} \) in (3.21)
Since $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{G}(X, \_)$ is continuous (3.22) is also a pullback.

Now consider (3.24) in which the outside rectangle is a pullback.
The existence of \( p \), which implies the existence of \( \Gamma_p = \langle \chi, p \rangle \), implies

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{\chi} & X \\
\downarrow p & & \downarrow f \\
C & \xrightarrow{a} & A
\end{array}
\]

(3.25)

is a pullback. The unique factorization property of \( q \) is apparent from (3.23). \( \Box \)

**PROPOSITION 11:** In any topos \( \mathcal{E} \), \( \text{Par}_\mathcal{E}(\_ , B) \) is representable.

**Proof:** Let \( r : C \rightarrow A \times B \) be a relation. Let \( a = r \cdot \text{pr}_1 \) and \( b = r \cdot \text{pr}_2 \).

Construct \( q : Q \rightarrow A \) from \( a \) as in Proposition 10 above. Then

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{c} & C & \xrightarrow{b} & B \\
\downarrow q & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & & & & A
\end{array}
\]

(3.26)

is a partial map from \( A \) to \( B \). This operation of associating a partial map with a relation gives rise to a natural transformation

\( \mu : \text{Rel}_\mathcal{E}(\_ , B) \rightarrow \text{Par}_\mathcal{E}(\_ , B) \). The natural transformation

\( \gamma \mu : \text{Par}_\mathcal{E}(\_ , B) \rightarrow \text{Par}_\mathcal{E}(\_ , B) \), is the identity natural transformation

since if \( \delta \in \text{Par}_\mathcal{E}(A, B) \), (3.27) is a pullback with the factorization property required in Proposition 10.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A' & \xleftarrow{\text{pr}} & A' \\
\downarrow \text{pr} & & \downarrow \text{pr} \\
A' & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & A
\end{array}
\]

(3.27)
Thus $\eta_Y : \text{Rel}^\otimes(-,B) \rightarrow \text{Rel}^\otimes(-,B)$ is an idempotent natural transformation. Since $\text{Rel}^\otimes(-,B) \cong \text{Hom}_\otimes(-,B^\Omega)$ it follows that $\eta_Y$ is induced by an idempotent endomorphism $\eta : B^\Omega \rightarrow B^\Omega$. This map $\eta$ may also be described as the cartesian-adjoint of the characteristic function of $\langle _,1_B \rangle : B \rightarrow (B^\Omega) \otimes B$, i.e. $\eta = \text{ch}(\langle _,1_B \rangle)^*$. Let $\tilde{B} = \text{def} \text{Eqz}(1_{B^\Omega},\eta)$ and $\varepsilon = \text{def} \text{Eqz}(1_{B^\Omega},\eta)$. Consider the diagram (3.28).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{B} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & B^\Omega \\ \downarrow h \downarrow \downarrow j & & \downarrow j \\ B^\Omega & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{B^\Omega}} & B^\Omega \end{array}$$ (3.28)

The existence of the limit morphism $h$ in (3.28) says that the idempotent $\eta$ splits. This splitting of $\eta$ induces a splitting of $\eta_Y$ which shows that $\text{Par}_\otimes(-,B) \cong \text{Hom}_\otimes(-,\tilde{B})$.

**PROPOSITION 12:** Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{B} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & B^\Omega \\ \downarrow \eta_B \downarrow \downarrow j & & \downarrow j \\ B & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & B^\Omega \end{array}$$ (3.29)

be as in the proof above of Proposition 11. Then $\langle _ \rangle : B \rightarrow B^\Omega$ factors uniquely through $\varepsilon$, i.e. there exists a unique map $\eta_B : B \rightarrow \tilde{B}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{B} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & B^\Omega \\ \downarrow \eta_B \downarrow \downarrow j & & \downarrow j \\ B & \xrightarrow{\langle _ \rangle} & \tilde{B} \end{array}$$ (3.30) commute.
Proof: Consider the diagram (3.31).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \Delta} & B \otimes B \\
\downarrow \cdot \iota_\theta & & \downarrow \cdot \{ \cdot \} \otimes 1_\theta \\
B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \langle \cdot, 1_\theta \rangle} & (B^* \Omega) \otimes B \\
\downarrow \cdot \iota_\eta & & \downarrow \cdot \varphi \cdot \epsilon \cdot \langle \cdot, 1_\theta \rangle \\
1 & \xrightarrow{\cdot \iota_\epsilon} & \Omega \\
\end{array}
\]

(3.31)

The bottom rectangle is a pullback by the definition of \( g \). The top rectangle is a pullback because \( \cdot \{ \cdot \} \otimes_1 1_B \) is a monic. Thus
\[ \cdot \{ \cdot \} \otimes_1 1_B \cdot g^* = \cdot \varphi \cdot \epsilon \cdot (\cdot) = \cdot \delta. \]

Therefore

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \{ \cdot \} \otimes 1_\delta} & B \otimes B \\
\downarrow \cdot \iota_\eta & & \downarrow \cdot \iota_\delta \\
(B^* \Omega) \otimes B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \varphi \cdot \epsilon} & \Omega \\
\end{array}
\]

(3.32)

commutes

and by cartesian-adjointness

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
B^* \Omega & \xrightarrow{\cdot \{ \cdot \}} & B \\
\downarrow \cdot \iota_\eta & & \downarrow \cdot \iota_\delta \\
B^* \Omega & \xrightarrow{\cdot \varphi \cdot \epsilon} & B^* \Omega \\
\end{array}
\]

(3.33)

commutes.

Now let \( \eta_B \) be the indicated limit morphism in the equalizer diagram (3.34).

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \delta} & B^* \Omega \\
\downarrow \cdot \eta_\theta & & \downarrow \cdot \eta_\delta \cdot \epsilon \\
B & \xrightarrow{\cdot \{ \cdot \}} & B^* \Omega \\
\end{array}
\]

(3.34)
**PROPOSITION 13:** Given any partial map $\Delta: \text{Pat}_\delta(A,B)$ there exists a unique $\vec{\gamma}: A \rightarrow \bar{B}$ such that

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A' & \xrightarrow{\vec{\delta}'} & B \\
\downarrow\vec{\delta}'' & & \downarrow\eta_B \\
A & \xrightarrow{\vec{\delta}} & \bar{B}
\end{array}
$$

is a pullback.

**Proof:** Let $\delta$ be as in Proposition 12 above. Let $\Gamma_\delta = \langle\delta', \delta''\rangle: A' \rightarrow A \otimes B$ be the graph of $\delta$. Let $\gamma_0 = \text{ch}(\Gamma_\delta): A \otimes B \rightarrow \Omega$ and let $\gamma'_0: A \rightarrow B \otimes \Omega$ be the cartesian-adjoint of $\gamma_0$. We want to define $\vec{\gamma}$ as the indicated limit morphism in the equalizer diagram (3.36).

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\vec{\epsilon}} & B \otimes \Omega \\
\downarrow\vec{\gamma} & & \downarrow\gamma_0' \otimes \eta_B \\
A & \xrightarrow{\gamma_0'} & B \otimes \Omega
\end{array}
$$

**Lemma 1:** $\gamma'_0 = \gamma_0' \circ \delta$.

**Proof:** By cartesian-adjointness it is enough to show that $\gamma'_0 = \gamma_0' \circ \delta: A \otimes B \rightarrow \Omega$. To do this it is sufficient to show that the outside of (3.37) is a pullback.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A' & \xrightarrow{\Gamma_\delta} & A \otimes B \\
\downarrow\delta'' & & \downarrow\gamma_0' \otimes \eta_B \\
B & \xrightarrow{\langle\cdot, \cdot\rangle_{\otimes \delta}} & (B \otimes \Omega) \otimes B \\
\downarrow\eta_{\otimes \delta} & & \downarrow\eta \\
1 & \xrightarrow{\cdot \eta} & \Omega
\end{array}
$$
But the lower rectangle is a pullback by the definition of \( g \). Hence it is enough to show that the top rectangle is a pullback. To do this it is sufficient to show that (3.38) is a pullback.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A' & \to & A \\
\downarrow f' & & \downarrow f'' \\
B & \to & B^\triangleleft \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(3.38)

So suppose that we have two morphisms \( a : X \to A \) and \( b : X \to B \) such that (3.39) commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \to & A \\
\downarrow a & & \downarrow f'' \\
A' & \to & A \\
\downarrow f' & & \downarrow f'' \\
B & \to & B^\triangleleft \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(3.39)

By cartesian-adjointness (3.40) commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X \otimes B & \to & A \otimes B \\
\downarrow \cdot a \otimes 1_B & & \downarrow \cdot f'' \\
B \otimes B & \to & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(3.40)

Therefore (3.41) commutes

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \to & X \otimes B \\
\downarrow \cdot a \otimes 1_B & & \downarrow \cdot f'' \\
B \otimes B & \to & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

(3.41)
But \( \delta = \mathrm{ch}(\Delta) \), so \( \Delta \delta \) factors through \( \operatorname{true} \). Hence \( \langle a, b \rangle \circ \gamma_\delta \) factors through \( \operatorname{true} \). We then take the limit morphism \( l : X \to A' \) in (3.42) to be our limit morphism for (3.39).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\downarrow l \\
A' \\
\downarrow r_a \\
A \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
A \otimes B \\
\downarrow r_b \\
\Omega \\
\end{array} \quad \text{(3.42)}
\]

Therefore Lemma 1 is proved.\( \square \)

Now look at (3.43).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow f' \\
A \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
B \\
\downarrow \eta_B \\
B^\Omega \\
\end{array} \quad \text{(3.43)}
\]

The outside of (3.43) is a pullback by the proof of Lemma 1 [see (3.38)] and the fact that \( \tilde{\delta} e = \gamma_\delta^* \). But since \( e \) is monic, this implies that the rectangle is a pullback. This proves the existence of \( \tilde{\delta} \).

To show that \( \tilde{\delta} \) is unique, suppose there exist two maps \( \tilde{\delta}_0 \) and \( \tilde{\delta}_1 \) each making (3.44) into a pullback.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow f' \\
A \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
B \\
\downarrow \eta_B \\
B^\Omega \\
\end{array} \quad \text{(3.44)}
\]

Let \( \tilde{\delta}_i = (\tilde{\gamma}_i e)^* : A \otimes B \to \Omega \) for \( i = 1, 2 \). By symmetry and the fact that \( e \) is monic it is enough to show that \( \tilde{\delta}_0 \leq \tilde{\delta}_1 \) in order to prove
the uniqueness of \(\tilde{\delta}\). We apply the Remark at the end of III.2. Suppose (3.45) commutes

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\downarrow \\
\Omega
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\langle a, b \rangle \\
\downarrow \\
\delta_0
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
A \otimes B \\
\downarrow \\
\Omega
\end{array}
\tag{3.45}
\]

Now

\[
\langle a, b \rangle \delta_0 = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot (a \otimes 1_B \cdot \delta_0) = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot (\delta_0^* \cdot \delta_0)^* = \\
= \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot (\delta_0^* e) = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot (\delta_0^* e g)^* = \\
= \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot (\delta_0^* g)^* = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot a \otimes 1_B \cdot \delta_0^* \otimes 1_B \cdot g^* = \\
= \langle a, b \rangle \cdot \delta_0^* \otimes 1_B \cdot g^* = \langle a, b \cdot g \rangle \cdot \delta_0^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} = \\
= \langle a \cdot g \cdot \delta_0^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} = \langle \{1\} B \rangle. \\
\tag{3.46}
\]

So we have the situation pictured in (3.47) which commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\downarrow b \\
B \\
\downarrow 1_B
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\langle a, g \cdot \delta_0^* \cdot b \rangle \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle \\
\delta^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
A \otimes B \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
B \\
\delta^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\tag{3.47}
\]

Therefore \(a \cdot g \cdot \delta_0^* = b \cdot \{\_\}\). Now consider the diagram (3.48).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
X \\
\downarrow a' \\
A' \\
\downarrow a
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\langle a' \cdot b' \rangle \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle \\
\delta^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle \\
B
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\langle a' \cdot b' \rangle \\
\downarrow \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle \\
\delta^* \cdot \delta_{\{1\}} \langle \{1\}, \delta \rangle
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
B \oplus \Omega
\end{array}
\tag{3.48}
\]
Since the inner quadrilateral with lower right hand corner $\tilde{B}$ is a pullback by (3.44) and since $e$ is monic, the inner quadrilateral with $B^\Omega$ in the lower right hand corner is a pullback also. Therefore there exists a map $a' : X \to A'$ such that $a''' = a$ and $a'''' = b$. From (3.44) we conclude that $a'''' = b\eta_B$. Multiplying on the right by $e$ we get

$$a'''' = a''''e = b\eta_B e = b \cdot \{ \} \quad (3.49)$$

Looking at cartesian adjoints yields

$$a_{\Omega_B} \cdot \delta = b_{\Omega_B} \cdot \delta \quad (3.50)$$

which implies

$$\langle a, b \rangle \cdot \delta = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot a_{\Omega_B} \cdot \delta = \langle 1_X, b \rangle \cdot b_{\Omega_B} \cdot \delta - \langle b, b \rangle \cdot \delta \quad (3.51)$$

But the outside of (3.52) obviously commutes.

$$X \xrightarrow{\langle b, b \rangle} BGB \xrightarrow{\delta} \Omega$$

Thus $\delta_0 \leq \delta_1$. By symmetry $\delta_1 \leq \delta_0$. Therefore $\delta_0 = \delta_1$ and by cartesian-adjointness $\delta_{\Omega} = \delta_{\Omega}^\ast$. Since $e$ is monic we have $\tilde{\delta}_0 = \tilde{\delta}_1$.

This then completes the proof of Proposition 13.0.
III.4 The fundamental theorem of topoi

Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ be topoi. A functor $L : \mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2$ is called a logical-morphism if

(i.) $L$ is finitely bicontinuous,
(ii.) $(\_ \wedge \_)^* L \cong (\_ \wedge \_^* L)$, and
(iii.) $\Omega^L \cong \Omega^{\mathcal{S}_2}$.

**THEOREM I** (The fundamental theorem of topoi):

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a topos and $B \in \textbf{Obj}_{\mathcal{S}}$; then $\mathcal{S} \downarrow B$ is a topos. Furthermore, if $f : B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ is an arrow in $\mathcal{S}$ then the functor $f^* : \mathcal{S} \downarrow B_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \downarrow B_1$ (see III.1) is a logical morphism.

**Proof:** First we wish to show that $\mathcal{S} \downarrow B$ is cartesian-closed. So given objects $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} C \\ \downarrow g \end{pmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{S} \downarrow B$, we wish to construct $\begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f^* \end{pmatrix}$.

Let $k : B \downarrow A \rightarrow \tilde{B}$ be the unique map making

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
B \downarrow A & \xrightarrow{k} & \tilde{B}
\end{array}
$$

into a pullback.

Let $k^* : B \rightarrow A \downarrow \tilde{B}$ be the cartesian-adjoint of $k$. Let $\gamma$ be the pushout of $g$ along $\eta_c$.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{g} & B \\
\downarrow \eta_c & & \downarrow \eta_0 \\
\tilde{C} & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & \tilde{B}
\end{array}
$$

(4.2)
Then define $\begin{pmatrix} \overline{p} \\ \downarrow B \end{pmatrix}$ to be the pullback of $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{G}$ along $\mathcal{M}^* k$.

Then define

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
A \\
\downarrow f
\end{pmatrix}
\end{pmatrix}
\cap
\begin{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
C \\
\downarrow g
\end{pmatrix}
\end{pmatrix}
= df
\begin{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\overline{p} \\
\downarrow B
\end{pmatrix}
\end{pmatrix}
$$

Now suppose that we are given $\begin{pmatrix} X \\
\downarrow h \end{pmatrix}$. Consider the diagram (4.5) below.

The left-hand square is a pullback by the definition of $\delta + B$ and the middle square is a pullback by the definition of $\overline{p}$ and the continuity of $\text{Hom}_S(X,\_)$.

Note that on the bottom line of the diagram, the map $1 \rightarrow \overline{\text{Par}}_S(X\otimes A,B)$ corresponds to $X\otimes A \rightarrow B \otimes A \rightarrow B$, i.e. it is the element of $\overline{\text{Par}}_S(X\otimes A,B)$ obtained from the pullback (4.6)
But this is determined by the pullback

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{r} & A \\
\downarrow s & & \downarrow f \\
X & \xrightarrow{h} & B
\end{array}
\]

which is the product of \((X \xrightarrow{h} B)\) and \((A \xrightarrow{f} B)\) in \(\mathcal{S}^B\). Thus

\[
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}} \left( \begin{pmatrix} X \\ \downarrow h \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \\ B \end{pmatrix} \right) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}^B} \left( \begin{pmatrix} X \\ \downarrow h \\ B \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} C \\ \downarrow g \\ B \end{pmatrix} \right)
\]

and \(\mathcal{S}^B\) is cartesian-closed.

Next we show that \(\mathcal{S}^B\) has a subobject classifier, by Proposition 8 it is enough to show that the functor \(\text{Sub}_{\mathcal{S}^B}\) is representable. Simply note that

\[
\begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \end{pmatrix} : \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{S}^B} \cong A : \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{S}} \cong A : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}}(\_ , \Omega^\mathcal{S}) \cong
\]

\[
\cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \end{pmatrix} : \Gamma_B , \Omega^\mathcal{S} \right) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}^B} \left( \begin{pmatrix} A \\ \downarrow f \end{pmatrix} , \Omega^\mathcal{S} : \chi_B \right).
\]
Hence $\Omega^A \ast B = \Omega^B \cd : \chi_B$.

Next we wish to show that $: f^\#$ is a logical morphism. First by Proposition 7 we have that $\Sigma_f \ast : f^\# \ast : \Pi_f$. Hence $: f^\#$ is finitely bicontinuous.

Next by using the technique employed in the proof of Proposition 7 we can see that it is sufficient to show that $: \chi_B$ preserves exponentiation. We will do this by showing that $(A \ast C) : \chi_B$ and $A : \chi_B \ast C : \chi_B$ function as representing objects for the same functor. First we note that given any

\[
\left( \begin{array}{c} D \\ \downarrow d \\ B \end{array} \right)
\]

we have that

\[
D \boxtimes A \cong \left( \left( \begin{array}{c} D \\ \downarrow d \\ B \end{array} \right) \otimes \Lambda : \chi_B \right) : \Sigma_B .
\]

This is because both (4.11) and (4.12) are pullbacks.

\[
\begin{array}{c} \left( \begin{array}{c} D \\ \downarrow d \\ B \end{array} \right) \otimes \Lambda : \chi_B : \Sigma_B \xrightarrow{pr_1 \circ \chi_B} A \boxtimes B \\
\downarrow pr_1 & \downarrow d & \downarrow B \\
D & \left( \begin{array}{c} A \boxtimes B \end{array} \right) & \left( \begin{array}{c} B \end{array} \right) \\
\end{array}
\]

(4.11)

\[
\begin{array}{c} D \boxtimes A \xrightarrow{pr_2 \circ pr_1 \circ A \circ d} A \boxtimes B \\
\downarrow pr_1 & \downarrow d & \downarrow B \\
D & \left( \begin{array}{c} A \boxtimes B \end{array} \right) & \left( \begin{array}{c} B \end{array} \right) \\
\end{array}
\]

(4.12)
Hence we have that
\[
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}^B}(D, A^\ast C) : \chi_B \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}} \left( \begin{array}{c} D \\ B \end{array} \right) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{S}^C}(D, A^\ast C) : \chi_B \cong \left( \begin{array}{c} D \\ B \end{array} \right) : \chi_B.
\]

(4.13)

Finally the \( \Omega \) condition on \( f^\# \) follows easily for
\[
\Omega_{\mathcal{S}^B_2} : f^\# \cong \Omega_{\mathcal{S}^B_1} \circ f^\# \cong \Omega_{\mathcal{S}^B_1} \cong \Omega_{\mathcal{S}^B_1}.
\]

(4.14)

III.5 Morphisms in a topos

Throughout this section let \( \mathcal{S} \) be an elementary topos, \( A, B, C, \ldots \in \text{Obj} \)

and \( a, b, c, \ldots \in \text{Arr}_\mathcal{S} \).

PROPOSITION 14: Monomorphisms are equalizers in \( \mathcal{S} \).

Proof: Let \( A \xrightarrow{m} B \) be a monomorphism in \( \mathcal{S} \). Let \( c : B \rightarrow 1 \) be the unique such map. Consider the diagram
The outside part is a pullback and the whole thing commutes. Hence
\[ A = \text{Eqz}(c \cdot \text{true}, \text{ch}(m)) \] and \[ m = \text{Eqz}(c \cdot \text{true}, \text{ch}(m)). □ \]

**PROPOSITION 15:** Monomorphisms which are also epimorphisms are isomorphisms in \( \mathcal{D} \).

**Proof:** Suppose that \( A \xrightarrow{a} B \) is both monic and epic. By Proposition 14 it is an equalizer, so suppose

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Omega & \xrightarrow{\text{true}} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

The fact that this is an equalizer diagram says that given any \( d : D \to B \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
D & \xrightarrow{d} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Omega & \xrightarrow{\text{true}} & \Omega
\end{array}
\]

commutes, there is a unique limit morphism \( \lambda : D \to A \) such that
commutes. In particular, taking \( D = B \) and \( .d = .1 \) we define \( .a^{-1} \) to be the limit morphism in (5.6)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{.a} & B \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \ \cdot \ \cdot \\
D & \xrightarrow{.d} & B
\end{array}
\]

(5.5)

If \( A \xrightarrow{.a} B \) is an arrow in \( \mathcal{S} \) then the equalizer of the cokernel pair of \( .a \) is called the image of \( .a \) and is denoted by \( \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow B \).

**Proposition 16:** For every arrow \( A \xrightarrow{.a} B \), \( \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow B \) is the smallest subobject of \( B \) through which \( .a \) factors.

**Proof:** We must show that

i.) there exists a unique morphism \( A \xrightarrow{.a} \text{Im}(a) \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{.a} & B \\
\downarrow \ \cdot .a & & \downarrow \ \cdot .a \\
\text{Im}(a) & \xrightarrow{.a} & \text{Im}(a)
\end{array}
\]

(5.7)

commutes and

ii.) given any subobject \( S \rightarrow B \) through which \( .a \) factors (into \( A \xrightarrow{.a'} S \rightarrow B \) say) then there exists a unique morphism \( \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow S \) making
i.) is obvious, given the cokernal pair of \( .a \) is \( B \xrightarrow{e_1} C \) we define \( .a \) to be the indicated limit morphism in the equalizer diagram (5.9) below:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Im}(a) & \xrightarrow{c} & B \\
& \searrow_{a'} & \downarrow_{a} \\
& & A
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{e_1} & C \\
& \downarrow_{a} & \\
& & S
\end{array}
\]

(5.9)

If \( S \xrightarrow{f} B \) is a subobject of \( B \) and \( B \xrightarrow{e_1} C' \) is the cokernel pair of \( .s \) then \( .a \) factors through \( .s \) if and only if \( .ac_1 = .ac_2 \). The only if part is easy to see, as \( .ac_1 = .a'sc_1 = .a'sc_2 = .ac_2 \). Conversely, if \( .ac_1 = .ac_2 \) then as \( .s \) is the equalizer of its cokernel pair the required map \( A \xrightarrow{a'} S \) is the limit morphism in the equalizer diagram (5.10) below.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & \xrightarrow{s} & B \\
& \searrow_{a'} & \downarrow_{a} \\
& & A
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{e_1} & C' \\
& \downarrow_{a} & \\
& & S
\end{array}
\]

(5.10)

So if we are given an \( S \xrightarrow{f} B \) through which \( .a \) factors we have that \( .ac_1 = .ac_2 \). Now note that \( \text{Im}(a) \cdot c_1 = \text{Im}(a) \cdot c_2 \). To see this look at the diagram (5.11)
as \(ac_1' = ac_2'\) there exists a colimit morphism \(l' : C \rightarrow C'\) making appropriate things commute. Hence \(im(a) \cdot c_1 = im(a) \cdot c_2\) implies that 
\(im(a) \cdot c_1' = im(a) \cdot c_1' \cdot l' = im(a) \cdot c_2' \cdot l' = im(a) \cdot c_2'\). But this now implies the existence of a limit morphism \(l : im(a) \rightarrow S\) in the equalizer diagram (5.12) below.

PROPOSITION 17: Let \(a\) and \(a'\) be as in Proposition 16 above. Then

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{a} & B \\
\downarrow{a'} & & \downarrow{im(a)} \\
Im(a) & \xrightarrow{i} & S
\end{array}
\]
iii.) Given that

![Diagram 5.14]

commutes, there exists a unique \( e : \text{Im}(a) \rightarrow \text{Im}(c) \) such that

![Diagram 5.15]

commutes.

Proof: i.) First note that \( \text{Im}(a) = B \) if and only if \( .a \) is a epimorphism.

Let \( B \xrightarrow{.c_1} G \) be the cokernel pair of \( .a \). If \( .a \) is epic then \( .a c_1 = .a c_2 \) implies that \( .c_1 = .c_2 \). Hence \( .1_B \) equalizes the cokernel pair of \( .a \). Conversely, suppose that \( \text{Im}(a) = B \). Look at

![Diagram 5.16]

then we want \( .a d_1 = .a d_2 \) implies \( .d_1 = .d_2 \). Let \( .l \) be the colimit morphism in the cokernel pair diagram (5.17) below where \( .a d_1 = .a d_2 \).

![Diagram 5.17]

Then \( .d_1 = .c_1 .l \) and \( .d_2 = .c_2 .l \). So \( \text{Im}(a) = B \) implies \( .c_1 = .c_2 \).
whence \( d_1 = c_1 \ell = c_2 \ell = d_2 \).

Now to show i.) it suffices to show that \( \text{Im}(a^0) = \text{Im}(a) \). But this follows from Proposition 16.

ii.) Let \( A \twoheadrightarrow S \rightarrowtail B \) be an epic-monic factorization of \( A \rightarrowtail B \).
By Proposition 16 there is a morphism \( \text{Im}(a) \rightarrowtail S \) such that

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\ [-] \downarrow \overset{a}{\longrightarrow} \overset{\text{Im}(a)}{\longrightarrow} \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} B \\
| \downarrow \overset{i}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} S \\
| \downarrow \overset{0}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{0}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{0}{\longrightarrow} \\
C \\ [-] \downarrow \overset{c}{\longrightarrow} \overset{\text{Im}(c)}{\longrightarrow} D
\end{array}
\]

(5.18)

commutes.

As \( a^0 \) and \( e \) are epic and \( * \) commutes, \( i \) is epic. As \( \text{Im}(a) \) and \( c \) are mono and \( ** \) commutes, \( i \) is mono. Hence by Proposition 15 \( i \) is an isomorphism.

iii.) Let \( D \rightarrowtail F \) be the cokernel pair of \( c \). Consider the following diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\ [-] \downarrow \overset{a}{\longrightarrow} \overset{\text{Im}(a)}{\longrightarrow} \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} B \\
| \downarrow \overset{b}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} C \\
| \downarrow \overset{c}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} D \\
| \downarrow \overset{e}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} | \downarrow \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} \text{Im}(c)
\end{array}
\]

(5.19)

\( \text{Im}(c) \) is the equalizer of \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \). Thus \( b.c^0.\text{Im}(c)d_1 = b.c^0.\text{Im}(c)d_2 \), which implies
\[a^0 \text{Im}(a) d_1 = a d_1 = b c d_1 = b c^0 \text{Im}(c) d_1 = b c^0 \text{Im}(c) d_2 =
\]
\[= b c d_2 = a d_2 = a^0 \text{Im}(a) d_2.\]  

(5.20)

As \(a^0\) is epic, this implies \(\text{Im}(a) d_1 = \text{Im}(a) d_2\). Hence there is a limit morphism \(e\) from \(\text{Im}(a)\) into the equalizer of \(d_1\) and \(d_2\), namely \(\text{Im}(c)\), and this limit morphism \(e\) makes the diagram (5.19) commute. \(\square\)

III.6 Heyting algebra valued functors and Boolean topoi

A **Heyting algebra** is a partially ordered set \(\langle H, \leq \rangle\) such that for any two elements \(a, b \in H\)

i.) the greatest lower bound of \(a\) and \(b\), denoted by \((a \wedge b) \in H\), exists;

ii.) the least upper bound of \(a\) and \(b\), denoted by \((a \vee b) \in H\), exists;

iii.) the pseudo-complement of \(a\) relative to \(b\), defined to be the greatest \(x \in H\) such that \(a \wedge x \leq b\) and denoted by \((a \setminus b) \in H\), exists; and

iv.) a least element \(0\) exists.

Recalling Example 3 of II.1 where we established a 1-1 correspondence between partially-ordered sets and partially-ordered categories, we have the following propositions.

**Proposition 18:** A partially-ordered set \(\langle H, \leq \rangle\) is a Heyting algebra if and only if the corresponding partially-ordered category \(\mathcal{O}(H, \leq)\) is cartesian-closed.

**Proof:** Take \(a \wedge b = a \Theta b\), \(a \vee b = a \Theta b\), \(a \setminus b = a \setminus b\), and \(0 = 0\). That \(\wedge, \vee, \setminus,\) and \(0\) have the right properties is easily seen. \(\square\)
Now suppose we have a topos $\mathcal{E}$ and $1 \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{E}$ is a terminal object. Let $A \rightarrow^{a} 1$ and $B \rightarrow^{b} 1$ be subobjects of $1$. Using the fact that we can talk about images in $\mathcal{E}$ (Propositions 16 and 17) there is a natural way to define greatest lower bounds, least upper bounds, and pseudo-complements on the partially-ordered set $1: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$, namely take $a \wedge b$ to be $\text{im}(a \circ b)$, $a \vee b$ to be $\text{im}(a \circ b)$, and $a \Rightarrow b$ to be $\text{im}(a \circ b)$. Under this interpretation $1: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$ becomes a Heyting algebra with the map $0 \rightarrow 1$ as least element. Thus we have established

**Proposition 19:** If $\mathcal{E}$ is an elementary topos and $1$ is a terminal object in $\mathcal{E}$ then $1: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$ has a natural Heyting algebra structure. \(\square\)

Next we note that if $B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{E}$, then since $1_B$ is the terminal object in $\mathcal{E} + B$, $\mathcal{E} + B$ is a topos, and $B: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E} = (1_B): \text{Sub}_{\mathcal{E} + B}$ we have

**Proposition 20:** If $\mathcal{E}$ is an elementary topos and $B \in \text{Obj}_\mathcal{E}$ then $B: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$ has a natural Heyting algebra structure. \(\square\)

As the operations of $B: \text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$ are preserved by pulling back, we may naturally view $\text{Sub}_\mathcal{E}$ as a Heyting algebra valued functor.

**Theorem II:** If $\mathcal{E}$ is an elementary topos and $\Omega$ is the subobject classifier in $\mathcal{E}$ then $\Omega$ has a natural Heyting algebra structure in $\mathcal{E}$.

**Proof:** We must show that there exist mappings $\Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow^\wedge \Omega$, $\Omega \circ \Omega \rightarrow^\lor \Omega$, $\Omega \rightarrow^\Rightarrow \Omega$, and $1 \rightarrow^0 \Omega$, which satisfy the properties of the Heyting algebra operations. Let $\text{false} : 1 \rightarrow \Omega$ be the characteristic function of $0 \rightarrow 1$. Take $0$ to be $\text{false}$. Let

(i.) $\wedge$ be the characteristic function of $1 \rightarrow \Omega \times \Omega$
(ii.) \( \mathcal{V} \) be the characteristic function of
\[
\text{im}(\langle \mathcal{L}_\Omega, \text{true} \rangle \otimes \langle \text{true}, 1_\Omega \rangle)
\]
(iii.) \( \Rightarrow \) be the map \( \langle \mathcal{P}_1, \wedge \rangle \ast \delta \) where \( \delta \) is the Kronnecker-delta.

It is now easy to directly verify that fact that these maps satisfy the required conditions.

In a Heyting algebra \( \langle H, \leq \rangle \) for any \( a \in H \) we define \( \sim a \) to be the element \( a = 0 \). We say that a Heyting algebra is a Boolean algebra if and only if for all \( a \in H \), \( \sim \sim a = a \).

An elementary topos \( \mathcal{D} \) is said to be a Boolean topos if and only if its subobject classifier \( \Omega \) is a Boolean algebra. We define the map \( \sim : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega \) to be the characteristic function of \( \text{false} \).

A Boolean topos is said to be a two-valued topos if \( \{ \text{true}, \text{false} \} = \text{Hom}_\mathcal{D}(1, \Omega) \).

The following proposition is fairly easy to prove.

**Proposition 21:** Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be a topos and let \( \Omega \) be the subobject classifier in \( \mathcal{D} \). Then the following are equivalent:

i.) \( \mathcal{D} \) is a Boolean topos

ii.) \( \text{true} \otimes \text{false} : 1 \otimes 1 \rightarrow \Omega \) is an isomorphism

iii.) \( \sim = 1_\Omega : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega \). \( \square \)
CHAPTER IV

TOPOI AND SETS

Throughout this chapter $\mathcal{V}_1$ is a Boolean topos and all objects and morphisms are in $\mathcal{V}$ unless otherwise specified.

IV.1 The language $\mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{V})$ and its interpretation

We now describe a language $\mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{V})$ which is an extension by definitions of the language $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_1)$ (i.e. $\mathcal{L}$ with constant symbols for elements of $\mathcal{V}_1$ adjoined) and indicate how $\mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{V})$ is to be syntactically interpreted in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_1)$.

Variables: $\mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{V})$ has three sorts of variables:

1.) Object variables, denoted $A, B, C, \ldots$, which are to be interpreted as ranging over $\text{Ob}_{\mathcal{V}}$;

2.) Arrow variables, denoted $a, b, c, \ldots$, which are to be interpreted as ranging over $\text{Arr}_{\mathcal{V}}$; and

3.) Typed variables of type $A$ (for each $A \in \text{Ob}_{\mathcal{V}}$), denoted $x^A_1, x^A_2, \ldots$, which are to be interpreted as ranging over $\text{Par}_{\mathcal{V}}(1, A)$.

Terms: Object constants and object variables are object terms; arrow constants and arrow variables are arrow terms. Typed terms are defined inductively as follows:

a.) constants in $\text{Par}_{\mathcal{V}}(1, A)$ and typed variables of type $A$ are terms of type $A$;

b.) if $t^A$ is a term of type $A$ and $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{V}}(A, B)$ then $t^A.f$ is a term of type $B$; and
c.) if $t_1^A$ is a term of type $A$ and $t_2^B$ is a term of type $B$ then $(t_1^A, t_2^B)$ is a term of type $A \& B$. Typed terms are then interpreted in the obvious manner. (Note: we may occasionally abuse our language by referring to a term of type $A$ as an "element of $A".)

Relations and atomic formulas:

1.) There are two arrow relation symbols:
   
   i.) the binary relation symbol $\rightarrow_{\text{Arr}}$ and
   
   ii.) the 3-ary relation symbol $\rightarrow_{\text{Arr}} \circ$, which are to be interpreted as the relations of equality and composition of arrows respectively. Atomic formulas are formed from arrow terms as follows:
   
   a.) if $t_1$ and $t_2$ are arrow terms, $t_1 =_{\text{Arr}} t_1$ is an atomic formula; and
   
   b.) if $t_1$, $t_2$, and $t_3$ are arrow terms then $t_1 =_{\text{Arr}} t_2 \circ t_3$ is an atomic formula.

2.) There are relation symbols of type $A$ for each $A \in \text{Obj}_\delta$ as follows:
   
   i.) a binary relation symbol $\rightarrow_{A}$ and
   
   ii.) for each subobject $m : B \rightarrow A$, a unary predicate $\in_m B$, which are to be interpreted as equality restricted to $\text{Par}_\delta(1, A)$ and factorization of elements of $\text{Par}_\delta(1, A)$ through $m$ respectively. For example if $\notin \text{Par}_\delta(1, A)$ then $\notin \in_m B$ holds if and only if there exists a map $a : A' \rightarrow A$ such that (1.1) commutes.
Atomic formulas are formed from typed terms as follows:

a.) if $t_1^A$ and $t_2^A$ are terms of type $A$ then $t_1^A = t_2^A$ is an atomic formula and

b.) if $t^A$ is a term of type $A$ and $m : B \rightarrow A$ is a subobject of $A$, then $t^A \in m.B$ is an atomic formula.

Formulas:

1.) If $\phi$ is an atomic formula then $\phi$ is a formula.

2.) If $\phi$ is a formula then $\neg \phi$ is a formula.

3.) If $\phi$ and $\psi$ are formulas then $\phi \lor \psi$ is a formula.

4.) If $\phi$ is a formula and $A$ is an object variable then

   $\exists A \phi$ is a formula.

5.) If $\phi$ is a formula and $a$ is an arrow variable then

   $\exists a \phi$ is a formula.

6.) If $\phi$ is a formula and $x^A$ is a variable of type $A$ then

   $\exists x^A \phi$ is a formula.

Sentences $\sigma$ of $L'(\phi)$ are given a truth value $[\sigma]$ in $B$, the completion of the Boolean algebra $1:\text{Sub}_\phi$, according to the following inductive scheme:
1. \( [[t_1 = \text{Arr} \cdot t_2]] = \text{df} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_1 \text{ and } t_2 \text{ are arrow constants} \\ 0 & \text{denoting the same arrow in } \mathcal{G} \\ 0 : 0 \rightarrow 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \)

2. \( [[t_1 = \text{Arr} \cdot t_2 \cdot t_3]] = \text{df} \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t_1 \text{ denotes the composition of} \\ \text{the arrows denoted by } t_2 \text{ and } t_3 \\ 0 : 0 \rightarrow 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \)

3. \( [[t_1^A : t_2^A]] = \text{df} \cdot \text{colim } \langle A, Y \rangle \) where \( \langle A, Y \rangle \) is the colimit of the solid part of (1.2)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow^{t_1^A}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow^{t_2'}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
A'' \\
\downarrow^{t_3''}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\downarrow^{1}
\end{array}
\end{array} \]

4. \( [[t^A \in B]] = \text{df} \cdot \text{P} \) i.e. the pullback of \( \cdot m : B \rightarrow A \) along \( \cdot t^A \) composed with \( \cdot t^A \) as in the left hand edge of (1.3)

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\downarrow^{P}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\bar{m} \cdot t^A \\
\downarrow^{\bar{m} \cdot t^A}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
A' \\
\downarrow^{t^A'}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow^{t^A}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\downarrow^{1}
\end{array}
\end{array} \]

5. \( [[t \Phi]] = \text{df} \sim [[\Phi]] \)

6. \( [[\Phi \lor \Psi]] = \text{df} [[\Phi]] \lor [[\Psi]] \)
We say that a sentence \( \sigma \) is true in the external interpretation if \( [\sigma] = 1 \).

IV.2 The language \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \): external and internal interpretations.

Let \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \) be the fragment of \( \mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{S}) \) obtained by deleting object variables, arrow variables, and the relations \(-=\) and \(-\approx\).

By the external interpretation of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \), we shall mean its \( B \)-valued interpretation as a fragment of \( \mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{S}) \) above.

The internal interpretation of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \), which we define below, assigns to each formula \( \phi(x_1^A, \ldots, x_n^A) \) of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \), having exactly \( n \) free variables of types \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \), a truth value \( \|\phi\| \) which is an arrow in \( \mathcal{S} \),

\[ \|\phi\| : A_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n \to \Omega. \]

\( \|\phi\| \) is defined inductively as follows:

1.) \( \|x_i^A\| \) \( =_A \) \( x_2^A \) \( =_A \) \( \text{ch}(A) = \delta : A \otimes A \to \Omega \)

2.) If \( m : B \to A \) is a subobject of \( A \) then \( \|x^A_m\| \) \( =_A \) \( \text{ch}(m) : A \to \Omega \)

3.) If \( f : A \to B \) is an arrow in \( \mathcal{S} \) and \( \psi(x^B) \) is a formula of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \) with a free variable of type \( B \) then \( \|\psi(x^A.f)\| = \|f\| \cdot \|\psi(x^B)\| \).

4.) \( \|\sim\psi\| = \|\psi\|.\sim \)

5.) \( \|\psi_1 \lor \psi_2\| = \|\psi_1\| \cdot \|\psi_2\| \cdot \lor \)

\[ 7.) \ [\exists A \phi(A)] =_A \sup_{B} \{ [\phi(T)] \mid T \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{B}} \} \]

\[ 8.) \ [\exists a \phi(.a)] =_A \sup_{B} \{ [\phi(.t)] \mid t \in \text{Arr}_{\mathcal{B}} \} \]

\[ 9.) \ [\exists x^A \phi(x^A)] =_A \sup_{B} \{ [\phi(t^A)] \mid t^A \in \text{Par}_{\mathcal{B}}(1^A, A) \} \]
6.) Let $\psi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ be a formula of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$ with exactly $n+1$ free variables of types $A, A_1, \ldots, A_n$. Let $\iota = \text{df} \, [\| \psi \|]$ be the subobject of $A \otimes A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n$ whose characteristic function is $\| \psi \|$. Let $D$ denote the domain of $\iota$. Let $\pi : A \otimes A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n \to A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n$ be the obvious natural projection map. Now define

$\| \exists x^A (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \| = \text{df} \, \text{ch}(\iota \circ \pi)$

where $\iota \circ \pi$ is the monic part of $\iota \circ \pi$ as in III.5, Propositions III.16 and III.17.

See (2.1)

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
\downarrow \iota \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \downarrow \\
\text{A} \otimes A_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes A_n \\
\downarrow \iota \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \downarrow \text{Im}(i \circ \pi) \\
\Omega
\end{array}
$$

(2.1)

A formula $\phi$ of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$ is said to be valid in the internal interpretation if $\| \phi \|$ factors through $\text{true} : 1 \to \Omega$. We shall write $\| \phi \| = T$ to abbreviate "$\phi$ is valid in the internal interpretation".

The following three propositions, which are proved by Mitchell in [19], relate the external and internal interpretations of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$.

Define $\exists ! x \phi(x)$ by (2.2) in $\mathcal{L}$.

$$
\exists ! x \phi(x) = \text{df} \, \exists x (\phi(x) \land \forall y (\phi(y) \leftrightarrow (x=y)))
$$

(2.2)

PROPOSITION 1: If $\| \forall x^A \exists ! y^B \phi(x^A, y^B) \| = T$ then there exists a unique morphism $g : A \to B$ such that $\| \phi(x^A, x^A \cdot g) \| = T$. \(\Box\)
PROPOSITION 2: If \( \| \exists ! y \Phi(y) \| = T \) then there exists a morphism \( g : 1 \to B \) such that \( \| \forall z \frac{1}{T} \Phi(z \cdot g) \| = T \) where \( z \cdot g \) is a variable of type \( 1 \) which does not occur free in \( \Phi \).°

Let \( WC \) denote the following axiom:

\[ WC : \text{Let} \ a : A \to 1 \text{ and let } A \xrightarrow{a^0} \text{Im}(a) \xrightarrow{\text{im}(a)} 1 \text{ be the epic-monic factorization of } a \text{ (see Proposition III.17). Then } a^0 \text{ splits.} \]

We say that a sentence \( \sigma \) of \( L(\mathcal{S}) \) is \( \delta \)-absolute if \( \| \sigma \| = T \) if and only if \( \sigma \) is true in the external interpretation.

PROPOSITION 3: Let \( \mathcal{S} \) be a Boolean topos satisfying \( WC \), \( \Phi(x_1^{A_1}, \ldots, x_n^{A_n}) \) be a formula of \( L(\mathcal{S}) \) with exactly \( n \) free variables of types \( A_1, \ldots, A_n \), and \( p_i \in \text{Par}^\mathcal{S}(1, A_i) \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Then \( \Phi(p_1, \ldots, p_n) \) is \( \delta \)-absolute.°

IV.3 Boolean ZFC topoi and two-valued ZFC topoi

A natural numbers object in a topos \( \mathcal{S} \) is an object \( N \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{S} \), together with maps

\[ 1 \xrightarrow{0} N \xrightarrow{s} N \]

such that for any object \( X \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{S} \), together with maps

\[ 1 \xrightarrow{x} X \xrightarrow{k} X \]

there exists a unique map \( h : N \to X \) such that (3.1) commutes.

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \xrightarrow{0} & N \\
\downarrow{0} \quad \downarrow{s} & & \downarrow{s} \\
N & \xrightarrow{\cdot h} & N \\
\downarrow{\cdot x} \quad \downarrow{\cdot h} & & \downarrow{\cdot h} \\
X & \xrightarrow{\cdot k} & X \\
\end{array} \quad (3.1) \]

A topos \( \mathcal{S} \) is said to satisfy the category form of the Axiom of Choice (abbreviated CAC) if all coequalizers split in \( \mathcal{S} \), or equivalently
(by the dual of Proposition III.14) if all epimorphisms split in \( \mathcal{S} \).

A topos \( \mathcal{S} \) is said to satisfy the category form of the Bounding Principle (abbreviated CBP) if for every formula \( \phi \) of \( \mathcal{L}'(\mathcal{S}) \) with parameters in \( \mathcal{S} \) and every \( \mathbf{A} \in \text{Obj}_{\mathcal{S}} \), \( \mathcal{S} \) satisfies (3.2).

\[
\forall \mathbf{x} \exists B \phi(\mathbf{x}^A, B) \rightarrow \exists C \forall x \exists B \exists .b : B \rightarrow C \land \phi(\mathbf{x}^A, B) \tag{3.2}
\]

A topos \( \mathcal{S} \) is said to be a Boolean ZFC topos if

i.) \( \mathcal{S} \) is Boolean

ii.) \( \mathcal{S} \) has a natural numbers object

iii.) \( \mathcal{S} \) satisfies CAC, and

iv.) \( \mathcal{S} \) satisfies CBP.

A topos \( \mathcal{S} \) is said to be a two-valued ZFC topos if it is both a two-valued topos and a Boolean ZFC topos.

In IV.4 and IV.5 we construct two functions:

i.) \( \mathcal{C} : (\text{Boolean-valued models of ZFC}) \rightarrow (\text{Boolean ZFC topoi}) \)

ii.) \( \mathcal{M} : (\text{Boolean ZFC topoi}) \rightarrow (\text{Boolean-valued models of ZFC}) \).

One should think of these constructions as taking place in ZFCI and referring to Boolean-valued models of ZFC which, though they are contained in \( V_1 \), may not be sets relative to \( V_1 \).

IV.4 The construction of \( \mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}] \)

Let \( B \) be a complete Boolean algebra and let \( M^{(B)} \) be a \( B \)-valued model of ZFC. Then \( \mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}] \) is the category whose set of objects is
the universe of $M^{(B)}$ and whose arrows are ordered triples $<x,f,y>$ such that $[[f : x \rightarrow y]] = i^{(B)}$, the maximal element of $B$. Domains, codomains, composition of arrows, and identity arrows are defined in the obvious fashion.

**Theorem I**: If $M^{(B)}$ is a $B$-valued model of ZFC then $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$ is a Boolean ZFC topos and $\Omega^{[M^{(B)}]} \cong B$.

**Proof**: $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$ is easily seen to be finitely bicomplete. Products and coproducts are cartesian products and disjoint unions in $M^{(B)}$. If $f : x \rightarrow y$ and $g : x \rightarrow y$, the role of the equalizer of $f$ and $g$ is played by $\{z \mid z \in x \land f(z) = g(z)\}$ and its inclusion in $x$ and the role of coequalizer is played by $y/\sim$ and the projection from $y$ to $y/\sim$, where $\sim$ is the smallest equivalence relation on $y$ such that for all $z \in x$, $f(z) \sim g(z)$.

Exponentiation in $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$ is given by exponentiation in $M^{(B)}$, i.e. $x^y$ is $^x y$. The counit of the cartesian adjunction is given by ordinary evaluation, i.e. it is the function $e : (^y x) \times y \rightarrow y$ defined by $e(f,z) = \text{df } f(z)$ for all $f \in ^x y$ and $z \in x$.

$B$ obviously plays the role of $\Omega$ with $\text{true : } 1 \rightarrow \Omega$ being the function which sends $\emptyset$ to $1^{(B)}$.

$\omega$ is the natural numbers object of $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$. The map $0 : 1 \rightarrow \omega$ is the canonical inclusion and $s : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ is the ordinary successor function.

In order to check that epimorphisms split in $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$ let $e : x \rightarrow y$ be an epimorphism in $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$. Then $e$ is a surjection in $M^{(B)}$. By AC there exists a choice function $f : y \rightarrow x$ picking out a single element
of $e^{-1}(z)$ for every $z \in y$. $f$ is the required section of $e$.

Finally, $BP$ in $M^{(B)}$ translates exactly into $CBP$ in $\mathcal{C}[M^{(B)}]$. □

**COROLLARY I.1:** If $M$ is a classical model of ZFC then $\mathcal{C}[M]$ is a two-valued ZFC topos. □

**IV.5 The construction of $\mathbb{W}[\mathcal{S}]$**

A partially ordered set $<t, \leq>$ is called a **Scott tree** if

i.) for all $x \in t$ the set $\hat{x} = \{ z \mid z \leq x \wedge z \in x \}$ is well-ordered by $\leq$;

ii.) $t$ has a greatest element $\overset{*}{x}$;

iii.) $<t, \leq>$ is $\leq$-well founded and $<t, \geq>$ is $\geq$-well founded (see I.4); and

iv.) $<t, \leq>$ has no order automorphisms other than the identity.

If $x \in t$ let $\uparrow x$ denote the set of immediate predecessors of $x$ in $t$.

In any model of ZFC we can then define the set represented by the Scott tree $<t, \leq>$ recursively by insisting that $<t, \leq>$ represents a set $z$ if and only if the elements of $z$ are exactly the sets represented by the Scott trees of the form $<\hat{a}, \leq | \hat{a}>$ where $a \uparrow \overset{*}{x}$. □

Now let $\mathcal{S}$ be a Boolean topos. If $s : B \rightarrow A \times A$ is a relation from $A$ to $A$ we can interpret $a_1 \leq_s a_2$ to mean $(a_1, a_2) \in B$. In this manner we may express the statement "$<A, \leq_s>$ is a Scott tree" as a single sentence $ST(A, s)$ of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S})$ with parameters $A$ and $s$. We then can say that $<A, \leq_s>$ is a Scott tree in $\mathcal{S}$ if $\|ST(A, s)\| = T$. If $\mathcal{S}$ also satisfies $WC$ then by Proposition 3, $ST(A, s)$ is also externally true in $\mathcal{S}$. By clause ii.) in the definition of Scott tree and Proposition 2 there is a maximal element $\overset{*}{x} : 1 \rightarrow A$ in $\mathcal{S}$ and the subobject $\uparrow \overset{*}{x}$ of $A$ is well defined. If $a^A$
is a term of type \(A\), let \(s\) denote the Scott subtree of \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle\) obtained by restricting \(\leq_s\) to \([b^A, b^A \leq_s a^A]\), the pullback of \(\text{true}\) along \(\|b^A \leq_s a^A\|\).

It is easy to see that if \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle\) and \(\langle B, \leq_t \rangle\) are two Scott trees in \(\mathcal{D}\) and if \(f^{A\times B}\) is a term of type \(A\times B\), we may express the statement "\(f^{A\times B}\) is an order isomorphism from \(A\) onto \(B\)" in \(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{D})\) by employing the counit of the cartesian adjunction \(\Omega\) to use \(f^{A\times B}\) as a function from \(A\) to \(B\).

Let \(B\) denote the completion of the Boolean algebra \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{D}(1, \Omega)\). Then \(\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{D}]\) is the \(B\)-valued structure specified by the following:

i.) the universe of \(\mathcal{D}[\mathcal{D}]\) is the set \(\{\langle A, \leq_s \rangle | ST(A, s)\}\)

ii.) \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle \in \langle B, \leq_t \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{D}] = df \| \exists f^{A\times B} \) (\(f^{A\times B}\) is an order isomorphism from \(A, \leq_s\) onto \(B, \leq_t\))\.

iii.) \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle \in \langle B, \leq_t \rangle \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}[\mathcal{D}] = df \| \exists f^{A\times B} \) (\(f^{A\times B}\) is an order isomorphism from \(A, \leq_s\) onto \(t_b\) for some term \(b\) of type \(\{A\times B\}\))\.

If \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle\) is a Scott tree in \(\mathcal{D}\) and \(B\) is an object in \(\mathcal{D}\), we say that \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle\) structures \(B\) if \(B\equiv \star \mathcal{D}\) in \(\mathcal{D}\). An object \(B\) is said to be structured if there exists some Scott tree \(\langle A, \leq_s \rangle\) in \(\mathcal{D}\) which structures \(B\). Note that the category of structured objects in \(\mathcal{D}\) and arrows between them is a full subcategory of \(\mathcal{D}\).

**PROPOSITION 4:** If \(\mathcal{D}\) satisfies CAC then every object of \(\mathcal{D}\) is structured.

**Proof:** If \(\mathcal{D}\) satisfies CAC then every object \(A\) can be well ordered in the sense that there exists a subobject \(.w:B\rightarrow A\times A\) such for any two terms of type \(A\), \(a_1^A\) and \(a_2^A\), \(a_1^A \leq_w a_2^A\) if and only if \(\|(a_1^A, a_2^A)\in B\| = T\), and \(.w\) is a well ordering. The proof of this in \(\mathcal{D}\) is just the imitation of the usual proof in sets.
Informally we let \( <C, \leq_j> \) be the set of strictly descending sequences in \( A \) ordered by the requirement that \( <a_1, \ldots, a_n> \leq_j <b_1, \ldots, b_m> \) if and only if \( m < n \) and \( a_i = b_i \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, m \).

More formally if \( O_A \) denotes the \( \leq \)-minimal element of \( A \) we define

\[
C = \text{df } \left( \forall a_1 \leq a_2 \rightarrow (f^{A^+A}, a_1) \cdot \mathcal{U} = O_A \right) \land \\
\land \forall a_1 \forall a_2 \left( a_1 < a_2 \rightarrow (f^{A^+A}, a_2) \cdot \mathcal{U} < (f^{A^+A}, a_1) \cdot \mathcal{U} \right)
\]

and \( .j : Y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_A \) is the subobject specified by

\[
(f_1^{A^+A}, a_1) <_j (f_2^{A^+A}, a_2) \equiv \text{df } a_2 < a_1 \land \\
\land a_3(a_3 < a_2 \rightarrow (f_1^{A^+A}, a_3) \cdot \mathcal{U} = (f_1^{A^+A}, a_1) \cdot \mathcal{U})
\]

It is now fairly easy to check out that \( <C, \leq_j> \) is a Scott tree in \( \mathcal{D} \) which structures \( A \).

**Theorem II:** Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be a Boolean ZFC topos and let \( B \) denote the completion of the Boolean algebra \( \text{Hom}_B(1, \Omega) \). Then \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{D}] \) is a \( B \)-valued model of ZFC.

**Proof:** It is sufficient to show that \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{D}] \) satisfies \( \text{AxExt}, \text{AxInf}_B, \text{AxPower}, \text{AxFound}, \text{Limited Aussonderung}, \text{BP}, \) and \( \text{AC} \).

**AxExt:** If \( [<A, \leq_s>] = [<B, \leq_t>] = \text{true} = 1(B) \) then if we let \( x = <A, \leq_s> \) and \( y = <B, \leq_t> \), we have that

\[
\| \exists f^{A^+B} (f \text{ is an order isomorphism from } x \text{ to } y) \| = T
\]  

This implies \( \| \forall z (x \leftrightarrow z(y)) \| = \text{true} = 1(B) \). Conversely if \( [x \neq y] = \text{true} \) then since \( <A, \leq_s> \) is not order isomorphic to \( <B, \leq_t> \) there must exist either...
an $a \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $s_a \neq y$ or a $b \in \mathbb{B}$ such that $t_b \neq x$. Since CAC implies WC, Proposition 3 tells us that there exists a Scott tree $z$ such that $\models \neg z \in x \leftrightarrow z \in y$. For this $z$, $[z \in x \leftrightarrow z \in y] = \text{false} = 0^{(B)}$.

**AxIn6**: It is easy to check that in the proof of Proposition 4 the Scott tree $\langle C, \leq \rangle$ which structures the natural numbers object $\mathbb{N}$ is an ordinal of order type $\geq \omega$.

**AxPower**: Let $\langle A, \leq \rangle$ be a Scott tree. The power set of $\langle A, \leq \rangle$ will be the Scott tree $\langle B, \leq \rangle$ constructed as follows:

$B$ will be a subobject of $(A \otimes (\mathbb{A} \uparrow \downarrow)) \otimes (\mathbb{A} \uparrow \downarrow) \otimes 1$. We will let the single element of $1$ be $\star_t$. Let $\star^+ = \mathsf{df} \star^+_s$. If $a$ is an element of $A$ and $a \not\in \star^+$, let $\overline{a}$ be the unique element of $\star^+_s$ such that $a \leq \overline{a}$. An element $(a, f)$ of $A \otimes (\mathbb{A} \uparrow \downarrow)$ is in $B$ if and only if $(f, a) \cdot \mathsf{true}$ factors through $\mathsf{true}$. For such an $(a, f)$ we will define $(a, f) \leq_t g$, where $g$ is an element of $\star^+_s$, if $f = g$. Finally if $b \in A$, define $(a, f) \leq_t (b, g)$ if $f = g$ and $a \leq_s b$.

The part of the above definition which makes $\langle B, \leq \rangle$ the power set of $\langle A, \leq \rangle$ is that $\star^+_t = \star^+_s$. The rest of the construction simply makes sure $\langle B, \leq \rangle$ is a Scott tree with a maximal element $\star_t$ and appropriate structure below $\star^+_t$.

**AxFound**: This follows immediately from the well foundedness of Scott trees. We use the fact that CAC implies WC again in order to use Proposition 3 as we did in the proof of AxExt.

**Limited Außsonderung**: Limited formulas in $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{A}])$ may be translated into formulas of $\mathcal{L}(\mathfrak{B})$ by identifying limited variables with typed variables.
If \( \phi(x) \) is a limited formula with one free variable \( x \) in \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}]) \) let \( \phi^+ \) denote its translation into \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}) \). Then \( \{ x \in (A, \leq) | \phi(x) \} \) is the subobject \( \{x^A | \|\phi^+(x^A)\| \} \) of \( A \) together with the induced ordering. That this is the right set then follows from Proposition 3.

**BP:** Follows immediately from CBP and Proposition 3.

**AC:** As remarked in the proof of Proposition 4, we may use CAC to well-order any object in \( \mathcal{B} \). It then follows from Proposition 3 that we can well order any set in \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \).

This completes the proof of Theorem II.□

**COROLLARY II.1:** If \( \mathcal{B} \) is a two-valued ZFC topos then \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \) is a classical model of ZFC.□

**THEOREM III:** If \( \mathcal{B} \) is a Boolean ZFC topos then \( \mathcal{C}[\mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}]] \) is equivalent as a category to \( \mathcal{B} \).

**Proof:** We use the fact that by Proposition 4, every object of \( \mathcal{B} \) is structured. Define the functor \( K : \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \) as follows:

i.) If \( (A, \leq) \) is an object of \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \) let \( (A, \leq) : K = \text{df} \times^+_s \).

ii.) If \( f^+ = \langle x, f, y \rangle \) is a morphism in \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \), where \( x = (A, \leq) \) and \( y = (B, \leq) \), then \( f \) is a set of ordered pairs in \( \mathcal{M}[\mathcal{B}] \), whence there is a formula \( \psi(a, b) \) of \( \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{B}) \), with free variables \( a \) and \( b \) of types \( \times^+_s \) and \( \times^+_t \) respectively expressing \( \langle s_a, t_b \rangle \times^+_f \) and such that \( \|\forall a \exists! b \psi(a, b)\| = T \). Then by Proposition 1 we may define \( f^+ : K : \times^+_s \rightarrow \times^+_t \) to be the unique morphism such that \( \|\forall a \psi(a, a. f^+: K)\| = T \).

\( K \) is obviously surjective on objects and faithful. It is also
full for if \( \langle A, \leq_S \rangle \) and \( \langle B, \leq_T \rangle \) are Scott trees and \( h \in \text{Hom}_S(\langle * \uparrow, * \downarrow \rangle_s) \) then if we let \( f = \{ \langle a, * \downarrow b \rangle | a(\uparrow * \downarrow \leq_s) \land b = a.h \} \), we have that 
\[ f^\uparrow = \langle * \downarrow s, f, * \downarrow t \rangle \] is a morphism in \( \mathfrak{C}[\mathbb{M}[\mathfrak{B}]] \) and \( f^\uparrow : K = h. \square \)

Mitchell in [19] proves

**PROPOSITION 5:** There is no way to define \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{B}] \) so that

i.) \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{B}] \) is separated and

ii.) there is an equivalence of categories \( : K : \mathfrak{C}[\mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{B}]] \rightarrow \mathfrak{B} \) which is definable in \( \mathfrak{B} \). \( \square \)

Hence we cannot insist that \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{B}] \) be separated. We say that two \( \mathfrak{B} \)-valued models \( M^{(B)}_1 \) and \( M^{(B)}_2 \) are **weakly isomorphic** if \( (M^{(B)}_1)_s \cong (M^{(B)}_2)_s \) (see 1.5).

**THEOREM IV:** If \( M^{(B)} \) is a \( \mathfrak{B} \)-valued model of ZFC then \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{C}[M^{(B)}]] \) is weakly isomorphic to \( M^{(B)} \).

**Proof:** We need to define a function \( f : M^{(B)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}[\mathfrak{M}[M^{(B)}]] \) which preserves \( \| \_ = \_ \| \) and \( \| \_ \in \_ \| \) and such that for every \( y \) in \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{C}[M^{(B)}]] \) there exists an \( x \) in \( M^{(B)} \) such that \( \| y = f(x) \| = f^{(B)} \) in \( \mathfrak{M}[\mathfrak{C}[M^{(B)}]] \). It is provable in ZFC that for every set \( x \) there exists a Scott tree \( \langle t, \leq \rangle \) which represents \( x \) and that every Scott tree represents a set. If \( x \) is a set in \( M^{(B)} \), let \( \langle t, \leq \rangle \) be the Scott tree representing \( x \) and let \( f(x) \) be the Scott tree \( \langle t, \leq \rangle \) in \( \mathfrak{C}[M^{(B)}] \) where
\[ i = \langle \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \rangle_t t^a | a_1 \leq a_2 \rangle, h, A \times A \rangle \) and \( h \) is the inclusion function. This \( f \) is the required function. \( \square \)
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