

From quantales to a Grothendieck monoidal topology: Towards a closed monoidal generalization of topos

Hugo Luiz Mariano
University of São Paulo

Toposes in Mondovì
Istituto Grothendieck
September 9-11, 2024

Abstract

In this talk, we will present some recent developments associated with some PhD theses in IME-USP (Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo, Brazil) on categories of sheaves over quantales and categories of quantale valued sets, returning to a theme of studies involving logic and categories carried out at IME-USP in the latter half of the 1990, but now from a new perspective: considering semicartesian and commutative quantales, as non-idempotent generalizations of locales (= complete Heyting algebras).

Abstract

In this talk, we will present some recent developments associated with some PhD theses in IME-USP (Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo, Brazil) on categories of sheaves over quantales and categories of quantale valued sets, returning to a theme of studies involving logic and categories carried out at IME-USP in the latter half of the 1990, but now from a new perspective: considering semicartesian and commutative quantales, as non-idempotent generalizations of locales (= complete Heyting algebras).

We will list some properties of the (monoidal) categories obtained, indicating some similarities and differences with the Grothendieck topos. The main goal of these efforts is to develop a closed monoidal but not cartesian closed generalization of the notion of elementary topos, in order to cover some mathematical situations (including generalizations of metric spaces), to enable an axiomatic study of these categories, and a general definition of their internal logic, which shows clues of being some form of linear logic.

Abstract

In this talk, we will present some recent developments associated with some PhD theses in IME-USP (Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo, Brazil) on categories of sheaves over quantales and categories of quantale valued sets, returning to a theme of studies involving logic and categories carried out at IME-USP in the latter half of the 1990, but now from a new perspective: considering semicartesian and commutative quantales, as non-idempotent generalizations of locales (= complete Heyting algebras).

We will list some properties of the (monoidal) categories obtained, indicating some similarities and differences with the Grothendieck topos. The main goal of these efforts is to develop a closed monoidal but not cartesian closed generalization of the notion of elementary topos, in order to cover some mathematical situations (including generalizations of metric spaces), to enable an axiomatic study of these categories, and a general definition of their internal logic, which shows clues of being some form of linear logic.

A future goal is to establish a precise relationship between the present approach and the enriched category approach to sheaves over quantales (and quantaloids) developed by I. Stubbe.

From quantales to a Grothendieck monoidal topology: Towards a closed monoidal generalization of topos

Hugo Luiz Mariano
University of São Paulo

Toposes in Mondovì
Istituto Grothendieck
September 9-11, 2024

Part (I): Preliminaries

Part (II): Towards a monoidal topos theory

Part (I): Preliminaries

(I.1) Presheaves and sheaves

- A **presheaf** (of sets) on a small category \mathcal{C} is a (contra)variant functor $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow Set$
- A morphism of presheaves is just a natural transformation $\eta : F \rightarrow F'$
- $pSh(\mathcal{C}) := Set^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$, the category of all presheaves and natural transformations

(I.1) Presheaves and sheaves

- A **presheaf** (of sets) on a small category \mathcal{C} is a (contra)variant functor $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow Set$
- A morphism of presheaves is just a natural transformation $\eta : F \rightarrow F'$
- $pSh(\mathcal{C}) := Set^{\mathcal{C}^{op}}$, the category of all presheaves and natural transformations
- If X is a topological space, then the family of continuous real functions $(Cont(U, \mathbb{R}))_{U \in Open(X)}$ determines, under restriction, a **sheaf** \mathcal{C} of sets (or rings) since:

(* for any $U \in Open(X)$ and any compatible family of continuous functions defined in a covering of U , $\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i = U$, admits a unique continuous gluing defined on U

(I.1) Presheaves and sheaves

$$C(U) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} C(U_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} C(U_i \cap U_j)$$

(I.1) Presheaves and sheaves

$$C(U) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} C(U_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_i} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} C(U_i \cap U_j)$$

- The notion of sheaf over X depends only on the poset $(\text{Open}(X), \subseteq)$: this is a locale.
- (L, \leq) is a **locale** if it is a complete lattice such that $a \wedge \bigvee_{i \in I} b_i = \bigvee_{i \in I} a \wedge b_i$
- Locale = complete Heyting Algebra

(I.1) Presheaves and sheaves

$$C(U) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} C(U_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} C(U_i \cap U_j)$$

- The notion of sheaf over X depends only on the poset $(\text{Open}(X), \subseteq)$: this is a locale.
- (L, \leq) is a **locale** if it is a complete lattice such that $a \wedge \bigvee_{i \in I} b_i = \bigvee_{i \in I} a \wedge b_i$
- Locale = complete Heyting Algebra
- Let (L, \leq) be a locale, $F : (L, \leq)^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ be a presheaf. Then F is a sheaf if for any $u \in L$ and any covering $\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i = u$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \wedge u_j)$$

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- $Sh(L) \hookrightarrow pSh(L)$ is the full subcategory of all sheaves over the locale L
- In $Sh(L)$, $Sub(Hom(-, u)) \cong [0, u] \subseteq L$
- A **localic topos**, \mathcal{E} , is a category that is equivalent to $Sh(L)$, for some locale L .

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- $Sh(L) \hookrightarrow pSh(L)$ is the full subcategory of all sheaves over the locale L
- In $Sh(L)$, $Sub(Hom(-, u)) \cong [0, u] \subseteq L$
- A **localic topos**, \mathcal{E} , is a category that is equivalent to $Sh(L)$, for some locale L .
- A **Grothendieck pretopology** on a small category \mathcal{C} with finite limits (or just pullbacks) is a certain family $Cov = (Cov(u))_{u \in Obj(\mathcal{C})}$, where each member of $Cov(u)$ is a family of \mathcal{C} -arrows with codomain u .

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

A **Grothendieck pretopology** on \mathcal{C} associates to each object U of \mathcal{C} a set $K(U)$ of families of morphisms $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$ satisfying some rules:

- 1 The singleton family $\{U' \xrightarrow{f} U\}$, formed by an isomorphism $f : U' \xrightarrow{\cong} U$, is in $K(U)$;
- 2 If $\{U_i \xrightarrow{f_i} U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $K(U)$ and $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{g_{ij}} U_i\}_{j \in J_i}$ is in $K(U_i)$ for all $i \in I$, then $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{f_i \circ g_{ij}} U\}_{i \in I, j \in J_i}$ is in $K(U)$;
- 3 If $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $K(U)$, and $V \rightarrow U$ is any morphism in \mathcal{C} , then the family of pullbacks $\{V \times_U U_i \rightarrow V\}$ is in $K(V)$.

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

A **Grothendieck pretopology** on \mathcal{C} associates to each object U of \mathcal{C} a set $K(U)$ of families of morphisms $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$ satisfying some rules:

- 1 The singleton family $\{U' \xrightarrow{f} U\}$, formed by an isomorphism $f : U' \xrightarrow{\cong} U$, is in $K(U)$;
- 2 If $\{U_i \xrightarrow{f_i} U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $K(U)$ and $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{g_{ij}} U_i\}_{j \in J_i}$ is in $K(U_i)$ for all $i \in I$, then $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{f_i \circ g_{ij}} U\}_{i \in I, j \in J_i}$ is in $K(U)$;
- 3 If $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $K(U)$, and $V \rightarrow U$ is any morphism in \mathcal{C} , then the family of pullbacks $\{V \times_U U_i \rightarrow V\}$ is in $K(V)$.

For locales:

$(u_i \leq u)_{i \in I} \in \text{Cov}(u)$ iff $\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i = u$;

(Ax.3) $v \leq u \Rightarrow \bigvee_{i \in I} (u_i \wedge v) = (\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i) \wedge v = u \wedge v = v$

(I.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a **sheaf** w.r.t. the pretopology Cov iff for any $u \in \mathit{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and any covering $\{f_i : u_i \rightarrow u\}_{i \in I} \in \mathit{Cov}(u)$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{(F(f_i))_i} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \times_u u_j)$$

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a **sheaf** w.r.t. the pretopology Cov iff for any $u \in \mathit{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and any covering $\{f_i : u_i \rightarrow u\}_{i \in I} \in \mathit{Cov}(u)$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{(F(f_i))_i} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \times_u u_j)$$

- A category \mathcal{E} is a **Grothendieck topos** iff $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathit{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, \mathit{Cov})$, for some small category \mathcal{C} endowed with a Grothendieck pretopology.

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is a **sheaf** w.r.t. the pretopology Cov iff for any $u \in \mathit{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and any covering $\{f_i : u_i \rightarrow u\}_{i \in I} \in \mathit{Cov}(u)$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{(F(f_i))_i} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \times_u u_j)$$

- A category \mathcal{E} is a **Grothendieck topos** iff $\mathcal{E} \simeq \mathit{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, \mathit{Cov})$, for some small category \mathcal{C} endowed with a Grothendieck pretopology.
- \mathbf{Set} , $p\mathit{Sh}(\mathcal{C})$, $\mathit{Sh}(L)$ are Grothendieck toposes.

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- A category \mathcal{E} is a Grothendieck topos iff there is a small category \mathcal{D} and a pair of functors $\mathcal{E} \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{j} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} \text{pSh}(\mathcal{D})$ such that:
 - (i) j is full and faithful;
 - (ii) a preserves finite limits;
 - (iii) $a \dashv j$.

(1.2) Localic Topos and Grothendieck Topos

- A category \mathcal{E} is a Grothendieck topos iff there is a small category \mathcal{D} and a pair of functors $\mathcal{E} \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{j} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} \text{pSh}(\mathcal{D})$ such that:
 - (i) j is full and faithful;
 - (ii) a preserves finite limits;
 - (iii) $a \dashv j$.
- A category is a Grothendieck topos iff:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete and cocomplete;
 - (iii) is κ -accessible, for some regular cardinal κ ;
 - (iv) admits exponentiation (it is cartesian closed);
 - (v) has a subobject classifier

(I.3) Elementary Topos

(I.3) Elementary Topos

- An **elementary topos** is a category \mathcal{E} such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) has finite limits (and finite colimits);
 - (iii) admits exponentiation: $\mathcal{E}(a \times b, c) \cong \mathcal{E}(a, c^b)$;
 - (iv) has a subobject classifier: $\top : 1 \rightarrow \Omega$

(I.3) Elementary Topos

- An **elementary topos** is a category \mathcal{E} such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) has finite limits (and finite colimits);
 - (iii) admits exponentiation: $\mathcal{E}(a \times b, c) \cong \mathcal{E}(a, c^b)$;
 - (iv) has a subobject classifier: $\top : 1 \rightarrow \Omega$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{m} & b \\ \downarrow !_a & \text{p.b.} & \downarrow \chi_m \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{\top} & \Omega \end{array}$$

- $\forall a \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{E}), [m] \in \text{Sub}(a) \xrightarrow{\cong} \chi_m \in \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega)$ is a natural bijection

(I.3) Elementary Topos

- An **elementary topos** is a category \mathcal{E} such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) has finite limits (and finite colimits);
 - (iii) admits exponentiation: $\mathcal{E}(a \times b, c) \cong \mathcal{E}(a, c^b)$;
 - (iv) has a subobject classifier: $\top : 1 \rightarrow \Omega$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \xrightarrow{m} & b \\ \downarrow !_a & \text{p.b.} & \downarrow \chi_m \\ 1 & \xrightarrow{\top} & \Omega \end{array}$$

- $\forall a \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{E}), [m] \in \text{Sub}(a) \xrightarrow{\cong} \chi_m \in \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega)$ is a natural bijection
- Every Grothendieck topos is an elementary topos
- Set_{fin} is an elementary topos that is not a Grothendieck topos

(1.4) Internal logic of a topos

- In $Sh(L)$, $\Omega : L^{op} \rightarrow Set$, $\Omega(u) = [0, u]$,
 $v \leq u \mapsto (u' \in [0, u] \mapsto u' \wedge v \in [0, v])$
 $Sh(L)(Hom(-, a), \Omega) \cong Sub(Hom(-, a)) \cong [0, a]$

(1.4) Internal logic of a topos

- In $Sh(L)$, $\Omega : L^{op} \rightarrow Set$, $\Omega(u) = [0, u]$,
 $v \leq u \mapsto (u' \in [0, u] \mapsto u' \wedge v \in [0, v])$
 $Sh(L)(Hom(-, a), \Omega) \cong Sub(Hom(-, a)) \cong [0, a]$
- $\Omega \in Obj(\mathcal{E})$ encodes an intuitionist (propositional) logic internal to \mathcal{E}
- Ω is an internal Heyting algebra $\frac{a \wedge b \leq c}{a \leq b \rightarrow c}$

(1.4) Internal logic of a topos

- In $Sh(L)$, $\Omega : L^{op} \rightarrow Set$, $\Omega(u) = [0, u]$,
 $v \leq u \mapsto (u' \in [0, u] \mapsto u' \wedge v \in [0, v])$
 $Sh(L)(Hom(-, a), \Omega) \cong Sub(Hom(-, a)) \cong [0, a]$
- $\Omega \in Obj(\mathcal{E})$ encodes an intuitionist (propositional) logic internal to \mathcal{E}
- Ω is an internal Heyting algebra $\frac{a \wedge b \leq c}{a \leq b \rightarrow c}$
- The internal operation $\wedge : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ corresponds to external (natural) operations $(\wedge_a : Sub(a) \times Sub(a) \rightarrow Sub(a))_{a \in Obj(\mathcal{E})}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega \times \Omega) & \xrightarrow{\wedge \circ -} & \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow = \\ \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega) \times \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E}(a, \Omega) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ Sub(a) \times Sub(a) & \xrightarrow{\wedge_a} & Sub(a) \end{array}$$

(I.5) Localic topos: alternative descriptions

- A L -set is a pair (X, δ) where $\delta : X \times X \rightarrow L$ is a L -fuzzy partial equivalence relation on X : (Sym) $\delta(x, y) = \delta(y, x)$;
(Trans) $\delta(x, y) \wedge \delta(y, z) \leq \delta(x, z)$
- It holds: (Ide) $\delta(x, x) \wedge \delta(x, y) \wedge \delta(y, y) = \delta(x, y)$
- Let $(X, \delta), (X', \delta')$ be L -sets:
functional morphism: $f : X \rightarrow X'$ such that...;
relational morphism: $r : X \times X' \rightarrow L$ such that...
- Various special subclasses of L -sets: in particular, the (Scott-)complete L -sets
- $L\text{-sets}_{func}^c \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{incl} \\ \xleftarrow{comp} \end{matrix} L\text{-sets}_{func}, \text{incl} \dashv \text{comp}$
- $Sh(L) \simeq L\text{-sets}_{func}^c \simeq L\text{-sets}_{rel}^c \cong L\text{-sets}_{rel} \simeq V^L / \equiv$

Part (II): Towards a monoidal topos theory

(II.1) Motivations and previous works

Motivations:

- Mathematical practice: new notions and examples of sheaves
- Categories with a non-intuitionistic internal logic

(II.1) Motivations and previous works

Motivations:

- Mathematical practice: new notions and examples of sheaves
- Categories with a non-intuitionistic internal logic

Previous works (middle 1990):

- Miraglia-Coniglio: Q -sets, Q a right sided idempotent quantale
- Ulrich Höhle: Weak topos (fuzzy sets)

(II.2) Quantales: a generalization of locales

- A **quantale** is a structure (Q, \otimes, \leq) such that: (i) (Q, \leq) is a complete lattice; (ii) (Q, \otimes) is a semigroup; (iii) distributive laws: $a \otimes \bigvee_{i \in I} b_i = \bigvee_{i \in I} a \otimes b_i$; $(\bigvee_{i \in I} b_i) \otimes a = \bigvee_{i \in I} (b_i \otimes a)$
- **Examples:** (a) (L, \wedge, \leq) locale; (b) $(Ideals(A), \cdot, \subseteq)$, A a commutative ring with 1; (c) $([0, \infty], +, \geq)$ Lawvere quantale; (d) $(clrgld(B), \cdot, \subseteq)$, B a C^* -algebra

(II.2) Quantales: a generalization of locales

- A **quantale** is a structure (Q, \otimes, \leq) such that: (i) (Q, \leq) is a complete lattice; (ii) (Q, \otimes) is a semigroup; (iii) distributive laws: $a \otimes \bigvee_{i \in I} b_i = \bigvee_{i \in I} a \otimes b_i$; $(\bigvee_{i \in I} b_i) \otimes a = \bigvee_{i \in I} (b_i \otimes a)$
- **Examples:** (a) (L, \wedge, \leq) locale; (b) $(Ideals(A), \cdot, \subseteq)$, A a commutative ring with 1; (c) $([0, \infty], +, \geq)$ Lawvere quantale; (d) $(clrgld(B), \cdot, \subseteq)$, B a C^* -algebra
- **Some subclasses:** (i) Q is **unital** whenever (Q, \otimes) is a monoid; (ii) Q is **idempotent** whenever $a \otimes a = a, \forall a$; (iii) Q is **semicartesian** whenever $a \otimes b \leq a \wedge b$
- unital + semicartesian = \top is the identity;
idempotent + semicartesian = locale
- Examples (a), (b), (c) are commutative, unital and semicartesian; (a), (b) are non-idempotent (in general); (d) is idempotent, right-sided and non-commutative (in general)

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

We assume that (Q, \otimes, \leq) is a commutative semicartesian quantale

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

We assume that (Q, \otimes, \leq) is a commutative semicartesian quantale

- **Sheaf over Q :** $F : Q^{op} \rightarrow Set$, $u \in Q$, $\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i = u$

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \otimes u_j)$$

$u_i \otimes u_j \leq u_i, u_j \rightsquigarrow$ induced projections

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

We assume that (Q, \otimes, \leq) is a commutative semicartesian quantale

- **Sheaf over Q :** $F : Q^{op} \rightarrow Set$, $u \in Q$, $\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i = u$

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \otimes u_j)$$

$u_i \otimes u_j \leq u_i, u_j \rightsquigarrow$ induced projections

Example: $(x) \in Ideals(A) \mapsto A[x^{-1}]$

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

(II.3) What is a "quantalic topos"?

We assume that (Q, \otimes, \leq) is a commutative semicartesian quantale

- **Sheaf over Q :** $F : Q^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$, $u \in Q$, $\bigvee_{i \in I} u_i = u$

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{\text{equalizer}} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_i} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \otimes u_j)$$

$u_i \otimes u_j \leq u_i, u_j \rightsquigarrow$ induced projections

Example: $(x) \in \text{Ideals}(A) \mapsto A[x^{-1}]$

- A **Q -set** is a pair (X, δ) where $\delta : X \times X \rightarrow Q$ is a Q -fuzzy partial equivalence relation on X (or a Q -valued pseudometric on X):

(Sym) $\delta(x, y) = \delta(y, x)$;

(Trans) $\delta(x, y) \otimes \delta(y, z) \leq \delta(x, z)$;

(Ide) $\delta(x, x) \otimes \delta(x, y) = \delta(x, y) = \delta(x, y) \otimes \delta(y, y)$

Note that $E_x := \delta(x, x) \in \text{Idem}(Q)$

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

Q -valued sets: José Alvim, Caio Mendes

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

Q -valued sets: José Alvim, Caio Mendes

- $Q\text{-sets}_{func}$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete ($1 = Idem(Q)$, $\delta(e, e') = e \otimes e'$);
 - (iii) is cocomplete;

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

Q -valued sets: José Alvim, Caio Mendes

- $Q\text{-sets}_{func}$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete ($1 = Idem(Q)$, $\delta(e, e') = e \otimes e'$);
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{card(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

Q -valued sets: José Alvim, Caio Mendes

- $Q\text{-sets}_{func}$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete ($1 = Idem(Q)$, $\delta(e, e') = e \otimes e'$);
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{\text{card}(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;
 - (v) is a monoidal semicartesian category
$$X \otimes X' = \{(x, x') \in X \times X' : Ex = E'x'\};$$
$$\delta_{\otimes}((x, x'), (y, y')) := \delta(x, y) \otimes \delta'(x', y');$$
 - (vi) admits exponentiation:
$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}(a \otimes b, c) \cong Q\text{-sets}_{func}(a, c^b);$$

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

Q -valued sets: José Alvim, Caio Mendes

- $Q\text{-sets}_{func}$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete ($1 = Idem(Q)$, $\delta(e, e') = e \otimes e'$);
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{card(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;
 - (v) is a monoidal semicartesian category
$$X \otimes X' = \{(x, x') \in X \times X' : Ex = E'x'\};$$
$$\delta_{\otimes}((x, x'), (y, y')) := \delta(x, y) \otimes \delta'(x', y');$$
 - (vi) admits exponentiation:
$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}(a \otimes b, c) \cong Q\text{-sets}_{func}(a, c^b);$$
 - (vii) has a classifier for regular subobjects $1 \twoheadrightarrow \Omega$
$$\Omega = Idem(Q) \dot{\sqcup} Idem(Q), \delta((e, i), (e', i')) = e \otimes e'$$

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

- (X, δ) is a (Scott)-complete Q -set iff:
"every singleton on X ($\sigma : X \rightarrow Q$ such that...) is uniquely represented ($\exists! x, \sigma = \delta(x, -)$)"

$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}^c \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{incl} \\ \xleftarrow{comp} \end{array} Q\text{-sets}_{func}, \text{ where } comp \dashv incl$$

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

- (X, δ) is a (Scott)-complete Q -set iff:
"every singleton on X ($\sigma : X \rightarrow Q$ such that...) is uniquely represented ($\exists! x, \sigma = \delta(x, -)$)"

$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}^c \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{incl} \\ \xleftarrow{comp} \end{array} Q\text{-sets}_{func}, \text{ where } comp \dashv incl$$

- Q is **strong quantale** iff $\forall e \in Idem(Q)$,
 $e \leq \bigvee_i a_i \Rightarrow e \leq \bigvee_i a_i \otimes a_i$
- If Q is commutative, semicartesian and strong quantale:

$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}^c \simeq Q\text{-sets}_{rel}^c \cong Q\text{-sets}_{rel}$$

(II.4) On Q -valued sets

- (X, δ) is a (Scott)-complete Q -set iff:
"every singleton on X ($\sigma : X \rightarrow Q$ such that...) is uniquely represented ($\exists! x, \sigma = \delta(x, -)$)"

$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}^c \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{incl} \\ \xleftarrow{comp} \end{array} Q\text{-sets}_{func}, \text{ where } comp \dashv incl$$

- Q is **strong quantale** iff $\forall e \in Idem(Q)$,
 $e \leq \bigvee_i a_i \Rightarrow e \leq \bigvee_i a_i \otimes a_i$
- If Q is commutative, semicartesian and strong quantale:

$$Q\text{-sets}_{func}^c \simeq Q\text{-sets}_{rel}^c \cong Q\text{-sets}_{rel}$$

(II.5) On sheaves over \mathcal{Q}

Sheaves over \mathcal{Q} : Ana Luiza Tenório

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

Sheaves over Q : Ana Luiza Tenório

- $Sh(Q)$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete;
 - (iii) is cocomplete;

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

Sheaves over Q : Ana Luiza Tenório

- $Sh(Q)$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete;
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) $Sh(Q) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(Q)$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves 1; $a \dashv i$
 - (v) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{\text{card}(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

Sheaves over Q : Ana Luiza Tenório

- $Sh(Q)$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete;
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) $Sh(Q) \xrightleftharpoons[a]{i} pSh(Q)$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves 1; $a \dashv i$
 - (v) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{\text{card}(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;
 - (v) is a monoidal semicartesian category $F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;
 - (vi) admits exponentiation: $Sh(Q)(F \otimes G, H) \cong Sh(Q)(F, H^G)$;

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

Sheaves over Q : Ana Luiza Tenório

- $Sh(Q)$ is a category such that:
 - (i) is locally small;
 - (ii) is complete;
 - (iii) is cocomplete;
 - (iv) $Sh(Q) \xrightleftharpoons[a]{i} pSh(Q)$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves 1; $a \dashv i$
 - (v) is κ -accessible, for the regular cardinal $\kappa = \max\{\text{card}(Q)^+, \aleph_0\}$;
 - (v) is a monoidal semicartesian category $F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;
 - (vi) admits exponentiation: $Sh(Q)(F \otimes G, H) \cong Sh(Q)(F, H^G)$;

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

- (vii) $Sub(Hom(-, a), *) \cong ([0, a], \otimes)$;
(viii) $Sh(Q)$ is not a topos (in general);

(II.5) On sheaves over Q

- (vii) $Sub(Hom(-, a), *) \cong ([0, a], \otimes)$;
- (viii) $Sh(Q)$ is not a topos (in general);
- (ix) Quantales with extra properties:
 - best idempotent approximations: $u^- \leq u \leq u^+$;
 - variant notions of subobject classifiers in $Sh(Q)$:
 $\Omega^-(u) = \{q \in Q : q \otimes u^- = q\}$,
 $v \leq u \mapsto (q \in \Omega^-(u) \mapsto q \otimes v^- \in \Omega^-(v))$
 $\Omega^+(u) = \{q \in Q : q^+ \otimes u = q\}$,
 $v \leq u \mapsto (q \in \Omega^+(u) \mapsto q^+ \otimes v \in \Omega^+(v))$

(II.6) Generalization: Lopologies

Grothendieck lopologies (examples, results, applications): Ana Luiza Tenório

(II.6) Generalization: Lopologies

Grothendieck lopologies (examples, results, applications): Ana Luiza Tenório

A **Grothendieck prelopology** on a *small monoidal semicartesian category* $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ with finite limits (or just terminal 1 and equalizers) is a certain family $Cov = (Cov(u))_{u \in Obj(\mathcal{C})}$, where each member of $Cov(u)$ is a family of \mathcal{C} -arrows with codomain u .

The pseudo-pullback

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a semicartesian monoidal category with equalizers.

The pseudo-pullback

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a semicartesian monoidal category with equalizers. The **pseudo-pullback** of morphism $f : A \rightarrow C$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ is

the equalizer of the parallel arrows $A \otimes B \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{f \circ \pi_1} \\ \xrightarrow{g \circ \pi_2} \end{matrix} C$ where $\pi_1 = \rho_A \circ (id_A \otimes !_B)$ and $\pi_2 = \lambda_B \circ (!_A \otimes id_B)$.

The diagram illustrates the pseudo-pullback construction. At the top left is the object $A_f \otimes_g B$. Three arrows originate from it: e points to $A \otimes B$, p_1 points to A , and p_2 points to B . From $A \otimes B$, an arrow π_2 points to B , and an arrow π_1 points to A . From A , an arrow f points to C . From B , an arrow g points to C . The diagram shows that the composition $f \circ \pi_1$ is equal to $g \circ \pi_2$, as indicated by the equalizer symbol \rightrightarrows between the two paths to C .

Grothendieck prelopology

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ be a semicartesian monoidal category with equalizers. A **Grothendieck prelopology** on \mathcal{C} associates to each object U of \mathcal{C} a set $L(U)$ of families of morphisms $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I}$ such that:

(1) The singleton family $\{U' \xrightarrow{f} U\}$, formed by an isomorphism $f : U' \xrightarrow{\cong} U$, is in $L(U)$;

(2) If $\{U_i \xrightarrow{f_i} U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(U)$ and $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{g_{ij}} U_i\}_{j \in J_i}$ is in $L(U_i)$ for all $i \in I$, then $\{V_{ij} \xrightarrow{f_i \circ g_{ij}} U\}_{i \in I, j \in J_i}$ is in $L(U)$;

(3) If $\{f_i : U_i \rightarrow U\}_{i \in I} \in L(U)$, then

$\{f_i \otimes id_V : U_i \otimes V \rightarrow U \otimes V\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(U \otimes V)$ and

$\{id_V \otimes f_i : V \otimes U_i \rightarrow V \otimes U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(V \otimes U)$, for any V object in \mathcal{C}

(II.6) Generalization: Lopologies

(4) If $\{U_i \xrightarrow{f_i} U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(U)$ and $g : V \rightarrow U$ is any morphism in \mathcal{C} , then $\{\phi_i : U_i \otimes_{f_i} V \rightarrow U \otimes_{id_U} V\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(U \otimes_{id_U} V)$ and $\{\phi_i : V \otimes_{f_i} U \rightarrow V \otimes_{id_U} U\}_{i \in I}$ is in $L(V \otimes_{id_U} U)$.

For each $i \in I$, the arrow $\phi_i : U_i \otimes_{f_i} V \rightarrow U \otimes_{id_U} V$ is unique because of the universal property of the equalizer:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 U_i \otimes_{f_i} V & \xrightarrow{e_i} & U_i \otimes V & \xrightarrow{\pi_1^i} & U_i \\
 \downarrow \phi_i & & \downarrow f_i \otimes id_V & & \downarrow f_i \\
 U \otimes_{id_U} V & \xrightarrow{e} & U \otimes V & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & U \\
 & & \searrow \pi_2 & & \nearrow g \\
 & & & V &
 \end{array}$$

(II.6) Generalization: Lopologies

Example

If Q is a semicartesian quantale, then "sup-covering" is a Grothendieck pretopology in Q .

(II.6) Generalization: Lopologies

Example

If Q is a semicartesian quantale, then "sup-covering" is a Grothendieck prelopology in Q .

Proposition

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \times, 1)$ is a cartesian category with equalizers, then are equivalent:

- L is a Grothendieck **prelopology** in \mathcal{C} ;
- L is a Grothendieck **pretopology** in \mathcal{C} .

(II.6) Generalization: Lopotologies

Example

If Q is a semicartesian quantale, then "sup-covering" is a Grothendieck pretopology in Q .

Proposition

Let $(\mathcal{C}, \times, 1)$ is a cartesian category with equalizers, then are equivalent:

- L is a Grothendieck **pretopology** in \mathcal{C} ;
- L is a Grothendieck **pretopology** in \mathcal{C} .

Fact

A product of pretopologies is a pretopology in the product category.

(II.7) Grothendieck Lopus

- $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ is a sheaf w.r.t. the pretopology L iff for any $u \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and any covering $\{f_i : u_i \rightarrow u\}_{i \in I} \in L(u)$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{(F(f_i))_i} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \otimes_u u_j)$$

(II.7) Grothendieck Lopus

- $F : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ is a sheaf w.r.t. the pretopology L iff for any $u \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ and any covering $\{f_i : u_i \rightarrow u\}_{i \in I} \in L(u)$, we have an equalizer

$$F(u) \xrightarrow{(F(f_i))_i} \prod_{i \in I} F(u_i) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_l} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{proj}_r} \end{array} \prod_{i,j \in I} F(u_i \otimes_u u_j)$$

- A category \mathcal{E} is a **Grothendieck lopus** iff $\mathcal{E} \simeq \text{Sh}((\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1), L)$, for some small semicartesian category $(\mathcal{C}, \otimes, 1)$ endowed with a Grothendieck pretopology.

(II.7) Grothendieck Lopus

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

- (i) is locally small;
- (ii) is complete;
- (iii) is cocomplete;

(II.7) Grothendieck Lops

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

(i) is locally small;

(ii) is complete;

(iii) is cocomplete;

(iv) $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(\mathcal{C})$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves

1 ; $a \dashv i$

(v) is an accessible category

(II.7) Grothendieck Lpos

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

(i) is locally small;

(ii) is complete;

(iii) is cocomplete;

(iv) $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(\mathcal{C})$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves

1 ; $a \dashv i$

(v) is an accessible category

(v) is a monoidal semicartesian category

$F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;

(II.7) Grothendieck Lpos

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

(i) is locally small;

(ii) is complete;

(iii) is cocomplete;

(iv) $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(\mathcal{C})$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves

1 ; $a \dashv i$

(v) is an accessible category

(v) is a monoidal semicartesian category

$F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;

(II.7) Grothendieck Lpos

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

(i) is locally small;

(ii) is complete;

(iii) is cocomplete;

(iv) $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(\mathcal{C})$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves 1; $a \dashv i$

(v) is an accessible category

(v) is a monoidal semicartesian category

$F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;

Remark: A sufficient condition that guarantees that $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is closed monoidal category is: for all U , $F(U \otimes -)$ is a sheaf whenever F is.

(II.7) Grothendieck Lpos

$Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is a category such that:

(i) is locally small;

(ii) is complete;

(iii) is cocomplete;

(iv) $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L) \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{a} \end{matrix} pSh(\mathcal{C})$ is such that: i is full inclusion; a preserves 1; $a \dashv i$

(v) is an accessible category

(v) is a monoidal semicartesian category

$F \otimes G := a(i(F) \otimes_{Day} i(G))$;

Remark: A sufficient condition that guarantees that $Sh(\mathcal{C}, L)$ is closed monoidal category is: for all U , $F(U \otimes -)$ is a sheaf whenever F is. This condition is satisfied whenever:

(a) \mathcal{C} is a quantale, or

(b) $U \otimes -$ preserves equalizers, or

(c) K is a strong lopology in \mathcal{C} (i.e., holds another technical axiom)

(II.7) Grothendieck Lopus

Another possible approach to Grothendieck lopus:

A category \mathcal{E} is a **Grothendieck lopus** if and only if \mathcal{E} has a small set of generators and $Y : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \text{Set}^{\mathcal{E}^{op}}$ has a left adjoint monoidal functor that preserves pseudo-pullback.

(II.8) Future works

- Grothendieck lpos: categorical axiomatization?

(II.8) Future works

- Grothendieck lpos: categorical axiomatization?
- Elementary lpos: categorical axiomatization?

(II.8) Future works

- Grothendieck lpos: categorical axiomatization?
- Elementary lpos: categorical axiomatization?
- Elementary lpos? Possible presentation by categorical logic: "monoidal/linear tripos" ...

(II.8) Future works

- Grothendieck lopus: categorical axiomatization?
- Elementary lopus: categorical axiomatization?
- Elementary lopus? Possible presentation by categorical logic: "monoidal/linear tripos" ...
- Establish relationships with the work of Isar Stubbe on enriched categories over quantaloids

Main references:

- [1] Ana Luiza Tenório, Caio de Andrade Mendes, Hugo Luiz Mariano, *On sheaves on semicartesian quantales and their truth values*, to appear in Journal of Logic and Computation
<https://doi.org/10.1093/logcom/exad081>.
- [2] Ana Luiza Tenório, Hugo Luiz Mariano, *Grothendieck prelopologies: towards a closed monoidal sheaf category*, arxiv preprint 2024, arXiv:2404.12313.
- [3] José Goudet Alvim, Caio de Andrade Mendes, Hugo Luiz Mariano, *Quantale valued sets: Categorical Constructions and Properties*, to appear in Studia Logica.
- [4] José Goudet Alvim, Caio de Andrade Mendes, Hugo Luiz Mariano, *Q-Sets and Friends: Regarding Singleton and Gluing Completeness*, arxiv preprint 2023, arXiv:2302.03691
- [5] David Reyes Gaona, *Internal and external aspects of continuous logic and categorical logic for sheaves over quantales*, Master's dissertation, UNAL-Colombia, 2023.

Thank you very much!!!