



Introduction to Category Theory — Paige Randall North

Lecture 2 - July 1, 2025

1 Terminal Objects

Definition 1.1 (Terminal object). An object T in a category $\mathcal{C}$ is a valid terminal if for every object $Z \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$, there is exactly one map $Z \xrightarrow{!} T$.

Example 1.1. Consider the following example categories, as well as their terminal objects (or lack thereof).

1. *Set*:

The terminal object of the category *Set* is the singleton set $\{*\}$. For any set Z , we have exactly one function from Z to $\{*\}$:

$$!_Z := \lambda z. * \quad : \quad Z \longrightarrow \{*\}$$

2. *Ty*:

The terminal object of the category *Ty* is the unit type `unit`. For any type Z , we have exactly one function from Z to `unit`:

$$!_Z := \lambda z. \texttt{tt} \quad : \quad Z \longrightarrow \texttt{unit}$$

3. *Prop*:

The terminal object of the category *Prop* is the true proposition `True`. For any proposition P , we immediately have that it implies `True`. Additionally, we have only one such map by definition.

4. The category $\mathcal{C}$ with a single object A :

The terminal object of the category is A , with the identity function as the only morphism to A .

$$!_A := \text{id}_A \quad : \quad A \longrightarrow A$$

5. The category $\mathcal{C}$ with two objects A, B and no maps (beyond the identity maps):

This category does not have any terminal objects (there is no map from A to B or from B to A).

6. The category $\mathcal{C}$ with two objects A, B and the map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$:

This terminal object of this category is B . We have the following unique maps:

$$\begin{aligned} !_A &:= f & : & A \longrightarrow B \\ !_B &:= \text{id}_A & : & B \longrightarrow B \end{aligned}$$

2 Isomorphisms

In category theory, we typically do not consider equality between objects, but talk about equivalence up to isomorphism.

Definition 2.1 (Isomorphism). A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism if there exists another map $g : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $g \circ f = \text{id}_X$ and $f \circ g = \text{id}_Y$. If such a map exists, we say that X and Y are isomorphic.

Notation 2.1 (Isomorphism). We write $X \cong Y$ to mean there exists an isomorphism between X and Y , $f : X \cong Y$ to mean f is an isomorphism, and f^{-1} to be the inverse of f .

Isomorphisms can also be represented with commuting diagrams:

$$A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xleftarrow{f^{-1}} \end{array} B$$

In $\mathcal{Set}$, isomorphisms are bijections between sets. In $\mathcal{Prop}$, isomorphisms are bi-implications between formulae.

Exercise 2.1. If f is an isomorphism, then f^{-1} is unique.

Hint: Use the definition, assume two inverse options g and h , show they must be equal.

Lemma 2.1. If $f : X \cong Y$, then for any $Z \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$, we have the following.

1. $f_* : \text{hom}(Z, X) \cong \text{hom}(Z, Y)$
2. $f^* : \text{hom}(X, Z) \cong \text{hom}(Y, Z)$

This justifies thinking about sets (objects) up to bijection because we cannot distinguish between isomorphic objects.

Proof sketch. Define f_* by $(Z \xrightarrow{g} X) \mapsto (Z \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{f} Y)$, or $f_*(g) = f \circ g$. We show this with a diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z & \xrightarrow{g} & X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & f_*(g) & & \end{array}$$

We also define f_*^{-1} by $(Z \xrightarrow{h} Y) \mapsto (Z \xrightarrow{h} Y \xrightarrow{f^{-1}} X)$. Diagrammatically:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z & \xrightarrow{h} & Y & \xrightarrow{f^{-1}} & X \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & f_*^{-1}(h) & & \end{array}$$

Do case analysis on composition of f_* and f_*^{-1} to see that the f_* terms cancel out. $\square$

Lemma 2.2 (Uniqueness of terminal objects). Terminal objects are unique up to unique isomorphism.

Proof. Consider two terminal objects $T, T' \in \mathbf{ob} \mathcal{C}$. Since T' is terminal, there exists a unique map $T \xrightarrow{!} T'$, similarly there exists a unique map $T' \xrightarrow{!'} Z$. Now the composition $! \circ !'$ given by $T \xrightarrow{!} T' \xrightarrow{!'} T$ must be equal to id_T by the requirements of T being terminal and the existence of id_T . The same reasoning applies to justify $! \circ !' = \text{id}_{T'}$. $\square$

3 Duality

Definition 3.1 (Opposite category). Given a category $\mathcal{C}$, define $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$ to be the opposite category of $\mathcal{C}$, by setting

1. $\mathbf{ob} \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} := \mathbf{ob} \mathcal{C}$
2. $\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}}(X, Y) := \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(Y, X)$

Exercise 3.1. Check rigorously that $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$ is a category.

Exercise 3.2. Check rigorously that given $f : X \cong Y$ in a category $\mathcal{C}$, then $X \cong Y$ in $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$.

Example 3.1. In $\mathcal{Set}^{\text{op}}$, objects are still sets and for any two sets $X, Y \in \mathbf{ob} \mathcal{Set}$, a map $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ exists for a function $Y \xrightarrow{f} X$ in $\mathcal{Set}$. i.e. we have $\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{Set}^{\text{op}}}(X, Y) := \{f : Y \rightarrow X \mid f \text{ is a function}\}$.

4 Initial Objects

In Category theory, many constructions have dual constructions in the opposite category. Initial objects are an example; they can be defined in terms of terminal objects and duality.

Definition 4.1 (Initial object). An initial object in a category $\mathcal{C}$ is a terminal object in the opposite category $\mathcal{C}^{\text{op}}$.

The uniqueness of initial objects then follows from Lemma 2.2 (uniqueness of terminal objects). However, we can also define initial objects in their own right.

Definition 4.2 (Initial object). An object I in a category $\mathcal{C}$ is an initial object if for every object $Z \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C}$, there is exactly one map $I \xrightarrow{i} Z$.

It is easy to show that these two definitions are equivalent.

In $\mathcal{Set}$, the initial object is the empty set, because there exists exactly one function from the empty set to any other set: the empty function.

In $\mathcal{Ty}$, the initial object is the empty type, $\perp$, for a similar reason to $\mathcal{Set}$.

In $\mathcal{Prop}$, the initial object is $\perp$, because it implies any other formula.