

# **Categories for the Curious**

**A Light Intro to Category Theory**

John Cavanaugh

2026-01-15

# Table of contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 Partially Ordered Sets</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 The “Divides” Relation . . . . .	5
2.2 Defining Posets . . . . .	6
2.3 Advanced Exercises . . . . .	7
<b>References</b>	<b>8</b>

# Preface

This site contains the course notes for an informal one-semester seminar on category theory at CSU East Bay.

# **1 Introduction**

# 2 Partially Ordered Sets

## 2.1 The “Divides” Relation

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $m$  and  $n$  be integers. We say  $m$  divides  $n$ , and we write  $m | n$  if there exists an integer  $q$  such that  $mq = n$ .

For example, 3 divides 6 since  $3 \cdot 2 = 6$ , and  $-5$  divides 15 since  $-5 \cdot 3 = 15$ .

**Exercise 2.1.** Show that for any integer  $a$  we have  $a | a$ .

Solution

We have  $a \cdot 1 = a$ , so  $a$  satisfies Definition 2.1 with 1 in place of  $q$ .

This is called *reflexivity*, and we say that  $|$  is *reflexive* because it satisfies this property.

Another important note about the “divides” relation is that to say “ $a$  divides  $b$ ” is not the same as saying “ $b/a$  is an integer.” The latter is a statement about the result of applying the division binary *operation* to  $a$  and  $b$ .<sup>1</sup> The number 0 is what primarily causes issues here: “0 divides 0” is true, since  $0 \cdot q = 0$  for any number  $q$ . Meanwhile,  $0/0$  is undefined.

This property is known as *antisymmetry*, and we say that  $|$  is an *antisymmetric* relation on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Exercise 2.2.** Show that if  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $c$  are integers, and  $a | b$  and  $b | c$ , then  $a | c$ .

Solution

If  $a | b$ , then there exists an integer  $k_1$  such that  $ak_1 = b$ . If  $b | c$ , then there exists an integer  $k_2$  such that  $bk_2 = c$ . Hence,  $a(k_1k_2) = (ak_1)k_2 = bk_2 = c$ . So  $a$  divides  $c$  with  $k_1k_2$  in place of  $q$  in Definition 2.1.

This property is called *transitivity*, and we say that  $|$  is a *transitive* relation on the integers.

---

<sup>1</sup>A binary operation on a set  $X$  is a mapping  $X \times X \rightarrow X$ . A relation is not a mapping; it is simply a statement (something that is either true or false).

For all that follows, we denote by  $\mathbb{N}$  the *natural numbers*, consisting of the non-negative integers  $0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Take special care that we are including zero in this set.<sup>2</sup> It will soon be apparent why we do this.

**Exercise 2.3.** Show that for natural numbers  $a$  and  $b$ , if  $a | b$  and  $b | a$ , then  $a = b$ .<sup>3</sup>

Solution

If  $a | b$ , then there exists a natural number  $k_1$  such that  $ak_1 = b$ . Similarly,  $b | a$  implies there exists a natural number  $k_2$  such that  $bk_2 = a$ . Hence,  $b = ak_1 = bk_1k_2$ . We may similarly show that  $a = k_1k_2a$ . The first equation tells us that  $b(1 - k_1k_2) = 0$ . Then either  $b = 0$  or  $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ .

If  $b = 0$ , then because  $ak_1 = b$  we have either  $a = 0$  (and thus  $a = b$ ), or we have  $k_1 = 0$ . This would imply that  $a = k_1k_2a = 0 \cdot k_2a = 0$ . So  $a = b = 0$ .

If  $b \neq 0$  (i.e.,  $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ ), then certainly  $a = 1 \cdot a = ak_1 = b$ . In either case,  $a = b$ .

**Exercise 2.4.** Give an example of a pair of integers for which  $a | b$  and  $b | a$ , yet  $a \neq b$ .

## 2.2 Defining Posets

Given a set  $X$  and a binary relation  $\preccurlyeq$  defined on  $X$ , we say that  $(X, \preccurlyeq)$  is a *partially ordered set* and that  $\preccurlyeq$  is a *partial order* on  $X$  if the relation  $\preccurlyeq$  is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive.

We will use  $\preccurlyeq$  to denote an arbitrary partial order. The set  $(\mathbb{N}, |)$  is a poset, since we verified that  $|$  is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric on  $\mathbb{N}$  in the previous section. On the other hand,  $(\mathbb{Z}, |)$  is not a poset, since  $|$  is not antisymmetric if we allow both positive and negative integers (see Exercise 2.4).

**Exercise 2.5.** Show that the following are posets:

1.  $(\mathbb{Z}, \leq)$ .
2. For an arbitrary set  $X$ ,  $(\mathcal{P}(X), \subseteq)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is the *power set* of  $X$ , the set of all of its subsets.
3.  $(\mathbb{C}, \preccurlyeq)$ , where  $a + bi \preccurlyeq c + di$  if and only if either  $a \leq c$ , or  $a = c$  while  $b \leq d$  (this is called the “lexicographic order” on the complex numbers).
4. Given a vector space  $V$ , the subspaces of  $V$  form a partially ordered set under the subspace relation.

---

<sup>2</sup>This differs from another convention that excludes zero, which we may be used to.

<sup>3</sup>If we allow  $a$  and  $b$  to be negative, then the most general statement we can make is that the magnitudes are equal.

## 2.3 Advanced Exercises

These assume prior knowledge and may be safely skipped.

**Exercise 2.6.** Show that the following are posets:

1. For an arbitrary group  $G$ , the pair  $(\mathcal{A}(G), \leq)$  is a partially ordered set, where  $\mathcal{A}(G)$  consists of the subgroups of  $G$  and  $\leq$  is the “subgroup” relation.
2. For a path-connected, locally path-connected, semilocally simply-connected topological space  $X$  with a distinguished basepoint  $x_0 \in X$ , the set of basepoint-preserving isomorphism classes of path-connected covering spaces  $p : (\tilde{X}, \tilde{x}_0 \rightarrow (X, x_0)$  is a poset under the relation:  $(\tilde{X}_1, \tilde{x}_1) \preccurlyeq (\tilde{X}_2, \tilde{x}_2)$  if and only if there exists a basepoint-preserving covering map  $f : \tilde{X}_2 \rightarrow \tilde{X}_1$  such that  $p_1 \circ f = p_2$  (this can be rephrased a bit less precisely by saying  $X_2$  is a covering of  $X_1$ ) (Hatcher 2002, 68).
3. Given a finite, Galois field extension  $E/F$ , there is a partial order on the intermediate fields  $F \subseteq K \subseteq E$  under the inclusion relation:  $K_1 \preccurlyeq K_2$  if and only if  $K_1 \subseteq K_2$ .

Solution

Every group is a subgroup of itself, so the subgroup relation is reflexive.

# References

Hatcher, Allen. 2002. *Algebraic Topology*. USA: Cambridge University Press. <https://pi.math.cornell.edu/~hatcher/AT/ATpage.html>.