

# Yoneda Lemma Notes

Sebastian Conybeare

February 28, 2016

## 1 Warm-Up: Cayley's Theorem

Before talking about the Yoneda Lemma, we have to talk about Cayley's Theorem, which we can't do without talking about groups.

### 1.1 Groups

**Definition 1.1.1.** A group  $(G, \cdot, e)$  consists of a set  $G$ , together with a binary operation  $\cdot : G \times G \rightarrow G$  and an element  $e \in G$  satisfying the following properties:

- For all  $x, y, z \in G$ ,  $x(yz) = (xy)z$ .
- For all  $x \in G$ ,  $ex = xe = x$ .
- For each  $x \in G$ , there exists  $y \in G$  so that  $xy = yx = e$ .

when the operation is clear from context, we refer to  $(G, \cdot, e)$  as simply  $G$ .

**Example 1.1.2.** The group  $GL(n)$  of invertible  $n \times n$  matrices is a group under matrix multiplication.

**Example 1.1.3.**  $GL(n)$  has a subgroup  $SO(n)$  which consists of those matrices which also have determinant 1.

**Example 1.1.4.** For any set  $X$ , the set  $S(X)$  of bijections  $X \rightarrow X$  is a group under composition.

**Example 1.1.5.** The **free group on two generators**,  $F_2$ , is the set of reduced strings over the alphabet  $\{a, a^{-1}, b, b^{-1}\}$ , where a string  $w$  is **reduced** if no two adjacent symbols of  $w$  are inverses. The group operation is given by concatenation, followed by iterated removal of forbidden substrings.

**Exercise 1.1.6.** *Prove that each of the above examples satisfies the group axioms.*

## 1.2 The Category of Groups

**Definition 1.2.1.** Let  $G$  and  $H$  be groups. A function  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  is a homomorphism if  $\phi(x)\phi(y) = \phi(xy)$  for all  $x, y \in G$ .

**Exercise 1.2.2.** Let  $\mathbf{GRP}$  be the class of all groups. Prove that taking  $\mathbf{GRP}(G, H)$  to be the set of homomorphisms from  $G$  to  $H$  defines a category with composition given by function composition, which we will call the category of groups. Prove that a morphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  is an isomorphism iff the underlying function of sets is a bijection. (**Hint: show that the function  $\phi^{-1}$  is a homomorphism.**)

## 1.3 Cayley's Theorem

Most of the examples were given as a set of symmetries, in a sense made precise by the following definition:

**Definition 1.3.1.** A permutation group  $P$  is a group which is isomorphic to a subgroup of  $S(X)$  for some set  $X$ .

**Remark 1.3.2.** The examples of groups that we discussed were mostly of the form “the set of bijections  $X \rightarrow X$  which satisfy property  $P$ ,” and so are permutation groups. However,  $F_2$  may appear to buck this trend; it is not immediately obvious that  $F_2$  is a permutation group.

**Theorem 1.3.3** (Cayley's Theorem). *Let  $G$  be a group. Then  $G$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of  $S(G)$ . In particular,  $G$  is a permutation group.*

*Proof.* Let  $H = \{f \in S(G) \mid \exists g \in G. \forall x \in G. f(x) = gx\}$ . We define  $\phi : G \rightarrow H$  by  $\phi(g)(x) = gx$ .  $\phi$  is obviously surjective, and is injective since  $\phi(g)(e) = ge = g$  for all  $g \in G$ . Finally,  $\phi$  is an isomorphism, since if  $g, g' \in G$ , then  $(\phi(g) \circ \phi(g'))(x) = \phi(g)(g'x) = gg'x = \phi(gg')(x)$ , and in particular,  $\phi(gg') = \phi(g) \circ \phi(g')$ .  $\square$

The upshot here is that every group, even  $F_2$ , is a symmetry group of **something**. The most noticeable consequence of Cayley's Theorem is that group theorists don't bother to distinguish symmetry groups from general groups; they just call them all, well, groups!

## 2 The Yoneda Lemma

### 2.1 Functors and Equivalences

**Definition 2.1.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be categories, and let  $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be a functor. We say that  $F$  is **full** if the induced function  $f^* : \mathcal{C}(X, Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(FX, FY)$  is always surjective, and we call  $F$  **faithful** if  $f^*$  is always injective. If  $F$  is both full and faithful, we say that  $F$  is **fully faithful**, or a **fully faithful embedding** when we want to think of  $\mathcal{C}$  as a subcategory of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**Definition 2.1.2.** A full subcategory  $\mathcal{C}'$  of a category  $\mathcal{C}$  is a subcategory such that the inclusion  $i : \mathcal{C}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is a full functor.

**Exercise 2.1.3.** Prove that the inclusion of a subcategory is always a faithful functor.

**Definition 2.1.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be categories. A functor  $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is **essentially surjective** if it is surjective on isomorphism classes of objects. Explicitly,  $F$  is essentially surjective if for every object  $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ , there exists an isomorphism  $\phi : F(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} Y$  for some object  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ . We say that  $F$  is a **weak equivalence of categories**, or just an equivalence if  $F$  is fully faithful and essentially surjective.

**Exercise 2.1.5.** Let  $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be a fully faithful functor. Prove that there is a full subcategory  $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  and an equivalence  $\tilde{F} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}'$  so that  $F \cong i \circ \tilde{F}$ , where  $i : \mathcal{D}' \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is the inclusion functor.

Consider a full subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathbf{SET}$  which contains the terminal object  $1 = \{*\}$ . The functor  $h^1 = \mathcal{C}(1, -) : \mathbf{SET} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$  is then naturally isomorphic to the inclusion functor  $i : \mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{SET}$ , by the transformation  $\alpha : h^1 \Rightarrow i$  given by  $\alpha_X(f) = f(*)$ .

**Exercise 2.1.6.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{C}'$  is a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ , and that the terminal object  $1 \in \mathcal{C}$  is also in  $\mathcal{C}'$ . Prove that  $1$  is a terminal object of  $\mathcal{C}'$ .

Now let's stop and think about how nice this situation is. Suppose I give you a category  $\mathcal{D}$ , and I tell you that  $\mathcal{D}$  is equivalent to a full subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathbf{SET}$  which contains the terminal object, but I don't tell you which subcategory it is, or what the inclusion functor is. Then you can recover the inclusion functor up to a unique natural isomorphism by taking the hom-functor  $h^1$ , where  $1$  is the terminal object of  $\mathcal{D}$ . In particular, given an object  $X \in \mathcal{D}$ , you can figure out which set  $X$  is! Given an arbitrary category  $\mathcal{C}$ , even if there is a terminal object  $1 \in \mathcal{C}$ , we've no right to expect that  $\mathcal{C}$  be equivalent to a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{SET}$ .

**Exercise 2.1.7.** Let  $\mathcal{FD}$  be the small category whose set of objects  $\{\mathbb{R}^n \mid 0 \leq n\}$  consists of one vector space of each finite dimension, and whose morphisms  $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  are given by linear transformations, composed normally. Prove that  $1 = \mathbb{R}^0$  is a terminal object, and that  $h^1 : \mathcal{FD} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$  is not faithful. Conclude that  $\mathcal{FD}$  is not equivalent to any full subcategory of  $\mathbf{SET}$  which contains the terminal object of  $\mathbf{SET}$ .

**Exercise 2.1.8.** Suppose that  $i : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$  is fully faithful, and that  $X$  and  $Y$  are objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  with two distinct morphisms  $f \neq g : X \rightarrow Y$ . Prove that any terminal object  $C$  must be mapped to a terminal object of  $\mathbf{SET}$  under  $i$ . Conclude that  $\mathcal{FD}$  is not equivalent to a full subcategory of  $\mathbf{SET}$ .

**Exercise 2.1.9.** Let  $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be a fully faithful functor, and let  $F(g) \in \mathcal{D}(F(A), F(B))$  be an isomorphism. Prove that  $g$  is an isomorphism.

**Exercise 2.1.10.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be categories, let  $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be functors, and  $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$  a natural transformation. Further suppose that  $\alpha_X$  is an isomorphism for each  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ . Prove that  $\alpha$  is an isomorphism in the category  $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}]$  of functors from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathcal{D}$ . (**Hint:** Once you figure out what you're trying to prove, the answer is immediate)

## 2.2 Presheaves

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a locally small category. Then for each object  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , there is a representable contravariant functor  $h_A = \mathcal{C}(-, A) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$ .  $h_A$  acts on morphisms by sending each arrow  $g : X \rightarrow Y$  to the function  $h_A(g) = (- \circ g) : \mathcal{C}(Y, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X, A)$ . Now suppose that  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is a morphism in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $f$  induces a natural transformation  $h_f : h_A \Rightarrow h_B$ . For each object  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $(h_f)_X : \mathcal{C}(X, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X, B)$  is defined by  $(h_f)_X(t) = f \circ t$ . Checking naturality amounts to checking that for any  $g : X \rightarrow Y$ , the diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}(Y, A) & \xrightarrow{h_A(g) = (- \circ g)} & \mathcal{C}(X, A) \\ (h_f)_Y = (f \circ -) \downarrow & & \downarrow (h_f)_X = (f \circ -) \\ \mathcal{C}(Y, B) & \xrightarrow{h_B(g) = (- \circ g)} & \mathcal{C}(X, B) \end{array}$$

or in other words, that for each map  $m \in \mathcal{C}(Y, A)$ ,  $(f \circ m) \circ g = f \circ (m \circ g)$ . Furthermore, given  $f : A \rightarrow B$  and  $g : B \rightarrow C$ ,  $h_g \circ f = h_{g \circ f}$ , since precomposing a map with  $f \circ g$  is the same as precomposing it with  $g$  and then precomposing the result with  $f$ . Finally,  $h_{\text{Id}} = \text{Id}$ , since composing with the identity gives you back what you started with.

**Definition 2.2.1.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category. A **presheaf** on  $\mathcal{C}$  is a contravariant functor from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathbf{SET}$ . If  $F$  and  $G$  are presheaves on  $\mathcal{C}$ , a morphism  $F \rightarrow G$  of presheaves is a natural transformation. We denote the category of presheaves on  $\mathcal{C}$  as  $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ .

**Remark 2.2.2.** The previous discussion amounts to  $h_{(-)}$  being a (covariant) functor from  $\mathcal{C}$  to the category  $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  of **presheaves** on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

## 2.3 The Yoneda Lemma

**Theorem 2.3.1** (The Yoneda Lemma). *Let  $F$  be a presheaf on  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then there is bijection  $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})(h_X, F) \cong F(X)$  which is natural in  $X$ .*

**Exercise 2.3.2** (The Yoneda Embedding). *Assume the Yoneda lemma, and prove that the functor  $h_{(-)} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  is a fully faithful embedding.*

**Remark 2.3.3.** In light of ?THM? ??, we can now justify the choice to define  $\mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  as the category of *contravariant* functors from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\mathbf{SET}$ . We really care about the Yoneda embedding  $h_{(-)}$ , which allows us to freely interchange between objects of  $X \in \mathcal{C}$  and representable presheaves  $h_X \in \mathbf{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ . Indeed, we began with a bifunctor  $\mathcal{C}(-, -) : \mathcal{C}^{op} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$ . We can give an alternate description of  $h_{(-)}$  as the currying of  $\mathcal{C}(-, -)$  into the form  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}^{op}, \mathbf{SET})$ .

**Exercise 2.3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category, and define  $\mathbf{coPSh}(\mathcal{C})$  as the category of **covariant** functors  $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{SET}$ . Assuming ?THM? ??, show that there is a fully faithful embedding  $h^{(-)} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{coPSh}(\mathcal{C})$ . Then, assuming the Yoneda lemma, prove that for any copresheaf  $F \in \mathbf{coPSh}(\mathcal{C})$ , there is a bijection  $\mathbf{coPSh}(\mathcal{C})(h^X, F) \cong F(X)$  which is natural in  $X$ .*

**Corollary 2.3.5.** *Suppose that  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ , and that  $\alpha : h_A \Rightarrow h_B$  is a natural isomorphism. Then there is a unique isomorphism  $\tilde{\alpha} : A \rightarrow B$  so that  $h_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* The result follows immediately from the Yoneda lemma and ?THM? ?? □

**Exercise 2.3.6.** *Prove that the collection of representables is a separating family of  $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$*

**Example 2.3.7.** Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{V \rightrightarrows E\}$  be the category with two distinct non-identity morphisms  $s, t : V \rightarrow E$ . Then a presheaf  $F \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  amounts to sets  $F(E), F(V)$  with source and target maps  $s, t : F(E) \rightarrow F(V)$ , or in other words, a directed reflexive multi-graph. A graph homomorphism  $\phi : F \rightarrow G$  consists of maps  $\phi_E : F(E) \rightarrow G(E)$  and  $\phi_V : F(V) \rightarrow G(V)$  which commutes with the source and target maps. The representable presheaf  $h_V$  consists of a single vertex  $\text{Id}_V$  and no edges, and its source and target maps are thus trivial. The representable  $h_E$  consists of a single edge  $\text{Id}_E$  and two distinct vertices  $s, t \in h_E(V) = \mathcal{C}(V, E)$ . In other words,  $h_V$  is the graph with one vertex, and  $h_E$  is the graph with a single edge and distinct endpoints.

Let  $G \in \text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  be a graph. We will try to understand the maps from representables into  $G$ . A graph homomorphism from  $h_V$  to  $G$  amounts to a mapping of vertices and edges which preserves source and target relations. If the Yoneda lemma is true, we should expect these to correspond to vertices of  $G$ . Indeed, there are no edges in  $h_V$ , and thus no source or target relations to preserve, so everything comes free besides the map of vertices. There's only one vertex in  $V$ , so that map is just given by an element of  $G(V)$ , as expected.

Now we direct our attention toward morphisms  $\alpha : h_E \rightarrow G$ . Such a morphism is determined by maps

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_E : h_E(E) &\rightarrow G(E) \\ \alpha_V : h_E(V) &\rightarrow G(V)\end{aligned}$$

and must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_E(s(e)) &= s(\alpha_V(e)) \\ \alpha_E(t(e)) &= t(\alpha_V(e))\end{aligned}$$

for each edge  $e \in h_E(E)$ . But  $h_E$  only has one edge, so our choice of morphism is reduced to picking an edge  $e' \in G(E)$ , along with the function  $\alpha_V : h_E(V) = \{s, t\} \rightarrow G(V)$ . But the constraints above can then be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_E(s) &= s(e') \\ \alpha_E(t) &= t(e')\end{aligned}$$

which looks an awful lot like a *definition* of  $\alpha_V$ . Thus, the natural transformations from  $h_E$  to  $G$  are in bijection with  $G(E)$ .

## 2.4 Limits, Revisited

We will defer the proof of the Yoneda lemma to section ???. First, we will attempt to understand limits in a locally small category  $\mathcal{C}$  via presheaves on  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Let  $D$  be a small category. We define  $\text{pt} : D^{op} \rightarrow \text{SET}$  as the functor which sends every object of  $D$  to  $1 = \{*\}$ , and every morphism to the unique function  $1 \rightarrow 1$ .

**Exercise 2.4.1.** *Prove that  $\text{pt}$  is the terminal object of  $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ .*

**Theorem 2.4.2.** *Let  $J$  be a small category, and  $D \in \text{PSh}(J)$  a  $J^{op}$ -shaped diagram of sets. Then the limit  $\lim D$  can be identified with the set  $\text{PSh}(J)(\text{pt}, D)$  of natural transformations from  $\text{pt}$  to  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that the limit of  $D$  can be identified with the subset of  $\prod_{j \in J} D(j)$  given by

$$\lim D = \left\{ (x_j)_{j \in J} \in \prod_{j \in J} D(j) \mid \forall j, j' \in J, g \in J(j, j'), D(j)(x_{j'}) = x_j \right\}$$

which is a set since  $J$  is small. On the other hand, natural transformations from  $\text{pt}$  to  $D$  are given by those indexed collections

$$(\eta_j)_{j \in J} \in \prod_{j \in J} \{\text{pt}(j) \rightarrow D(j)\} \cong \prod_{j \in J} D(j)$$

which satisfy

$$\eta_j \circ \text{pt}(g) = D(g) \circ \eta_{j'}$$

for all  $j, j' \in J, g \in J(j, j')$ . But that's exactly what we wrote for  $\lim D$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.3.** In light of this theorem, we can plainly see that the operation which sends a presheaf on  $D$  to its limit is just the functor  $h^{\text{pt}} : \text{PSh}(D) \rightarrow \text{SET}$ . In particular,  $D \mapsto \lim D$  can naturally be made into a covariant functor.

**Exercise 2.4.4** (Limits of Diagrams are Pointwise). *[?, Proposition 8.8] Let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be (possibly large) categories. If  $\mathcal{D}$  is complete, then so is the functor category  $[\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}]$ , and for every object  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ , the evaluation functor  $\text{ev}_X : [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}] \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  is continuous.*

**Definition 2.4.5.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a locally small category,  $J$  a small category, and  $D : J^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  a  $J^{op}$ -shaped diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ . We define the **presheaf-valued limit**,  $\widehat{\lim} D$  as the limit of the diagram  $h_D(-) : J^{op} \rightarrow \text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$ .

**Remark 2.4.6.** The definition of  $\widehat{\lim} D$  is such that morphisms from  $h_X$  to  $D$ , which are the same as elements of  $D(X)$ , are just cones from  $X$  to  $D$ . In other words, if  $D$  really does have a limit  $L$ , then morphisms from  $h_X$  to  $F$  are just cones from  $X$  to  $F$ , which are themselves just morphisms from  $X$  to  $L$ .

**Definition 2.4.7** (Improved Definition of Limits). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a locally small category, and let  $D : J \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . We then define a limit of  $D$  as an object  $L \in \mathcal{C}$ , together with an isomorphism  $h_L \cong \widehat{\lim} D$ . In other words, the limit of  $D$  is the representing object of  $\widehat{\lim} D$ .

**Exercise 2.4.8.** Prove that ?THM? ?? is equivalent to the standard definition. Conclude that the Yoneda embedding is continuous functor.

**Remark 2.4.9.** Remember that our goal was to understand limits in an arbitrary (locally small) category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Unfortunately, a category  $\mathcal{C}$  need not have small limits. However, by ?THM? ??, that  $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})$  has all limits. Furthermore, by ?THM? ??, if  $D : J^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  happens to have a limit  $L$ , there will be a unique isomorphism  $L \cong \widehat{\lim} D$  which preserves the limit structure.

## 2.5 Proof of The Yoneda Lemma

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a locally small category, let  $F$  be a presheaf on  $\mathcal{C}$ , and  $X$  an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We will define a family of maps  $\alpha_X : \text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})(h_X, F) \rightarrow F(X)$ , and then show that they make up a natural isomorphism.

First, observe that  $\text{PSh}(\mathcal{C})(h_X, F) = h_F(h_X)$  as functors in  $X$ . For any morphism of presheaves  $\beta : h_X \rightarrow F$ , let  $\alpha_X(\beta) = \beta_X(\text{Id}_X)$ . To show that  $\alpha_X$  is natural in  $X$ , we want to show that for any  $g : X \rightarrow Y$ , the following diagram commutes,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} h_F(h_Y) & \xrightarrow{h_F(h_g)} & h_F(h_X) \\ \alpha_Y \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_X \\ F(Y) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(X) \end{array}$$

which is to say that for any  $\beta \in h_F(h_Y)$  (equivalently,  $\beta : h_Y \rightarrow F$ ), we want to show that  $F(g)(\alpha_Y(\beta)) = \alpha_X(\beta \circ h_g)$ . Now, applying the definition of  $\alpha$  gives us:

$$F(g)(\alpha_Y(\beta)) = F(g)(\beta_Y(\text{Id}_Y))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_X(\beta \circ h_g) &= (\beta \circ h_g)_X(\text{Id}_X) \\ &= \beta_X(g) \end{aligned}$$

from which point it suffices to show that  $F(g)(\beta_Y(\text{Id}_Y)) = \beta_X(g)$ , which immediately follows from the naturality of  $\beta$ .

All that remains is to show that  $\alpha_X$  is a bijection for each  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ . First we will show that  $\alpha_X$  is surjective. Let  $x \in F(x)$ . We wish to construct a morphism  $\eta : h_X \rightarrow F$  so that

$\alpha_X(\eta) = x$ . For  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ , we define  $\eta_Y : h_X(Y) \rightarrow F(Y)$  as  $\eta_Y(g) = F(g)(x)$ . We verify:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_X(\eta) &= \eta_X(\text{Id}_X) \\ &= F(\text{Id}_X)(x) \\ &= \text{Id}_{F(X)}(x) \\ &= x\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will check that  $\eta$  is a natural transformation. Indeed, if  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$  is a morphism of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then for any  $k \in h_X(Z)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_Y(h_X(g)(k)) &= \eta_Y(k \circ g) \\ &= F(k \circ g)(x) \\ &= F(g)(F(k)(x)) \\ &= F(g)(\eta_Z(k))\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we will check that  $\alpha_X$  is injective. Suppose that  $\beta, \gamma : h_X \rightarrow F$  are morphisms of presheaves, such that  $\alpha_X(\beta) = \alpha_X(\gamma)$ , or in other words:

$$\beta_X(\text{Id}_X) = \gamma_X(\text{Id}_X)$$

We want to show, for an arbitrary  $g : Y \rightarrow X$ , that  $\beta_Y(g) = \gamma_Y(g)$ . We have the following commutative diagrams due to the naturality of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} h_X X & \xrightarrow{h_X(g)} & h_X Y \\ \beta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta_Y \\ F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(Y) \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} h_X X & \xrightarrow{h_X(g)} & h_X Y \\ \gamma_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_Y \\ F(X) & \xrightarrow{F(g)} & F(Y) \end{array}$$

which allow us to compute

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_Y(g) &= \beta_Y(\text{Id}_X \circ g) \\ &= \beta_Y(h_X(g)(\text{Id}_X)) \\ &= F(g)(\beta_X(\text{Id}_X)) \\ &= F(g)(\gamma_X(\text{Id}_X)) \\ &= \gamma_Y(h_X(g)(\text{Id}_X)) \\ &= \gamma_Y(\text{Id}_X \circ g) \\ &= \gamma_Y(g)\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof that  $\alpha_X$  is an isomorphism. □

## References

- [1] Steve Awodey, *Basic Category Theory*, Oxford Logic Guides, second edition, 2010.