

Category Theory to Yoneda's Lemma

Greg O'Keefe

March 17, 2025

This development proves Yoneda's lemma and aims to be readable by humans. It only defines what is needed for the lemma: categories, functors and natural transformations. Limits, adjunctions and other important concepts are not included.

There is no explanation or discussion in this document. See [O'K04] for this and a survey of category theory formalisations.

Contents

1 Categories	2
1.1 Definitions	2
1.2 Lemmas	2
2 Set is a Category	4
2.1 Definitions	4
2.2 Simple Rules and Lemmas	4
2.3 Set is a Category	6
3 Functors	10
3.1 Definitions	10
3.2 Simple Lemmas	11
3.3 Identity Functor	12
4 HomFunctors	14
5 Natural Transformations	18
6 Yoneda's Lemma	19
6.1 The Sandwich Natural Transformation	19
6.2 Sandwich Components are Bijective	23

1 Categories

```
theory Cat
imports HOL-Library.FuncSet
begin

  record ('o, 'a) category =
    ob :: 'o set (⟨Ob1⟩ 70)
    ar :: 'a set (⟨Ar1⟩ 70)
    dom :: 'a ⇒ 'o (⟨Dom1 → [81] 70)
    cod :: 'a ⇒ 'o (⟨Cod1 → [81] 70)
    id :: 'o ⇒ 'a (⟨Id1 → [81] 80)
    comp :: 'a ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a (infixl ⟨·₁⟩ 60)

  definition
    hom :: [('o, 'a, 'm) category-scheme, 'o, 'o] ⇒ 'a set
      (⟨Hom1 - -> [81, 81] 80) where
      hom CC A B = { f. f ∈ ar CC & dom CC f = A & cod CC f = B }
```

```
locale category =
  fixes CC (structure)
  assumes dom-object [intro]:
    f ∈ Ar ⇒ Dom f ∈ Ob
  and cod-object [intro]:
    f ∈ Ar ⇒ Cod f ∈ Ob
  and id-left [simp]:
    f ∈ Ar ⇒ Id (Cod f) ∙ f = f
  and id-right [simp]:
    f ∈ Ar ⇒ f ∙ Id (Dom f) = f
  and id-hom [intro]:
    A ∈ Ob ⇒ Id A ∈ Hom A A
  and comp-types [intro]:
    ⋀ A B C. (comp CC) : (Hom B C) → (Hom A B) → (Hom A C)
  and comp-associative [simp]:
    f ∈ Ar ⇒ g ∈ Ar ⇒ h ∈ Ar
    ⇒ Cod h = Dom g ⇒ Cod g = Dom f
    ⇒ f ∙ (g ∙ h) = (f ∙ g) ∙ h
```

1.2 Lemmas

```
lemma (in category) homI:
  assumes f ∈ Ar and Dom f = A and Cod f = B
  shows f ∈ Hom A B
  using assms by (auto simp add: hom-def)

lemma (in category) homE:
  assumes A ∈ Ob and B ∈ Ob and f ∈ Hom A B
  shows Dom f = A and Cod f = B
```

```

proof-
  show  $\text{Dom } f = A$  using assms by (simp add: hom-def)
  show  $\text{Cod } f = B$  using assms by (simp add: hom-def)
qed

lemma (in category) id-arrow [intro]:
  assumes  $A \in \text{Ob}$ 
  shows  $\text{Id } A \in \text{Ar}$ 
proof-
  from  $\langle A \in \text{Ob} \rangle$  have  $\text{Id } A \in \text{Hom } A A$  by (rule id-hom)
  thus  $\text{Id } A \in \text{Ar}$  by (simp add: hom-def)
qed

lemma (in category) id-dom-cod:
  assumes  $A \in \text{Ob}$ 
  shows  $\text{Dom } (\text{Id } A) = A$  and  $\text{Cod } (\text{Id } A) = A$ 
proof-
  from  $\langle A \in \text{Ob} \rangle$  have  $1: \text{Id } A \in \text{Hom } A A ..$ 
  then show  $\text{Dom } (\text{Id } A) = A$  and  $\text{Cod } (\text{Id } A) = A$ 
    by (simp-all add: hom-def)
qed

lemma (in category) compI [intro]:
  assumes  $f: f \in \text{Ar}$  and  $g: g \in \text{Ar}$  and  $\text{Cod } f = \text{Dom } g$ 
  shows  $g \cdot f \in \text{Ar}$ 
  and  $\text{Dom } (g \cdot f) = \text{Dom } f$ 
  and  $\text{Cod } (g \cdot f) = \text{Cod } g$ 
proof-
  have  $f \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Cod } f)$  using  $f$  by (simp add: hom-def)
  with  $\langle \text{Cod } f = \text{Dom } g \rangle$  have  $f\text{-homset}: f \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Dom } g)$  by simp
  have  $g\text{-homset}: g \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } g) (\text{Cod } g)$  using  $g$  by (simp add: hom-def)
  have  $(\cdot) : \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } g) (\text{Cod } g) \rightarrow \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Dom } g) \rightarrow \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Cod } g) ..$ 
  from this and  $g\text{-homset}$ 
  have  $(\cdot) g \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Dom } g) \rightarrow \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Cod } g)$ 
    by (rule funcset-mem)
  from this and  $f\text{-homset}$ 
  have  $gf\text{-homset}: g \cdot f \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Cod } g)$ 
    by (rule funcset-mem)
  thus  $g \cdot f \in \text{Ar}$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def)
  from  $gf\text{-homset}$  show  $\text{Dom } (g \cdot f) = \text{Dom } f$  and  $\text{Cod } (g \cdot f) = \text{Cod } g$ 
    by (simp-all add: hom-def)
qed

end

```

2 Set is a Category

```
theory SetCat
imports Cat
begin

2.1 Definitions

record 'c set-arrow =
  set-dom :: 'c set
  set-func :: 'c ⇒ 'c
  set-cod :: 'c set

definition
set-arrow :: ['c set, 'c set-arrow] ⇒ bool where
set-arrow U f ←→ set-dom f ⊆ U & set-cod f ⊆ U
  & (set-func f): (set-dom f) → (set-cod f)
  & set-func f ∈ extensional (set-dom f)

definition
set-id :: ['c set, 'c set] ⇒ 'c set-arrow where
set-id U = (λs∈Pow U. (set-dom=s, set-func=λx∈s. x, set-cod=s))

definition
set-comp :: ['c set-arrow, 'c set-arrow] ⇒ 'c set-arrow (infix ⟨ ⊛ ⟩ 70) where
set-comp g f =
(
  set-dom = set-dom f,
  set-func = compose (set-dom f) (set-func g) (set-func f),
  set-cod = set-cod g
)

definition
set-cat :: 'c set ⇒ ('c set, 'c set-arrow) category where
set-cat U =
(
  ob = Pow U,
  ar = {f. set-arrow U f},
  dom = set-dom,
  cod = set-cod,
  id = set-id U,
  comp = set-comp
)
```

2.2 Simple Rules and Lemmas

```
lemma set-objectI [intro]: A ⊆ U ⇒ A ∈ ob (set-cat U)
  by (simp add: set-cat-def)
```

```
lemma set-objectE [intro]: A ∈ ob (set-cat U) ⇒ A ⊆ U
```

```

by (simp add: set-cat-def)

lemma set-homI [intro]:
assumes A ⊆ U
and B ⊆ U
and f : A → B
and f ∈ extensional A
shows (set-dom=A, set-func=f, set-cod=B) ∈ hom (set-cat U) A B
using assms by (simp add: set-cat-def hom-def set-arrow-def)

lemma set-dom [simp]: dom (set-cat U) f = set-dom f
by (simp add: set-cat-def)

lemma set-cod [simp]: cod (set-cat U) f = set-cod f
by (simp add: set-cat-def)

lemma set-id [simp]: id (set-cat U) A = set-id U A
by (simp add: set-cat-def)

lemma set-comp [simp]: comp (set-cat U) g f = g ∘ f
by (simp add: set-cat-def)

lemma set-dom-cod-object-subset [intro]:
assumes f: f ∈ ar (set-cat U)
shows dom (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U)
and cod (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U)
and set-cod f ⊆ U
and set-dom f ⊆ U
proof-
note [simp] = set-cat-def set-arrow-def
have dom (set-cat U) f = set-dom f using f by simp
also show ... ⊆ U using f by simp
finally show dom (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U) ..
have cod (set-cat U) f = set-cod f using f by simp
also show ... ⊆ U using f by simp
finally show cod (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U) ..
qed

```

In this context, $f \in \text{hom } A B$ is quite a strong claim.

```

lemma set-homE [intro]:
assumes f: f ∈ hom (set-cat U) A B
shows A ⊆ U
and B ⊆ U
and set-dom f = A
and set-func f : A → B
and set-cod f = B
proof-
have 1: f ∈ ar (set-cat U)

```

```

using f by (simp add: hom-def set-cat-def)
show 2: set-dom f = A
  using f by (simp add: set-cat-def hom-def set-arrow-def)
from 1 have set-dom f ⊆ U ..
thus A ⊆ U by (simp add: 2)
show 3: set-cod f = B
  using f by (simp add: set-cat-def hom-def set-arrow-def)
from 1 have set-cod f ⊆ U ..
thus B ⊆ U by (simp add: 3)
have set-func f ∈ (set-dom f) → (set-cod f)
  using f by (auto simp add: set-cat-def hom-def set-arrow-def)
thus set-func f ∈ A → B
  by (simp add: 2 3)
qed

```

2.3 Set is a Category

```

lemma set-id-left:
  assumes f: f ∈ ar (set-cat U)
  shows set-id U (set-cod f) ⊙ f = f
proof-
  from ⟨f ∈ ar (set-cat U)⟩ have set-cod f ⊆ U ..
  hence 1: set-id U (set-cod f) ⊙ f =
    ⟨
      set-dom= set-dom f,
      set-func= compose (set-dom f) (λx∈set-cod f. x) (set-func f),
      set-cod= set-cod f
    ⟩
  using f by (simp add: set-comp-def set-id-def)
  have 2: compose (set-dom f) (λx∈set-cod f. x) (set-func f) = set-func f
  proof (rule extensionalityI)
    show compose (set-dom f) (λx∈set-cod f. x) (set-func f) ∈ extensional (set-dom f)
      by (rule compose-extensional)
    show set-func f ∈ extensional (set-dom f)
      using f by (simp add: set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
    fix x
    assume x-in-dom: x ∈ set-dom f
    have f-into-cod: set-func f : (set-dom f) → (set-cod f)
      using f by (simp add: set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
    from f-into-cod and x-in-dom
    have f-x-in-cod: set-func f x ∈ set-cod f
      by (rule funcset-mem)
    show compose (set-dom f) (λx∈set-cod f. x) (set-func f) x = set-func f x
      by (simp add: x-in-dom f-x-in-cod compose-def)
  qed
  from 1 have set-id U (set-cod f) ⊙ f =
    ⟨
      set-dom= set-dom f,

```

```

set-func=set-func f,
set-cod=set-cod f
|
by (simp only: 2)
also have ... = f
  by simp
finally show ?thesis .
qed

lemma set-id-right:
  assumes f: f ∈ ar (set-cat U)
  shows f ⊕ (set-id U (set-dom f)) = f
proof-
  from ⟨f ∈ ar (set-cat U)⟩ have set-dom f ⊆ U ..
  hence 1: f ⊕ (set-id U (set-dom f)) =
  |
  set-dom=set-dom f,
  set-func=compose (set-dom f) (set-func f) (λx∈set-dom f. x),
  set-cod=set-cod f
  |
  using f by (simp add: set-comp-def set-id-def)
  have 2: compose (set-dom f) (set-func f) (λx∈set-dom f. x) = set-func f
  proof (rule extensionalityI)
    show compose (set-dom f) (set-func f) (λx∈set-dom f. x) ∈ extensional (set-dom f)
      by (rule compose-extensional)
    show set-func f ∈ extensional (set-dom f)
      using f by (simp add: set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
    fix x
    assume x-in-dom: x ∈ set-dom f
    thus compose (set-dom f) (set-func f) (λx∈set-dom f. x) x = set-func f x
      by (simp add: compose-def)
  qed
  from 1 have f ⊕ (set-id U (set-dom f)) =
  |
  set-dom=set-dom f,
  set-func=set-func f,
  set-cod=set-cod f
  |
  by (simp only: 2)
  also have ... = f
  by simp
  finally show ?thesis .
qed

lemma set-id-hom:
  assumes A ∈ ob (set-cat U)
  shows id (set-cat U) A ∈ hom (set-cat U) A A
proof-

```

```

from ⟨A ∈ ob (set-cat U)⟩ have 1: A ⊆ U ..
hence id (set-cat U) A = (set-dom=A, set-func=λx∈A. x, set-cod=A)
  by (simp add: set-cat-def set-id-def)
also have ... ∈ hom (set-cat U) A A
proof (rule set-homI)
  show (λx∈A. x) ∈ A → A
    by (rule funcsetI, auto)
  show (λx∈A. x) ∈ extensional A
    by (rule restrict-extensional)
qed (rule 1, rule 1)
finally show ?thesis .
qed

```

```

lemma set-comp-types:
comp (set-cat U) ∈ hom (set-cat U) B C → hom (set-cat U) A B → hom (set-cat U) A C
proof (rule funcsetI)
  fix g
  assume g-BC: g ∈ hom (set-cat U) B C
  hence comp-cod: set-cod g = C ..
  show comp (set-cat U) g ∈ hom (set-cat U) A B → hom (set-cat U) A C
  proof (rule funcsetI)
    fix f
    assume f-AB: f ∈ hom (set-cat U) A B
    hence comp-dom: set-dom f = A ..
    show comp (set-cat U) g f ∈ hom (set-cat U) A C
    proof-
      have comp (set-cat U) g f =
        ⟨
          set-dom = A,
          set-func = compose (set-dom f) (set-func g) (set-func f),
          set-cod = C
        ⟩
      by (simp add: set-cat-def set-comp-def comp-cod comp-dom)
      also have ... ∈ hom (set-cat U) A C
      proof (rule set-homI)
        from f-AB show A ⊆ U ..
        from g-BC show C ⊆ U ..
        from f-AB have fs-f: set-func f: A → B ..
        from g-BC have fs-g: set-func g: B → C ..
        from fs-g and fs-f
        show compose (set-dom f) (set-func g) (set-func f) : A → C
          by (simp only: comp-dom) (rule funcset-compose)
        show compose (set-dom f) (set-func g) (set-func f) ∈ extensional A
          by (simp only: comp-dom) (rule compose-extensional)
      qed
      finally show ?thesis .
    qed
  qed

```

```

qed
qed

```

We reason explicitly about the function component of the composite arrow, leaving the rest to the simplifier.

```

lemma set-comp-associative:
  fixes f and g and h
  assumes f:  $f \in ar(\text{set-cat } U)$ 
    and g:  $g \in ar(\text{set-cat } U)$ 
    and h:  $h \in ar(\text{set-cat } U)$ 
    and hg:  $\text{cod } (\text{set-cat } U) h = \text{dom } (\text{set-cat } U) g$ 
    and gf:  $\text{cod } (\text{set-cat } U) g = \text{dom } (\text{set-cat } U) f$ 
  shows comp (set-cat U) f (comp (set-cat U) g h) =
    comp (set-cat U) (comp (set-cat U) f g) h
  proof (simp add: set-cat-def set-comp-def)
    show compose (set-dom h) (set-func f) (compose (set-dom h) (set-func g)) (set-func h) =
      compose (set-dom h) (compose (set-dom g) (set-func f) (set-func g)) (set-func h)
  proof (rule compose-assoc)
    show set-func h ∈ set-dom h → set-dom g
      using h hg by (simp add: set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
  qed
qed

```

```

theorem set-cat-cat: category (set-cat U)
proof (rule category.intro)
  fix f
  assume f:  $f \in ar(\text{set-cat } U)$ 
  show dom (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U) using f ..
  show cod (set-cat U) f ∈ ob (set-cat U) using f ..
  show comp (set-cat U) (id (set-cat U) (cod (set-cat U) f)) f = f
    using f by (simp add: set-id-left)
  show comp (set-cat U) f (id (set-cat U) (dom (set-cat U) f)) = f
    using f by (simp add: set-id-right)
next
  fix A
  assume A:  $A \in ob(\text{set-cat } U)$ 
  then show id (set-cat U) A ∈ hom (set-cat U) A A
    by (rule set-id-hom)
next
  fix A and B and C
  show comp (set-cat U) ∈ hom (set-cat U) B C → hom (set-cat U) A B → hom (set-cat U) A C
    by (rule set-comp-types)
next
  fix f and g and h
  assume f:  $f \in ar(\text{set-cat } U)$ 

```

```

and g ∈ ar (set-cat U)
and h ∈ ar (set-cat U)
and cod (set-cat U) h = dom (set-cat U) g
and cod (set-cat U) g = dom (set-cat U) f
then show comp (set-cat U) f (comp (set-cat U) g h) =
  comp (set-cat U) (comp (set-cat U) f g) h
  by (rule set-comp-associative)
qed

end

```

3 Functors

```

theory Functors
imports Cat
begin

```

3.1 Definitions

```

record ('o1,'a1,'o2,'a2) functor =
  om :: 'o1 ⇒ 'o2
  am :: 'a1 ⇒ 'a2

```

abbreviation

```

om-syn (⟨- o⟩ [81]) where
Fo ≡ om F

```

abbreviation

```

am-syn (⟨- a⟩ [81]) where
Fa ≡ am F

```

```

locale two-cats = AA?: category AA + BB?: category BB
  for AA :: ('o1,'a1,'m1)category-scheme (structure)
  and BB :: ('o2,'a2,'m2)category-scheme (structure) +
  fixes preserves-dom :: ('o1,'a1,'o2,'a2)functor ⇒ bool
  and preserves-cod :: ('o1,'a1,'o2,'a2)functor ⇒ bool
  and preserves-id :: ('o1,'a1,'o2,'a2)functor ⇒ bool
  and preserves-comp :: ('o1,'a1,'o2,'a2)functor ⇒ bool
  defines preserves-dom G ≡ ∀f∈ArAA. Go (DomAA f) = DomBB (Ga f)
  and preserves-cod G ≡ ∀f∈ArAA. Go (CodAA f) = CodBB (Ga f)
  and preserves-id G ≡ ∀A∈ObAA. Ga (IdAA A) = IdBB (Go A)
  and preserves-comp G ≡
    ∀f∈ArAA. ∀g∈ArAA. CodAA f = DomAA g → Ga (g ·AA f) = (Ga g)
    ·BB (Ga f)

```

```

locale functor = two-cats +
  fixes F (structure)
  assumes F-preserves-arrows: Fa : ArAA → ArBB
  and F-preserves-objects: Fo : ObAA → ObBB

```

```

and  $F$ -preserves-dom: preserves-dom  $F$ 
and  $F$ -preserves-cod: preserves-cod  $F$ 
and  $F$ -preserves-id: preserves-id  $F$ 
and  $F$ -preserves-comp: preserves-comp  $F$ 
begin

lemmas  $F$ -axioms =  $F$ -preserves-arrows  $F$ -preserves-objects  $F$ -preserves-dom
 $F$ -preserves-cod  $F$ -preserves-id  $F$ -preserves-comp

lemmas func-pred-defs = preserves-dom-def preserves-cod-def preserves-id-def pre-
serves-comp-def

end

```

This gives us nicer notation for asserting that things are functors.

abbreviation

```

Functor ( $\langle$ Functor $- : - \rightarrow - \rangle$  [81]) where
Functor  $F : AA \rightarrow BB \equiv$  functor  $AA$   $BB$   $F$ 

```

3.2 Simple Lemmas

For example:

```
lemma (in functor) Functor  $F : AA \rightarrow BB ..$ 
```

```

lemma functors-preserve-arrows [intro]:
assumes Functor  $F : AA \rightarrow BB$ 
and  $f \in ar AA$ 
shows  $F_a f \in ar BB$ 
proof-
  from  $\langle$ Functor $F : AA \rightarrow BB\rangle$ 
  have  $F_a : ar AA \rightarrow ar BB$ 
    by (simp add: functor-def functor-axioms-def)
  from this and  $\langle f \in ar AA \rangle$ 
  show ?thesis by (rule funcset-mem)
qed

```

```

lemma (in functor) functors-preserve-homsets:
assumes 1:  $A \in Ob_{AA}$ 
and 2:  $B \in Ob_{AA}$ 
and 3:  $f \in Hom_{AA} A B$ 
shows  $F_a f \in Hom_{BB} (F_o A) (F_o B)$ 
proof-
  from 3
  have 4:  $f \in Ar$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def)
  with  $F$ -preserves-arrows
  have 5:  $F_a f \in Ar_{BB}$ 

```

```

    by (rule funcset-mem)
from 4 and F-preserves-dom
have DomBB (Fa f) = FO (DomAA f)
    by (simp add: preserves-dom-def)
also from 3 have ... = FO A
    by (simp add: hom-def)
finally have 6: DomBB (Fa f) = FO A .
from 4 and F-preserves-cod
have CodBB (Fa f) = FO (CodAA f)
    by (simp add: preserves-cod-def)
also from 3 have ... = FO B
    by (simp add: hom-def)
finally have 7: CodBB (Fa f) = FO B .
from 5 and 6 and 7
show ?thesis
    by (simp add: hom-def)
qed

```

```

lemma functors-preserve-objects [intro]:
assumes Functor F : AA → BB
    and A ∈ ob AA
shows FO A ∈ ob BB
proof-
from ⟨Functor F : AA → BB⟩
have FO : ob AA → ob BB
    by (simp add: functor-def functor-axioms-def)
from this and ⟨A ∈ ob AA⟩
show ?thesis by (rule funcset-mem)
qed

```

3.3 Identity Functor

definition

```

id-func :: ('o,'a,'m) category-scheme ⇒ ('o,'a,'o,'a) functor where
id-func CC = (⟨om=(λA∈ob CC. A), am=(λf∈ar CC. f)⟩)

```

```

locale one-cat = two-cats +
assumes endo: BB = AA

```

```

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-arrows:
shows (id-func AA)a : Ar → Ar
by (unfold id-func-def, rule funcsetI, simp)

```

```

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-objects:
shows (id-func AA)O : Ob → Ob
by (unfold id-func-def, rule funcsetI, simp)

```

```

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-dom:
  shows preserves-dom (id-func AA)
  unfolding preserves-dom-def endo
proof
  fix f
  assume f: f ∈ Ar
  hence lhs: (id-func AA)o (Dom f) = Dom f
    by (simp add: id-func-def) auto
  have (id-func AA)a f = f
    using f by (simp add: id-func-def)
  hence rhs: Dom (id-func AA)a f = Dom f
    by simp
  from lhs and rhs show (id-func AA)o (Dom f) = Dom (id-func AA)a f
    by simp
qed

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-cod:
  preserves-cod (id-func AA)
  apply (unfold preserves-cod-def, simp only: endo)
proof
  fix f
  assume f: f ∈ Ar
  hence lhs: (id-func AA)o (Cod f) = Cod f
    by (simp add: id-func-def) auto
  have (id-func AA)a f = f
    using f by (simp add: id-func-def)
  hence rhs: Cod (id-func AA)a f = Cod f
    by simp
  from lhs and rhs show (id-func AA)o (Cod f) = Cod (id-func AA)a f
    by simp
qed

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-id:
  preserves-id (id-func AA)
  unfolding preserves-id-def endo
proof
  fix A
  assume A: A ∈ Ob
  hence lhs: (id-func AA)a (Id A) = Id A
    by (simp add: id-func-def) auto
  have (id-func AA)o A = A
    using A by (simp add: id-func-def)
  hence rhs: Id ((id-func AA)o A) = Id A
    by simp
  from lhs and rhs show (id-func AA)a (Id A) = Id ((id-func AA)o A)
    by simp
qed

```

```

lemma (in one-cat) id-func-preserves-comp:
  preserves-comp (id-func AA)
unfolding preserves-comp-def endo
proof (intro ballI impI)
  fix f and g
  assume f: f ∈ Ar and g: g ∈ Ar and Cod f = Dom g
  then have g ∙ f ∈ Ar ..
  hence lhs: (id-func AA)a (g ∙ f) = g ∙ f
    by (simp add: id-func-def)
  have id-f: (id-func AA)a f = f
    using f by (simp add: id-func-def)
  have id-g: (id-func AA)a g = g
    using g by (simp add: id-func-def)
  hence rhs: (id-func AA)a g ∙ (id-func AA)a f = g ∙ f
    by (simp add: id-f id-g)
  from lhs and rhs
  show (id-func AA)a (g ∙ f) = (id-func AA)a g ∙ (id-func AA)a f
    by simp
qed

theorem (in one-cat) id-func-functor:
  Functor (id-func AA) : AA → AA
proof-
  from id-func-preserves-arrows
  and id-func-preserves-objects
  and id-func-preserves-dom
  and id-func-preserves-cod
  and id-func-preserves-id
  and id-func-preserves-comp
  show ?thesis
    by unfold-locales (simp-all add: endo preserves-dom-def
      preserves-cod-def preserves-id-def preserves-comp-def)
qed

end

```

4 HomFunctors

```

theory HomFunctors
imports SetCat Functors
begin

locale into-set = two-cats AA BB
  for AA :: ('o,'a,'m)category-scheme (structure)
  and BB (structure) +
  fixes U and Set
  defines U ≡ (UNIV::'a set)

```

```

defines Set ≡ set-cat U
assumes BB-Set: BB = Set
fixes homf (⟨Hom'(-,-')⟩)
defines homf A ≡ ⟨
  om = (λB ∈ Ob. Hom A B),
  am = (λf ∈ Ar. ⟨set-dom=Hom A (Dom f), set-func=(λg ∈ Hom A (Dom f). f ·
    g), set-cod=Hom A (Cod f)⟩)
  ⟩

```

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-arrows:

$$\text{Hom}(A, -)_a : Ar \rightarrow ar \text{ Set}$$

proof (rule funcsetI)

fix f

assume f: f ∈ Ar

thus Hom(A, -)_a f ∈ ar Set

proof (simp add: homf-def Set-def set-cat-def set-arrow-def U-def)

have 1: (·) : Hom (Dom f) (Cod f) → Hom A (Dom f) → Hom A (Cod f) ..

have 2: f ∈ Hom (Dom f) (Cod f) using f by (simp add: hom-def)

from 1 and 2 have 3: (·) f : Hom A (Dom f) → Hom A (Cod f)

by (rule funcset-mem)

show (λg ∈ Hom A (Dom f). f · g) : Hom A (Dom f) → Hom A (Cod f)

proof (rule funcsetI)

fix g'

assume g' ∈ Hom A (Dom f)

from 3 and this show (λg ∈ Hom A (Dom f). f · g) g' ∈ Hom A (Cod f)

by simp (rule funcset-mem)

qed

qed

qed

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-objects:

$$\text{Hom}(A, -)_o : Ob \rightarrow ob \text{ Set}$$

proof (rule funcsetI)

fix B

assume B: B ∈ Ob

have Hom(A, -)_o B = Hom A B

using B by (simp add: homf-def)

moreover have ... ∈ ob Set

by (simp add: U-def Set-def set-cat-def)

ultimately show Hom(A, -)_o B ∈ ob Set by simp

qed

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-dom:

assumes f: f ∈ Ar

shows Hom(A, -)_o (Dom f) = dom Set (Hom(A, -)_a f)

proof –

```

have  $\text{Dom } f \in \text{Ob}$  using  $f$  ..
hence 1:  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_o (\text{Dom } f) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
  using  $f$  by (simp add: homf-def)
have 2:  $\text{dom Set} (\text{Hom}(A, -)_a f) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
  using  $f$  by (simp add: Set-def homf-def)
from 1 and 2 show ?thesis by simp
qed

```

```

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-cod:
  assumes  $f: f \in Ar$ 
  shows  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_o (\text{Cod } f) = \text{cod Set} (\text{Hom}(A, -)_a f)$ 
proof-
  have  $\text{Cod } f \in \text{Ob}$  using  $f$  ..
  hence 1:  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_o (\text{Cod } f) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Cod } f)$ 
    using  $f$  by (simp add: homf-def)
  have 2:  $\text{cod Set} (\text{Hom}(A, -)_a f) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Cod } f)$ 
    using  $f$  by (simp add: Set-def homf-def)
  from 1 and 2 show ?thesis by simp
qed

```

```

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-id:
  assumes  $B: B \in Ob$ 
  shows  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_a (\text{Id } B) = \text{id Set} (\text{Hom}(A, -)_o B)$ 
proof-
  have 1:  $\text{Id } B \in Ar$  using  $B$  ..
  have 2:  $\text{Dom} (\text{Id } B) = B$ 
    using  $B$  by (rule AA.id-dom-cod)
  have 3:  $\text{Cod} (\text{Id } B) = B$ 
    using  $B$  by (rule AA.id-dom-cod)
  have 4:  $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{Id } B) \cdot g) = (\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. g)$ 
    by (rule ext) (auto simp add: hom-def)
  have  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_a (\text{Id } B) = ()$ 
    set-dom= $\text{Hom } A B$ ,
    set-func= $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. g)$ ,
    set-cod= $\text{Hom } A B$ )
    by (simp add: homf-def 1 2 3 4)
  also have ... =  $\text{id Set} (\text{Hom}(A, -)_o B)$ 
    using  $B$  by (simp add: Set-def U-def set-cat-def set-id-def homf-def)
  finally show ?thesis .
qed

```

```

lemma (in into-set) homf-preserves-comp:
  assumes  $f: f \in Ar$ 
  and  $g: g \in Ar$ 
  and  $fg: \text{Cod } f = \text{Dom } g$ 
  shows  $\text{Hom}(A, -)_a (g \cdot f) = (\text{Hom}(A, -)_a g) \odot (\text{Hom}(A, -)_a f)$ 
proof-

```

```

have 1:  $g \cdot f \in Ar$  using assms ..
have 2:  $\text{Dom } (g \cdot f) = \text{Dom } f$  using  $f g fg$  ..
have 3:  $\text{Cod } (g \cdot f) = \text{Cod } g$  using  $f g fg$  ..
have lhs:  $\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a (g \cdot f) = \emptyset$ 
  set-dom= $\text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ ,
  set-func= $(\lambda h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). (g \cdot f) \cdot h)$ ,
  set-cod= $\text{Hom } A (\text{Cod } g)$ 
  by (simp add: homf-def 1 2 3)
have 4:  $\text{set-dom } ((\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a g) \odot (\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a f)) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
  using f by (simp add: set-comp-def homf-def)
have 5:  $\text{set-cod } ((\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a g) \odot (\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a f)) = \text{Hom } A (\text{Cod } g)$ 
  using g by (simp add: set-comp-def homf-def)
have set-func  $((\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a g) \odot (\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a f))$ 
  = compose  $(\text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)) (\lambda y \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g). g \cdot y) (\lambda x \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). f \cdot x)$ 
  using f g by (simp add: set-comp-def homf-def)
also have ... =  $(\lambda h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). (g \cdot f) \cdot h)$ 
proof (
  rule extensionalityI,
  rule compose-extensional,
  rule restrict-extensional,
  simp)
fix h
assume 10:  $h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
hence 11:  $f \cdot h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g)$ 
proof -
  from 10 have h:  $h \in Ar$  by (simp add: hom-def)
  have 100:  $(\cdot) : \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Dom } g) \rightarrow \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f) \rightarrow \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g)$ 
    by (rule AA.comp-types)
  have f:  $f \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Cod } f)$  using f by (simp add: hom-def)
  hence 101:  $f \in \text{Hom } (\text{Dom } f) (\text{Dom } g)$  using fg by simp
  from 100 and 101
  have  $(\cdot) f : \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f) \rightarrow \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g)$ 
    by (rule funcset-mem)
  from this and 10
  show  $f \cdot h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g)$ 
    by (rule funcset-mem)
qed
hence  $\text{Cod } (f \cdot h) = \text{Dom } g$ 
  and  $\text{Dom } (f \cdot h) = A$ 
  and  $f \cdot h \in Ar$ 
  by (simp-all add: hom-def)
thus compose  $(\text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)) (\lambda y \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } g). g \cdot y) (\lambda x \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). f \cdot x) h =$ 
   $(g \cdot f) \cdot h$ 
  using fg fg 10 by (simp add: compose-def 10 11 hom-def)
qed
finally have 6:  $\text{set-func } ((\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a g) \odot (\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a f))$ 

```

```

= ( $\lambda h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). (g \cdot f) \cdot h$ ) .
from 4 and 5 and 6
have rhs: ( $\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a g$ )  $\odot$  ( $\text{Hom}(A, \text{-})_a f$ ) = []
   $\text{set-dom} = \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ ,
   $\text{set-func} = (\lambda h \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f). (g \cdot f) \cdot h)$ ,
   $\text{set-cod} = \text{Hom } A (\text{Cod } g)$ ]
by simp
show ?thesis
  by (simp add: lhs rhs)
qed

```

```

theorem (in into-set) homf-into-set:
  Functor Hom(A, -) : AA → Set
proof (intro functor.intro functor-axioms.intro)
  show Hom(A, -)_a : Ar → ar Set
    by (rule homf-preserves-arrows)
  show Hom(A, -)_o : Ob → ob Set
    by (rule homf-preserves-objects)
  show ∀ f ∈ Ar. Hom(A, -)_o (Dom f) = dom Set (Hom(A, -)_a f)
    by (intro ballI) (rule homf-preserves-dom)
  show ∀ f ∈ Ar. Hom(A, -)_o (Cod f) = cod Set (Hom(A, -)_a f)
    by (intro ballI) (rule homf-preserves-cod)
  show ∀ B ∈ Ob. Hom(A, -)_a (Id B) = id Set (Hom(A, -)_o B)
    by (intro ballI) (rule homf-preserves-id)
  show ∀ f ∈ Ar. ∀ g ∈ Ar.
    Cod f = Dom g →
    Hom(A, -)_a (g · f) = comp Set (Hom(A, -)_a g) (Hom(A, -)_a f)
    by (intro ballI impI, simp add: Set-def set-cat-def) (rule homf-preserves-comp)
  show two-cats AA Set
proof intro-locales
  show category Set
    by (unfold Set-def, rule set-cat-cat)
  qed
qed
end

```

5 Natural Transformations

```

theory NatTrans
imports Functors
begin

locale natural-transformation = two-cats +
fixes F and G and u
assumes Functor F : AA → BB
and Functor G : AA → BB

```

```

and  $u : ob AA \rightarrow ar BB$ 
and  $u \in extensional (ob AA)$ 
and  $\forall A \in Ob. u A \in Hom_{BB} (F_O A) (G_O A)$ 
and  $\forall A \in Ob. \forall B \in Ob. \forall f \in Hom A B. (G_a f) \cdot_{BB} (u A) = (u B) \cdot_{BB} (F_a f)$ 

```

abbreviation

```

nt-syn ( $\langle - : - \Rightarrow - \text{ in } Func \langle -, -' \rangle [81] \rangle$ ) where
 $u : F \Rightarrow G \text{ in } Func(AA, BB) \equiv natural\text{-transformation } AA BB F G u$ 

```

```
locale endoNT = natural-transformation + one-cat
```

```
theorem (in endoNT) id-restrict-natural:
```

```
( $\lambda A \in Ob. Id A) : (id\text{-func } AA) \Rightarrow (id\text{-func } AA) \text{ in } Func(AA, AA)$ )
```

```
proof (intro natural-transformation.intro natural-transformation-axioms.intro
```

```
two-cats.intro ballI)
```

```
show ( $\lambda A \in Ob. Id A) : Ob \rightarrow Ar$ 
```

```
by (rule funcsetI) auto
```

```
show ( $\lambda A \in Ob. Id A) \in extensional (Ob)$ 
```

```
by (rule restrict-extensional)
```

```
fix A
```

```
assume A:  $A \in Ob$ 
```

```
hence  $Id A \in Hom A A ..$ 
```

```
thus ( $\lambda X \in Ob. Id X) A \in Hom ((id\text{-func } AA)_O A) ((id\text{-func } AA)_O A)$ 
```

```
using A by (simp add: id-func-def)
```

```
fix B and f
```

```
assume B:  $B \in Ob$ 
```

```
and  $f \in Hom A B$ 
```

```
hence  $f \in Ar$  and  $A = Dom f$  and  $B = Cod f$  and  $Dom f \in Ob$  and  $Cod f \in Ob$ 
```

```
using A by (simp-all add: hom-def)
```

```
thus ( $id\text{-func } AA)_a f \cdot (\lambda A \in Ob. Id A) A$ 
```

```
= ( $\lambda A \in Ob. Id A) B \cdot (id\text{-func } AA)_a f$ 
```

```
by (simp add: id-func-def)
```

```
qed (auto intro: id-func-functor, unfold-locales, unfold-locales)
```

```
end
```

6 Yoneda Lemma

```

theory Yoneda
imports HomFunctors NatTrans
begin

```

6.1 The Sandwich Natural Transformation

```

locale Yoneda = functor + into-set +
assumes TERM (AA :: ('o,'a,'m)category-scheme)
fixes sandwich :: ['o,'a,'o]  $\Rightarrow$  'a set-arrow ( $\langle \sigma'(-,-) \rangle$ )

```

```

defines sandwich A a ≡ ( $\lambda B \in Ob. (\|$ 
  set-dom=Hom A B,
  set-func=( $\lambda f \in Hom A B. set-func (F_a f) a$ ),
  set-cod= $F_o B$ 
   $\|)$ )
fixes unsandwich :: [ $'o, 'o \Rightarrow 'a$  set-arrow]  $\Rightarrow 'a$  ( $\langle \sigma^{\leftarrow} ('-, -') \rangle$ )
defines unsandwich A u ≡ set-func (u A) (Id A)

```

lemma (in Yoneda) F-into-set:
Functor F : AA → Set
proof–
from F-axioms have Functor F : AA → BB by intro-locales
thus ?thesis
by (simp only: BB-Set)
qed

lemma (in Yoneda) F-comp-func:
assumes 1: A ∈ Ob and 2: B ∈ Ob and 3: C ∈ Ob
and 4: g ∈ Hom A B and 5: f ∈ Hom B C
shows set-func (F_a (f ∘ g)) = compose (F_o A) (set-func (F_a f)) (set-func (F_a g))
proof–
from 4 and 5
have 7: Cod g = Dom f
and 8: g ∈ Ar
and 9: f ∈ Ar
and 10: Dom g = A
by (simp-all add: hom-def)
from F-preserves-dom and 8 and 10
have 11: set-dom (F_a g) = F_o A
by (simp add: preserves-dom-def BB-Set Set-def) auto
from F-preserves-comp and 7 and 8 and 9
have F_a (f ∘ g) = (F_a f) ∘_{BB} (F_a g)
by (simp add: preserves-comp-def)
hence set-func (F_a (f ∘ g)) = set-func ((F_a f) ∘ (F_a g))
by (simp add: BB-Set Set-def)
also have ... = compose (F_o A) (set-func (F_a f)) (set-func (F_a g))
by (simp add: set-comp-def 11)
finally show ?thesis .
qed

lemma (in Yoneda) sandwich-funcset:
assumes A: A ∈ Ob
and a ∈ F_o A
shows σ(A,a) : Ob → ar Set
proof (rule funcsetI)
fix B
assume B: B ∈ Ob

```

thus  $\sigma(A,a)$   $B \in ar Set$ 
proof (simp add: Set-def sandwich-def set-cat-def)
  show set-arrow  $U ()$ 
    set-dom = Hom A B,
    set-func =  $\lambda f \in Hom A B. set-func (F_a f) a,$ 
    set-cod =  $F_o B$ )
proof (simp add: set-arrow-def, intro conjI)
  show Hom A B  $\subseteq U$  and  $F_o B \subseteq U$ 
    by (simp-all add: U-def)
  show  $(\lambda f \in Hom A B. set-func (F_a f) a) \in Hom A B \rightarrow F_o B$ 
  proof (rule funcsetI, simp)
    fix  $f$ 
    assume  $f : f \in Hom A B$ 
    with  $A B$  have  $F_a f \in Hom_{BB} (F_o A) (F_o B)$ 
      by (rule functors-preserve-homsets)
    hence  $F_a f \in ar Set$ 
      and set-dom  $(F_a f) = (F_o A)$ 
      and set-cod  $(F_a f) = (F_o B)$ 
      by (simp-all add: hom-def BB-Set Set-def)
    hence set-func  $(F_a f) : (F_o A) \rightarrow (F_o B)$ 
      by (simp add: Set-def set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
    thus set-func  $(F_a f) a \in F_o B$ 
      using  $\langle a \in F_o A \rangle$ 
      by (rule funcset-mem)
    qed
  qed
  qed
  qed

```

lemma (in Yoneda) sandwich-type:

assumes $A : A \in Ob$ **and** $B : B \in Ob$
and $a \in F_o A$
shows $\sigma(A,a)$ $B \in hom Set (Hom A B) (F_o B)$

proof –

have $\sigma(A,a) \in Ob \rightarrow Ar Set$
using A **and** $\langle a \in F_o A \rangle$ **by** (*rule sandwich-funcset*)
hence $\sigma(A,a)$ $B \in ar Set$
using B **by** (*rule funcset-mem*)
thus $?thesis$
using B **by** (*simp add: sandwich-def hom-def Set-def*)

qed

lemma (in Yoneda) sandwich-commutes:

assumes $AOb : A \in Ob$ **and** $BOb : B \in Ob$ **and** $COb : C \in Ob$
and $aFa : a \in F_o A$
and $fBC : f \in Hom B C$
shows $(F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B) = (\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (Hom(A,-)_a f)$

proof–

from fBC have 1: $f \in Ar$ and 2: $\text{Dom } f = B$ and 3: $\text{Cod } f = C$
 by (simp-all add: hom-def)

from BOb have $\text{set-dom } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B)) = \text{Hom } A B$
 by (simp add: set-comp-def sandwich-def)

also have ... = $\text{set-dom } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f))$
 by (simp add: set-comp-def homf-def 1 2)

finally have $\text{set-dom-eq}:$
 $\text{set-dom } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B))$
 $= \text{set-dom } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) .$

from $BOb COb fBC$ have $(F_a f) \in \text{Hom}_{BB} (F_o B) (F_o C)$
 by (rule functors-preserve-homsets)

hence $\text{set-cod } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B)) = F_o C$
 by (simp add: set-comp-def BB-Set Set-def set-cat-def hom-def)

also from COb
 have ... = $\text{set-cod } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f))$
 by (simp add: set-comp-def sandwich-def)

finally have $\text{set-cod-eq}:$
 $\text{set-cod } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B))$
 $= \text{set-cod } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) .$

from AOb and BOb and COb and fBC and aFa
 have $\text{set-func-lhs}:$
 $\text{set-func } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B)) =$
 $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. \text{set-func } (F_a (f \cdot g)) a)$
 apply (simp add: set-comp-def sandwich-def compose-def)
 apply (rule extensionalityI, rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)
 by (simp add: F-comp-func compose-def)

have $(\cdot) : \text{Hom } B C \rightarrow \text{Hom } A B \rightarrow \text{Hom } A C ..$
 from this and fBC
 have $\text{opfType}: (\cdot) f : \text{Hom } A B \rightarrow \text{Hom } A C$
 by (rule funcset-mem)

from 1 and 2
 have $\text{set-func } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) =$
 $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. \text{set-func } (\sigma(A,a) C) (f \cdot g))$
 apply (simp add: set-comp-def homf-def)
 apply (simp add: compose-def)
 apply (rule extensionalityI, rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)
 by auto

also from COb and $opfType$
 have ... = $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. \text{set-func } (F_a (f \cdot g)) a)$
 apply (simp add: sandwich-def)
 apply (rule extensionalityI, rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)
 by (simp add: Pi-def)

finally have $\text{set-func-rhs}:$
 $\text{set-func } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) =$
 $(\lambda g \in \text{Hom } A B. \text{set-func } (F_a (f \cdot g)) a) .$

from set-func-lhs and set-func-rhs have
 $\text{set-func } ((F_a f) \odot (\sigma(A,a) B))$
 $= \text{set-func } ((\sigma(A,a) C) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f))$

```

by simp
with set-dom-eq and set-cod-eq show ?thesis
  by simp
qed

lemma (in Yoneda) sandwich-natural:
assumes A ∈ Ob
and a ∈ FO A
shows σ(A,a) : Hom(A,-) ⇒ F in Func(AA,Set)
proof (intro natural-transformation.intro natural-transformation-axioms.intro two-cats.intro)
  show category AA ..
  show category Set
    by (simp only: Set-def)(rule set-cat-cat)
  show Functor Hom(A,-) : AA → Set
    by (rule homf-into-set)
  show Functor F : AA → Set
    by (rule F-into-set)
  show ∀ B ∈ Ob. σ(A,a) B ∈ hom Set (Hom(A,-)O B) (FO B)
    using assms by (auto simp add: homf-def intro: sandwich-type)
  show σ(A,a) : Ob → ar Set
    using assms by (rule sandwich-funcset)
  show σ(A,a) ∈ extensional (Ob)
    unfolding sandwich-def by (rule restrict-extensional)
  show ∀ B ∈ Ob. ∀ C ∈ Ob. ∀ f ∈ Hom B C.
    comp Set (F a f) (σ(A,a) B) = comp Set (σ(A,a) C) (Hom(A,-)a f)
    using assms by (auto simp add: Set-def intro: sandwich-commutes)
qed

```

6.2 Sandwich Components are Bijective

```

lemma (in Yoneda) unsandwich-left-inverse:
assumes 1: A ∈ Ob
and 2: a ∈ FO A
shows σ←(A,σ(A,a)) = a
proof-
  from 1 have Id A ∈ Hom A A ..
  with 1
  have 3: σ←(A,σ(A,a)) = set-func (Fa (Id A)) a
    by (simp add: sandwich-def homf-def unsandwich-def)
  from F-preserves-id and 1
  have 4: Fa (Id A) = id Set (FO A)
    by (simp add: preserves-id-def BB-Set)
  from F-preserves-objects and 1
  have FO A ∈ ObBB
    by (rule funcset-mem)
  hence FO A ⊆ U
    by (simp add: BB-Set Set-def set-cat-def)
  with 2

```

```

have 5: set-func (id Set (FO A)) a = a
  by (simp add: Set-def set-id-def)
show ?thesis
  by (simp add: 3 4 5)
qed

lemma (in Yoneda) unsandwich-right-inverse:
assumes 1: A ∈ Ob
and 2: u : Hom(A,-) ⇒ F in Func(AA,Set)
shows σ(A,σ←(A,u)) = u
proof (rule extensionalityI)
  show σ(A,σ←(A,u)) ∈ extensional (Ob)
    by (unfold sandwich-def, rule restrict-extensional)
  from 2 show u ∈ extensional (Ob)
    by (simp add: natural-transformation-def natural-transformation-axioms-def)
  fix B
  assume 3: B ∈ Ob
  with 1
  have one: σ(A,σ←(A,u)) B = ()
    set-dom = Hom A B,
    set-func = (λf∈Hom A B. (set-func (Fa f)) (set-func (u A) (Id A))),
    set-cod = FO B []
    by (simp add: sandwich-def unsandwich-def)
  from 1 have Hom(A,-)O A = Hom A A
    by (simp add: homf-def)
  with 1 and 2 have (u A) ∈ hom Set (Hom A A) (FO A)
    by (simp add: natural-transformation-def natural-transformation-axioms-def,
      auto)
  hence set-dom (u A) = Hom A A
    by (simp add: hom-def Set-def)
  with 1 have applicable: Id A ∈ set-dom (u A)
    by (simp)(rule)
  have two: (λf∈Hom A B. (set-func (Fa f)) (set-func (u A) (Id A)))
  = (λf∈Hom A B. (set-func ((Fa f) ⊕ (u A)) (Id A)))
    by (rule extensionalityI,
      rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional,
      simp add: set-comp-def compose-def applicable)
  from 2
  have (∀X∈Ob. ∀Y∈Ob. ∀f∈Hom X Y. (Fa f) ·BB (u X) = (u Y) ·BB (Hom(A,-)A f))
    by (simp add: natural-transformation-def natural-transformation-axioms-def
      BB-Set)
  with 1 and 3
  have three: (λf∈Hom A B. (set-func ((Fa f) ⊕ (u A)) (Id A)))
  = (λf∈Hom A B. (set-func ((u B) ⊕ (Hom(A,-))A f)) (Id A))
    apply (simp add: BB-Set Set-def)
    apply (rule extensionalityI)
    apply (rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)

```

```

    by simp
 $\text{have } \forall f \in \text{Hom } A B. \text{set-dom} (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f) = \text{Hom } A A$ 
    by (intro ballI, simp add: homf-def hom-def)
 $\text{have } \text{roolz}: \bigwedge f. f \in \text{Hom } A B \implies \text{set-dom} (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f) = \text{Hom } A A$ 
    by (simp add: homf-def hom-def)
from 1 have rooly:  $\text{Id } A \in \text{Hom } A A ..$ 
 $\text{have } \text{roolx}: \bigwedge f. f \in \text{Hom } A B \implies f \in \text{Ar}$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def)
 $\text{have } \text{roolw}: \bigwedge f. f \in \text{Hom } A B \implies \text{Id } A \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
proof-
fix f
assume  $f \in \text{Hom } A B$ 
hence  $\text{Dom } f = A$  by (simp add: hom-def)
thus  $\text{Id } A \in \text{Hom } A (\text{Dom } f)$ 
    by (simp add: rooly)
qed
have annoying:  $\bigwedge f. f \in \text{Hom } A B \implies \text{Id } A = \text{Id } (\text{Dom } f)$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def)
have  $(\lambda f \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{set-func} ((u B) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) (\text{Id } A))$ 
 $= (\lambda f \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{compose} (\text{Hom } A A) (\text{set-func} (u B))) (\text{set-func} (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f))) (\text{Id } A))$ 
apply (rule extensionalityI)
apply (rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)
by (simp add: compose-def set-comp-def roolz rooly)
also have ... =  $(\lambda f \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{set-func} (u B) f))$ 
apply (rule extensionalityI)
apply (rule restrict-extensional, rule restrict-extensional)
apply (simp add: compose-def homf-def rooly roolx roolw)
apply (simp only: annoying)
apply (simp add: roolx id-right)
done
finally have four:
 $(\lambda f \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{set-func} ((u B) \odot (\text{Hom}(A,-)_a f)) (\text{Id } A))$ 
 $= (\lambda f \in \text{Hom } A B. (\text{set-func} (u B) f)) .$ 
from 2 and 3
have uBhom:  $u B \in \text{hom Set} (\text{Hom}(A,-)_o B) (F_o B)$ 
    by (simp add: natural-transformation-def natural-transformation-axioms-def)
with 3
have five:  $\text{set-dom} (u B) = \text{Hom } A B$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def homf-def Set-def set-cat-def)
from uBhom
have six:  $\text{set-cod} (u B) = F_o B$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def homf-def Set-def set-cat-def)
have seven:  $\text{restrict} (\text{set-func} (u B)) (\text{Hom } A B) = \text{set-func} (u B)$ 
    apply (rule extensionalityI)
    apply (rule restrict-extensional)
proof-
from uBhom have  $u B \in \text{ar Set}$ 
    by (simp add: hom-def)

```

```

hence almost: set-func (u B)  $\in$  extensional (set-dom (u B))
  by (simp add: Set-def set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
from almost and five
show set-func (u B)  $\in$  extensional (Hom A B)
  by simp
fix f
assume f  $\in$  Hom A B
thus restrict (set-func (u B)) (Hom A B) f = set-func (u B) f
  by simp
qed
from one and two and three and four and five and six and seven
show  $\sigma(A, \sigma^\leftarrow(A, u)) B = u B$ 
  by simp
qed

```

In order to state the lemma, we must rectify a curious omission from the Isabelle/HOL library. They define the idea of injectivity on a given set, but surjectivity is only defined relative to the entire universe of the target type.

definition

```

surj-on :: ['a  $\Rightarrow$  'b, 'a set, 'b set]  $\Rightarrow$  bool where
surj-on f A B  $\longleftrightarrow$  ( $\forall y \in B. \exists x \in A. f(x) = y$ )

```

definition

```

bij-on :: ['a  $\Rightarrow$  'b, 'a set, 'b set]  $\Rightarrow$  bool where
bij-on f A B  $\longleftrightarrow$  inj-on f A & surj-on f A B

```

definition

```

equinumerous :: ['a set, 'b set]  $\Rightarrow$  bool (infix  $\cong 40$ ) where
equinumerous A B  $\longleftrightarrow$  ( $\exists f. \text{bij-betw } f A B$ )

```

lemma *bij-betw-eq*:

```

bij-betw f A B  $\longleftrightarrow$ 
inj-on f A \wedge (\forall y \in B. \exists x \in A. f(x) = y) \wedge (\forall x \in A. f x \in B)
unfolding bij-betw-def by auto

```

theorem (in Yoneda) *Yoneda*:

```

assumes 1: A  $\in$  Ob
shows FO A  $\cong$  {u. u : Hom(A, -)  $\Rightarrow$  F in Func(AA, Set)}
unfolding equinumerous-def bij-betw-eq inj-on-def
proof (intro exI conjI bexI ballI impI)
  — Sandwich is injective
  fix x and y
  assume 2: x  $\in$  FO A and 3: y  $\in$  FO A
  and 4:  $\sigma(A, x) = \sigma(A, y)$ 
  hence  $\sigma^\leftarrow(A, \sigma(A, x)) = \sigma^\leftarrow(A, \sigma(A, y))$ 
  by simp
  with unsandwich-left-inverse
  show x = y
  by (simp add: 1 2 3)

```

```

next
  — Sandwich covers  $F A$ 
  fix  $u$ 
  assume  $u \in \{y. y : Hom(A, -) \Rightarrow F \text{ in } Func(AA, Set)\}$ 
  hence  $\vartheta : u : Hom(A, -) \Rightarrow F \text{ in } Func(AA, Set)$ 
    by simp
  with 1 show  $\sigma(A, \sigma^{-}(A, u)) = u$ 
    by (rule unsandwich-right-inverse)
  — Sandwich is into  $F A$ 
  from 1 and 2
  have  $u A \in hom Set(Hom A A) (F_O A)$ 
    by (simp add: natural-transformation-def natural-transformation-axioms-def homf-def)
  hence  $u A \in ar Set \text{ and } dom Set(u A) = Hom A A \text{ and } cod Set(u A) = F_O A$ 
    by (simp-all add: hom-def)
  hence  $uAfuncset : set-func(u A) : (Hom A A) \rightarrow (F_O A)$ 
    by (simp add: Set-def set-cat-def set-arrow-def)
  from 1 have  $Id A \in Hom A A ..$ 
  with  $uAfuncset$ 
  show  $\sigma^{-}(A, u) \in F_O A$ 
    by (simp add: unsandwich-def, rule funcset-mem)
next
  fix  $x$ 
  assume  $x \in F_O A$ 
  with 1 have  $\sigma(A, x) : Hom(A, -) \Rightarrow F \text{ in } Func(AA, Set)$ 
    by (rule sandwich-natural)
  thus  $\sigma(A, x) \in \{y. y : Hom(A, -) \Rightarrow F \text{ in } Func(AA, Set)\}$ 
    by simp
qed

end

```

References

- [O'K04] Greg O'Keefe. Towards a readable formalisation of category theory.
 In Mike Atkinson, editor, *Computing: The Australasian Theory Symposium*, volume 91 of *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 212–228. Elsevier, 2004.