Special Session in memory of F.W. Lawvere CT 2023 Louvain-la-Neuve Anders Kock, Dept. of Math., University of Aarhus

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ



# Thank you to the **organizers**;

and to

#### M.M. Clementino and J. Picado

for making the interview with L. in 2007 (Braga, Portugal), including the picture:

and to

#### Fatima and Danilo Lawvere

for friendship and help

#### CT 1987 in Louvain-Ia-Neuve and Leuven

"I dedicate this talk to the fundamental unity of the Indoeuropean languages"

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

#### Unification

The unification of mathematics is an important strategy for learning, developing and using mathematics

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

(L. and Schanuel, in "Conceptual Mathematics" 2009)

From topology to algebra; steps in the unification

Algebraic topology; homology functors

 $\mathsf{Top}.\mathsf{Spaces} \to \mathsf{Abelian}\ \mathsf{groups}$ 

Later

Simplicial sets  $\rightarrow$  Abelian groups;

A simplicial set itself as a functor  $\Delta^* \to$  Sets; adjoint functors.

## From Categories to Category Theory

Lawvere:

The Category of Categories as a **Foundation** for Mathematics (La Jolla 1965)

The past 100 years' tradition of "foundations" as justification has not helped mathematics very much. In my own education I was fortunate to have two teachers who used the term "foundations" in a common-sense way ...:

Foundations of Algebraic Topology, published in 1952 by Eilenberg (with Steenrod), and the Mechanical Foundations of Elasticity and Fluid Mechanics, published in the same year by Truesdell.

... I reasoned that Grothendieck's theory of Abelian categories should have a non-linear analogue whose examples would include categories of sheaves of sets; ... and noted that, on the basis of my work on the category of sets, such a theory would have a greater autonomy than the Abelian one could have. Mac Lane books:

Homology 1963

Categories for the Working Mathematician 1971.

The title of the latter indicates that in 1971, category theory is seen not just as a tool for Algebraic Topology/Homological Algebra, but for every working mathematician.

The slogan is "Adjoint functors arise everywhere". (Mac Lane 1971)

#### Zürich 1966

#### Eckmann's seminar 1966-67



#### $(Triple = Monad = (T, \eta, \mu))$

# Cafe Odeon 1966



・ロト・「聞・・思・・思・」 しゃくの

#### 1967-1973

1967-1969: Chicago

1969-1971: Halifax. Not renewed due to political activities

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- 1971-1972: Aarhus
- 1972-1973: Perugia
- 1973-2023: Buffalo

#### Categorical Dynamics 1967

Tangent bundle of M:

$$T(M)=M^D$$

M a object (space) in an unspecified Cartesian closed category, D a postulated infinitesimal object.

Since the late 1970s "Synthetic Differential Geometry": postulate further a commutative ring R, ("the line"), and requires  $R \times R \rightarrow R^D$  to be an iso; then R is called of "line type". and develop axiomatically;

in a topos, with the insight brought about from Elementary Toposes: just argue as if the topos were SETS



Hanne, Anders, Bill, Fatima



・ロト ・日子・ ・ ヨア・

∋ ) ∋

Marie, Danilo, Silvana, Joachim, Hans

"TOPOS THEORETIC METHODS IN GEOMETRY", Aarhus Math. Institute, Various Publication Series No. 30 (1979).

Among the scheduled events were "Discussion on philosophy", with Joyal and Lawvere (780517), as well as an elaboration (780524). Some of L.'s contribution in this discussion are published in Cahiers 1980:

## Scientific world picture



(Cahiers 1980)

## Mathematical world picture

Mathematics: studying space and quantity and their relations Logic of mathematics: constructing concept and reasoning for this



I agree with Brouwer that  $\mathbb{N}$  is subjective, in contrast to the continuum which is objective (quote from 780517) In the circle may add: continuum.

#### The continuum

the continuum .. [is] primarily a **concept** derived **directly** from our historical-scientific experience with the world of matter-in-motion

not only a mental from construction  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\Omega$ : (the subjective idealizations of iteration and truth respectively)

A model for the continuum *may* be constructed (Dedekind, Cauchy, ...) from  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\Omega$  and the denoted  $\mathbb{R}$ . Thus: subjective, and leads to to space filling curves, which do not exists. [But] space is here now (quote from 780517)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Space vs. Quantity

#### (From 780524)

The actions of Grelid are not so lad.

Problems come when making then rijonions. Nobody would use Hilbert's book for a brigh school first book.

Mate : study of space forms and guantitation relations, and their relationship. Consist we take this rates directly and arrive at occurrence for mathematics. . Slightly rehemptically



(Barrie variable genality : distance). This picken is not good , enough to be a cat. Because than an, Reg. distance : space forms. Roughly:

 $\boldsymbol{S}$  a topos of Spaces

 ${\bf Q}$  a Picard closed additive category of physical dimensions (with objects types of quantities: length, area, volume, mass, time-lapse,  $\ldots$  linear maps

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Space vs. Quantity



## Conceptual Construction vs Formal Deduction

Inside the logic of mathematics, have a non-antagonistic contradiction,

- LCC: Logic of Conceptual Construction
- LFD: Logic of Formal Deduction

Nearly every piece of mathematics involves usually an advance in both.

LFD is not the whole thing: this idea "waves the flag of LFD to oppose LCC", especially the <u>purpose</u> of math., (clarifying, guiding,) (from 780517).

LFD is overestimated, LCC underestimated

#### Concepts

- The existence of Euclidean Geometry is more important than any specific Theorem in it.
- The fact that there must be a Continuum is more important than the way you "construct" it.
- Euclidean geometry was from the outset based on the **concepts** plane, line, point, derived from experience from the real world, say, architecture. "Line" a concept derived from taut strings, typically made of linen, whence the name.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Grothendieck

Grothendieck was in Buffalo in the spring of 1973, and gave a series of colloquium talks.

L. coming back from Perugia only in time for the last of these. According to Michael Wright:

Alas, none of Gs talks to the Buffalo Math Colloquium (as distinct from the Lecture Courses) were recorded and Bill attended and made notes only of the last talk. ... Bill gave an account of this Talk in the course of the discussions held in Fougeres in 2005, which are now (finally) in the course of being transcribed. The talk contained

... an overarching view of how G saw Narrow-sense logic as fitting within (broad-sense) Geometry what Bill referred to in passing as "Grothendiecks Vision of how to by-pass Logic".

Good cocepts imply fewer proofs. LCC over LFD.

# Schanuel



・ロト ・ 日 ト ・ モ ト ・ モ ト

э

#### Photo: R.Walters, Sydney 1988

S. and L. worked together on a daily and private basis for decades. In the Buffalo winters, they (with Fatima) went together to Oxaca in Mexico. - L. writes in an obituary for Schanuel 2014:

We studied deep into the nights; sometimes Fatima heard us giggle, because we had discovered how simply some results could be proved. In the morning she typed the notes that I had left on her table.

Danilo:

She [Fatima] made sure that dad went to conferences with notes or drafts, and she ensured that deadlines were met, letters were answered as well as all the extensive class notes we have. *Conceptual Mathematics* [with Schanuel, 2009] was in part conceived by her, and she was the driving force in getting it done, and then published.

#### Archives; Danilo Lawvere

Danilo:

There is a lot to do with respect to the archive, but my mom [Fatima L.] sure did prepare the way.

First, I want to say that the plans for archiving and making available all of my dads work is already underway, and it is something I will be working on for several years.

Some of the first steps will be ensuring that the materials on the website have links, then move toward unpublished works, and then comments to TAC, selected correspondence etc. I may be able to get some assistance from the math department here and am looking at the possible places to put the papers (possibly University of Buffalo).

Dads website we are planning to update https://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~wlawvere/

# Archives; Michael Wright, and links (url)

Michael Wright has recorded and scanned a lot of material from Lawvere abd others, including scannings of notes I took from L.s lectures over the years, in particular from L.'s many visits to Aarhus. These scannings are about to be made public on his https://archmathsci.org/category/mathematics/ I have made some of these scannings of my notes available, e.g. https://users-math.au.dk/kock/780524.pdf where "780524" is the date of the lecture, here May 24 1978 (from Aarhus Open House 1978). Also 780516, 780517, 780518, 780519 Braga Interview:

http://www.mat.uc.pt/~picado/lawvere/interview.pdf
Best source:

https://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~wlawvere/

Thank you !

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

"Nevertheless there are areas which are out of fashion, for instance category theory and set theoretic topology, also mathematical logic, partially, judging from the number of posts"

Vasco Alexander Schmidt, inteviewing Matthias Kreck, in the chapter "The Unity of Mathematics", in Springer's "Mathematics Unlimited - 2001 and Beyond"