

# Cartesian closed and stable subconstructs of $[0, 1]$ -Cat

Hongliang Lai\*, Qingzhu Luo

*School of Mathematics, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, China*

---

## Abstract

Let  $\&$  be a continuous triangular norm on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  and  $\mathbf{A}$  be a cartesian closed and stable subconstruct of the category consisting of all real-enriched categories. Firstly, it is shown that the category  $\mathbf{A}$  is cartesian closed if and only if it is determined by a suitable subset  $S \subseteq M^2$  of  $[0, 1]^2$ , where  $M$  is the set of all elements  $x$  in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $x\&x$  is idempotent. Secondly, it is shown that all Yoneda complete real-enriched categories valued in the set  $M$  and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors form a cartesian closed category.

*Keywords:* enriched category, continuous triangular norm, stable subconstruct, cartesian closed category, Yoneda complete.

---

## 1. Introduction

Let  $\&$  be a continuous triangular norm on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$ . Then  $\mathbf{Q} = ([0, 1], \&, 1)$  becomes a commutative and unital quantale [25]. Categories enriched over  $\mathbf{Q}$  is called real-enriched categories [29]. As observed by Lawvere [22] in 1973, there is a deep connection between enriched categories and generalized logic. Particularly, for real-enriched categories, this generalized logic is the *BL*-logic developed by Hájek [15]. Therefore, real-enriched categories may be viewed as ordered sets in the sense of *BL*-logic. Real-enriched categories encompass preordered sets, generalized metric spaces and fuzzy preordered sets [18, 28] in a unified framework. Naturally, they become the fundamental objects for quantitative domain theory, see e.g. [2, 3, 6, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21].

Cartesian closed categories are of particular interest in domain theory [13], as explained: “One of the most noteworthy features of **DCPO** is that it is cartesian closed. Not only is this fundamental for the application of continuous lattices and domains to logic and computing, but it also provides evidence of the mathematical naturalness of the notion.” When the quantitative domain theory is concerned, Yoneda complete quantale-enriched categories, in which all forward Cauchy nets (or forward Cauchy sequences) are convergent, are often treated as quantitative preordered sets satisfying the directed completeness [6, 10, 11, 12, 20, 26, 27]. However, unlike its classical counterpart, the category **YCCat** consisting of Yoneda complete real-enriched categories and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors need not be cartesian closed in general. In fact, it is cartesian closed if and only if the continuous triangular norm  $\& = \wedge$  [21, Theorem 4.7].

Consider the category  $[0, 1]$ -Cat consisting of all real-enriched categories and  $[0, 1]$ -functors. Since **YCCat** is a reflective subcategory of  $[0, 1]$ -Cat, Yoneda complete real-enriched categories  $A$  and  $B$  share the product object in both  $[0, 1]$ -Cat and **YCCat**. If the power object  $B^A$  in  $[0, 1]$ -Cat exists, then their power object in **YCCat** is a subobject of  $B^A$ . However, it is not easy to seek the power object of  $A$  and  $B$  in  $[0, 1]$ -Cat. It is even unfortunate that the power object in  $[0, 1]$ -Cat may fail to exist in general [7, 8]. Therefore, we give up the whole category  $[0, 1]$ -Cat but consider its cartesian closed and full subcategory  $\mathbf{A}$ . Since the power objects  $B^A$  do exist for all  $A, B$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ , one can seek the power object  $[A \rightarrow B]$  of Yoneda complete real-enriched categories  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{YCCat}$ , as a subobject of the power object  $B^A$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

---

\*Corresponding author.

*Email addresses:* hllai@scu.edu.cn (Hongliang Lai), luqingzhu@foxmail.com (Qingzhu Luo)

In this paper, firstly, we find out all cartesian closed and stable subcategories of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Observe that the category  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** contains a trivial cartesian closed and stable subcategory **POrd**, consisting of all crisp preordered sets and order preserving maps. Moreover, in a particular case, let  $\mathbb{L} = ([0, 1], \&_{\mathbb{L}}, 1)$ , where  $\&_{\mathbb{L}}$  is the Lukasiewicz triangular norm, and  $\mathbb{L}_3 = (\{0, 0.5, 1\}, \&_{\mathbb{L}}, 1)$  be the subquantale of  $\mathbb{L}$ , then the category  $\mathbb{L}$ -**Cat** has a stable subcategory  $\mathbb{L}_3$ -**Cat**. The category  $\mathbb{L}_3$ -**Cat** is cartesian closed [21, Example 4.8]. Therefore, one obtains a chain consisting of cartesian closed categories in the below:

$$\mathbf{POrd} \subseteq \mathbb{L}_3\text{-Cat} \subseteq \mathbb{L}\text{-Cat}.$$

Thus, one can see that there may be non-trivial cartesian closed and stable subcategories of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** which is larger than **POrd** even if the quantale  $\mathbb{L}$  is not a frame. In fact, we characterize explicitly all cartesian closed and stable subcategories of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, which are determined by suitable subsets  $S \subseteq M^2$  of  $[0, 1]^2$ , where  $M = \{a \in [0, 1] \mid a \& a \text{ is idempotent}\}$ .

Secondly, we show that the category  $M$ -**YCCat**, which consists of all Yoneda complete real-enriched categories valued in the set  $M$  and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors, is cartesian closed. Thus, one obtains a chain of cartesian closed categories:

$$\mathbf{DCPO} \subseteq K\text{-YCCat} \subseteq M\text{-YCCat},$$

where  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $(M, \&, 1)$ .

The contents are arranged as follows. Section 2: Some basic concepts about real-enriched categories are recalled. Section 3: Describe all stable subcategories of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Section 4: Characterize all cartesian closed and stable subcategories of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Section 5: Prove that for each complete subquantale  $(K, \&, 1)$  of  $(M, \&, 1)$ , the category  $K$ -**YCCat** is cartesian closed.

## 2. Real-enriched categories

In this section, some basic notions of real-enriched categories are recalled. Terminologies and notations are mainly from [29].

A *triangular norm* [18] (*t-norm* for short) is a binary operation  $\&$  on the unit interval  $[0, 1]$  such that for all  $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ ,

- (1)  $x \& y = y \& x$ ;
- (2)  $x \& (y \& z) = (x \& y) \& z$ ;
- (3)  $x \& y \leq x \& z$  whenever  $y \leq z$ ;
- (4)  $x \& 1 = x$ .

That is, the triple  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  is a commutative po-monoid [4]. A t-norm  $\&$  is called to be *continuous* if  $\& : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a continuous function with respect to the usual topology. In this case, the function  $x \& - : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  preserves arbitrary joins for each  $x \in [0, 1]$ , hence the triple  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  is also a quantale [25].

There are three basic continuous t-norms listed in the below:

- the Gödel t-norm:  $x \&_G y = x \wedge y$ ;
- the product t-norm  $x \&_P y = x \cdot y$ ;
- the Lukasiewicz t-norm:  $x \&_{\mathbb{L}} y = \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$ .

One can obtain all continuous t-norms by ordinal sums of the product t-norm and Lukasiewicz t-norm.

**Theorem 2.1.** ([18]) *Every continuous t-norm  $\&$  on  $[0, 1]$  is an ordinal sum of the product t-norm and the Lukasiewicz t-norm. That means, there is a countable set of disjoint open intervals  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$  in  $[0, 1]$  such that*

- (i) for each  $i \in I$ , both  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are idempotent and there is an order isomorphism  $\varphi_i : [0, 1] \longrightarrow [a_i, b_i]$  satisfying either  $\varphi_i(x \cdot y) = \varphi_i(x) \& \varphi_i(y)$  or  $\varphi_i(x \&_L y) = \varphi_i(x) \& \varphi_i(y)$ ;
- (ii)  $x \& y = x \wedge y$  whenever  $(x, y) \notin \bigcup_{i \in I} (a_i, b_i)^2$ .

Each  $[a_i, b_i]$  with the restriction of  $\&$  is called an Archimedean block of  $\&$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** ([18]) Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm on  $[0, 1]$  and  $p$  be an idempotent element of  $\&$ . Then  $x \& y = x \wedge y$  whenever  $x \leq p \leq y$ .

**Standing Assumption.** In the rest of this paper,  $\&$  is always assumed to be a continuous t-norm.

**Definition 2.3.** ([29]) Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm. A *real-enriched category*, or a  $[0, 1]$ -category for short, is a pair  $(X, r)$ , where  $X$  is a set and  $r : X^2 \longrightarrow [0, 1]$  is a map such that

- (i)  $r(x, x) = 1$  for all  $x \in X$ ;
- (ii)  $r(y, z) \& r(x, y) \leq r(x, z)$  for all  $x, y, z \in X$ .

A  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  is *symmetric* if  $r(x, y) = r(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . If one interpret the value  $r(x, y)$  as the truth degree that  $x$  is smaller than or equal to  $y$ , then a real-enriched category can be regarded as a quantitative preordered set in Lawvere's sense [22], or a fuzzy preordered set in the fuzzy set theory [5, 18].

Suppose both  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are  $[0, 1]$ -categories. A map  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  is called a  $[0, 1]$ -functor if

$$r(x_1, x_2) \leq s(f(x_1), f(x_2))$$

for all  $x_1, x_2$  in  $X$ . All  $[0, 1]$ -categories and  $[0, 1]$ -functors form a category, denoted by

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat.}$$

In the following example, it is shown that preordered sets and generalized metric spaces can all be regarded as real-enriched categories.

**Example 2.4.** (1) Let  $(X, \leq)$  be a preordered set. Define a map  $r_\leq : X \times X \longrightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$r_\leq(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \not\leq y, \\ 1, & x \leq y. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $(X, r_\leq)$  is a real-enriched category. Moreover, the assignment  $(X, \leq) \mapsto (X, r_\leq)$  on objects gives a full embedding functor

$$\pi : \mathbf{POrd} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat},$$

where  $\mathbf{POrd}$  is the category of all preordered sets and order preserving maps.

(2) A map  $d : X \times X \longrightarrow [0, \infty]$  is called a generalized metric [22] on the set  $X$  if it satisfies that

- (i)  $d(x, x) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ ,
- (ii)  $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$  for all  $x, y$  and  $z$  in  $X$ .

A map  $f$  between generalized metric spaces  $(X, d_1)$  and  $(Y, d_2)$  is called to be non-expansive if

$$d_1(x, y) \geq d_2(f(x), f(y)).$$

All generalized metric spaces and non-expansive maps form a category, denoted by  $\mathbf{GMet}$ . Let  $\&$  be the product t-norm, since the map  $x \mapsto -\ln x$  is an isomorphism between the po-monoids  $([0, 1], \cdot, 1)$  and  $([0, \infty]^{\text{op}}, +, 0)$ , it induces an isomorphism between the category  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$  and  $\mathbf{GMet}$ . In this case, a real-enriched category  $(X, r)$  is assigned to a generalized metric space  $(X, -\ln r)$ .

### 3. Stable subconstructs of $[0,1]$ -Cat

In this section, we consider the stable subconstructs of the concrete category  $[0,1]$ -Cat. Our main technique is similar to that in [24] for quasi-metric spaces. We make some slight changes for real-enriched categories.

Recall from [1] that a construct is a concrete category  $(\mathbf{A}, U)$  over **Set** with  $U$  being the forgetful functor. A subcategory  $\mathbf{A}$  of a construct  $\mathbf{B}$  is called a subconstruct. A subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $\mathbf{B}$  is called *concretely reflective* in  $\mathbf{B}$  if for each  $\mathbf{B}$ -object there is an identity-carried  $\mathbf{A}$ -reflection arrow. Reflectors induced by identity-carried reflection arrows are called concrete reflections. A concretely reflective subcategory of an amnesic concrete category is always full [1, Proposition 5.24]. Concretely coreflective subconstructs and concrete coreflections are defined dually.

A subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of a construct  $\mathbf{B}$  is *stable* [24] if  $\mathbf{A}$  is simultaneously concretely reflective and concretely coreflective in  $\mathbf{B}$ .

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, U)$  be a construct, a *source* is a family of morphisms  $\{f_i : A \rightarrow A_i\}_{i \in I}$  with domain  $A$  and codomain  $A_i$ . A source  $\{A \rightarrow A_i\}_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathbf{A}$  is *initial* provided that a set-map  $f : UB \rightarrow UA$  is an  $\mathbf{A}$ -morphism whenever each composite  $f_i \circ f : UB \rightarrow UA_i$  is an  $\mathbf{A}$ -morphism. Dually, a *sink* is a family of morphisms  $\{f_i : A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$  with domain  $A_i$  and codomain  $A$ . A sink  $\{A_i \rightarrow A\}_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathbf{A}$  is *final* provided that a set-map  $f : UA \rightarrow UB$  is an  $\mathbf{A}$ -morphism whenever each composite  $f \circ f_i : UA_i \rightarrow UB$  is an  $\mathbf{A}$ -morphism.

A construct  $(\mathbf{A}, U)$  is *topological* [1] if every  $U$ -structured source  $\{f_i : X \rightarrow UA_i\}_{i \in I}$  has a unique initial lift  $\{f_i : A \rightarrow A_i\}_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ , which implies the existence of unique final lifts of  $U$ -structured sinks.

**Example 3.1.** The category  $[0,1]$ -Cat is topological. For a structured source  $\{f_i : X \rightarrow (X_i, r_i)\}_{i \in I}$  in **Set**, the initial lift in  $[0,1]$ -Cat is given by  $\{f_i : (X, d_{in}) \rightarrow (X_i, r_i)\}_{i \in I}$  with

$$d_{in}(x, y) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} r_i(f_i(x), f_i(y)).$$

For a structured sink  $\{f_i : (X_i, r_i) \rightarrow X\}_{i \in I}$  in **Set**, the final lift in  $[0,1]$ -Cat is given by  $\{f_i : (X_i, r_i) \rightarrow (X, d_{fin})\}_{i \in I}$  with

$$d_{fin}(x, y) = \bigwedge \{s(x, y) \mid (X, s) \text{ is a } [0,1]\text{-category with } r_i(x, y) \leq s(f_i(x), f_i(y)) \text{ for all } i \in I\}.$$

A full subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of a construct  $\mathbf{B}$  is *initially closed* if every initial source in  $\mathbf{B}$  whose codomain is a family of  $\mathbf{A}$ -objects has its domain in  $\mathbf{A}$ . And a full subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of a construct  $\mathbf{B}$  is *finally closed* if every final sink in  $\mathbf{B}$  whose domain is a family of  $\mathbf{A}$ -objects has its codomain in  $\mathbf{A}$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** ([1, Proposition 21.31]) *For any full subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of a topological construct  $\mathbf{B}$  the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbf{A}$  is a stable subconstruct of  $\mathbf{B}$ .
- (2)  $\mathbf{A}$  is both initially closed and finally closed in  $\mathbf{B}$ .

The category  $[0,1]$ -Cat contains **POrd** as a stable subconstruct. In fact, the embedding functor

$$\pi : \mathbf{POrd} \rightarrow [0,1]\text{-Cat}$$

is simultaneously concretely reflective and concretely coreflective.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \leftarrow \sigma & \\ \mathbf{POrd} & \xrightarrow{\perp} & [0,1]\text{-Cat} \\ & \leftarrow \rho & \end{array}$$

For each  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$ , the coreflection  $\rho(X) = (X, \leq_{\rho(r)})$  is equipped with the greatest preorder below  $r$  given by

$$x \leq_{\rho(r)} y \iff r(x, y) = 1,$$

while the reflection  $\sigma(X) = (X, \leq_{\sigma(r)})$  is equipped with the smallest preorder on  $X$  above  $r$ , which is the transitive closure of the reflexive relation  $\leq_{\sigma'(r)}$  given by

$$x \leq_{\sigma'(r)} y \iff r(x, y) \neq 0.$$

Now we describe all stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Let  $(\mathbf{A}, U)$  be a construct, the *fibre*  $\mathbf{A}(X)$  of a set  $X$  is the class consisting of all  $\mathbf{A}$ -objects  $A$  with  $UA = X$  ordered by  $A \leq B$  if and only if  $\text{id}_X : A \rightarrow B$  is an  $\mathbf{A}$ -morphism. The construct  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** is *fibre-small*, that is, the fibre  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**( $X$ ) of each set  $X$  is small. Our main idea is based on the fact that the fibre  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**( $2$ ) of the set  $2 = \{0, 1\}$  is finally dense in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. So, the stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**( $2$ ) determine all stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**.

Let  $(2, r)$  be a  $[0, 1]$ -category. Then  $r$  is completely determined by the values of  $r(0, 1) = a$  and  $r(1, 0) = b$  since  $r(0, 0) = r(1, 1) = 1$  holds always. Conversely, every pair  $(a, b) \in [0, 1]^2$  determines a two-point  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(2, r)$  with  $r(0, 0) = r(1, 1) = 1, r(0, 1) = a$  and  $r(1, 0) = b$ . Thus, by abuse of notation, we often write the  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(2, r)$  as  $(2, a, b)$  for a pair  $(a, b) \in [0, 1]^2$ . That is, there is an order isomorphism

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat}(2) \cong [0, 1]^2.$$

Moreover, the fibre  $\mathbf{A}(2)$  can be viewed as a subset of  $[0, 1]^2$  for any subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm. If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a stable subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, then the fibre  $\mathbf{A}(2)$  satisfies the following properties:*

$$(S1) \quad (a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2) \implies \bigvee (a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2), \bigwedge (a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2);$$

$$(S2) \quad (a, b) \in \mathbf{A}(2) \implies (b, a) \in \mathbf{A}(2);$$

$$(S3) \quad (a_1, b_1) \in \mathbf{A}(2), (a_2, b_2) \in \mathbf{A}(2) \implies (a_1 \& a_2, b_1 \& b_2) \in \mathbf{A}(2).$$

*Proof.* (S1): It can be easily verified that the sink  $\{\text{id}_2 : (2, a_i, b_i) \rightarrow (2, a, b)\}_{i \in I}$  with  $a = \bigvee a_i$  and  $b = \bigvee b_i$  is final in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, since  $\mathbf{A}$  is finally closed by Proposition 3.2, it follows that  $(\bigvee a_i, \bigvee b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$  whenever all  $(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$ . Dually, since the source  $\{\text{id}_2 : (2, a, b) \rightarrow (2, a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$  with  $a = \bigwedge a_i$  and  $b = \bigwedge b_i$  is initial in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** and  $\mathbf{A}$  is initially closed, it follows that  $(\bigwedge a_i, \bigwedge b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$  whenever all  $(a_i, b_i) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$ .

(S2): Consider the map  $\tau : 2 \rightarrow 2$ ,  $\tau(0) = 1$  and  $\tau(1) = 0$ . Then  $\tau : (2, a, b) \rightarrow (2, b, a)$  is a final sink in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Thus, one obtains that  $(b, a) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$  if  $(a, b) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$ .

(S3): Let  $X = \{x, y, z\}$ . Consider maps  $f_1 : 2 \rightarrow X$ ,  $f_1(0) = x$ ,  $f_1(1) = y$  and  $f_2 : 2 \rightarrow X$ ,  $f_2(0) = y$ ,  $f_2(1) = z$ . Since  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** is topological, the sink  $\{f_i : (2, a_i, b_i) \rightarrow X \mid i = 1, 2\}$  has a unique final lift  $\{f_i : (2, a_i, b_i) \rightarrow (X, d_{fin}) \mid i = 1, 2\}$  in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Clearly, it holds that  $d_{fin}(x, z) = a_1 \& a_2$  and  $d_{fin}(z, x) = b_1 \& b_2$ . Let  $h : (2, a_1 \& a_2, b_1 \& b_2) \rightarrow (X, d_{fin})$  be a source with  $h(0) = x$  and  $h(1) = z$ , it is initial in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Thus, if both  $(a_1, b_1)$  and  $(a_2, b_2)$  are in  $\mathbf{A}(2)$ , then both  $(X, d_{fin})$  and  $(2, a_1 \& a_2, b_1 \& b_2)$  are also in  $\mathbf{A}$ . Hence,  $(a_1 \& a_2, b_1 \& b_2) \in \mathbf{A}(2)$  as desired.  $\square$

A subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$  satisfying the above conditions (S1) – (S3) is called a (symmetric) *suitable* [24] subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ . Given a suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$ , collect all objects  $(X, r)$  in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** such that

$$\forall x, y \in X, (r(x, y), r(y, x)) \in S,$$

then one obtains a full subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, denoted by

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_S.$$

**Example 3.4.** Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm. We list some suitable subsets of  $[0, 1]^2$  and the subconstructs  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_S$  of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**.

- (1) A subset  $K \subseteq [0, 1]$  is called a *complete sublattice* of  $[0, 1]$  if  $K$  is closed under arbitrary joins and meets. If  $K$  is at the same time closed under the binary operation  $\&$ , then the triple  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a quantale, called a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ . A  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  satisfying that  $r(x, y) \in K$  for all  $x, y \in X$  is called a  $K$ -category. Thus, all  $K$ -categories constitute a full subcategory of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, which is denoted by  $K$ -**Cat**.

Let  $(K, \&, 1)$  be a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ , then the product  $K^2$  is a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ . Clearly, one has that a real-enriched category  $(X, r) \in [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_{K^2}$  if and only if  $r(x, y) \in K$  for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ . Therefore, one has that

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K^2} = K\text{-Cat}.$$

Particularly, when  $K = 2 = \{0, 1\}$ , one has that

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{2^2} = 2\text{-Cat} \cong \mathbf{POrd}.$$

Let  $K_\Delta = \{(p, p) | p \in K\}$ . Then  $K_\Delta$  is also a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ . In this case, a  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r) \in [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_{K_\Delta}$  if and only if  $(X, r) \in K$ -**Cat** and  $r(x, y) = r(y, x)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ , that is,  $(X, r)$  is a symmetric  $K$ -category.

- (2) Since  $\&$  is a continuous t-norm, for each  $x \in [0, 1]$ , the set  $\{z \in [0, 1] \mid z \& z \leq x\}$  has the maximum. Define the square root of  $x$  by

$$x_{\&}^{\frac{1}{2}} = \max\{z \in [0, 1] \mid z \& z \leq x\},$$

then

$$S = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1]^2 \mid x \& x \leq y \leq x_{\&}^{\frac{1}{2}}\}$$

is a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ . It determines a stable subconstruct  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$  whose objects are those  $[0, 1]$ -categories  $(X, r)$  satisfying

$$r(x, y) \& r(x, y) \leq r(y, x) \leq (r(x, y))_{\&}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all  $x, y \in X$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm. A full subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** is stable if and only if there is a suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$  such that  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that in [24, Theorem 12.1.14] for quasi-metric spaces. We present here a sketch of the proof for the convenience to readers.

*Necessity:* By Proposition 3.3,  $\mathbf{A}(2)$  is a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ . We check that  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_{\mathbf{A}(2)}$ . Let  $(X, r)$  be a  $[0, 1]$ -category. For all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ , define a map

$$f_{xy} : 2 \longrightarrow X, \quad f_{xy}(0) = x \text{ and } f_{xy}(1) = y.$$

On one hand, one can see that each arrow

$$f_{xy} : (2, r(x, y), r(y, x)) \longrightarrow (X, r)$$

is an initial source in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Thus, the pair  $(r(x, y), r(y, x))$  is in  $\mathbf{A}(2)$  whenever  $(X, r)$  is in  $\mathbf{A}$ , which implies that the  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  is also in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_{\mathbf{A}(2)}$ . On the other hand, one can see that

$$\{f_{xy} : (2, r(x, y), r(y, x)) \longrightarrow (X, r) \mid x, y \in X\}$$

is a final sink in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Thus  $(X, r)$  is in  $\mathbf{A}$  whenever  $(X, r)$  lies in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_{\mathbf{A}(2)}$ .

*Sufficiency:* Let  $S$  be a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ , we show that  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$  is stable in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**.

Firstly, for a  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, let

$$C(r)(x, y) = \bigvee \{p \in \mathcal{Q} \mid (p, q) \in S \text{ and } (p, q) \leq (r(x, y), r(y, x))\}$$

for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ . It is clear that  $(C(r)(x, y), C(r)(y, x)) \in S$  for all  $x, y \in X$ . Notice that

$$C(r)(x, y) \& C(r)(y, z) \leq r(x, y) \& r(y, z) \leq r(x, z)$$

and the pair

$$(C(r)(x, y) \& C(r)(y, z), C(r)(z, y) \& C(r)(y, x))$$

lies in  $S$  for all  $x, y$  and  $z$  in  $X$ . Thus, one has that

$$C(r)(x, y) \& C(r)(y, z) \leq C(r)(x, z),$$

that is,  $(X, C(r))$  lies in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$ . Therefore,

$$\text{id}_X : (X, C(r)) \longrightarrow (X, r)$$

is the coreflection arrow.

Secondly, for a  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$ , let

$$R(r)(x, y) = \bigwedge \{s(x, y) \mid (X, s) \in [0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}_S \text{ and } r(x, y) \leq s(x, y)\}$$

for all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ . One can easily check that  $(X, R(r))$  is also in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$ . Therefore,

$$\text{id}_X : (X, r) \longrightarrow (X, R(r))$$

is the reflection arrow. □

**Corollary 3.6.** *A stable subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** contains **POrd** as a subconstruct if and only if there is a complete subquantale  $(K, \&, 1)$  of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  such that  $\mathbf{A} = K\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show the necessity. Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a stable subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** containing **POrd**, by the above Proposition 3.5,  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$  for some suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$ . Then it holds that  $2^2 = \mathbf{POrd}(2) \subseteq \mathbf{A}(2) = S$ . Define

$$K = \{a \mid (a, b) \in S\},$$

it is clearly a complete sublattice of  $[0, 1]$  and  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ . Moreover,  $S \subseteq K^2$ . For each  $(a, b) \in K^2$ , there exists  $m$  and  $n$  with  $(a, m) \in S$  and  $(n, b) \in S$  such that

$$(a, b) = ((a, m) \wedge (1, 0)) \vee ((n, b) \wedge (0, 1)) \in S$$

since  $S$  is suitable, it follows that  $K^2 = S$ . Hence  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}_{K^2} = K\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}$ . □

#### 4. Closed stable subconstructs of $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**

Let  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  be  $[0, 1]$ -categories. Define

$$r \otimes s((x, y), (x', y')) = r(x, x') \& s(y, y')$$

for all  $(x, y), (x', y') \in X \times Y$ . Then  $(X \times Y, r \otimes s)$  is a  $[0, 1]$ -category, called the *tensor product* of  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$ , and is denoted by  $(X, r) \otimes (Y, s)$ .

Denote the set of all  $[0, 1]$ -functors from  $(X, r)$  to  $(Y, s)$  by  $[(X, r), (Y, s)]$ . Equipped with the real-enriched relation

$$d_{\otimes} : [(X, r), (Y, s)]^2 \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad d_{\otimes}(f, g) = \bigwedge_{x \in X} s(f(x), g(x)),$$

then  $([(X, r), (Y, s)], d_{\otimes})$  is a  $[0, 1]$ -category. For a given  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$ , the assignment  $(Y, s) \mapsto ([(X, r), (Y, s)], d_{\otimes})$  is a functor on  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, which is the right adjoint of  $(X, r) \otimes (-)$ . Therefore, together with the terminal object  $\mathbb{1} = (\{\star\}, e)$  where  $e(\star, \star) = 1$ ,  $([0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$  is a monoidal closed category [27].

**Proposition 4.1.** *All stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** are monoidal closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be a subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, then there is a suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$  such that  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]$ -**Cat** $_S$ . For  $[0, 1]$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ , that is,  $(r(x, x'), r(x', x)) \in S$  and  $(s(y, y'), s(y', y)) \in S$  for all  $x, x' \in X$  and  $y, y' \in Y$ . Then the pair

$$(r \otimes s((x, y), (x', y')), r \otimes s((x', y'), (x, y))) = (r(x, x'), r(x', x)) \& (s(y, y'), s(y', y)) \in S$$

for all  $(x, y), (x', y') \in X \times Y$ . And the pair

$$\begin{aligned} (d_{\otimes}(f, g), d_{\otimes}(g, f)) &= \left( \bigwedge_{x \in X} s(f(x), g(x)), \bigwedge_{x \in X} s(g(x), f(x)) \right) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} (s(f(x), g(x)), s(g(x), f(x))) \in S \end{aligned}$$

for all  $f, g \in [(X, r), (Y, s)]$ . Hence the tensor product  $(X, r) \otimes (Y, s)$  and the function space  $([(X, r), (Y, s)], d_{\otimes})$  are both in  $\mathbf{A}$ . Since the terminal object  $\mathbb{1}$  is contained in  $\mathbf{A}$  trivially,  $(\mathbf{A}, \otimes, \mathbb{1})$  is monoidal closed.  $\square$

In the category  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, one can also consider the cartesian product of  $[0, 1]$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$ . Define

$$r \times s((x, y), (x', y')) = r(x, x') \wedge s(y, y')$$

for all  $(x, y), (x', y') \in X \times Y$ , then  $(X \times Y, r \times s)$  is the product of  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. However, the category  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** is cartesian closed if and only if the t-norm  $\& = \wedge$  [21, Theorem 4.7], hence, it need not be cartesian closed in general. Our aim is to find out the cartesian closed ones among all stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**.

Recall from [1] that a category  $\mathbf{A}$  is *cartesian closed* if it has finite products and for each  $\mathbf{A}$ -object  $A$  the functor  $A \times - : \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$  has a right adjoint. The right adjoint functor for  $A \times -$  is denoted on objects by  $B \mapsto B^A$ , called power objects, and the associated co-universal arrows are denoted by

$$\text{ev} : A \times B^A \rightarrow B,$$

called evaluation morphisms.

**Lemma 4.2.** *([1, Proposition 27.9]) Any isomorphism-closed reflective and coreflective full subcategory of a cartesian closed category is again cartesian closed.*

To describe the structure map of the power objects in  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**, we need to introduce the *residuated* operation  $\rightarrow$  on  $[0, 1]$  that corresponds to  $\wedge$ . For all  $x$  and  $y \in [0, 1]$ , define

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} y, & x > y, \\ 1, & x \leq y. \end{cases}$$

Then the binary operations  $\wedge$  and  $\rightarrow$  satisfy the adjoint condition

$$x \wedge y \leq z \iff y \leq x \rightarrow z$$

for all  $x, y$  and  $z$  in  $[0, 1]$ . By this adjoint condition, one can easily see the properties in the below.

**Proposition 4.3.** *For all  $x, x_i \in [0, 1]$ , it holds that*

$$x \rightarrow \left( \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \right) = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (x \rightarrow x_i), \quad \left( \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i \right) \rightarrow x = \bigwedge_{i \in I} (x_i \rightarrow x).$$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Suppose  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are  $[0, 1]$ -categories such that their power object  $(Y, s)^{(X, r)}$  exists in the category  $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. Then the following statements hold.*

(1) ([7, 8]) The power object  $(Y, s)^{(X, r)}$  has an underlying set

$$|(Y, s)^{(X, r)}| = [(X, r), (Y, s)]$$

and is equipped with the structure map

$$d_{\Pi} : [(X, r), (Y, s)]^2 \longrightarrow K, \quad d_{\Pi}(f, g) = \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y)).$$

(2) For all  $[0, 1]$ -functors  $f$  and  $g$  in  $[(X, r), (Y, s)]$ ,  $d_{\Pi}(f, g) \leq d_{\otimes}(f, g)$ .

(3) If  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ ,  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are both  $K$ -categories, then the power object  $(Y, s)^{(X, r)}$  is also a  $K$ -category.

*Proof.* (2) : Let  $f, g \in [(X, r), (Y, s)]$ . It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\Pi}(f, g) &= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y)) \\ &\leq \bigwedge_{x \in X} r(x, x) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(x)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x \in X} s(f(x), g(x)) \\ &= d_{\otimes}(f, g). \end{aligned}$$

(3) : It is obvious from the definition of  $\rightarrow$ . □

For a  $K$ -category  $(X, r)$ , the functor  $X \times - : K\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow K\text{-Cat}$  has a right adjoint if and only if the  $[0, 1]$ -functor from  $(X, r)$  to the terminal object  $\mathbb{1}$  has a right adjoint in the sense of [7, 8, 9]. Therefore, as a special case of the Theorem 3.4 in [8], one obtains the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.5.** ([8]) Suppose  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  and  $(X, r)$  is a  $K$ -category. The functor  $(X, r) \times (-) : K\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow K\text{-Cat}$  has a right adjoint if and only if it holds that

$$(u \& v) \wedge r(x, y) \leq \bigvee_{z \in X} (u \wedge r(x, z)) \& (v \wedge r(z, y))$$

for all  $u, v \in K$  and  $x, y \in X$ .

**Theorem 4.6.** Let  $(K, \&, 1)$  be a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ . The following statements are equivalent:

- (1) the category  $K\text{-Cat}$  is cartesian closed;
- (2) the category  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_{\Delta}}$  is cartesian closed;
- (3) for all  $u, v, r \in K$ , it holds that

$$(u \& v) \wedge r = ((u \wedge r) \& v) \vee ((v \wedge r) \& u);$$

- (4)  $a \& a$  is idempotent for all  $a \in K$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) : It follows from that the category  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_{\Delta}}$  is reflective and coreflective in  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$  since  $K_{\Delta}$  is a suitable subset of  $[0, 1]^2$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) : Let  $u, v, r \in K$ . Consider the two-point  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(A, \rho) = (2, r, r)$ , since the category  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_{\Delta}}$  is cartesian closed, the functor

$$(A, \rho) \times - : [0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_{\Delta}} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_{\Delta}}$$

has a right adjoint hence it preserves final sinks [1]. Let  $(B, s) = (\{x, z\}, s)$  where  $s(x, z) = s(z, x) = u$ ,  $(C, t) = (\{z, y\}, t)$  where  $t(z, y) = t(y, z) = v$ , and  $(D, d) = (\{x, z, y\}, d)$  where  $d(x, z) = d(z, x) = u$ ,  $d(z, y) = d(y, z) = v$  and  $d(x, y) = d(y, x) = u \& v$ . Then

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(B, s) & & \\
& \searrow^{i_B} & \\
& & (D, d) \\
& \nearrow_{i_C} & \\
(C, t) & &
\end{array}$$

is a clearly a final sink in  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_\Delta}$  where  $i_B$  and  $i_C$  are the corresponding embedding. It follows that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(A \times B, \rho \times s) & & \\
& \searrow^{id_A \times i_B} & \\
& & (A \times D, \rho \times d) \\
& \nearrow_{id_A \times i_C} & \\
(A \times C, \rho \times t) & &
\end{array}$$

is also a final sink in  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_\Delta}$ . Since

$$\rho \times d((0, x), (1, y)) = r \wedge (u \& v),$$

and

$$d_{fin}((0, x), (1, y)) = ((u \wedge r) \& v) \vee ((v \wedge r) \& u)$$

where  $(A \times D, d_{fin})$  is the final lift of the structured sink

$$\{A \times B \longrightarrow A \times D, A \times C \longrightarrow A \times D\}.$$

Hence the equality

$$(u \& v) \wedge r = ((u \wedge r) \& v) \vee ((v \wedge r) \& u)$$

holds for all  $u, v, r \in K$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) : Let  $u = v = a$  and  $r = a \& a$ , it follows that

$$a \& a = a \& a \& a,$$

hence  $a \& a$  is idempotent for all  $a \in K$ .

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) : We need to show that the functor  $(X, r) \times - : K\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow K\text{-Cat}$  has a right adjoint for every object  $(X, r)$  in  $K\text{-Cat}$ , equivalently, for all  $u, v \in K$  and all  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$ , it holds that

$$(u \& v) \wedge r(x, y) \leq \bigvee_{z \in X} (u \wedge r(x, z)) \& (v \wedge r(z, y)).$$

We check the inequality in two cases.

*Case 1:* There is an idempotent element  $p$  between  $u$  and  $v$ . Without loss of generality, let  $u \leq p \leq v$ . In this case,  $a \& v = a \wedge v = a$  for all  $a \leq u$  by Lemma 2.2, one has that

$$\bigvee_{z \in X} (u \wedge r(x, z)) \& (v \wedge r(z, y)) \geq (u \wedge r(x, y)) \& (v \wedge r(y, y)) = u \wedge r(x, y) = (u \& v) \wedge r(x, y).$$

*Case 2:* There is no idempotent element between  $u$  and  $v$ . In this case, since  $\&$  is a continuous t-norm on  $[0, 1]$ , by Theorem 2.1, there is an open interval  $(p, q) \subseteq [0, 1]$  with both  $p$  and  $q$  being idempotent such that  $u, v \in (p, q)$  and no point in  $(p, q)$  is idempotent. Since  $u \& u$  and  $v \& v$  are both idempotent, clearly one has that  $p = u \& u = v \& v = u \& v$  and  $p \& u = p \& v = p$ . On one hand, if  $r(x, y) \geq p$ , then it holds that

$$\bigvee_{z \in X} (u \wedge r(x, z)) \& (v \wedge r(z, y)) \geq (u \wedge r(x, y)) \& (v \wedge r(y, y)) \geq p \& v = p = (u \& v) \wedge r(x, y).$$

On the other hand, if  $r(x, y) \leq p$ , then it holds that

$$\bigvee_{z \in X} (u \wedge r(x, z)) \& (v \wedge r(z, y)) \geq (u \wedge r(x, y)) \& (v \wedge r(y, y)) = r(x, y) \& v = r(x, y) = (u \& v) \wedge r(x, y).$$

Therefore, the inequality

$$\bigvee_{z \in X} (u \& r(x, z)) \wedge (v \& r(z, y)) \geq (u \& v) \wedge r(x, y)$$

always holds as desired.  $\square$

Collecting all elements  $a$  in  $[0, 1]$  such that  $a \& a$  is idempotent, then one obtains a complete sublattice

$$M = \{a \in [0, 1] \mid a \& a \text{ is idempotent}\}$$

of  $[0, 1]$ . Clearly,  $(M, \&, 1)$  is the largest complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  satisfying the fourth condition in the above theorem.

**Theorem 4.7.** *Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm. A stable subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  is cartesian closed if and only if there is a suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$  contained in  $M^2$  such that  $\mathbf{A} = [0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}_S$ . Hence  $M$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  is the largest cartesian closed and stable subconstruct in  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show the necessity. Suppose the cartesian closed and stable subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  be the form of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}_S$  for some suitable subset  $S$  of  $[0, 1]^2$ . For each  $(p, q) \in S$ , without loss of generality, let  $p \leq q$ . Then one has that both  $(p, p) = (p, q) \wedge (q, p) \in S$  and  $(q, q) = (p, q) \vee (q, p) \in S$ . Therefore, the subset

$$K = \{p \in [0, 1] \mid (p, p) \in S\}$$

is a complete sublattice of  $[0, 1]$  and  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ . Furthermore, it holds that

$$K_\Delta \subseteq S \subseteq K^2.$$

Since  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}_{K_\Delta}$  is a stable subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  and it is also contained in  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}_S$ , it is a stable subcategory of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}_S$ . Hence, it is cartesian closed by Lemma 4.2. By Theorem 4.6, it follows that  $a \& a$  is idempotent for all  $a \in K$ . That means,  $S \subseteq M^2$  as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 4.8.** We describe the complete subquantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  explicitly in this remark.

- (1) Let  $\&$  be the Gödel t-norm. Then  $M = [0, 1]$  since all elements in  $[0, 1]$  are idempotent. In this case,  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  itself is cartesian closed.
- (2) Let  $\&$  be the product t-norm. Then  $M = \{0, 1\}$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{POrd}$  is the largest cartesian closed and stable subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$ . Additionally, through the isomorphism between  $x \mapsto -\ln x$  and  $([0, 1], \cdot, 1)$  to  $([0, \infty]^{\text{op}}, +, 0)$ , the complete subquantale  $(\{0, 1\}, \cdot, 1)$  is transformed to the complete subquantale  $(\{0, \infty\}, +, 0)$ . Therefore, the category  $\mathbf{GMet}$  includes the isomorphic copy of  $\mathbf{POrd}$  as the largest cartesian closed and stable subconstruct.
- (3) Let  $\&$  be the Łukasiewicz t-norm. Then  $M = [0, 0.5] \cup \{1\}$ . Notice that  $L_3 = \{0, 0.5, 1\} \subseteq M$ , thus,  $M$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  is a cartesian closed subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  which is larger than  $L_3$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$ .
- (4) Let  $\&$  be a continuous t-norm in general. Collect all Archimedean blocks  $\{[a_i, b_i]\}_{i \in I}$  of  $\&$  such that each one has an isomorphism  $\varphi_i : ([0, 1], \&_L, 1) \rightarrow ([a_i, b_i], \&, b_i)$ , then

$$M = \{x \in [0, 1] \mid x \text{ is idempotent}\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} [\varphi_i(0), \varphi_i(0.5)] \right).$$

If the index set  $I$  is not empty, the quantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  is not a frame since each  $x$  in  $(\varphi_i(0), \varphi_i(0.5))$  is not idempotent, but the category  $M$ - $\mathbf{Cat}$  is cartesian closed.

For example, define  $\& : [0, 1]^2 \longrightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$x\&y = \begin{cases} 2x \cdot y, & x, y \in [0, 0.5], \\ \max\{x + y - 1, 0.5\}, & x, y \in [0.5, 1], \\ x \wedge y, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly  $\&$  is a continuous t-norm. In this case,  $\{0, 0.5, 1\}$  is the set of all idempotent elements of  $\&$  and  $M = [0.5, 0.75] \cup \{0, 1\}$ .

## 5. Cartesian closed subcategories of $\mathbf{YCCat}$

In this section, we show that, for each complete subquantale  $(K, \&, 1)$  of  $(M, \&, 1)$ , all Yoneda complete  $K$ -categories and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors form a cartesian closed category.

**Definition 5.1.** A net  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in a  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  is *forward Cauchy* [26, 27] if

$$\bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu \leq \gamma} r(x_\mu, x_\gamma) = 1.$$

A forward Cauchy net converges to  $a \in X$  if

$$r(a, x) = \bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} r(x_\mu, x)$$

for all  $x \in X$ , and  $a$  is called a *Yoneda limit* of  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$ , denoted as  $a = \lim x_\lambda$ .

A  $[0, 1]$ -category  $(X, r)$  is *Yoneda complete* if every forward Cauchy net in  $(X, r)$  converges. For a  $[0, 1]$ -functor  $f : (X, r) \longrightarrow (Y, s)$  and a forward Cauchy net  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $(X, r)$ ,  $\{f(x_\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is clearly a forward Cauchy net in  $(Y, s)$ , the  $[0, 1]$ -functor  $f$  is *Yoneda continuous* if it preserves the Yoneda limit of all forward Cauchy nets in  $(X, r)$ , that is,  $f(\lim x_\lambda) = \lim f(x_\lambda)$  for all forward Cauchy nets  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $(X, r)$ . All Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -categories and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors constitute a category

**YCCat.**

**Example 5.2.** (1) Every finite  $[0, 1]$ -categories is trivially Yoneda complete.

(2) When  $K = 2 = \{0, 1\}$ , a Yoneda complete 2-category is precisely a directed complete preordered set, and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors between Yoneda complete 2-categories are exactly Scott continuous maps.

(3) For all  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ , define

$$d(x, y) = \sup\{z \in [0, 1] \mid x\&z \leq y\},$$

then  $([0, 1], d)$  is a Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -category [27, Proposition 2.30].

Let  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  be  $[0, 1]$ -categories. All Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors from  $(X, r)$  to  $(Y, s)$  constitute a set  $[(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ , which is a subset of  $[(X, r), (Y, s)]$ . Equipped with the real-enriched relation  $d_\otimes$  on  $[(X, r), (Y, s)]$ , one obtains a  $[0, 1]$ -category  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\otimes)$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** ([21, Theorem 3.8]) *Let  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  be both Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -categories. Then both  $(X, r) \otimes (Y, s)$  and  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\otimes)$  are Yoneda complete. Therefore, the category  $(\mathbf{YCCat}, \otimes, 1)$  is monoidal closed.*

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}$  be stable subconstruct of  $[0, 1]$ -Cat. Then the category  $(\mathbf{A} \cap \mathbf{YCCat}, \otimes, 1)$  is monoidal closed.*

*Proof.* For given Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  in  $\mathbf{A}$ , the tensor product  $(X, r) \otimes (Y, s)$  and the function space  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\otimes)$  in  $\mathbf{YCCat}$  are both in  $\mathbf{A}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.5.** ([21, Proposition 4.3]) *Let  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  be both Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -categories. Then the cartesian product  $(X \times Y, r \times s)$  is also Yoneda complete.*

But **YCCat** need not be cartesian closed, since it is shown in [21, Theorem 4.7] that the category **YCCat** is cartesian closed if and only if the continuous t-norm  $\& = \wedge$ .

For the complete subquantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ , collect all the Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors, one obtains a category

### **$M$ -YCCat.**

We show that  **$M$ -YCCat** is cartesian closed in the sequel.

By Proposition 4.4 and Theorem 4.6, the power object  $(Y, s)^{(X, r)}$  of Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  always exists in  **$M$ -Cat**. We check that its subobject  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$  consisting of all Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors from  $(X, r)$  to  $(Y, s)$  is also Yoneda complete.

**Proposition 5.6.** *Suppose  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are both Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories and  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is a forward Cauchy net in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$ . Then  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is also forward Cauchy in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\otimes})$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that  $d_{\Pi}(f, g) \leq d_{\otimes}(f, g)$  for all  $f, g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ . □

Therefore, if  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is a forward Cauchy net in  $([X \rightarrow Y], d_{\Pi})$ , then for each  $x \in X$ , the net  $\{f_{\lambda}(x)\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is forward Cauchy in  $(Y, s)$ . So, one can define a function

$$f : (X, r) \longrightarrow (Y, s), \quad f(x) = \lim f_{\lambda}(x)$$

in a pointwise way. The function  $f$  is a Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functor [20, Theorem 4.2]. Our aim is to show that  $f$  is already a Yoneda limit of the net  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $([X \rightarrow Y], d_{\Pi})$ , hence  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$  is indeed Yoneda complete.

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $(X, r)$  be a  $[0, 1]$ -category and  $\alpha$  be a real number in  $[0, 1]$ . A net  $\{x_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is called to be *eventually  $\alpha$ -monotone* if there is some  $\lambda_0 \in D$  such that  $\alpha \leq r(x_{\lambda}, x_{\mu})$  for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$ .

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let  $(X, r)$  be a  $[0, 1]$ -category and  $\{x_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  be an eventually  $\alpha$ -monotone net in  $(X, r)$  for some idempotent element  $\alpha$  of  $\&$ . Then there is some  $\lambda_0 \in D$  such that for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$ ,*

$$\alpha \wedge r(x_{\mu}, x) \leq \alpha \wedge r(x_{\lambda}, x)$$

for all  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\{x_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is eventually  $\alpha$ -monotone, there is some  $\lambda_0$  such that  $\alpha \leq r(x_{\lambda}, x_{\mu})$  for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$ . Thus, one has that

$$\alpha \wedge r(x_{\mu}, x) = \alpha \wedge \alpha \wedge r(x_{\mu}, x) = \alpha \wedge (\alpha \& r(x_{\mu}, x)) \leq \alpha \wedge (r(x_{\lambda}, x_{\mu}) \& r(x_{\mu}, x)) \leq \alpha \wedge r(x_{\lambda}, x)$$

for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$  and all  $x \in X$ . □

Recall from [13] that  $x$  is *way below*  $y$  (written as  $x \ll y$ ) in a directed complete poset  $(L, \leq)$  if for all directed subset  $D \subseteq L$ ,  $y \leq \bigvee D$  always implies the existence of a  $d \in D$  with  $x \leq d$ . An element  $x$  is *compact* if  $x \ll x$ .

**Proposition 5.9.** *In the complete subquantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ , denote the set of all idempotent elements of  $\&$  by  $\mathbf{Idm}_{\&}$ , it holds that*

$$1 = \bigvee \{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \mid \alpha \ll 1 \text{ in } M\}.$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.1 and Remark 4.8, we divide the proof into two cases.

*Case 1:* There is some Archimedean block  $[a, b]$  of the t-norm  $\&$  satisfying that  $b = 1$ . One can see that the top element  $1 \in M$  is an isolated point in  $M$ . Thus, one has that  $1 \ll 1$  in  $M$  and  $1 = \bigvee \{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \mid \alpha \ll 1 \text{ in } M\}$ .

*Case 2:* Every Archimedean block  $[a, b]$  of the t-norm  $\&$  satisfies that  $b < 1$ . One has that the top element  $1 \in M$  is not isolated in  $\mathbf{Idm}_{\&}$ , hence,  $1 = \bigvee \{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \mid \alpha < 1\}$ . Furthermore, for all idempotent  $\alpha$  with  $\alpha < 1$ , it holds that  $\alpha \ll 1$  in  $M$ . Thus, one obtains that  $1 = \bigvee \{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \mid \alpha \ll 1 \text{ in } M\}$  as desired.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.10.** *Each forward Cauchy net  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in an  $M$ -category  $(X, r)$  is eventually  $\alpha$ -monotone for all elements  $\alpha \ll 1$  in the complete sublattice  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that

$$\{\alpha_\lambda = \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu \leq \gamma} r(x_\mu, x_\gamma) \mid \lambda \in D\}$$

is a directed subset in  $M$  and  $\bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \alpha_\lambda = 1$ . If  $\alpha \ll 1$ , then there is some  $\lambda_0 \in D$  such that

$$\alpha \leq \alpha_{\lambda_0} = \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu \leq \gamma} r(x_\mu, x_\gamma).$$

Thus, for all  $\gamma \geq \mu \geq \lambda_0$ ,  $\alpha \leq r(x_\mu, x_\gamma)$ , which means that  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is eventually  $\alpha$ -monotone.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.11.** *Suppose  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories, then the  $M$ -category  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\Pi)$  is also Yoneda complete.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\{f_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is a forward Cauchy net in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\Pi)$ . We claim that the Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functor  $f : (X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)$  given by

$$f(x) = \lim f_\lambda(x)$$

is a Yoneda limit of  $\{f_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_\Pi)$ . That is, we need to check that, for all  $g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ ,

$$d_\Pi(f, g) = \bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g).$$

Let  $\alpha$  be an idempotent element such that  $\alpha \ll 1$  in  $M$ . By Lemma 5.10, there is a  $\lambda_0 \in D$  such that for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$ ,

$$\alpha \leq d_\Pi(f_\lambda, f_\mu) \leq s(f_\lambda(x), f_\mu(x))$$

for all  $x \in X$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 5.8, it holds that, for all  $\mu \geq \lambda \geq \lambda_0$ ,

$$\alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \leq \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\lambda, g)$$

and

$$\alpha \wedge s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \leq \alpha \wedge s(f_\lambda(x), g(y))$$

for all  $g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$  and  $x, y \in X$ .

Thus, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \wedge \bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) &= \bigvee_{\lambda \in D} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \\ &= \bigvee_{\lambda_0 \leq \lambda} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \\ &= \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \\ &= \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \wedge \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) &= \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \\
&= \bigvee_{\lambda_0 \leq \lambda} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \\
&= \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \\
&= \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)).
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$  and  $x, y \in X$ .

Therefore, for all  $g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ , one can calculate as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f, g) &= \alpha \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y)) \right) \\
&= \left( \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow a \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y)) \right) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} \left( (r(x, y) \rightarrow a) \wedge (r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y))) \right) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow (\alpha \wedge s(f(x), g(y))) \quad (\text{Proposition 4.3 (3)}) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow \left( \alpha \wedge \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \right) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow \left( \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \right) \\
&= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} \left( r(x, y) \rightarrow \alpha \right) \wedge \left( r(x, y) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \right) \quad (\text{Proposition 4.3 (3)}) \\
&= \left( \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow \alpha \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \right) \\
&= \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f_\mu(x), g(y)) \quad (\text{Proposition 4.3 (3)}) \\
&= \alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{\lambda_0 \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \\
&= \alpha \wedge \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the complete subquantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  of  $([0, 1], \&, 1)$  satisfies the property

$$1 = \bigvee \{ \alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \mid a \ll 1 \text{ in } M \},$$

it follows that

$$d_\Pi(f, g) = \bigvee_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \\ \alpha \ll 1}} \left( \alpha \wedge d_\Pi(f, g) \right) = \bigvee_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbf{Idm}_{\&} \\ \alpha \ll 1}} \left( \alpha \wedge \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g) \right) = \bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}} \bigwedge_{\lambda \leq \mu} d_\Pi(f_\mu, g).$$

for all  $g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ . Hence,  $f$  is a Yoneda limit of  $\{f_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{D}}$  as desired.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.12.** *Let  $(X, r), (Y, s), (Z, t)$  be Yoneda complete  $[0, 1]$ -categories. A  $[0, 1]$ -functor  $f : (X, r) \times (Y, s) \rightarrow (Z, t)$  is Yoneda continuous if and only if it is Yoneda continuous separately.*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of [21, Proposition 3.7].  $\square$

**Proposition 5.13.** *Suppose  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$  are Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories, then the evaluation map  $\text{ev} : (X, r) \times ((X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)), d_{\Pi} \rightarrow (Y, s)$  given by  $\text{ev}(x, f) = f(x)$  is a Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functor.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\text{ev}$  is a  $[0, 1]$ -functor and  $\text{ev}(-, f) : (X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)$  is Yoneda continuous for each  $f \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ . Given an  $x \in X$  and a forward Cauchy net  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$ , by Theorem 5.11, the function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  given by  $f(x) = \lim f_{\lambda}(x)$  is a Yoneda limit of  $\{f_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$ . It follows that  $\text{ev}(x, f) = f(x) = \lim f_{\lambda}(x)$ , hence  $\text{ev}(x, -)$  is Yoneda continuous. By Proposition 5.12,  $\text{ev}$  is Yoneda continuous.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.14.** *Suppose  $(X, r), (Y, s)$  and  $(Z, t)$  are all Yoneda complete  $M$ -categories and  $f : (X, r) \times (Z, t) \rightarrow (Y, s)$  is a Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functor, then  $\hat{f} : (Z, t) \rightarrow ((X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)), d_{\Pi}$  is also a Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functor, where  $\hat{f}(z) = f(-, z)$  for each  $z \in Z$ .*

*Proof.* It is easily verified that  $\hat{f}$  is a  $[0, 1]$ -functor. Given a forward Cauchy net  $\{x_{\lambda}\}_{\lambda \in D}$  in  $(Z, t)$  which converges to  $a \in Z$ , then  $\{f(-, x_{\lambda})\}_{\lambda \in D}$  is a forward Cauchy net in  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$  with a pointwise Yoneda limit  $g$ , which is given by

$$g(x) = \lim f(x, x_{\lambda}).$$

Since  $f$  is Yoneda continuous, it follows that  $\hat{f}(a)(x) = f(x, a) = \lim f(x, x_{\lambda}) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ , that is,  $\hat{f}(a) = g$ . The  $[0, 1]$ -functor  $\hat{f}$  is Yoneda continuous as desired.  $\square$

Combine the results of Proposition 5.5, Theorem 5.11, Proposition 5.13 and Proposition 5.14, we have the following:

**Theorem 5.15.** *The category  $M\text{-YCCat}$  is cartesian closed.*

**Corollary 5.16.** *Let  $(K, \&, 1)$  be a complete subquantale of  $(M, \&, 1)$ .*

- (1) *The category  $K\text{-YCCat}$  is cartesian closed.*
- (2) *All symmetric  $K$ -categories in  $K\text{-YCCat}$  and Yoneda continuous  $[0, 1]$ -functors form a cartesian closed category.*

*Proof.* (1): Notice that, for Yoneda complete  $K$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$ , both the product  $(X, r) \times (Y, s)$  and the power object  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$  in  $M\text{-YCCat}$  are also  $K$ -categories.

(2): For symmetric Yoneda complete  $K$ -categories  $(X, r)$  and  $(Y, s)$ , it is easy to see that product  $(X, r) \times (Y, s)$  is also a symmetric Yoneda complete  $K$ -category. It suffices to check that the power object  $([(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)], d_{\Pi})$  in  $M\text{-YCCat}$  is a symmetric  $K$ -category, that is, for all  $f, g \in [(X, r) \rightarrow (Y, s)]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\Pi}(f, g) &= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(x, y) \rightarrow s(f(x), g(y)) \\ &= \bigwedge_{x, y \in X} r(y, x) \rightarrow s(g(y), f(x)) \\ &= d_{\Pi}(g, f). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Example 5.17.** Consider the Łukasiewicz norm  $\&_{\mathbb{L}}$ . Notice that  $M = [0, 0.5] \cup \{1\}$  and  $\mathbb{L}_3 = \{0, 0.5, 1\} \subseteq M$ . Clearly,  $(\mathbb{L}_3, \&_{\mathbb{L}}, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $(M, \&_{\mathbb{L}}, 1)$ . Therefore, both  $M\text{-YCCat}$  and  $\mathbb{L}_3\text{-YCCat}$  are cartesian closed. The fact that category  $\mathbb{L}_3\text{-YCCat}$  is cartesian closed is firstly shown in [23].

If  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $(M, \&, 1)$ , then both  $K^2$  and  $K_\Delta$  are suitable subsets of  $[0, 1]^2$  contained in  $M^2$ . By the above Corollary,  $\mathbf{YCCat} \cap [0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K^2}$  and  $\mathbf{YCCat} \cap [0, 1]\text{-Cat}_{K_\Delta}$  are cartesian closed. However, it remains open whether  $\mathbf{YCCat} \cap \mathbf{A}$  is cartesian closed for all cartesian closed and stable subconstruct  $\mathbf{A}$  of  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ .

## 6. Conclusion

Let  $\&$  be a continuous triangular norm with Archimedean blocks, that is,  $\&$  is not idempotent. Neither the category  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$  nor the category  $\mathbf{YCCat}$  is cartesian closed. Some cartesian closed subcategories of them are found out. Firstly, all cartesian closed and stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$  is characterized by suitable subsets of  $[0, 1]^2$ . It is shown that a stable subconstructs of  $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$  is cartesian closed if and only if the associated suitable subset  $S \subseteq M^2$ , and then  $M\text{-Cat}$  is the largest one among all cartesian and stable subconstructs. Secondly, it is shown that  $K\text{-YCCat}$  is cartesian closed if  $(K, \&, 1)$  is a complete subquantale of  $(M, \&, 1)$ . It is remarkable that the quantale  $(M, \&, 1)$  need not be a frame but both the category  $M\text{-Cat}$  and  $M\text{-YCCat}$  are cartesian closed.

## Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## Acknowledgment

The authors express their sincere thanks to the referees for their most valuable comments and suggestions on this paper and acknowledge the support of National Natural Science Foundation of China (12171342).

## References

- [1] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, G.E. Strecker, *Abstract and Concrete Categories*, Wiley, New York, 1990.
- [2] P. America, J.J.M.M. Rutten, Solving reflexive domain equations in a category of complete metric spaces, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 39 (1989) 343–375.
- [3] S. Antoniuk, P. Waszkiewicz, A duality of generalized metric spaces, *Topology and its Applications* 158 (2011) 2371–2381.
- [4] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, Third Edition, American Mathematical Society, 1973.
- [5] R. Bělohlávek, *Fuzzy Relational Systems: Foundations and Principles*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [6] M. Bonsangue, F. Breugel, J.J.M.M. Rutten, Generalized metric spaces: Completion, topology, and powerdomains via the Yoneda embedding, *Theoretical Computer Science* 193 (1998) 1–51.
- [7] M.M. Clementino, D. Hofmann, W. Tholen, Exponentiability in categories of lax algebras, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 11 (2003) 337–352.
- [8] M.M. Clementino, D. Hofmann, Exponentiation in  $\mathbf{V}$ -categories, *Topology and its Applications* 153 (2006) 3113–3128.
- [9] R. Dyckhoff, W. Tholen, Exponentiable morphisms, partial products and pullback complements, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 49 (1987) 103–116.
- [10] L. Fan, A new approach to quantitative domain theory, *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 45 (2001) 77–87.
- [11] B. Flagg, R. Kopperman, Continuity spaces: Reconciling domains and metric spaces, *Theoretical Computer Science* 177 (1997) 111–138.
- [12] R.C. Flagg, Ph. Sünderhauf, The essence of ideal completion in quantitative form, *Theoretical Computer Science* 278 (2002) 141–158.

- [13] G. Gierz, K.H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J.D. Lawson, M. Mislove, D.S. Scott, *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [14] G. Gutierrez, D. Hofmann, Approaching metric domains, *Applied Categorical Structures* 21 (2013) 617–650.
- [15] P. Hájek, *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.
- [16] D. Hofmann, P. Waszkiewicz, Approximation in quantale-enriched categories, *Topology and its Applications* 158 (2011) 963–977.
- [17] D. Hofmann, P. Nora, Enriched Stone-type dualities, *Advances in Mathematics* 330 (2018) 307–360.
- [18] E.P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, *Triangular Norms*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [19] H.P. Künzi, M.P. Schellekens, On the Yoneda completion of a quasi-metric space, *Theoretical Computer Science* 278 (2002) 159–194.
- [20] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Complete and directed complete  $\Omega$ -categories, *Theoretical Computer Science* 388 (2007) 1–25.
- [21] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Closedness of the category of liminf complete fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 282 (2016) 86–98.
- [22] F.W. Lawvere, Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories, *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano* 43 (1973) 135–166.
- [23] M. Liu, B. Zhao, A non-frame valued cartesian closed category of liminf complete fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 321 (2017) 50–54.
- [24] R. Lowen, *Index Analysis, Approach Theory at Work*, Springer, 2015.
- [25] K.I. Rosenthal, *Quantales and Their Applications*, Longman, Essex, 1990.
- [26] K.R. Wagner, Solving recursive domain equations with enriched categories, Ph.D. Thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, Technical report CMU-CS-94-159, July 1994.
- [27] K.R. Wagner, Liminf convergence in  $\Omega$ -categories, *Theoretical Computer Science* 184 (1997) 61–104.
- [28] L.A. Zadeh, Similarity relations and fuzzy orderings, *Information Sciences* 3 (1971) 177–200.
- [29] D. Zhang, Introductory notes on real-enriched categories, arXiv:2403.09716 [math.CT].