

## Re: How to visualize limits in category theory

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-12/8900.html>

---

*analytic\_at\_gmail.com*

**Date:** 12/19/04

Date: 18 Dec 2004 17:29:20 -0800

Oh come on, just admit it! You're thinking in terms of venn diagrams like the rest of us ;)

KRamsay wrote:

> *In article <cpun6f\$oji\$1@panix5.panix.com>, lrudolph@panix.com (Lee Rudolph)*

> *writes:*

> *|"Jesse F. Hughes" <jesse@phiwumbda.org> writes:*

> *|>barr@barrs.org (Michael Barr) writes:*

> *|>*

> *|>> When I think about limits, I think about subobjects of products.*

> *|>*

> *|>That's \*much\* clearer than what I wrote, when I said a category is*

> *|>complete just in case it has equalizers and products. My answer is*

> *|>relevant to completeness, but not a good answer to how to visualize*

> *|>limits.*

> *|*

> *|I was pleased to see Michael Barr rework the verb being used*

> *|into "think about", and I'm distressed to see you return to*

> *|"visualize".*

> *|*

> *|When I visualize products, I often visualize them as boxes. When*

> *|I visualize subobjects, I often visualize them as amorphous shapes*

> *|inside the boxes. :-)*

> *|*

> *|Actually, I tend to keep a picture in mind of the diagram used to*

> *|define the limit object, picturing the object itself as the result of*

> *|a compromise between two forces. The definition can be considered*

> *|in two parts; on the one hand the object has to be large enough*

> *| (it has supporting struts inside...) and on the other hand it can't*

> *| be excessively big (it has a tight covering surrounding it).*

> *|*

> *|Keith Ramsay*