# Topos Quantum Theory on Quantization-Induced Sheaves

Kunji Nakayama<sup>\*</sup> Faculty of Law Ryukoku University Fushimi-ku, Kyoto 612-8577

February 29, 2024

#### Abstract

In this paper, we construct a sheaf-based topos quantum theory. It is well known that a topos quantum theory can be constructed on the topos of presheaves on the category of commutative von Neumann algebras of bounded operators on a Hilbert space. Also, it is already known that quantization naturally induces a Lawvere-Tierney topology on the presheaf topos. We show that a topos quantum theory akin to the presheaf-based one can be constructed on sheaves defined by the quantization-induced Lawyere-Tierney topology. That is, starting from the spectral sheaf as a state space of a given quantum system, we construct sheaf-based expressions of physical propositions and truth objects, and thereby give a method of truth-value assignment to the propositions. Furthermore, we clarify the relationship to the presheafbased quantum theory. We give translation rules between the sheafbased ingredients and the corresponding presheaf-based ones. The translation rules have 'coarse-graining' effects on the spaces of the presheaf-based ingredients; a lot of different proposition presheaves, truth presheaves, and presheaf-based truth-values are translated to a proposition sheaf, a truth sheaf, and a sheaf-based truth-value, re-We examine the extent of the coarse-graining made by spectively. translation.

<sup>\*</sup>e-mail: nakayama@law.ryukoku.ac.jp

### 1 Introduction

Since Isham [1] applied topos theory to history quantum theory, topos theoretic approach to quantum theory has been studied by many researchers [2–18]. In this approach, quantum theory is reformulated within a framework of intuitionistic (hence, multi-valued) logic. Every physical proposition about a given quantum system is assigned a truth-value without falling foul of the Kochen-Specker no go theorem [19]. Therefore, the topos approach permits some kind of realistic interpretation regarding values of physical quantities that does not require things like the notion of measurement. Because of this, it can provide a promising framework for quantum gravity theory and quantum cosmology.

There are a few different ways of topos approach. Among them, we focus on the formalism made by Döring and Isham [6-9, 14, 15]. They adopted the topos of presheaves on the category of commutative von Neumann algebras of bounded operators on a Hilbert space. In their theory, the spectral presheaf plays a key role similar to state space of classical physics. As a result of the Kochen-Specker theorem, we cannot assign to every physical quantity of a quantum system a sharply determined value, which means there are no global elements of the spectral presheaf [2-5]. In this respect, the spectral presheaf is largely different from the state space of classical physics, since the latter consists of points, each of which corresponds to a state where every physical quantity has sharply determined value. Nonetheless, the spectral presheaf can work as a state space in that every physical proposition about a given quantum system can be expressed as its subobject, as every physical proposition about a classical system can be identified with its extensional expression, i.e., a subset of state space. By regarding the spectral presheaf as state space and using it in a topos theoretical framework, Döring and Isham succeeded in giving a method that assigns to every physical proposition a truth-value.

Döring and Isham's theory is an abstract, general theory; it does not need to be related to concrete classical systems, like ordinary quantum theories that are axiomatically or algebraically formulated on Hilbert spaces or  $C^*$ algebras. This is the case for the other topos quantum theories obtained so far. If quantization of a classical system is taken into consideration, however, some extra structures are induced on the topos on which a quantum theory is formulated. In fact, Nakayama [20] showed that quantization that is given by a function from classical observables to self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space naturally induces a Lawvere-Tierney topology on the presheaf topos of Döring and Isham. It is well-known that any Lawvere-Tierney topology defines sheaves, and furthermore, the collection of all such sheaves also forms a topos [21]. Thus, from the presheaf topos, we obtain another topos consisting of sheaves via quantization.

One question would arise. Can we construct a quantum theory on the topos of quantization-induced sheaves? One of the purposes of the present paper is to give an affirmative answer to the question. We can construct a topos quantum theory on the quantization-induced sheaves in a way akin to the presheaf-based theory of Döring and Isham. Such a theory could be canonical as a theory of the system quantized from the classical one since quantum observables corresponding to classical ones are identified therein.

Furthermore, the theory on quantization-induced sheaves can be formulated by means of topos-theoretic ingredients smaller than those of the presheaf-based theory. For example, as we will see, the space of truth-values of the quantization-induced topos is smaller than that of the matrical topos of presheaves. This is because, for each sheaf-based truth-value, there are a lot of different presheaf-based ones that can be regarded as its 'translations', and conversely, a lot of different presheaf-based truth-values are translated to one and the same sheaf-based one. The same holds for the space of propositions and that of truth objects, because each sheaf-based proposition and each truth object have a lot of different presheaf-based translations. We call these properties coarse-graining made by translation.

Another question would arise. To what degree do the spaces of presheafbased truth-values, propositions, and truth objects get coarse-grained via translation? In this paper, we answer this question to some extent. We give translation rules between the sheaf-based ingredients and the presheaf-based ones, and for an arbitrarily given sheaf-based one, we explicitly construct corresponding subspaces consisting of its presheaf-based translations that are regarded as the same from the sheaf-based viewpoint.

The present paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we briefly review Nakayama's result [20] about quantization-induced topologies and sheaves. Further, additional explanation about some related notions that we will need in later sections are given. In section 3, we develop the sheaf-based method of truth-value assignment. This is done along the line of the presheaf-based method given by Döring and Isham [15], which we briefly summarize in appendix A for referential convenience. (We should, however, note that the main purpose of Döring and Isham [15] is not to give the method itself but to propose a new interpretation for quantum probabilities, which is beyond the scope of the present paper.) In section 4, we give rules of translation of the ingredients necessary for truth-value assignment between the sheaf-based and the presheaf-based cases. In section 5, we deal with the coarse-graining problem mentioned above. Main results obtained therein are presented by theorems 5.1, 5.5, and 5.7.

### 2 Topos of Sheaves Induced by Quantization

In this section, we give a brief review of the results by Nakayama [20] and some supplementary explanations. Nakayama [20] defines quantization as an injective map v from a Lie algebra  $\mathcal{O}$ , a model of classical observables [22], to self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . The quantization map naturally defines a functor  $\phi$  from the category  $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{O})$  of sets of commutative classical observables to the category  $\mathbf{V}$  of commutative von Neumann algebras of bounded operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ . The functor  $\phi$  assigns to each  $C \in \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{O})$  the least commutative von Neumann algebra that includes  $e^{iv(C)}$ . We define a functor  $\psi: \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{C}(\mathcal{O})$  by

$$\psi(V) := \{ a \in \mathcal{O} \mid e^{i\nu(a)} \in V \}.$$
(2.1)

The functors  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  give a Galois connection between  $\mathbf{C}(\mathcal{O})$  and  $\mathbf{V}$ .

The endofunctor  $\flat := \phi \psi : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$  induces a Grothendieck topology J on  $\mathbf{V}$ , which is defined by for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$J(V) := \{ \omega \in \Omega(V) \mid \flat(V) \in \omega \},$$
(2.2)

where  $\Omega$  is the subobject classifier of the topos  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}} \equiv \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbf{V}^{\mathrm{op}}}$  of presheaves on  $\mathbf{V}$ .

As is well-known, every Grothendieck topology on  $\mathbf{V}$  is equivalent to a Lawvere-Tierney topology on  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . (As for general theory of topoi, see e.g., MacLane and Moerdijk's textbook [21].) The Grothendieck topology (2.2) gives the Lawvere-Tierney topology  $\Omega \xrightarrow{j} \Omega$  defined by, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega(V)$ ,

$$j_V(\omega) := \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \flat(V') \in \omega \},$$
(2.3)

where  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$  means that  $V', V \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $V' \subseteq V$ .

Each Lawvere-Tierney topology is equivalent to a closure operator. In the present case given by (2.3), for each presheaf  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and its subobject  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}(Q)$ , the closure  $\overline{S}$  of S in Q is defined by

$$\bar{S}(V) := \{ q \in Q(V) \mid Q(\flat(V) \hookrightarrow V)(q) \in S(\flat(V)) \}.$$
(2.4)

Any Lawvere-Tierney topology j on  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  defines sheaves as follows: Let  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}(Q)$  be dense in Q, that is,  $\overline{S} = Q$ . Then, a presheaf R is called a sheaf associated with a topology j, or simply, j-sheaf, if and only if, for any morphism  $\lambda \in \operatorname{Hom}(S, R)$ , there exists one and only one morphism  $\mu \in \operatorname{Hom}(Q, R)$  that makes the diagram



commute. All *j*-sheaves and all morphisms between them form a topos, which is denoted by  $\operatorname{Sh}_{i} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ .

Sheaves associated with the topology (2.3) are expressed by the functor  $\flat^*: \widehat{\mathbf{V}} \to \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  that is defined by, for each  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ ,

$$(b^*Q)(V) := Q(b(V)), \tag{2.6}$$

and for any  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$(\flat^* Q)(V' \hookrightarrow V) := Q(\flat(V') \hookrightarrow \flat(V)). \tag{2.7}$$

We can show that a presheaf Q is a *j*-sheaf if and only if Q is isomorphic to  $\flat^*Q$ . To make the condition more precise, we define a morphism  $Q \xrightarrow{\zeta_Q} \flat^*Q$  by  $(\zeta_Q)_V := Q(\flat(V) \hookrightarrow V)$ . Then, Q is a *j*-sheaf if and only if  $\zeta_Q$  is isomorphic. We should note that  $\zeta_Q$  is natural with respect to  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . That is,  $\zeta$  is a natural transformation from the identity functor  $I : \widehat{\mathbf{V}} \to \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  to the functor  $\flat^* : \widehat{\mathbf{V}} \to \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . Furthermore, we should note that  $\flat^*$  is in fact an associated sheaf functor (a sheafification functor) from  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  to  $\mathrm{Sh}_j\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ .

Returning to the diagram (2.5), we note that the morphism  $\mu$  is given by

$$\mu = \zeta_R^{-1} \circ \flat^* \lambda \circ \zeta_Q, \tag{2.8}$$

since the naturality of  $\zeta$  makes the diagram



commute. Here, this digram reflects the fact that  $b^*S = b^*\bar{S} = b^*Q$ .

In our formalism, truth-values of physical propositions are taken on the subobject classifier  $\Omega_j$  of  $\operatorname{Sh}_j \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . That is, they are given as global elements  $1 \rightarrowtail \Omega_j \in \Gamma \Omega_j$  of  $\Omega_j$ . As is well-known,  $\Omega_j$  is the equalizer of  $\Omega \xrightarrow{1_\Omega} \Omega$  and  $\Omega \xrightarrow{j} \Omega$ . In the present case,  $\Omega_j$  is a subobject of  $\Omega$  given by

$$\Omega_j(V) := \{ \omega \in \Omega(V) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \ (\flat(V') \in \omega \Rightarrow V' \in \omega) \}.$$
(2.10)

Since for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,  $\Omega_j(V)$  contains the set  $\mathfrak{t}_V$  of all subalgebras of V as the top element, the truth arrow true<sub>i</sub>  $\in \Gamma \Omega_i$  is given by

$$(\operatorname{true}_j)_V := \mathfrak{t}_V. \tag{2.11}$$

Later, we will deal with power objects in  $\operatorname{Sh}_{j}\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . As is well-known, the power object  $\mathbb{P}_{j}R \equiv \Omega_{j}^{R}$  of a j-sheaf R can be calculated in  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . That is, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$(\mathbb{P}_{j}R)(V) = \operatorname{Hom}(R_{\downarrow V}, (\Omega_{j})_{\downarrow V}) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}(R_{\downarrow V}, \Omega_{j}),$$

$$(2.12)$$

where  $R_{\downarrow V}$  and  $(\Omega_j)_{\downarrow V}$  are downward restrictions as presheaves, the definition of which is given by (A.4) and (A.5). (Since  $\operatorname{Sh}_j \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  is a full subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ ,  $\operatorname{Hom}_{\operatorname{Sh}_j \widehat{\mathbf{V}}}(A, B) = \operatorname{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}}(A, B)$  for arbitrary sheaves A and B. So we simply write  $\operatorname{Hom}(A, B)$  for both of them omitting the subscripts  $\operatorname{Sh}_j \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ .) Also, for  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$  and  $\lambda \in (\mathbb{P}_j R)(V), \ \lambda|_{V'} \equiv (\mathbb{P}_j R)(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\lambda)$  is defined as the morphism that makes the diagram



commute.

In order to give another, more useful expression of the power object  $\mathbb{P}_j R$ , we note that it is a sheaf representing the collection  $\operatorname{Sub}_j(R)$  of all subsheaves of R. Let Q be a presheaf. As we will see below,  $\mathbb{P}_j(b^*Q)$  can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^* Q)(V) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_j(\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V})) \tag{2.14}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{j}(\flat^{*}Q)(V' \hookrightarrow V) : \operatorname{Sub}_{j}(\flat^{*}(Q_{\downarrow V})) \to \operatorname{Sub}_{j}(\flat^{*}(Q_{\downarrow V'})); S \mapsto \flat^{*}(S_{\downarrow V'}).$$
(2.15)

In particular, since any *j*-sheaf R satisfies  $R \simeq b^* R$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}_j R \simeq \mathbb{P}_j(\flat^* R) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_j(\flat^*(R_{\downarrow V})).$$
(2.16)

Expression (2.14) comes from the fact that

$$\mathbb{P}_{j}(b^{*}Q)(V) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}((b^{*}Q)_{\downarrow V}, \Omega_{j}) \\
\simeq \operatorname{Hom}(b^{*}(Q_{\downarrow V}), \Omega_{j}) \\
\simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{j}(b^{*}(Q_{\downarrow V})).$$
(2.17)

Here, the bijectivity between the first and second lines on (2.17) is verified from the commutative diagram



That is, since  $\Omega_j$  is a *j*-sheaf, and since, as easily shown,  $(\flat^* Q)_{\downarrow V}$  is dense in  $\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V})$ ,  $\chi$  is uniquely determined by use of (2.8) for each morphism  $\kappa$ .

To see consistency between (2.13) and (2.15), let  $S^{\chi}$  be a subsheaf of  $\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V})$  corresponding to the characteristic morphism  $\chi$ . Then, in the diagram



the trapezoid at the right hand side is a pullback, and so is the outer square as easily shown. Thus, also the trapezoid at the left hand side is a pullback, which means that  $\flat^*(S^{\chi}_{\downarrow V'})$  is identified as the subsheaf of  $\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V'})$  that corresponds to the characteristic morphism  $\chi|_{V'} \equiv \mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*Q)(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\chi)$ .

## 3 Truth-Value Assignment on Quantization-Induced Sheaves

In the theory of Döring and Isham [6–9, 14, 15], the spectral presheaf  $\Sigma$ , the definition of which is given in appendix A, plays a role of state space of a given quantum system. Every physical proposition P is assumed to be representable as a clopen subobject of  $\Sigma$ , that is, an element of the collection  $\operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma)$  of all clopen subobjects of  $\Sigma$ . For instance, Döring and Isham showed that each projection operator  $\hat{P}$ , which corresponds to some physical propositions in ordinary quantum theory, naturally defines a clopen subobject  $\delta(\hat{P})$  of  $\Sigma$  via the 'daseinization operator'  $\delta$ . If we are given a quantum state, we can specify propositions regarded as true. They are represented by a truth object  $\mathbb{T}$ , of which global elements give the truth propositions. If we have  $\mathbb{T}$ , we can assign to every proposition P a truth value via topostheoretical setting. In appendix A, we give a brief explanation of the method of truth-value assignment developed by Döring and Isham [15], the style of

which is helpful for us to construct a sheaf-based theory. (It should be emphasized, however, that the main purpose of [15] is not to give the valuation method summarize in appendix A, but to propose a new interpretation of quantum probabilities based on intuitionistic logic, which is beyond the scope of the purpose of the present paper.)

In our formalism, we appropriate the 'spectral sheaf'  $\flat^*\Sigma$  for the role of state space. Namely, every proposition is assumed to be representable as a clopen subsheaf of  $\flat^*\Sigma$ . We, thus, regard  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma)$ , the collection of all clopen subsheaves of  $\flat^*\Sigma$ , as a proposition space. It can be internalized to  $\operatorname{Sh}_i \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  as a subsheaf  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma)$  of  $\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma)$  that is defined by

$$(\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma))(V) := \mathrm{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V})). \tag{3.1}$$

This definition really gives a presheaf because  $(\mathbb{P}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma))(V' \hookrightarrow V)$ , i.e., the restriction of  $(\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma))(V' \hookrightarrow V)$  to  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$ , takes values on  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V'}))$ . Furthermore,

**Proposition 3.1** The presheaf  $\mathbb{P}_{j \text{cl}}(\flat^* \Sigma)$  is a *j*-sheaf.

Proof. We have

$$b^{*}(\mathbb{P}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^{*}\Sigma))(V) = (\mathbb{P}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^{*}\Sigma))(b(V))$$

$$= \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^{*}(\Sigma_{\downarrow \flat(V)}))$$

$$= \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^{*}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$$

$$= (\mathbb{P}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^{*}\Sigma))(V), \qquad (3.2)$$

where from the second line to the third, we used (B.3). Furthermore, for each  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta_{\mathbb{P}_{jcl}(b^*\Sigma)})_V(S) &= b^*(S_{\downarrow b(V)}) \\ &= b^*(S_{\downarrow V}) \\ &= S. \end{aligned}$$
(3.3)

Therefore,  $\zeta_{\mathbb{P}_{i \text{ cl}}(b^*\Sigma)}$  is a natural isomorphism.

As is well-known,  $\operatorname{Sub}_j(\flat^*\Sigma) \simeq \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma)) := \operatorname{Hom}(1, \mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma))$ . That is, every  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}_j(\flat^*\Sigma)$  has its name  $[S]_j \in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma))$  defined by

$$(\lceil S \rceil_j)_V := \flat^*(S_{\downarrow V}), \tag{3.4}$$

and every  $s \in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*\Sigma))$  has its inverse, i.e., the subsheaf  $\lceil s \rceil_j^{-1}$  of  $\flat^*\Sigma$  given by

$$[s]_{j}^{-1}(V) := (s_{V})(V).$$
(3.5)

It is obvious that, for any  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j}(\flat^{*}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V})), \lceil S \rceil_{j} \in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(\flat^{*}\Sigma))$  if and only if S is a proposition, i.e.,  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(\flat^{*}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$ . Furthermore, for each proposition  $P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(\flat^{*}\Sigma)$ , the diagram



commutes. Therefore,  $\mathbb{P}_{j \text{ cl}}(b^*\Sigma)$  is a canonical internalization of  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j \text{ cl}}(b^*\Sigma)$ .

We can express propositions in different ways. To do so, we need to invoke the outer presheaf O of Döring and Isham [7,14,15] and a few related notions. (As for the definition of O, see (A.6) and (A.7).) We call the sheafification  $\flat^*O$ of O the outer sheaf. Furthermore, we call a set  $h \equiv {\hat{h}_V \in (\flat^*O)(V)}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  a hyper-element of  $\flat^*O$ , if

$$\hat{h}_V = \hat{h}_{\flat(V)}$$
 and  $\flat^* O(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\hat{h}_V) \preceq \hat{h}_{V'}.$  (3.7)

This is a *j*-sheaf counterpart of the notion of hyper-elements (A.12) defined by Döring and Isham [15]. We write  $\operatorname{Hyp}_{j}(b^{*}O)$  for the collection of all hyperelements of  $b^{*}O$ . Let  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^{*}O)$  be the collection of all downward closed, Boolean subsheaves of  $b^{*}O$ . That is, for all  $P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j}(b^{*}O)$ ,  $P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^{*}O)$ if and only if, for any  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , P(V) is a downward closed set of  $(b^{*}O)(V)$ containing a top element. (Obviously, such P(V)'s are complete Boolean lattices.) We can regard  $\operatorname{Hyp}_{j}(b^{*}O)$  and  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^{*}O)$  as proposition spaces equivalent to  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(b^{*}\Sigma)$ . This is because, corresponding to relation (A.10) proved by Döring and Isham [15], the following relation holds:

$$\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O) \simeq \operatorname{Hyp}_i(\flat^* O) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^* \Sigma). \tag{3.8}$$

Here, the bijection at the left hand side of (3.8) is realized by a function  $c_j : \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hyp}_j(\flat^* O)$  that is defined by

$$(c_j(A))_V := \forall A(V). \tag{3.9}$$

To see the right hand side of (3.8), we use the bijections  $\alpha_V : O(V) \to \mathcal{C}l(\Sigma(V))$   $(V \in \mathbf{V})$  introduced by Döring and Isham [15]. (For the definition, see (A.15).) These bijections allow us to regard  $\{\mathcal{C}l(\Sigma(V))\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  as a presheaf  $\mathcal{C}l\Sigma$  isomorphic to the outer presheaf O, and  $\{\alpha_V\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  as a natural isomorphism  $\alpha : O \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{C}l\Sigma$ . Furthermore,  $\alpha$  induces a natural isomorphism  $b^*\alpha : b^*O \xrightarrow{\sim} b^*(\mathcal{C}l\Sigma)$ , where  $b^*(\mathcal{C}l\Sigma)(V) = \mathcal{C}l\Sigma(b(V)) = \mathcal{C}l(\Sigma(b(V))) = \mathcal{C}l(b(V))$ . Therefore, we obtain a bijection  $k_j : \operatorname{Hyp}_j(b^*O) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(b^*\Sigma)$  that is given by

$$(k_{j}(h))(V) := (b^{*}\alpha)_{V}(\hat{h}_{V})$$
  
$$= \{\sigma \in (b^{*}\Sigma)(V) \mid \sigma(\hat{h}_{V}) = 1\}$$
  
$$= \{\sigma \in \Sigma(b(V)) \mid \sigma(\hat{h}_{b(V)}) = 1\}, \qquad (3.10)$$

and hence, a bijection  $f_j : \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^* \Sigma)$  defined by

$$(f_j(A))(V) := (\flat^* \alpha)_V (\lor A(V)).$$
(3.11)

It is obvious from (3.8) that  $k_{j\downarrow V}$ ,  $c_{j\downarrow V}$ , and  $f_{j\downarrow V}$ , the restrictions of  $k_j$ ,  $c_j$ , and  $f_j$ , respectively, to subalgebras of V, give the relation

$$\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*(O_{\downarrow V})) \simeq \operatorname{Hyp}_j(\flat^*(O_{\downarrow V})) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V})).$$
(3.12)

Therefore, the proposition space  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*O)$  can be internalized also as a subsheaf  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*O)$  of  $\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*O)$  that is defined by

$$(\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*O))(V) := \mathrm{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*(O_{\downarrow V})). \tag{3.13}$$

Every proposition  $P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O)$  has its name  $\lceil P \rceil_j \in \Gamma(\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O))$  in  $\operatorname{Sh}_j \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ , which is given by  $(\lceil P \rceil_j)_V := \flat^*(P_{\downarrow V})$ .

The daseinization operator  $\delta$  introduced by Döring and Isham [6,7,14,15] assigns to each projection operator  $\hat{P}$  on  $\mathcal{H}$  a global element  $\delta(\hat{P})$  of the outer presheaf O. (For the definition, see (A.8).) As a counterpart of  $\delta$ , we introduce a map  $\delta_j$ , which assigns to each  $\hat{P}$  a global element of  $\flat^*O$  by

$$\delta_{j}(\hat{P})_{V} := \bigwedge \{ \hat{a} \in (\flat^{*}O)(V) \mid \hat{P} \preceq \hat{a} \}$$
  
$$= \bigwedge \{ \hat{a} \in O(\flat(V)) \mid \hat{P} \preceq \hat{a} \}$$
  
$$= \delta(\hat{P})_{\flat(V)}. \qquad (3.14)$$

To see that really  $\delta_i(\hat{P}) \in \Gamma(\flat^* O)$ , we note that, for  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_j(\hat{P}))_{V'} &= \delta(\hat{P})_{\flat(V')} \\ &= \delta(\delta(\hat{P})_{\flat(V)})_{\flat(V')} \\ &= O(\flat(V') \hookrightarrow \flat(V))(\delta(\hat{P})_{\flat(V)}) \\ &= (\flat^* O)(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\delta_j(\hat{P})_V). \end{aligned}$$
(3.15)

Because of (3.8) and the fact that  $\Gamma(\flat^* O) \subseteq \operatorname{Hyp}_j(\flat^* O)$ ,  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$  can be regarded as a proposition sheaf. That is, it defines elements of  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O)$  and  $\operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^* \Sigma)$  by

$$(\delta_j(\hat{P}))(V) = \{ \hat{a} \in (\flat^* \mathcal{O})(V) \mid \hat{a} \preceq (\delta_j(\hat{P}))_V \}$$
(3.16)

and

$$(\delta_j(\hat{P}))(V) = \{ \sigma \in (\flat^* \Sigma)(V) \mid \sigma((\delta_j(\hat{P}))_V) = 1 \},$$
(3.17)

respectively.

As previously noted, every proposition is represented by a clopen subsheaf of  $\flat^*\Sigma$ . We can assign to it a truth-value, a global element of  $\Omega_j$ , if we are given a collection of truth propositions. It is internalized as a truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , which is a subsheaf of  $\mathbb{P}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma)$  that satisfies appropriate properties. We regard a subsheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$  of  $\mathbb{P}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma)$  as a truth sheaf if and only if  $\mathbb{T}_j(V)$  is a filter for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . That is, if  $\mathbb{T}_j(V)$  contains  $A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$  as an element, then it does also any  $B \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$  such that  $A \subseteq B$ . Also, if  $A, B \in \mathbb{T}_j(V)$ , then  $A \cap B \in \mathbb{T}_j(V)$ .

Let  $\tau_j$  be the characteristic morphism of  $\mathbb{T}_j$  as a subsheaf of  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma)$ . That is, the morphism  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(\flat^*\Sigma) \xrightarrow{\tau_j} \Omega_j$  makes the diagram



a pullback. The morphism  $\tau_j$  is given by, for each  $S \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j \operatorname{cl}}(\flat^*(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}))$ ,

$$(\tau_j)_V(S) = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \flat^*(S_{\downarrow V'}) \in \mathbb{T}_j(V') \}.$$
(3.19)

Given a truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , we can assign to each proposition P a truth value  $\nu(P; \mathbb{T}_j) \in \Gamma\Omega_j$  as

$$\nu(P; \mathbb{T}_j) = \tau_j \circ \lceil P \rceil_j, \tag{3.20}$$

each V-element of which is given by

$$\nu(P; \mathbb{T}_j)_V = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \flat^*(P_{\downarrow V'}) \in \mathbb{T}_j(V') \}.$$
(3.21)

Let  $\rho$  be a density matrix and  $r \in [0, 1]$ . Döring and Isham [15] defined generalized truth objects  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}$ , the definition of which is given by (A.21). Their global elements represent propositions that are only true with probability at least r in the state  $\rho$ . Following Döring and Isham, we define  $\mathbb{T}_{i}^{\rho, r} \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j \,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O)$  by, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}(V) := \{ A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*(O_{\downarrow V})) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \left( \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(V'))) \ge r) \}.$$
(3.22)

It is easy to see that every  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}(V)$  is a filter, and as we will see in proposition 3.2, it is really a *j*-sheaf.

When r = 1,  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,1}$  gives propositions that are true in the state  $\rho$ . Further, when  $\rho = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$ ,  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{|\varphi\rangle} \equiv \mathbb{T}_{j}^{|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|,1}$ , the counterpart of (A.23), is given by

$$\mathbb{T}_{j}^{|\varphi\rangle}(V) := \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^{*}(O_{\downarrow V})) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V (\delta_{j}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)_{V'} \in A(V'))\} \\
\simeq \{h \in \operatorname{Hyp}_{j}(b^{*}(O_{\downarrow V})) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V (\delta_{j}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)_{V'} \preceq \hat{h}_{V'})\} \\
= \{h \in \operatorname{Hyp}_{j}(b^{*}(O_{\downarrow V})) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V (|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \preceq \hat{h}_{V'})\} \\
\simeq \{S \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{cl}}(b^{*}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V})) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V (|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \preceq (b^{*}\alpha)_{V'}^{-1}(S(V')))\}.$$
(3.23)

**Proposition 3.2** For every state  $\rho$  and every coefficient  $r \in [0, 1]$ ,  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}$  is a *j*-sheaf.

Proof. First, we show that  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}$  is a presheaf. To do so, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , let  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$  and  $V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V'$ . Then, since we have  $\flat(V'') \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V'$ , it follows that for any  $A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*(O_{\downarrow V}))$ ,

$$\flat^*(A_{\downarrow V'})(V'') = A_{\downarrow V'}(\flat(V'')) = A(\flat(V'')), \qquad (3.24)$$

hence,

$$\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor \flat^*(A_{\downarrow V'})(V''))) = \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(\flat(V'')))).$$
(3.25)

This means that  $A \in \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}(V)$  implies  $\flat^{*}(A_{\downarrow V'}) \in \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}(V')$ , that is,  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,r}$  is a presheaf.

Next, let  $A \in (\flat^* \mathbb{T}_j^{\rho,r})(V) = \mathbb{T}_j^{\rho,r}(\flat(V))$ ; that is, suppose that for every  $V' \subseteq \flat(V)$ ,  $\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(V'))) \ge r$ . Then, for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ , since  $\flat(V') \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V)$ , we have

$$\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(V'))) = \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(\flat(V')))) \ge r, \qquad (3.26)$$

which means  $A \in \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}(V)$ . Thus,  $(\flat^* \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r})(V) \subseteq \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}(V)$  results.  $\zeta_{\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}}$ 

Finally,  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r} \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}}} b^* \mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}$  turns out to be a natural isomorphism, because for every  $A \in \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}(V)$ ,  $(\zeta_{\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r}})_{V}(A) = b^*(A_{\downarrow \flat(V)}) = b^*(A_{\downarrow V}) = A$ .

Let  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^*O) \xrightarrow{\tau_j^{\rho,r}} \Omega_j$  be the characteristic morphism of  $\mathbb{T}_j^{\rho,r}$ . From (3.19), we have, for each  $A \in \mathrm{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^*(O_{\downarrow V})) = (\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(b^*O))(V)$ ,

$$(\tau_j^{\rho,r})_V(A) = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor \flat^*(A_{\downarrow V'})(V''))) \ge r) \}$$
  
=  $\{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(V''))) \ge r) \}.$ (3.27)

Therefore, the truth-value of a physical proposition  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$  corresponding to a projection operator  $\hat{P}$  under the truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho,r}$  is given by, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$\nu_{j}(\delta_{j}(\hat{P}); \mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho, r})_{V} = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\delta_{j}(\hat{P})_{V''})) \geq r) \}$$
  
$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\delta_{j}(\hat{P})_{V'})) \geq r \}.$$
(3.28)

In particular, for  $\mathbb{T}_{j}^{\rho,\,r}=\mathbb{T}_{j}^{|\varphi\rangle},$  we have

$$\nu_{j}(\delta_{j}(\hat{P}); \mathbb{T}_{j}^{|\varphi\rangle})_{V} = \{V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \langle \varphi \mid (\delta_{j}(\hat{P})_{V'}) \mid \varphi \rangle = 1\}$$
$$= \{V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid |\varphi\rangle \langle \varphi \mid \preceq \delta_{j}(\hat{P})_{V'}\}$$
$$= \{V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \delta_{j}(|\varphi\rangle \langle \varphi \mid) \in \delta_{j}(\hat{P})(V')\}. \quad (3.29)$$

### 4 Translation Rules of Propositions, Truth Objects, and Truth-Values

In Section 3, we gave the truth-value function  $\nu_j$  that assigns a truth-value to each proposition sheaf  $P_j$  under a given truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$ . In this and the next sections, we clarify the structural relationship between the present sheafbased theory and the presheaf-based one. What we show in this section is that, for each  $P_j$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , there are corresponding proposition presheaves P and truth presheaves  $\mathbb{T}$  that can be regarded as 'translations', and that there exists a specific relation between global elements of  $\Omega_j$  and  $\Omega$ , which is satisfied by  $\nu_j(P_j; \mathbb{T}_j)$  and  $\nu(P; \mathbb{T})$  for all such propositions  $P_j$  and P and truth objects  $\mathbb{T}_j$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ . Precisely, we show that they satisfy the following relation:

$$\nu_j(P_j; \mathbb{T}_j) = r \circ \nu(P; \mathbb{T}), \tag{4.1}$$

where the morphism r is defined by the epi-mono factorization of j,



that is, r is defined by  $r_V(\omega) \equiv j_V(\omega) \in \Omega_j(V)$ . In the following, we give concrete translation relationships for proposition objects P and  $P_j$  and for truth objects  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$ .

First, we give a definition of translation of propositions. Note that each proposition presheaf  $P \in \text{Sub}_{dB}(O)$  is sheafficated to a proposition sheaf  $\flat^* P \in \text{Sub}_{j\,dB}(\flat^* O)$ . Therefore, it is quite natural to regard P and  $P_j$  as each other's translation if they satisfy

$$\flat^* P = P_j. \tag{4.3}$$

The following proposition, which is clear from the definition of  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$ , would suggest (4.3) as a sound definition of translation.

**Proposition 4.1** For every projection operator  $\hat{P}$ ,  $\delta(\hat{P})$  and  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$  are each other's translations.

Next, we define translation of truth objects. First, we note that, for each truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j \in \mathrm{Sub}_j(\mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*O))$ , the morphism  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O) \xrightarrow{\varrho_O} \mathbb{P}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^*O)$  induces a subsheaf of  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O)$ , which we denote by  $\varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)$ , as the pullback of  $\mathbb{T}_j$  along the morphism  $\varrho_O$ ; that is,

$$\varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V) := (\varrho_O)_V^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j(V)) 
= \{A \in (\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O))(V) \mid \flat^*A \in \mathbb{T}_j(V)\} 
= \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O_{\downarrow\flat(V)}) \mid \flat^*A \in \mathbb{T}_j(V)\}.$$
(4.4)

On the other hand, each truth presheaf  $\mathbb{T} \in \operatorname{Sub}(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O)$ , for which we propose that  $\mathbb{T}(V)$  is a filter for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , has its sheafification  $\flat^*\mathbb{T} \in \operatorname{Sub}_j(\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O))$ . We say that  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$  are each other's translation, if they satisfy

$$\flat^* \mathbb{T} = \varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j). \tag{4.5}$$

To show soundness of the definition (4.5) of translation, we give the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.2** For every density matrix  $\rho$  and  $r \in [0, 1]$ , the corresponding truth presheaf  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}$  and the truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}_{i}$  are each other's translation.

Proof. Let  $A \in \text{Sub}_{dB}(O_{\downarrow \flat(V)})$  and  $h \in \text{Hyp}(O_{\downarrow \flat(V)})$  be its corresponding hyper-element. Then  $A \in (\flat^* \mathbb{T}^{\rho, r})(V)$  if and only if

$$\forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V) \quad \operatorname{tr}(\rho \hat{h}_{V'}) \ge r, \tag{4.6}$$

whereas  $A \in (\varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j^{\rho,r}))(V)$  if and only if

$$\forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \quad \operatorname{tr}(\rho \hat{h}_{\flat(V')}) \ge r.$$
(4.7)

What we have to prove is that (4.6) and (4.7) are equivalent.

Suppose that (4.6) holds. Then, since for  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ , we have  $\flat(V') \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V)$ , (4.7) follows.

Conversely, suppose that (4.7). Then, in particular,

$$\operatorname{tr}(\rho \hat{h}_{\flat(V)}) \ge r. \tag{4.8}$$

On the other hand, for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V)$ ,

$$\hat{h}_{\flat(V)} \preceq \delta(\hat{h}_{\flat(V)})_{V'} \preceq \hat{h}_{V'}.$$
(4.9)

Thus, we have

$$r \le \operatorname{tr}(\rho \hat{h}_{\flat(V)}) \le \operatorname{tr}(\rho \hat{h}_{V'}), \tag{4.10}$$

which implies (4.6).

Now, let P and  $\mathbb{T}$  be arbitrary translations of  $P_j$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , respectively. In the following, we prove that they really satisfy (4.1).

First, note that the names  $\lceil P \rceil$  and  $\lceil P_j \rceil_j$  make the diagram



commute. Here, the definition of  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O) \xrightarrow{\varrho_O} \mathbb{P}_{j\,dB}(\flat^*O)$ , the restriction of  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}O) \xrightarrow{\varrho_O} \mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*O)$ , is given in appendix B. The commutativity of (4.11) is easily shown as

$$(\lceil P_{j} \rceil_{j})_{V} = b^{*}((b^{*}P)_{\downarrow V})$$
  

$$= b^{*}(P_{\downarrow V})$$
  

$$= b^{*}((P_{\downarrow V})_{\downarrow V})$$
  

$$= b^{*}((P_{\downarrow V})_{\downarrow b(V)})$$
  

$$= (\varrho_{O})_{V}((\zeta_{\mathbb{P}_{dB}O})_{V}(\lceil P \rceil_{V})), \qquad (4.12)$$

where we used (B.3) and (B.4).

**Proposition 4.3** Let  $\mathbb{P}_{dB}O \xrightarrow{\tau} \Omega$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,dB}(\flat^*O) \xrightarrow{\tau_j} \Omega_j$  be the characteristic morphisms of  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , respectively. Then, the diagram



commutes if and only if equation (4.5) is satisfied.

Proof. First, we note that, for each  $A \in b^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O)(V) = \operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O_{\downarrow \flat(V)})$ ,

$$(\flat^* r \circ \flat^* \tau)_V(A) = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V) \mid \flat(V') \in \tau_{\flat(V)}(A) \}$$
  
=  $\{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V) \mid A_{\downarrow\flat(V')} \in \mathbb{T}(\flat(V')) \},$  (4.14)

and,

$$(\zeta_{\Omega_j} \circ \tau_j \circ \varrho_O)_V(A) = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V) \mid \flat^*(A_{\downarrow V'}) \in \mathbb{T}_j(V') \}.$$
(4.15)

Suppose that the diagram (4.13) commutes. Then, for each  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V)$ ,  $A_{\downarrow\flat(V')} \in \mathbb{T}(\flat(V'))$  if and only if  $\flat^*(A_{\downarrow V'}) \in \mathbb{T}_j(V')$ . In particular, putting  $V' = \flat(V)$ , we obtain equation (4.5). Conversely, suppose that (4.5) holds. Then, we have, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V)$ ,  $\flat^*\mathbb{T}(V') = \varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V')$ ; that is, for all  $A' \in \mathrm{Sub}(O_{\downarrow\flat(V')})$ ,  $A' \in \mathbb{T}(\flat(V'))$  if and only if  $\flat^*A' \in \mathbb{T}_j(V')$ . In particular, for any  $A \in \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow\flat(V)})$ , we obtain the condition for the diagram (4.13) to commute, by taking  $A' = A_{\downarrow\flat(V')}$ .

To show the relation (4.1), let  $\mathbb{T}$  and P be transformations of  $\mathbb{T}_j$  and  $P_j$ , respectively.

Fitting together (4.11), (4.13), and naturality of  $\zeta$ , we have a commutative diagram



The outer pentagon of this diagram is just the relation (4.1).

We have proved that for all proposition objects P and  $P_j$  satisfying (4.3) and truth objects  $\mathbb{T}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_j$  satisfying (4.5), the truth-values  $\nu(P, \mathbb{T})$  and  $\nu_j(P_j, \mathbb{T}_j)$  are related via (4.1). This implies that P and  $\mathbb{T}$  represent virtually the same proposition as  $P_j$  and the same truth object as  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , respectively, from our sheaf-based viewpoint. In this sense, it is reasonable to call them each other's translation. Also, we call the same relation between global elements of  $\Omega_j$  and  $\Omega$  as (4.1), that is,

$$\nu_j = r \circ \nu, \tag{4.17}$$

the translation rule of global elements, and say that  $\nu_j \in \Gamma\Omega_j$  and  $\nu \in \Gamma\Omega$ are each other's translation if they satisfy (4.17).

### 5 Coarse-Graining Properties of Translation

For a proposition  $P_j$  and a truth sheaf and  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , their translation presheaves P and  $\mathbb{T}$  satisfying (4.3) and (4.5) are not determined uniquely. For such P's and  $\mathbb{T}$ 's, furthermore, the truth-values  $\nu(P, \mathbb{T})$  take various values. If we consider their sheaf translations, the various truth-values are transformed to one and the same value  $r \circ \nu(P, \mathbb{T})$ . In other words, a lot of different propositions, truth objects, and truth-values are not distinguished from the sheaf-based viewpoint. We call this aspect coarse-graining made by translation, the properties of which we observe in the following.

First, let us see coarse-graining of the space  $\Gamma\Omega$  of truth-values. The translation rule (4.17) is equivalent to the condition that for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$V' \in (\nu_j)_V \iff \flat(V') \in \nu_V.$$
 (5.1)

Let  $\gamma(\nu_j)$  be the set of all translations  $\nu \in \Gamma\Omega$  of  $\nu_j$ . Note that  $\gamma(\nu_j)$  has an order relation  $\leq$  inherited from  $\Gamma\Omega$ . Namely,  $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$  if and only if  $(\nu_1)_V \subseteq (\nu_2)_V$  for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . Furthermore,  $\gamma(\nu_j)$  is closed with respect to binary operations on  $\Gamma\Omega$ , the join  $\vee$  and the meet  $\wedge$ , each of which is defined by  $(\nu_1 \vee \nu_2)_V := (\nu_1)_V \cup (\nu_2)_V$  and  $(\nu_1 \wedge \nu_2)_V := (\nu_1)_V \cap (\nu_2)_V$ , respectively.

Let us define  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\vee}(\nu_j) \in \Gamma\Omega$  by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\vee}(\nu_j) := 1 \xrightarrow{\nu_j} \Omega_j \rightarrowtail \Omega_.$$
 (5.2)

This is the maximum translation of  $\nu_j$ . In fact, it is clear from the definition (2.10) that (5.1) is satisfied if we put  $\nu = \gamma^{\vee}(\nu_j)$ . Furthermore, if  $\nu \in \gamma(\nu_j)$ , then, since  $\flat(V') \in \nu_V$  for every  $V' \in \nu_V$ , we have  $V' \in (\nu_j)_V = \gamma^{\vee}(\nu_j)_V$  from (5.1). Thus,  $\nu \leq \gamma^{\vee}(\nu_j)$  follows.

Let us define  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\wedge}(\nu_j)$  by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\wedge}(\nu_j)(V) := \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid (\nu_j)_V \cap \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V') \neq \emptyset \},$$
(5.3)

where, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}, \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)$  is defined by

$$\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) := \{ W \in \mathbf{V} \mid V \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(W) \}.$$
(5.4)

We can straightforwardly verify that  $\gamma^{\wedge}(\nu) \in \gamma(\nu_j)$ . Moreover,  $\gamma^{\wedge}(\nu_j)$  is the least translation of  $\nu_j$ . To see this, let  $\nu \in \gamma(\nu_j)$  and  $V' \in \gamma^{\wedge}(\nu_j)_V$ . Then, we have  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V'')$  for some  $V'' \in (\nu_j)_V$ . Furthermore, since for such V'',  $\flat(V'') \in \nu_V$  because of (5.1). Thus, we have  $V' \in \nu_V$  since  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} \flat(V'')$ . Conversely, it is easy to show that every  $\nu \in \Gamma\Omega$  lying between  $\gamma^{\wedge}(\nu_j)$  and  $\gamma^{\vee}(\nu_j)$  satisfies (5.1). On the other hand, every  $\nu \in \Gamma\Omega$  is a translation of  $r \circ \nu \in \Gamma\Omega_j$ . We thus obtain the following result:

**Theorem 5.1** The truth-value space  $\Gamma\Omega$  can be expressed as a disjoint union of the lattices  $\gamma(\nu_j)$  ( $\nu_j \in \Gamma_j\Omega_j$ ), each of which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}(\nu_j) = \{ \nu \in \Gamma\Omega \mid \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\wedge}(\nu_j) \le \nu \le \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\vee}(\nu_j) \}.$$
(5.5)

Next, let us turn to the definition (4.3) of translation of propositions. Let  $\boldsymbol{\imath}(P_j)$  be the set of all translation presheaves of  $P_j$ . It is clear that  $\boldsymbol{\imath}(P_j)$  is an ordered set with respect to the inclusion relation defined on  $\operatorname{Sub}_{cl}\Sigma \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{dB}O$ . That is,  $P_1 \subseteq P_2$  if and only if  $P_1(V) \subseteq P_2(V)$  for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . Also, since (4.3) is equivalent to  $P(\flat(V)) = P_j(V)$  for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\imath}(P_j)$  is closed for  $\lor$  and  $\land$  defined on  $\operatorname{Sub}_{cl}\Sigma$ , where  $P_1 \land P_2$  and  $P_1 \lor P_2$  are defined by  $(P_1 \land P_2)(V) := P_1(V) \cap P_2(V)$  and  $(P_1 \lor P_2)(V) := P_1(V) \cup P_2(V)$ , respectively.

Among the translations  $P \in \iota(P_j)$ , there exists a canonical one  $\iota^{\vee}(P_j)$ . To give the definition, we note the following fact.

**Proposition 5.2** If  $h \equiv {\hat{h}_V \in (\flat^* O)(V)}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  is a hyper-element of  $\flat^* O$ , it is also a hyper-element of O.

Proof. Let h be a hyper-element of  $\flat^*O$ . Then, since  $\flat(V) \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$  for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , we have  $\hat{h}_V \in (\flat^*O)(V) = O(\flat(V)) \subseteq O(V)$ , whereas we have  $\flat(V') \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V'$  for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ . Thus, from (3.7) and (3.15), it follows

$$\delta(\hat{h}_V)_{V'} \preceq \delta(\delta(\hat{h}_V)_{V'})_{\flat(V')} = \delta(\hat{h}_V)_{\flat(V')} = \delta_j(\hat{h}_V)_{V'} \preceq \hat{h}_{V'}, \tag{5.6}$$

which means that h is a hyper-element of O.

Every proposition sheaf  $P_j \in \operatorname{Sub}_{j\,\mathrm{dB}}(\flat^* O)$  has its hyper-element  $\{\lor P_j(V)\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$ of  $\flat^* O$ . We define  $\boldsymbol{\iota}^{\lor}(P_j)$  as the proposition presheaf given by  $\{\lor P_j(V)\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$ as a hyper-element of O:

$$\mathbf{i}^{\vee}(P_{j})(V) := \{ \hat{a} \in O(V) \mid \hat{a} \preceq \lor P_{j}(V) \} \\
= \{ \hat{a} \in O(V) \mid \delta(\hat{a})_{\flat(V)} \in P_{j}(V) \} \\
= ((\zeta_{O})_{V})^{-1}(P_{j}(V)).$$
(5.7)

Clearly,  $\boldsymbol{\iota}^{\vee}(P_j)$  satisfies  $\flat^*(\boldsymbol{\iota}^{\vee}(P_j)) = P$ , that is, it is really a translation of  $P_j$ .

**Proposition 5.3** For every proposition sheaf  $P_j \in \text{Sub}_{j \, dB}(b^*O)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\iota}^{\vee}(P_j)$  is the largest translation of  $P_j$ .

Proof. The third line of (5.7) means that  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\vee}(P_j)$  is a pullback of  $P_j \rightarrow \flat^* O$ along the morphism  $O \xrightarrow{\zeta_O} \flat^* O$ . That is, it makes the tropezoid in the diagram



a pullback. On the other hand, if  $\flat^* P = P_j$ , the outer square commutes because of naturality of  $\zeta$ . We thus obtain an inclusion  $P \rightarrowtail \mathfrak{l}^{\vee}(P_j)$ .  $\Box$ 

For instance, for every projection operator  $\hat{P}$ , we have  $\delta(\hat{P})_V \leq \delta(\hat{P})_{\flat(V)} = \delta_j(\hat{P})_V$ , whereas  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$  defines  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\vee}(\delta_j(\hat{P}))$  as a hyper element of O. Therefore, the proposition presheaf  $\delta(\hat{P})$ , which is a translation of  $\delta_j(\hat{P})$  as previously mentioned, is included by  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\vee}(\delta_j(\hat{P}))$ .

We define  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_i)$  by, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j)(V) := \begin{cases} \{\hat{a} \in O(V) \mid \hat{a} \preceq \bigvee \{\delta(\vee P_j(W))_V\}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)}\} & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset, \\ \{\hat{O}\} & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

$$(5.9)$$

**Proposition 5.4** For every proposition sheaf  $P_j$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j)$  is the smallest translation of  $P_j$ .

Proof. Let  $k \in \text{Hyp}_j(\flat^* O)$  be the hyper-element corresponding to  $P_j$ . To show that  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j)$  is a presheaf, we define  $h := \{\hat{h}_V \in O(V)\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  by

$$\hat{h}_{V} := \begin{cases} \bigvee \{ \delta(\hat{k}_{W})_{V} \}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)} & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset, \\ \hat{O} & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$
(5.10)

Since for each V,  $\hat{h}_V$  is the top element of  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j)(V)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j)$  is a presheaf if and only if h is a hyper-element of O. Let us show this, first.

Suppose that  $\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \subseteq \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V')$  for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ , we have

$$\hat{h}_V = \bigvee \{\delta(\hat{k}_W)_V\}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)} \preceq \bigvee \{\delta(\hat{k}_{W'})_V\}_{W' \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V')}.$$
(5.11)

On the other hand, since  $O(V') \subseteq O(V)$ , we have, for every  $W' \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V')$ ,

$$\delta(\hat{k}_{W'})_V \preceq \delta(\hat{k}_{W'})_{V'}, \tag{5.12}$$

hence,

$$\bigvee \{\delta(\hat{k}_{W'})_V\}_{W' \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V')} \preceq \bigvee \{\delta(\hat{k}_{W'})_{V'}\}_{W' \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V')} = \hat{h}_{V'}.$$
(5.13)

From (5.11) and (5.13), we have

$$\delta(\hat{h}_V)_{V'} \preceq \delta(\hat{h}_{V'})_{V'} = \hat{h}_{V'}.$$
 (5.14)

If  $\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) = \emptyset$ , then  $\delta(\hat{h}^V)_{V'} = \hat{O} \preceq \hat{h}_{V'}$ . Thus, *h* is a hyper-element of *O*, hence really,  $\boldsymbol{\iota}^{\wedge}(P_j)$  a presheaf.

In order to show that  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j) \in \boldsymbol{\imath}(P_j)$ , it suffices to show that  $\hat{h}_{\flat(V)} = \hat{k}_V$ for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . Since  $V \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V))$ , we have

$$\hat{h}_{\flat(V)} = \bigvee \{ \delta(\hat{k}_W)_{\flat(V)} \}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V))}$$
  
=  $(\delta(\hat{k}_V)_{\flat(V)}) \lor (\bigvee \{ \delta(\hat{k}_W)_{\flat(V)} \}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V)) \setminus \{V\}}).$  (5.15)

On the other hand, we have  $\delta(\hat{k}_V)_{\flat(V)} = \delta_j(\hat{k}_{\flat(V)})_{\flat(V)} = \hat{k}_{\flat(V)} = \hat{k}_V$ , and  $\delta(\hat{k}_W)_{\flat(V)} \leq \hat{k}_{\flat(V)} = \hat{k}_V$  for all  $W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V)) \setminus \{V\}$ . Thus,  $\hat{h}_{\flat(V)} = \hat{k}_V$  results.

Finally, to show  $\mathbf{i}^{\wedge}(P_j)$  to be the smallest translation of  $P_j$ , let  $l \in \text{Hyp}(O)$ be the hyper-element corresponding to a translation  $P \in \mathbf{i}(P_j)$ . What we have to show is  $\hat{h}_V \preceq \hat{l}_V$  for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . It suffices to treat the case where  $\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset$ . Since we have

$$\delta(\hat{k}_W)_V = \delta(\hat{l}_{\flat(W)})_V \preceq \hat{l}_V \tag{5.16}$$

for all  $W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)$ , it follows that

$$\hat{h}_V = \bigvee \{\delta(\hat{k}_W)_V\}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^\flat(V)} \preceq \hat{l}_V.$$
(5.17)

It is obvious that every proposition presheaf  $P \in \text{Sub}_{dB}(O)$  is a translation of  $P_j$  if and only if  $\boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j) \subseteq P \subseteq \boldsymbol{\imath}^{\vee}(P_j)$ . On the other hand, every proposition presheaf P is a translation of the proposition sheaf  $\flat^* P$ . Thus, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 5.5** The proposition space  $\operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O)$  can be expressed as a disjoint union of the lattices  $\iota(P_i)$  ( $P_i \in \operatorname{Sub}_{i \, dB}(\flat^*O)$ ), each of which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\imath}(P_j) = \{ P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{cl}}(\Sigma) \mid \boldsymbol{\imath}^{\wedge}(P_j) \subseteq P \subseteq \boldsymbol{\imath}^{\vee}(P_j) \}.$$
(5.18)

Finally, we observe coarse-graining of truth presheaves. Let  $\operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\operatorname{cl}}\Sigma)$ be the set of all truth presheaves; that is,  $\mathbb{T} \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\operatorname{cl}}\Sigma)$  means that  $\mathbb{T} \in \operatorname{Sub}(\mathbb{P}_{\operatorname{cl}}\Sigma)$  and  $\mathbb{T}(V)$  is a filter for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ . We first note that we can define  $\vee$  and  $\wedge$  on  $\operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\operatorname{cl}}\Sigma)$ . In fact, we define  $\mathbb{T}_1 \vee \mathbb{T}_2 := \mathbb{T}_1 \cap \mathbb{T}_2$ , whereas for  $\mathbb{T}_1 \wedge \mathbb{T}_2$ , we let  $(\mathbb{T}_1 \vee \mathbb{T}_2)(V)$  the smallest filter  $\mathfrak{F}(\mathbb{T}_1(V) \cup \mathbb{T}_2(V))$ including  $\mathbb{T}_1(V) \cup \mathbb{T}_2(V)$ , that is,

$$(\mathbb{T}_1 \vee \mathbb{T}_2)(V) := \{ P \cap P' \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid P, P' \in \mathbb{T}_1(V) \cup \mathbb{T}_2(V) \}.$$
(5.19)

Let  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  be the set of all translation presheaves of a truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$ . Since the translation condition (4.5) is equivalent to  $\mathbb{T}(\boldsymbol{\flat}(V)) = (\varrho_O)_V^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j(V))$  for all  $V \in \mathbf{V}, \boldsymbol{\jmath}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  is closed for  $\vee$  and  $\wedge$  defined above.

Also for every truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , we can define its canonical translation  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\vee}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  that is the largest one among the translations satisfying (4.5). It is defined as the pullback of  $\varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j) \rightarrow \flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O)$  along the morphism  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O \xrightarrow{\zeta_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O}} \flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O)$ :

$$\boldsymbol{j}^{\vee}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V) = \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid (\zeta_{\mathbb{P}O})_{V}(A) \in \varrho_{O}^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V)\} \\ = \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid A_{\downarrow\flat(V)} \in \varrho_{O}^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V)\} \\ = \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid \flat^{*}(A_{\downarrow\flat(V)}) \in \mathbb{T}_{j}(\flat(V))\} \\ = \{A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid \flat^{*}(A_{\downarrow\downarrow}) \in \mathbb{T}_{j}(V)\}.$$
(5.20)

Clearly, if  $\mathbb{T}_j$  is a truth sheaf, every  $\mathbf{\jmath}^{\vee}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)$  is a filter, hence,  $\mathbf{\jmath}^{\vee}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  a truth presheaf.

Next, let us define, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  and  $W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_{V;W} \subseteq \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V})$  by

$$\mathbb{R}_{V;W} := \{ A_{\downarrow V} \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid A \in (\varrho_O^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j))(W) \},$$
(5.21)

and  $\mathbb{R}_V \subseteq \operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V})$  by

$$\mathbb{R}_V := \bigcup \{\mathbb{R}_{V;W}\}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)}.$$
(5.22)

We define  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  by

$$\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V) := \begin{cases} \mathfrak{F}_{V}(\mathbb{R}_{V}) & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset \\ \emptyset & \text{if } \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) = \emptyset, \end{cases}$$
(5.23)

where  $\mathfrak{F}_V(\mathbb{R}_V)$  is the smallest filter in  $\mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}O_{\downarrow V}$  including  $\mathbb{R}_V$ .

**Proposition 5.6** For every  $\mathbb{T}_j \in \text{Sub}_{\text{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\text{cl}}\Sigma)(O)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  is the smallest translation of  $\mathbb{T}_j$ .

Proof. We prove  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  to be a presheaf. Suppose that  $A \in \boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)$ . This is equivalent to that there exists a finite subset  $\mathbb{S}_V$  of  $\mathbb{R}_V$  such that  $\wedge \mathbb{S}_V \subseteq A$ , since  $\boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)$  is a filter [23]. Therefore, for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ , we have  $\wedge (\mathbb{S}_V)_{\downarrow V'} \subseteq A_{\downarrow V'}$ , where  $(\mathbb{S}_V)_{\downarrow V'} \equiv \{B_{\downarrow V'} \mid B \in \mathbb{S}_V\}$  is a finite subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{V'}$ . Thus,  $A_{\downarrow V'} \in \boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$ .

To show that  $\mathbf{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  is a translation of  $\mathbb{T}_j$ , note that  $V \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V))$ . We have, for every  $W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V)) \setminus \{V\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{R}_{\flat(V);W} = \{A_{\downarrow\flat(V)} \mid A \in (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(W)\} \subseteq (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V), \qquad (5.24)$$

whereas,

$$\mathbb{R}_{\flat(V);V} = \{A_{\downarrow\flat(V)} \mid A \in (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)\} = (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V).$$
(5.25)

Thus, we obtain

$$\mathbb{R}_{\flat(V)} = \mathbb{R}_{\flat(V); V} \cup (\bigcup \{\mathbb{R}_{\flat(V); W}\}_{W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(\flat(V)) \setminus \{V\}}) = (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V), \quad (5.26)$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{j}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(\boldsymbol{\flat}(V)) &= \mathfrak{F}_{\boldsymbol{\flat}(V)}(\mathbb{R}_{\boldsymbol{\flat}(V)}) \\
&= \mathfrak{F}_{\boldsymbol{\flat}(V)}((\varrho_{O})^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V)) \\
&= (\varrho_{O})^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_{j})(V),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

where from the second line to the third, we used the fact that  $(\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)$  itself is a filter.

Finally, we show that  $\mathbf{j}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)$  is the smallest translation of  $\mathbb{T}_j$ . It suffices to show for  $V \in \mathbf{V}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\mathbb{T}$  be an arbitrary translation of  $\mathbb{T}_j$ . Suppose that  $A \in \mathbf{j}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j)(V)$ . Then, there exists a finite subset  $\mathbb{S}_V$  of  $\mathbb{R}_V$  such that  $\wedge \mathbb{S}_V \subseteq A$ . On the other hand, for every  $B \in \mathbb{S}_V$ , there exists a  $W \in \mathcal{U}^{\flat}(V)$  such that  $B \in \mathbb{R}_{V;W}$ ; that is, there exists a  $C \in (\varrho_O)^{-1}(\mathbb{T}_j)(W) = \mathbb{T}(\flat(W))$  such that  $B = C_{\downarrow V}$ . This implies that  $B = \mathbb{T}(V \hookrightarrow \flat(W))(C) \in \mathbb{T}(V)$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{S}_V \subseteq \mathbb{T}(V)$ , hence,  $\wedge \mathbb{S}_V \in \mathbb{T}(V)$ , which implies  $A \in \mathbb{T}(V)$  since  $\mathbb{T}(V)$  is a filter.  $\Box$ 

**Theorem 5.7** For every truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{j}(\mathbb{T}_i)$  is a lattice that is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\jmath}(\mathbb{T}_j) = \{\mathbb{T} \in \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}\Sigma) \mid \boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\wedge}(\mathbb{T}_j) \subseteq \mathbb{T} \subseteq \boldsymbol{\jmath}^{\vee}(\mathbb{T}_j)\}.$$
 (5.28)

Every truth sheaf  $\mathbb{T}_j$  determines a lattice of truth presheaves consisting of translations  $\mathbb{T}_j$ . Not all truth presheaves, however, are not translations of truth sheaves. In fact, if  $\mathbb{T}$  is a translation of  $\mathbb{T}_j$ ,  $(\rho_O)_V((\mathfrak{b}^*\mathbb{T})(V)) = \mathbb{T}_j(V)$ needs to be satisfied. However, in general for such  $\mathbb{T}$ , it only holds that  $(\mathfrak{b}^*\mathbb{T})(V) \subseteq (\rho_O)_V^{-1}((\rho_O)_V((\mathfrak{b}^*\mathbb{T})(V)))$ . Consequently, the set  $\mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{filt}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}\Sigma)$  of truth presheaves is divided into the pairwise disjoint lattices each of which corresponds to one and the same truth sheaf and the other truth presheaves that fail to be translations.

### A Presheaf-Based Truth-Value Assignment

In this appendix, we give a brief explanation of the truth-value assignment method developed by Döring and Isham [15], for the purpose of convenience for comparison with the present truth-value assignment on j-sheaves.

The main ingredient is the spectral presheaf  $\Sigma$ , which is a presheaf such that, for each  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,  $\Sigma(V)$  is the Gelfand space on V, and for  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$  and  $\sigma \in \Sigma(V)$ ,  $\Sigma(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\sigma)$  is a restriction of  $\sigma$  to V'. The spectral presheaf plays a role of state space; every proposition on a given quantum system is assumed to be representable as a clopen subobject S of the spectral presheaf  $\Sigma$ , where S is called a clopen subobject of  $\Sigma$  when S(V) is a closed and open subset of  $\Sigma(V)$ . Thus, the collection  $\operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma)$  of all clopen subobjects of  $\Sigma$ can be regarded as a space of propositions. It is internalized to  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  by the clopen power object  $\mathbb{P}_{cl}\Sigma \equiv \Omega^{\Sigma}$  of  $\Sigma$ , which is expressed as

$$(\mathbb{P}_{cl}\Sigma)(V) := \operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}), \tag{A.1}$$

and

$$(\mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{cl}}\Sigma)(V' \hookrightarrow V) : \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}) \to \mathrm{Sub}_{\mathrm{cl}}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V'}); S \mapsto S_{\downarrow V}.$$
(A.2)

There is a bijection from  $\operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma)$  to  $\Gamma(\mathbb{P}_{cl}\Sigma) := \operatorname{Hom}(1, \mathbb{P}_{cl}\Sigma)$  which assigns to each proposition P its name  $\lceil P \rceil$  defined by

$$\lceil P \rceil_V := P_{\downarrow V}. \tag{A.3}$$

Here, for each presheaf  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , we define  $Q_{\downarrow V} \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  as the downward restriction of Q to  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ :

$$Q_{\downarrow V}(V') := \begin{cases} Q(V') & \text{if } V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V, \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(A.4)

and for each  $V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V'$ ,

$$Q_{\downarrow V}(V'' \hookrightarrow V') := \begin{cases} Q(V'' \hookrightarrow V') & \text{if } V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V, \\ \emptyset \stackrel{!}{\to} Q(V'') & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(A.5)

Döring and Isham gave other ways to express propositions. They are based on the outer presheaf O that is defined by

$$O(V) := \mathcal{P}(V) \tag{A.6}$$

and for  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$O(V' \hookrightarrow V) : O(V) \to O(V'); \hat{P} \mapsto \delta(\hat{P})_{V'}.$$
 (A.7)

Here,  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  is the set of all projection operators in V and  $\delta$  the daseinization operator, which assigns to each projection operator  $\hat{P}$  a collection  $\delta(\hat{P}) := \{\delta(\hat{P})_V\}_{V \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}}$ , each element  $\delta(\hat{P})_V$  of which is defined by

$$\delta(\hat{P})_V := \bigwedge \{ \hat{\alpha} \in \mathcal{P}(V) \mid \hat{P} \preceq \alpha \}.$$
(A.8)

Obviously,  $\delta(\hat{P})$  is a global element of the outer presheaf O. Note that for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ , it follows

$$\delta(\delta(\hat{P})_V)_{V'} = \delta(\hat{P})_{V'}.$$
(A.9)

This equality is often used in the text.

Döring & Isham proved that

$$\operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O) \simeq \operatorname{Hyp}(O) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma),$$
 (A.10)

and hence for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$\operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \simeq \operatorname{Hyp}(O_{\downarrow V}) \simeq \operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{cl}}(\Sigma_{\downarrow V}).$$
 (A.11)

Here,  $\operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O)$  is the collection of subobjects  $B \subseteq O$  such that, for every  $V \in \mathbf{V}, B(V) \subseteq O(V)$  is a downward closed set of O(V) with a top element. Obviously, it is a complete Boolean lattice. On the other hand,  $\operatorname{Hyp}(O)$  is the collection of all hyper-elements of O, where a hyper-element h of O is a collection  $\{\hat{h}_V \in O(V)\}_{V \in \mathbf{V}}$  that satisfies, for every  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$O(V' \hookrightarrow V)(\hat{h}_V) = \delta(\hat{h}_V)_{V'} \preceq \hat{h}_{V'}.$$
(A.12)

The bijection relation (A.10) is given by the function  $k : \text{Hyp}(O) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma)$ defined by

$$(k(h))(V) := \alpha_V(\tilde{h}_V), \tag{A.13}$$

and  $c: \operatorname{Sub}_{\operatorname{dB}}(O) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hyp}(O)$  defined by

$$c(A)_V := \forall A(V). \tag{A.14}$$

Here, the function  $\alpha_V : \mathcal{P}(V) \to \mathcal{C}l(\Sigma(V))$ , where  $\mathcal{C}l(\Sigma(V))$  is the collection of all clopen subsets of  $\Sigma(V)$ , is defined as

$$\alpha_V(\hat{P}) := \{ \sigma \in \Sigma(V) \mid \sigma(\hat{P}) = 1 \}.$$
(A.15)

Bijections for (A.11) are given as the restrictions of k and c to subalgebras of V.

In particular, every projection  $\hat{P}$  defines a proposition presheaf, the global element  $\delta(\hat{P}) \in \Gamma O \subseteq \text{Hyp}(O)$ . That is, as an element of  $\text{Sub}_{cl}\Sigma$ ,  $\delta(\hat{P})$  is given by

$$(\delta(\hat{P}))(V) := \alpha_V(\delta(\hat{P})_V) = \{\sigma \in \Sigma(V) \mid \sigma(\delta(\hat{P})_V)) = 1\},$$
(A.16)

and as that of  $\operatorname{Sub}_{dB}(O)$ ,

$$(\delta(\hat{P}))(V) := c_V^{-1}(\delta(\hat{P})_V)$$
  
= { $\hat{a} \in O(V) \mid \hat{a} \preceq \delta(\hat{P})_V$ }. (A.17)

Each proposition  $P \in \operatorname{Sub}_{cl}(\Sigma)$  is assigned a truth value relative to a truth object  $\mathbb{T}$ , a subobject of  $\mathbb{P}_{cl}\Sigma$  (or, equivalently that of  $\mathbb{P}_{dB}O$ ) of which global elements give truth propositions. Let  $\tau$  be the characteristic morphism of  $\mathbb{T}$ ; That is, the diagram



is a pullback. Then, for each proposition P, its truth-value  $\nu(P; \mathbb{T}) \in \Gamma\Omega$  is given by

$$\nu(P;\mathbb{T}) = \tau \circ \lceil P \rceil, \tag{A.19}$$

or more precisely,

$$\nu(P; \mathbb{T})_V = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid P_{\downarrow V} \in \mathbb{T}(V') \}.$$
(A.20)

In [15], Döring and Isham defined generalized truth object

$$\mathbb{T}^{\rho,r}(V) := \{ A \in \operatorname{Sub}_{\mathrm{dB}}(O_{\downarrow V}) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \left( \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\lor A(V'))) \ge r) \}, \quad (A.21)$$

which gives propositions that are true at least a probability  $r \in [0, 1]$  in a mixed state expressed by a density matrix  $\rho$ . Under the truth presheaf  $\mathbb{T}^{\rho, r}$ , the truth-value of  $\delta(\hat{P})$  is evaluated as

$$\nu_{j}(\delta_{j}(\hat{P}); \mathbb{T}^{\rho, r})_{V} = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\operatorname{tr}(\rho(\delta(\hat{P})_{V''})) \ge r) \}$$
$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \operatorname{tr}(\rho(\delta(\hat{P})_{V'})) \ge r \}.$$
(A.22)

If we take  $\rho = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$  and r = 1, the truth presheaf  $\mathbb{T}^{|\varphi\rangle} := \mathbb{T}^{|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|, 1}$  and the truth-value of  $\delta(\hat{P})$  are given by

$$\mathbb{T}^{|\varphi\rangle}(V) := \{ A \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathrm{dB}}O(V) \mid \forall V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \ (\delta(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)_{V'} \in A(V')) \}, \quad (A.23)$$

and

$$\nu(\delta(\hat{P}); \mathbb{T}^{|\varphi\rangle})(V) = \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \delta(\hat{P})_{V'} \in \mathbb{T}^{|\varphi\rangle}(V') \}$$
  

$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\delta(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)_{V''} \in \delta(\hat{P})(V'')) \}$$
  

$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (\delta(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)_{V''} \preceq \delta(\hat{P})_{V''}) \}$$
  

$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid \forall V'' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V' (|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \preceq \delta(\hat{P})_{V''}) \}$$
  

$$= \{ V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V \mid |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \preceq \delta(\hat{P})_{V'} \}, \qquad (A.24)$$

respectively.

### **B** Mathematical Miscellany

In the text, some propoerties of the functors  $\flat : \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}$  and  $\flat^* : \widehat{\mathbf{V}} \to \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  are used. In this appendix, we explain them for convenience.

Throughout the text, we use the relation  $\flat \flat = \flat$  without notice. Furthermore, the following fact is often used: for any presheaf  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and any subsheaf A of  $\flat^* Q$ ,

$$A = \flat^* A. \tag{B.1}$$

To show this, let  $A \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  be a subobject of  $\flat^*Q$ . The closure  $\overline{A}$  of A in  $\flat^*Q$  is given by

$$\bar{A}(V) = \{q \in (\flat^*Q)(V) \mid (\flat^*Q)(\flat(V) \hookrightarrow V)(q) \in A(\flat(V))\} \\
= \{q \in Q(\flat((V))) \mid q \in A(\flat(V))\} \\
= A(\flat(V)) \\
= \flat^*A(V).$$
(B.2)

Thus, A is closed (hence, a sheaf) if and only if  $A = b^*A$ .

When we deal with power objects, the following relations are crucially important: for each  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  and  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ , we have

$$b^*(Q_{\downarrow V}) = b^*(Q_{\downarrow \flat(V)}), \tag{B.3}$$

$$b^*((b^*Q)_{\downarrow V}) = b^*(Q_{\downarrow V}), \tag{B.4}$$

and furthermore, for any  $V' \subseteq_{\mathbf{V}} V$ ,

$$\flat^*((\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V}))_{\downarrow V'}) = \flat^*(Q_{\downarrow V'}). \tag{B.5}$$

They can be proved straightforwardly.

In section 4, we treat a relation between  $\flat^*\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_j\flat^*$ . They are functors from  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$  to  $\mathrm{Sh}_j\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ , and there exists a canonical natural transformation  $\flat^*\mathbb{P} \xrightarrow{\varrho} \mathbb{P}_j\flat^*$ , which is defined as follows. First, note that, for each presheaf  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ and  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ ,

$$p^*(\mathbb{P}Q)(V) = \mathbb{P}Q(b(V)) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}(Q_{\downarrow b(V)}, \Omega),$$
 (B.6)

and

$$\mathbb{P}_{j}(\flat^{*}Q)(V) \simeq \operatorname{Hom}(\flat^{*}(Q_{\downarrow V}), \Omega_{j}) = \operatorname{Hom}(\flat^{*}(Q_{\downarrow \flat(V)}), \Omega_{j}).$$
(B.7)

Let S be a subobject of  $Q_{\downarrow V}$  and  $Q_{\downarrow V} \xrightarrow{\chi} \Omega$  be the characteristic morphism of S in  $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ . Then, we have the following commutative diagram:



Here, the top square is a pullback, and hence, so is the bottom one, because of the left-exactness of the associated sheaf functor  $\flat^*$ . Thus, we define  $(\varrho_Q)_V$  as a function that maps the top square to the bottom one; that is, as a function from  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}Q)(V)$  to  $(\mathbb{P}_j(\flat^*Q))(V)$ , it is defined by

$$(\varrho_Q)_V(S) := \flat^* S, \tag{B.9}$$

and hence, as a function from  $\operatorname{Hom}(Q_{\downarrow\flat(V)},\Omega)$  to  $\operatorname{Hom}(\flat^*(Q_{\downarrow\flat(V)}),\Omega_j)$ ,

$$(\varrho_Q)_V(\chi) := \flat^*(r \circ \chi). \tag{B.10}$$

We can straightforwardly show that  $(\varrho_Q)(V)$  is natural with respect to  $Q \in \widehat{\mathbf{V}}$ and  $V \in \mathbf{V}$ .

In the text, the case where Q is the outer presheaf O is treated. As easily shown, the restriction of  $\rho_O$  to  $\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O)$  takes values on  $\mathbb{P}_{j\,dB}(\flat^*O)$  and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{c}
\flat^{*}(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O) \xrightarrow{\varrho_{O}|_{\flat^{*}(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O)}} \mathbb{P}_{j\,dB}(\flat^{*}O) \\ & & & &$$

commutes. Because of this, in section 4, we write  $\rho_O$  for the restriction  $\rho_O|_{\flat^*(\mathbb{P}_{dB}O)}$  described above.

### References

- C.J.Isham. Topos theory and consistent histories: The internal logic of the set of all consistent sets. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 36, 785 (1997)
- [2] C.J.Isham and J.Butterfield. A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: I. Internal valuations. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 37, 2669-2733 (1998)
- [3] J.Butterfield and C.J.Isham. A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: II. Conceptual aspects, and classic analogues. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 38, 837-859 (1999)
- [4] J.Hamilton, J.Butterfield and C.J.Isham. A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: III. Von Neumann algebras as the base category. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 39, 1413-1436 (2000)
- [5] J.Butterfield and C.J.Isham. A topos perspective on the Kochen-Specker theorem: IV. Internal valuations. Int. J. Theor. Phys. 41, 613-639 (2002)
- [6] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. A topos foundation for theoretical physics: I. Formal language for physics. J. Math. Phys. 49, 053515 (2008)
- [7] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. A topos foundation for theoretical physics: II. Daseinization and the liberation of quantum theory. J. Math. Phys. 49, 053516 (2008)

- [8] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. A topos foundation for theoretical physics: III. The representation of physical quantities with arrows  $\check{\delta}^o(A) : \underline{\Sigma} \to \underline{\mathbb{R}} \succeq$ . J. Math. Phys. 49, 053517 (2008)
- [9] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. A topos foundation for theoretical physics: IV. Categories of Systems. J. Math. Phys. 49, 053518 (2008)
- [10] C.Heunen, N.P.Landsman and B.Spitters. A topos for algebraic quantum theory *Comm. Math. Phys.* 291, 63 (2009)
- [11] C.Flori A topos formulation of history quantum theory J. Math. Phys. 51, 053527 (2010)
- [12] C.Heunen, N.P.Landsman and B.Spitters. in *Deep Beauty* (ed. H. Halvorson), 271 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2011)
- [13] C.Heunen, N.P.Landsman, B.Spitters and S.Wolters. The Gelfand spectrum of a noncommutative C\*-algebra: a topos-theoretic approach J. Austral. Math. Soc., 90, 39, (2011)
- [14] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. "What is a Thing?" Topos Theory in the Foundation of Physics. in *New Structures for Physics* (ed. B.Coecke) 753, Springer, Heidelberg (2011)
- [15] A.Döring and C.J. Isham. Classical and quantum probabilities as truth values J. Math. Phys. 53, 032101 (2012)
- [16] S.A.M.Wolters. A Comparison of two topos-theoretic approaches to quantum theory Comm. Math. Phys. 317, 3 (2013)
- [17] C.Flori. Group action in topos quantum physics J. Math. Phys. 54, 032106 (2013)
- [18] C.Flori. A First Course in Topos Quantum Theory Springer, Heidelberg (2013)
- [19] S.Kochen and E.P.Specker. The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics J. Math. Mech 17, 59 (1967)
- [20] K.Nakayama. Topologies on quantum topoi induced by quantization J. Math. Phys. 54, 072102 (2013)

- [21] S.MacLane and I.Moerdijk. Sheaves in Geometry and Logic: A First Introduction to Topos Theory. Springer-Verlag, New York (1992)
- [22] C.J.Isham. Topological and global aspect of quantum theory, in *Rel-ativity, Groups and Topology II* (ed. B.S.DeWitt and R.Stora), 1059 North-Holland, Amsterdam (1984)
- [23] B.A.Davey and H.A.Priestley. Introduction to Lattices and Order. Cambridge University Press, New York (1990)