Let me begin by telling you about the introductory text I intend(ed) to write, well, even started to type up a bit though most of my efforts and energy ended on the nLab entries like 'quality type', 'sufficiently cohesive topos' or 'Aufhebung'.

First of all, my **audience** was intended to be roughly at a math undergraduate level and my **goal** would have been, besides implicitly advertising topos theory by explicitly working out concrete examples that are both suggestive yet still easy to grasp[1], to prepare the reader to read Lawvere on cohesion and the **Hegel stuff**, with especially the latter being *in urgent need to be brought in disgestible possibly even publishable form to philosophers*.
So the overall plan would have been to help ventilate his ideas on the subjects by giving them a more explicit and didactic presentation.

The nLab-entry on sufficient cohesion should give you an illustration of what I planned to achieve: This entry in its current form is mainly a spelling out of a theorem from the TAC 2007 cohesion paper (well, even the 1985 paper on gros toposes) that brings together rather sketchy remarks and hints on the proof that Lawvere strayed over four or so papers between 1985 and 2007 into a strictly deductive and didactic form. Discounting the implicit vanity, you might say it's the first 'published' version of Lawvere's proof.

Now, concerning the **form** of the text, I intended to follow Lawvere's strategy employed from 1985 to 2007, and use a simple running example and intersperse the general theory with the application to this particular example. In difference to Lawvere in 1985 or 2007 I would have really worked through the example and even presented facets of the example that are not directly linked to cohesion or Aufhebung (The 1990 'qualitative distinctions' paper that develops the topos of graphs in various directions providing a nice example of this approach).

As a **running example** I planned to use the **topos of graphs**[2] since everybody knows graphs and they are quite useful in a wide range of applications like linguistics, anthropology etc. Furthermore besides the generic figures book and the Lawvere papers mentioned above there are two magnificent texts on this topos, namely, 'A guided tour through the topos of graphs' by Sebastiano Vigna and 'Categorical concepts in graph theory' by Bumby and Latch. In particular,

[1] In my opinion the 'generic figures' book suffers from having to much trivial running examples and every time things start to become interesting like the modal logic application, the synthetic differential geometry or the Aufhebungs story the text breaks up leaving the reader with just a bare hint and a reference. I think it would be much more attractive to work through a simple running example on these occasions (ok a bit difficult for SDG but the Bell or McLarty book still achieve to convey interesting insights with either a light categorical baggage or respectively in the form of a very short chapter) since such example guide one's intuition even at a research level by providing toy cases, touchstones for general ideas.

[2] Though I am everything but an expert in differential cohesion, I guess that in that case one would like to use the *Sierpinski topos* as a replacement for the topos of graphs.

the first paper gives a first glimpse at Grothendieck toposes in an absolutely examplary manner, providing a perfect blueprint for the level of sophistication and intellectual stimulation I would like to achieve!
I also planned to develop the linguistic/**grammatical side** of this topos a bit (There are some ideas on this in the qualitative distinctions paper developed later by Bob Walters on contextfree grammars in JPAA and even the automata mentioned by Vigna provide classical mathematical models for grammars). So its is likely that I would have done some linguistics/formal language theory on this occasion.
Graphs give you the occasion to mention **hypergraphs** which are interesting in themselves and could be used to illustrate the idea of colored graphs or more generally labelling as sketched in some of Lawvere's papers. The nLab entry on hypergraphs has this partly written up and develops the subtopos structure useable for Aufhebung at some length. This is also an instance of the important Wraith gluing construction and uses the category of elements. To sum up, hypergraphs are a nearby example that provide concrete illustration for a lot of every important categorical concepts (slicing, category of points, labelling, open subtopos, double negation subtoposes, Aufhebung etc.) hence I would have developed them as a side thread/spin off so even if I can't convert the reader to cohseion and Hegelanism she still carry a rich and vividly illustrated baggage of categorical concepts.

It is highly probable that I would have kept this text in a strictly mathematical form treating Aufhebung merely as a mathematical concept and merely briefly hinting to Hegelian background in order to avoid loosing the mathematical readership. I think furthermore that any attempt to **formalize Hegel** or bringing Lawvere's ideas on Aufhebung to the philosophers has to problematicize the question what one wants to achieve with this: whereas it is clear what 'formalizing string theory' means in principle at least since Galileo, the same can not be said of 'formalizing Hegel' given Hegel's scepticism concerning mathematical philosophy as expressed in the preface to the Phenemenology of spirit where he breaks with Schelling over this issue. Hence any attempt to bring Lawvere's Hegel to the philosophers has to address a lot of strictly philosophical questions and would very likely require a second paper turning the above sketched musings on cohesion winding around the topos of graphs into an introduction to the mathematical prerequisites.