

ON THE CHARACTERIZATION OF MONADIC CATEGORIES OVER SET

ENRICO M. VITALE

1. Introduction

In this work we look for a new proof of the theorem characterizing monadic categories over Set (see for example [1]); more precisely, we want to stress the role of the exactness condition. Let us recall the theorem (in the following “epi” means regular epimorphism and “projective” means regular projective object):

Let \mathcal{A} be a category; the following conditions are equivalent

- 1) \mathcal{A} is equivalent to the category of algebras $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ for a monad \mathbb{T} over Set
- 2) \mathcal{A} is an exact category and there exists an object $G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that
 - G is projective
 - $\forall I \in \text{Set} \exists I \bullet G$ (the I -indexed copower of G)
 - $\forall A \in \mathcal{A} \exists I \bullet G \rightarrow A$ epi

To prove that 1) implies 2) one takes as G the free algebra over the singleton; viceversa the hypothesis over G imply that \mathcal{A} has enough projectives. So this theorem leads us to study exact categories with enough projectives and, on the other hand, to find conditions such that $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ is exact and the free algebras are projective.

2. Regularity and exactness of $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$

In this section we sketch some elementary facts about $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ to obtain a topos theoretic example of a free exact category, i.e. of an exact category with enough projectives (cf. [4]).

Proposition 1 *Let \mathcal{A} be a regular category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} (with functor part T);*

- 1) *T preserves epi's if and only if the forgetful functor $U: \text{EM}(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ preserves epi's*
- 2) *if T preserves epi's, then $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ is regular and U preserves and reflects the epi-mono factorization.*

Key words and phrases: monadic categories, exact categories.

Proposition 2 *Let \mathcal{A} be a regular category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} ;*

- 1) *T sends epi's in split epi's (i.e. epi's with a section) if and only if U sends epi's in split epi's*
- 2) *if T sends epi's in split epi's, then the free algebras are projectives.*

Sketch of the proof: 2) Let $f: (D, d) \rightarrow (TC, \mu_C)$ be an epi in $EM(\mathbb{T})$, where (TC, μ_C) is the free algebra over $C \in \mathcal{A}$ ($\mu: T^2 \rightarrow T$ is the multiplication of \mathbb{T}); f is an epi in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ and so in \mathcal{A} , then Tf is a split epi in \mathcal{A} and using the section of Tf one can construct the section of f in $EM(\mathbb{T})$; the proof of 1) is analogous. ■

Lemma 3 *Let \mathcal{A} be an exact category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} ; consider an equivalence relation $e_1, e_2: (E, e) \rightrightarrows (X, x)$ in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ and its coequalizer $q: X \rightarrow Q$ in \mathcal{A} ; if*

$$TE \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Te_1} \\ \xrightarrow{Te_2} \end{array} TX \xrightarrow{Tq} TQ$$

is a coequalizer diagram in \mathcal{A} , then $e_1, e_2: (E, e) \rightrightarrows (X, x)$ is effective.

Proposition 4 *Let \mathcal{A} be an exact category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} ; if \mathbb{T} preserves the coequalizers in \mathcal{A} of the equivalence relations in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ and the epi's, then $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact.*

Corollary 5 *Let \mathcal{A} be an exact category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} ;*

- 1) *if T is left exact and preserves epi's, then $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact*
- 2) *if the coequalizer in \mathcal{A} of an equivalence relation in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is a split epi in \mathcal{A} , then $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact and free algebras are projectives*
- 3) *the axiom of choice holds in \mathcal{A} if and only if for every monad \mathbb{T} over \mathcal{A} the category $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact and the free algebras are projectives.*

As each algebra is a quotient of a free algebra, if free algebras are projective then $EM(\mathbb{T})$ has enough projectives; if, moreover, $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact, one has that $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is the free exact category over its full subcategory $KL(\mathbb{T})$ of free algebras (cf. [4]). An obvious example of such a situation is when \mathcal{A} is Set , or a power of Set , and we can apply the third point of corollary 5. Another example is the following:

Example 6 *Let \mathcal{E} be an elementary topos; the category of sup-lattices in \mathcal{E} is the free exact category over the category of relations in \mathcal{E} .*

Proof: Let us consider the covariant monad “power-set” $\mathcal{P}: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, for which $EM(\mathcal{P}) = \text{SL}(\mathcal{E})$ and $KL(\mathcal{P}) = \text{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$; the corresponding forgetful functor $\text{SL}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ sends epi's in split epi's (cf. [5]) and so $\text{SL}(\mathcal{E})$ is a regular category and the objects of $\text{Rel}(\mathcal{E})$ are projectives in $\text{SL}(\mathcal{E})$. It remains to prove that the second point of corollary 5 is satisfied; we sketch the proof using the internal language of \mathcal{E} : let $e_1, e_2: E \rightrightarrows X$ be an equivalence relation in $\text{SL}(\mathcal{E})$ and $q: X \rightarrow Q$ its coequalizer in \mathcal{E} ; we obtain a section $s: Q \rightarrow X$ defining $\forall y \in Y \quad s(y) = \text{Sup}\{x \in X \mid q(x) = y\}$. ■

For “esthetic reasons”, let us observe that the condition stated in 5.2 is also necessary; in fact we have the following lemma:

Lemma 7 *Let \mathbb{T} be a monad over a category \mathcal{A} ;*

- 1) *if $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is regular and free algebras are projectives, then U sends epi's in split epi's*
- 2) *if U sends epi's in (split) epi's, then the coequalizer in \mathcal{A} of an exact sequences in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is a (split) epi in \mathcal{A}*

Now we can summarize the previous discussion as follows:

Proposition 8 *let \mathcal{A} be an exact category and \mathbb{T} a monad over \mathcal{A} ; the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) *$EM(\mathbb{T})$ is exact and free algebras are projectives*
- 2) *the coequalizer in \mathcal{A} of an equivalence relation in $EM(\mathbb{T})$ is a split epi in \mathcal{A}*

3. Exact categories with enough projectives

In this section we obtain a property of exact categories which, in the case of monadic categories over Set , will allow us to give a short proof of the characterizing theorem.

Definition 9 *A full subcategory $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ of a category \mathcal{A} is said to be a projective cover of \mathcal{A} if*

- *every object of $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is projective in \mathcal{A}*
- *every object of \mathcal{A} is a quotient of an object of $P_{\mathcal{A}}$*

Lemma 10 *Let \mathcal{A} be a category with kernel pairs and $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ a projective cover of \mathcal{A} ; $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ “generates” \mathcal{A} via coequalizers.*

(The assertion means that, given a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{A} , we are able to build up a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 P' & \xrightarrow{a_1} & P & \xrightarrow{p} & A \\
 f' \downarrow & & \bar{f} \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\
 Q' & \xrightarrow{b_1} & Q & \xrightarrow{q} & B \\
 & & & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & B
 \end{array}$$

(Note: The diagram above is a simplified representation of the commutative diagram in the image. The original image shows a square with a triangle below it. The top row is $P' \xrightarrow{a_1} P \xrightarrow{p} A$. The bottom row is $Q' \xrightarrow{b_1} Q \xrightarrow{q} B$. Vertical arrows are $f': P' \rightarrow Q'$, $\bar{f}: P \rightarrow Q$, and $f: A \rightarrow B$. There are also arrows $a_2: P' \rightarrow P$ and $b_2: Q' \rightarrow Q$ shown as double lines with arrows pointing right. The bottom-right corner of the square is a triangle with vertices Q , B , and A , with arrows $q: Q \rightarrow B$, $f: A \rightarrow B$, and $\bar{f}: P \rightarrow Q$ forming the sides.)

such that the left square is in $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ and the two horizontal lines are coequalizers, so that f is the unique extension to the quotient.)

Proof: Given A in \mathcal{A} , there exists P in $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ and an epi $p: P \rightarrow A$; now consider the kernel pair

$$N(p) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1} \\ \xrightarrow{p_2} \end{array} P \xrightarrow{p} A$$

and again there exists an epi $p': P' \rightarrow N(p)$ with P' in $P_{\mathcal{A}}$, so that p is the coequalizer of p_1 and p_2 and then of $p'p_1 = a_1$ and $p'p_2 = a_2$; analogously one can work over B and now the three dotted arrows making the following diagram commutative arise respectively from the fact that P is projective and q is an epi, from the universality of $q_1, q_2: N(q) \rightrightarrows Q$ and from the fact that P' is projective and q' is an epi

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} P' & \xrightarrow{p'} & N(p) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1} \\ \xrightarrow{p_2} \end{array} & P & \xrightarrow{p} & A \\ \vdots \downarrow f & & \vdots \downarrow \bar{f} & & \vdots \downarrow \bar{f} & & \downarrow f \\ Q' & \xrightarrow{q'} & N(q) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{q_1} \\ \xrightarrow{q_2} \end{array} & Q & \xrightarrow{q} & B \end{array}$$

■

Proposition 11 *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be two exact categories with enough projectives, $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{B}}$ two projective covers and $P(\mathcal{A})$ and $P(\mathcal{B})$ the full subcategories of projective objects;*

- 1) \mathcal{A} is equivalent to \mathcal{B} if and only if $P(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalent to $P(\mathcal{B})$
- 2) if $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ is equivalent to $P_{\mathcal{B}}$, then $P(\mathcal{A})$ is equivalent to $P(\mathcal{B})$

Proof: 1) the non-trivial implication is the “if”: let $F: P(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{B})$ be an equivalence; define $F': \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ as follows: if $f: A \rightarrow B$ is in \mathcal{A} , consider its presentation as in the previous lemma

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} P' & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{a_1} \\ \xrightarrow{a_2} \end{array} & P & \xrightarrow{p} & A \\ f' \downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{f} & & \downarrow f \\ Q' & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{b_1} \\ \xrightarrow{b_2} \end{array} & Q & \xrightarrow{q} & B \end{array}$$

and put $F'f$ as the unique extension to the quotient of

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FP' & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Fa_1} \\ \xrightarrow{Fa_2} \end{array} & FP & \xrightarrow{F'p} & F'A \\ Ff' \downarrow & & \downarrow F\bar{f} & & \downarrow F'f \\ FQ' & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Fb_1} \\ \xrightarrow{Fb_2} \end{array} & Q & \xrightarrow{F'q} & F'B \end{array}$$

The existence of F' depends on the fact that the (jointly) monic part (i_1, i_2) of the epi-(jointly) mono factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FP' & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Fa_1} \\ \xrightarrow{Fa_2} \end{array} & FP \\ & \searrow n & \uparrow i_1 \\ & & N \\ & & \uparrow i_2 \end{array}$$

is an equivalence relation in \mathcal{B} ; this follows from the fact that the pair (a_1, a_2) is a pseudo-equivalence relation in $P(\mathcal{A})$ (i.e. as an equivalence relation but we do not require that a_1 and a_2 are jointly monic) and so the same holds for (Fa_1, Fa_2) in $P(\mathcal{B})$. See for instance the transitivity condition: consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M' & \xrightarrow{l_1} & FP' & & \\
 \downarrow l_2 & \searrow m & \downarrow n & & \\
 & M & \xrightarrow{n_1} & N & \\
 & \downarrow n_2 & & \downarrow i_2 & \\
 FP' & \xrightarrow{n} & N & \xrightarrow{i_1} & FP
 \end{array}$$

where M is the pullback of i_1 and i_2 and M' the pullback of Fa_1 and Fa_2 , so that the unique factorization $m: M' \rightarrow M$ is an epi; consider again a projective cover $m': R \rightarrow M'$; the transitivity of (Fa_1, Fa_2) in $P(\mathcal{B})$ means exactly that there exists a morphism $t: R \rightarrow FP'$ making commutative the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 R & \xrightarrow{m'} & M' & \xrightarrow{m} & M & \xrightarrow{(n_1 i_1, n_2 i_2)} & FP \times FP \\
 \downarrow t & & & & & & \downarrow id \\
 FP' & \xrightarrow{n} & N & \xrightarrow{(i_1, i_2)} & FP \times FP & &
 \end{array}$$

The fact that $m'm$ is an epi and (i_1, i_2) is a mono implies the existence of a morphism $\tau: M \rightarrow N$ which exhibits the transitivity of $i_1, i_2: N \rightrightarrows FP$. To show that F' is a full and essentially surjective functor is quite obvious (for this recall that F is an equivalence); the faithfulness of F' essentially depends on the fact that the image of (Fb_1, Fb_2) , being an equivalence relation in \mathcal{B} , is the kernel pair of its coequalizer $F'q$.

2) is trivial under the only condition that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} have enough projectives. \blacksquare

The previous proposition explains the name "free" given to an exact category with enough projectives: it is completely determined by the full subcategory of projective objects. In [4] we have discussed the universal property satisfied by this kind of categories.

4. Characterization theorem

Proposition 12 *Let \mathcal{C} be a category; the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) \mathcal{C} is equivalent to the category $KL(\mathbb{T})$ for a monad \mathbb{T} over Set
- 2) there exists an object $G \in \mathcal{C}$ such that
 - $\forall I \in Set \exists I \bullet G$
 - $\forall X \in \mathcal{C} \exists I \in Set$ such that $X \cong I \bullet G$

Proof: 2) \Rightarrow 1) consider the pair of functors

$$\text{Set} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\mathcal{C}(G, -)} \\ \xrightarrow{- \bullet G} \end{array} \mathcal{C}$$

The first condition says that $- \bullet G$ is left adjoint to $\mathcal{C}(G, -)$; the second condition says that the comparison functor $\text{KL}(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is essentially surjective and so it is an equivalence (here \mathbb{T} is the monad induced by $- \bullet G \dashv \mathcal{C}(G, -)$). ■

Proposition 13 *Let \mathcal{A} be a category; the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) \mathcal{A} is equivalent to the category $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ for a monad \mathbb{T} over Set
- 2) \mathcal{A} is an exact category and there exists an object $G \in \mathcal{A}$ such that
 - G is projective
 - $\forall I \in \text{Set} \exists I \bullet G$
 - $\forall A \in \mathcal{A} \exists I \bullet G \rightarrow A$ epi

Proof: 2) \Rightarrow 1) let \mathcal{C} be the full subcategory of \mathcal{A} spanned by $I \bullet G$ for $I \in \text{Set}$; by proposition 12, $\mathcal{C} \simeq \text{KL}(\mathbb{T})$ for a monad \mathbb{T} over Set ; so, by proposition 11, $\mathcal{A} \simeq \text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ because \mathcal{C} is a projective cover of \mathcal{A} and $\text{KL}(\mathbb{T})$ is a projective cover of $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$. ■

5. Presheaf categories

The two previous propositions can be generalized to characterize $\text{KL}(\mathbb{T})$ and $\text{EM}(\mathbb{T})$ when \mathbb{T} is a monad over Set^X for $X \in \text{Set}$ (to get examples as presheaf categories); the short proof suggested for proposition 13 remains, of course, unchanged. It is not surprising (cf. [6]) that proposition 11 allows us also to give a short proof for the characterization of presheaf categories (cf. [2, 3]). In the next lemma, $\text{Fam}\mathbb{C}$ is the sum completion of a small category \mathbb{C} .

Lemma 14 *Let \mathbb{C} be a small category and \mathcal{B} the full subcategory of $\text{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{op}}$ spanned by sums of representable functors; \mathcal{B} is equivalent to $\text{Fam}\mathbb{C}$.*

Proof: Consider the unique extension $Y': \text{Fam}\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ of the Yoneda embedding $Y: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$; obviously Y' is essentially surjective; its fullness and faithfulness easily follow from Yoneda's lemma. ■

Lemma 15 *Let \mathcal{B} be a category with disjoint sums and strict initial object; the following conditions are equivalent*

(1) \mathcal{B} is equivalent to the category $\text{Fam}\mathbb{C}$ for a small category \mathbb{C}

(2) there exists a small subcategory \mathbb{C} of \mathcal{B} such that

- $\forall B \in \mathcal{B} \exists \{C_i\}_I$ with $C_i \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $B \cong \coprod_I C_i$
- $\forall f: C \rightarrow \coprod_I C_i$ with $C, C_i \in \mathbb{C} \exists i_0 \in I$ such that f can be factorized through the injection $C_{i_0} \rightarrow \coprod_I C_i$
- the initial object $0 \notin \mathbb{C}$

Proof: 2) \Rightarrow 1) consider the unique extension $F: \text{Fam}\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ of the full inclusion of \mathbb{C} in \mathcal{B} ; the first condition implies that F is essentially surjective; the second conditions implies that F is full; the third condition (together with the disjointness and the fact that the initial object is strict) implies that F is faithful. ■

Proposition 16 *Let \mathcal{A} be an exact category with disjoint sums and strict initial objects; the following conditions are equivalent*

(1) \mathcal{A} is equivalent to the category of presheaves on a small category

(2) \mathcal{A} has a set $\{G_j\}_J$ of regular generators such that

- $\forall j \in J \ G_j$ is projective
- $\forall f: G \rightarrow \coprod_I G_i$ with $G, G_i \in \{G_j\}_J \exists i_0 \in I$ such that f can be factorized through the injection $G_{i_0} \rightarrow \coprod_I G_i$

(3) \mathcal{A} has a family of absolutely presentable generators

Proof: 1) \Rightarrow 3) and 3) \Rightarrow 2) are obvious (recall that an object $G \in \mathcal{A}$ is absolutely presentable if $\mathcal{A}(G, -): \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ preserves colimits).

2) \Rightarrow 1): two cases: first, if the initial object $0 \in \{G_j\}_J$ but $\{G_j\}_J \setminus 0$ is not a family of generators, then $\{G_j\}_J = \{0\}$ and so $\mathcal{A} \simeq 1 \simeq \text{Set}^\emptyset$; second, if $0 \notin \{G_j\}_J$ let \mathbb{C} be the full subcategory of generators and \mathcal{B} the full subcategory spanned by sums of generators; by lemma 15, $\mathcal{B} \simeq \text{Fam}\mathbb{C}$ and, by lemma 14, $\text{Fam}\mathbb{C}$ is a projective cover of $\text{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{op}}$; but \mathcal{B} is a projective cover of \mathcal{A} , so, by proposition 11, $\mathcal{A} \simeq \text{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{op}}$. ■

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank F. Borceux, M. C. Pedicchio, F. Van der Plancke and, in particular, A. Carboni for some useful discussions on this topic.

References

- [1] F. BORCEUX, Handbook of categorical algebra, *Cambridge University Press* (1994).
- [2] M. BUNGE, Relative functor categories and categories of algebras, *Journal of Algebra* 11-1 (1969).
- [3] M. BUNGE, Internal presheaves toposes, *Cahiers Topo. et Géo. Diff.* XVIII-3 (1977).
- [4] A. CARBONI A. AND E.M. VITALE, Algebraic categories as free categories, talk in 52nd Peripatetic Seminar on Sheaves and Logic, Valenciennes (1993).
- [5] A. JOYAL AND M. TIERNEY, An extension of the Galois theory of Grothendieck, *Memoirs American Mathematical Society* 51 (1984).
- [6] F.E.J. LINTON, Applied functorial semantics II, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 80, Springer (1969).

Département de Mathématique Pure et Appliquée
Université catholique de Louvain
Chemin du Cyclotron 2
B 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique
Email: vitale@math.ucl.ac.be