

# Representations of categories

Oliver Kullmann  
Computer Science Department  
University of Wales Swansea

PhD Theory Seminar (Hauptseminar)  
Swansea, February 28, 2007

# Introduction: The questions

The topics of this talk are:

- Which categories are **concrete** (more precisely, can be made concrete)?
- Are there *most general* concrete categories (which enable good representations of all concrete categories)?
- Which categories are **algebraic** (more precisely, can be made algebraic)?
- Are there *most general* algebraic categories (which enable good representations of all algebraic categories)?
- Is every concrete category algebraic (i.e., can be made algebraic)?

# Introduction: The answers

We will see:

- There are always non-concretisable categories.
- There are natural most general concrete categories.
- There are natural most general algebraic categories.
- By definition every algebraic category is concrete:  
Whether every concrete category is algebraic  
depends on the universe.

# Overview

- 1 Concrete categories
- 2 Stronger representations
- 3 Universal categories
- 4 Algebraic representations
- 5 Alg-universal categories
- 6 Algebraisation of concrete categories

Representations of  
categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete  
categories

Stronger  
representations

Universal  
categories

Algebraic  
representations

Alg-universal  
categories

Algebraisation of  
concrete  
categories

- A concrete category over a category  $\mathcal{G}$  is a pair  $(\mathcal{C}, V)$ , where  $\mathcal{C}$  is a category and  $V : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$  is a faithful functor.
- A concrete category is a concrete category over  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$ .
- A category  $\mathcal{C}$  is **concretisable** if there exists a functor  $V$  such that  $(\mathcal{C}, V)$  is a concrete category.
- Examples of concretisable categories are  $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}^t$ .

Which categories are concretisable ?!

# Three sizes of categories

Recall that categories come in three sizes:

- 1 small categories
- 2 large categories with small morphism sets
- 3 large categories with large morphism sets.

The third type is definitely not concretisable. Our aim is to solve the question for the first two types.

# General remarks on concretisation

- $\mathcal{G}$ -Concretisable categories for a concretisable category  $\mathcal{G}$  are again concretisable; we obtain all concretisable categories iff  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -concretisable.
- A category is concretisable iff it is *embeddable* into  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$ , that is, iff it is isomorphic to a subcategory of  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$ . The embedding can be done in such a way that all image sets are non-empty and disjoint.
- Asking for a *full embedding* into  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$  is too strong; for example a category  $\mathcal{C}$  with objects  $A, B, C \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$  such that

$$|\text{Mor}(B, C)| = 2, \quad |\text{Mor}(A, B)| \geq 2$$

has no full embedding into  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$  since for sets  $X, Y$  with  $|Y^X| = 2$  we have  $|X| = 1$  and  $|Y| = 2$ .

# Small categories are concretisable

Consider a small category  $\mathcal{C}$ :

- for  $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$  let

$$V(X) := \{f \in \text{Mor}(\mathcal{C}) : \text{cod}(f) = X\};$$

- for  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  let

$$V(f) := (\eta \in V(X) \mapsto f \circ \eta \in V(Y)).$$

( $V$  is not just faithful, but is also an embedding with non-empty disjoint images.)

So concretisation is always possible in the next universe. This leaves open concretisation of large categories with small morphism sets.



# The solution

- Freyd and Isbell provided a necessary and sufficient criterion for a category to be concretisable. (This criterion solves the problem for a fixed category  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{U}}$  (that is, fixed universe  $\mathbb{U}$ ) and all other categories (possibly from larger universes); however combining categories from different universes seems not really appropriate.)
- In every universe there are non-concretisable categories. (Actually, there seem to be no natural examples?!)

The (pure) concretisation issue seems to be settled.

# Full embeddings

- We we want to represent a category  $\mathcal{C}$  not just by an embedding, but by a *full embedding* into some nice category  $\mathcal{G}$  (that is,  $\mathcal{C}$  shall be isomorphic to a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{G}$ ).
- The framework for us is given by concretisable categories, i.e., we only want to represent concretisable categories.

A category  $\mathcal{C}$  is called **universal** iff every concretisable category has a full embedding into  $\mathcal{C}$ .

(Remark: Categories like  $\mathfrak{Set}$  are not universal because of the constant morphisms, while  $\mathfrak{Mod}$  is not universal because of the null morphisms — recall that discrete categories are concretisable.)

# Isomorphism-closed subcategories

Consider a category  $\mathcal{C}$ . Call a sub-category of  $\mathcal{C}$  **isomorphism-closed** (abbreviated by “i-c”) if it contains all objects isomorphic (in  $\mathcal{C}$ ) to some object of that sub-category.

- To specify a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}$ , it suffices to specify any set of objects.
- Even nicer, to specify an i-c full subcategory it suffices just to specify the isomorphism types.

Accordingly we can consider **i-c full embeddings** instead of just full embeddings; this question seems to have received no attention in the literature, but as a little hobby I will consider it here to some degree.

Representations of categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete categories

Stronger representations

Universal categories

Algebraic representations

Alg-universal categories

Algebraisation of concrete categories

# Two universal categories

The universal categories  $\mathbf{S}(P^+)$ ,  $\mathbf{S}(P^-)$  are as follows:

- 1 Objects are pairs  $(X, \mathbb{M})$ , where  $X$  is a set and  $\mathbb{M} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P}(X))$  is a set system on  $X$ .
- 2 The morphisms  $f : (X, \mathbb{M}) \rightarrow (X', \mathbb{M}')$  are maps  $f : X \rightarrow X'$ , “forward morphisms” in  $\mathbf{S}(P^+)$ , i.e.,

$$\forall A \in \mathbb{M} : f(A) \in \mathbb{M}'$$

and “backward morphisms” in  $\mathbf{S}(P^-)$ , i.e.,

$$\forall A' \in \mathbb{M}' : f^{-1}(A') \in \mathbb{M}.$$

Both categories are obviously concretisable.

- $\mathbf{S}(P^+)$  is the category of (arbitrary) hypergraphs with (possibly) infinite hyperedges.
- $\mathbf{S}(P^-)$  contains the category of closure systems as an i-c full subcategory (which in turn contains  $\mathfrak{IS}$  as an i-c full subcategory).

# Algebraic categories

Now let's try to make get more specific representing categories.

- An **algebraic category** is a full subcategory of the category of all (single-sorted) algebraic structures of some given type (finitary algebraic operations, arbitrary many).
- To consider multi-sorted algebras does not add anything here.
- Since we allow arbitrary full subcategories, any axiomatically specified category of algebras is included here.

Algebraic categories are concretisable. How special are they?

# Semigroups and monoids

- The category  $\mathcal{SGr}$  of semigroups is algebraic.
- And so is the category  $\mathcal{Mon}$  of monoids.

$\mathcal{Mon}$  has a non-full embedding into  $\mathcal{SGr}$  (the forgetful functor). Is there also some full embedding ?!?

There is also a non-full embedding of  $\mathcal{SGr}$  into  $\mathcal{Mon}$ , given by adjoining a (new) neutral element. Here we see easily that there cannot be a full embedding, since for example

$$\text{Mor}_{\mathcal{SGr}}((\mathbb{N}_0, +), (\mathbb{N}, +)) = \emptyset.$$

## More example

As for concretisability we have (but this time no so easy to prove):

**Lemma** *Every small category is algebraic.*

So again, going to the next universe we can make a given category algebraic (using a large signature).

Could every concretisable category be algebraic?!

Representations of  
categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete  
categories

Stronger  
representations

Universal  
categories

Algebraic  
representations

Alg-universal  
categories

Algebraisation of  
concrete  
categories

# Algebraic universality

Representations of  
categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete  
categories

Stronger  
representations

Universal  
categories

Algebraic  
representations

Alg-universal  
categories

Algebraisation of  
concrete  
categories

A category is **algebraic-universal** if every algebraic category has a full embedding.

- Are there algebraic-universal categories which are algebraic ?
- And if they exist, do we have universal categories amongst them ?



# A major result

**Theorem** *The category  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}$  of semigroups is algebraic-universal.*

- So there is for example a full embedding of  $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{D}\mathcal{N}$  into  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}$  (it would be nice to see it).
- Using truly large semigroups (in the next universe), thus every category can be represented by semigroups.

What about this universe — is  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}$  also universal !?!

(It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{T}$  is fully embeddable into  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}$ .  
But  $S(P^+)$  or  $S(P^-)$  !!?)

# Filters and ultrafilters

- A **filter** on a set  $X$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{P}(X)$  stable under binary intersection and superset-formation; the filter is **proper** if not containing  $\emptyset$ .
- An **ultrafilter** on  $X$  is a filter on  $X$  which is maximal amongst all proper filters.
- The set of ultrafilters on  $X$  is denoted by  $\beta X$ .
- For  $x \in X$  the generated **trivial** (or **principal**) **ultrafilter** is  $\mathcal{U}_x := \{A \in \mathbb{P}(X) : x \in A\}$ .
- On a finite set  $X$  every ultrafilter is trivial, and thus  $\text{card}(\beta X) = \text{card}(X)$ .
- On an infinite set  $X$  we have  $\text{card}(\beta X) = 2^{2^{\text{card}(X)}}$ .

# More than finite intersections ?

Filters are stable under finite intersections. Can more be said?

- 1 The elements of  $\beta X$  correspond 1-1 to finitely additive  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued probability measures  $\mu$  on  $X$ .
- 2 The non-trivial elements of  $\beta X$  correspond to those  $\mu$  which are not “point measures”, i.e., for which  $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ .
- 3 For an infinite cardinal number  $\alpha$ , the elements of  $\beta X$  stable under intersection of at most  $\alpha$  elements correspond 1-1 to the  $\alpha$ -additive  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued probability measures on  $X$ .

# Hypothesis (M)

Condition “(M)” on universe  $\mathbb{U}$  is:

*In  $\mathbb{U}$  there is a cardinal number  $\alpha \in \mathbb{U}$ , such that in  $\mathbb{U}$  every  $\alpha$ -additive  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued probability measure is trivial.*

- 1 For every  $\alpha$ , the smallest cardinality of a set  $X$  with a non-trivial  $\alpha$ -additive  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued measure is **strongly inaccessible** (that is, is uncountable and is unreachable by union and power-set formation).
- 2 So if  $\mathbb{U}$  does not fulfil (M), then  $\mathbb{U}$  contains an unbounded set of strongly inaccessible cardinal numbers.

# A necessary condition for “not (M)”

- The strongly inaccessible cardinal numbers are the cardinalities of universes.
- Call a universe  $\mathbb{U}$  a **universe of the second kind** if  $\mathbb{U}$  is not just a model of ZFC, but also of ZFCU (that is, besides the stability under all set-theoretic operations, for every  $x \in \mathbb{U}$  there exists also a universe  $\mathbb{U}'$  with  $x \in \mathbb{U}' \in \mathbb{U}$ ).
- A universe  $\mathbb{U}$  is a universe of the second kind iff  $\mathbb{U}$  contains an unbounded set of strongly inaccessible cardinal numbers (unbounded within  $\mathbb{U}$ ).

So if  $\mathbb{U}$  does not fulfil (M), then  $\mathbb{U}$  must be a universe of the second kind.

# About the universality of $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$

Representations of  
categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete  
categories

Stronger  
representations

Universal  
categories

Algebraic  
representations

Alg-universal  
categories

Algebraisation of  
concrete  
categories

If the universe fulfils (M):

- 1 *Every concretisable category is algebraic.*
- 2 So  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}$  is universal.

If the universe does not fulfil (M):

- 1  $\mathcal{G}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{R}^t$  is not algebraic.
- 2 So *no algebraic category is universal.*

Representations of  
categories

Oliver Kullmann

Concrete  
categories

Stronger  
representations

Universal  
categories

Algebraic  
representations

Alg-universal  
categories

Algebraisation of  
concrete  
categories

End