

Exponentiable functors between quantaloid-enriched categories

Maria Manuel Clementino*, Dirk Hofmann† and Isar Stubbe‡

July 3, 2007§

Abstract. Exponentiable functors between quantaloid-enriched categories are characterized in elementary terms. The proof goes as follows: the elementary conditions on a given functor translate into existence statements for certain adjoints that obey some lax commutativity; this, in turn, is precisely what is needed to prove the existence of partial products with that functor; so that the functor's exponentiability follows from the works of Niefield [1982] and Dyckhoff and Tholen [1987].

Keywords: quantaloid, enriched category, exponentiability, partial product.

MSC 2000 Classification: 06F07, 18A22, 18D05, 18D20

1. Introduction

The study of exponentiable morphisms in a category \mathcal{C} , in particular of exponentiable functors between (small) categories (i.e. Conduché fibrations), has a long history; see [Niefield, 2001] for a short account. Recently M. M. Clementino and D. Hofmann [2006] found simple necessary-and-sufficient conditions for the exponentiability of a functor between \mathcal{V} -enriched categories, where \mathcal{V} is a symmetric quantale which has its top element as unit for its multiplication and whose underlying sup-lattice is a locale. Our aim here is to prove the following characterization of the exponentiable functors between \mathcal{Q} -enriched categories, where now \mathcal{Q} is *any (small) quantaloid*, thus considerably generalizing the aforementioned result of [Clementino and Hofmann, 2006].

*Centro de Matemática, Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal. Email: mmc@mat.uc.pt

†Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal. Email: dirk@mat.ua.pt

‡Postdoctoral Fellow of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO), Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Antwerp, Belgium. Email: isar.stubbe@ua.ac.be

§First complete version written on August 17, 2006; submitted to *Applied Categorical Structures* on October 27, 2006; accepted for publication on March 30, 2007; revised on July 3, 2007.

Theorem 1.1 *A functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ between \mathcal{Q} -enriched categories is exponentiable, i.e. the functor “product with F ”*

$$- \times F: \mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})/\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})/\mathbb{B}$$

admits a right adjoint, if and only if the following two conditions hold:

1. *for every $a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$ and $\bigvee_i f_i \leq \mathbb{B}(Fa', Fa)$,*

$$\left(\bigvee_i f_i \right) \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) = \bigvee_i \left(f_i \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \right),$$

2. *for every $a, a'' \in \mathbb{A}$, $b' \in \mathbb{B}$, $f \leq \mathbb{B}(b', Fa)$ and $g \leq \mathbb{B}(Fa'', b')$,*

$$(g \circ f) \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a) = \bigvee_{a' \in F^{-1}b'} \left((g \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a')) \circ (f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a)) \right).$$

These conditions are “elementary” in the sense that they are simply equalities (of infima, suprema and compositions) of morphisms in the base quantaloid \mathcal{Q} . The second condition is precisely what [Clementino and Hofmann, 2006] had too, albeit in their more restrictive setting; but they did not discover the first condition *an sich*: because it is obviously always true if the base category is a locale.

The proof of our theorem goes as follows. In section 3 we first translate conditions 1.1–1 and 1.1–2 into existence statements for certain adjoints obeying some lax commutativity. Next, in section 4, we show that these latter adjoints are precisely what is needed to prove the existence of partial products in $\mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ over $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. The result then follows from R. Dyckhoff and W. Tholen’s [1987] observation, complementary to S. Niefield’s [1982] work, that a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in a category \mathcal{C} with finite limits is exponentiable if and only if \mathcal{C} admits partial products over f .

Acknowledgement. This work was done when Isar Stubbe was a post-doctoral researcher at the Centre for Mathematics of the University of Coimbra.

2. Preliminaries

For the basics on \mathcal{Q} -enriched categories we refer to [Stubbe, 2005]; all our notations are as in that paper. Here we shall just observe that $\mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ has pullbacks and a terminal object $-$ and therefore all finite limits [Borceux, 1994, Proposition 2.8.2] – and fix some notations.

The terminal object in $\mathbf{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$, write it as \mathbb{T} , has:

- objects: $\mathbb{T}_0 = \mathcal{Q}_0$, with types $tX = X$,
- hom-arrows: $\mathbb{T}(Y, X) = \top_{X,Y}$ = the top element of $\mathcal{Q}(X, Y)$.

For two functors $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $G: \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with common codomain, their pullback $\mathbb{A} \times_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{B}$ has:

- objects: $(\mathbb{A} \times_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{B})_0 = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{A}_0 \times \mathbb{B}_0 \mid Fa = Gb\}$ with $t(a, b) = ta = tb$,
- hom-arrows: $(\mathbb{A} \times_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{B})((a', b'), (a, b)) = \mathbb{A}(a', a) \wedge \mathbb{B}(b', b)$,

and comes with the obvious projections. All verifications are entirely straightforward.

For an $X \in \mathcal{Q}$, the one-object \mathcal{Q} -category with hom-arrow 1_X is written as $*_X$. There is an obvious bijection between the objects of type X in some \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{B} and the functors from $*_X$ to \mathbb{B} . Thus, let $[b]: *_{tb} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ stand for the functor “pointing at” $b \in \mathbb{B}$. Given a functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and an object $b \in \mathbb{B}$ in its codomain, we shall write \mathbb{A}_b for the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{A}_b & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{A} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow F \\ *_{tb} & \xrightarrow{[b]} & \mathbb{B} \end{array}$$

That is to say, \mathbb{A}_b has

- objects: $(\mathbb{A}_b)_0 = F^{-1}b = \{a \in \mathbb{A} \mid b = Fa\}$, all of type tb ,
- hom-arrows: $\mathbb{A}_b(a', a) = 1_{tb} \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a)$.

Note that $\mathbb{A}_b = \emptyset$ if and only if $b \notin F(\mathbb{A})$.

3. Adjoints obeying a lax commutativity

In this section we shall translate the elementary conditions in 1.1 into existence statements of certain adjoints obeying some lax commutative diagrams.

Lemma 3.1 *For a functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ between \mathcal{Q} -categories, the following are equivalent conditions:*

1. condition 1.1–1 holds,
2. for every $a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$, the order-preserving map

$$\downarrow \mathbb{B}(Fa', Fa) \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q}(ta, ta'): f \mapsto f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \quad (1)$$

has a right adjoint,

3. for every $b, b' \in F(\mathbb{A})$, the order-preserving map

$$\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) \longrightarrow \text{Matr}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}): f \mapsto \left(f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \right)_{(a, a') \in \mathbb{A}_b \times \mathbb{A}_{b'}} \quad (2)$$

has a right adjoint.

4. for every $b, b' \in F(\mathbb{A})$, the order-preserving map

$$\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) \longrightarrow \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}): f \mapsto \left(f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \right)_{(a, a') \in \mathbb{A}_b \times \mathbb{A}_{b'}} \quad (3)$$

has a right adjoint.

5. for every $b, b' \in \mathbb{B}$, the order-preserving map in (3) has a right adjoint.

Proof: The equivalence of the first two statements is trivial: an order-preserving map between complete lattices has a right adjoint if and only if it preserves arbitrary suprema.

Next, if we use $g \mapsto g^F$ as generic notation for the right adjoints to the maps in (2), then

$$M \mapsto M^F := \bigwedge \{ M(a', a)^F \mid (a, a') \in \mathbb{A}_b \times \mathbb{A}_{b'} \}$$

is the right adjoint to the map in (3). Conversely, if $M \mapsto M^F$ is the right adjoint to the map in (3), then for any $a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$

$$g \mapsto g^F := \left(T^{(a, a')}(g) \right)^F$$

is the right adjoint to the map in (2), with $T^{(a, a')}(g)$ standing for the \mathcal{Q} -matrix from \mathbb{A}_{F_a} to $\mathbb{A}_{F_{a'}}$ all of whose elements are set to the top element in $\mathcal{Q}(ta, ta')$ except for the element indexed by (a, a') which is set to g .

The equivalence of 3 and 4 follows straightforwardly from two facts: First, the *matrix*

$$\widehat{f} := \left(f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \right)_{a \in \mathbb{A}_b, a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}}$$

is always a *distributor* from \mathbb{A}_b to $\mathbb{A}_{b'}$: because for any $a, a_1 \in \mathbb{A}_b$ and $a', a'_1 \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}$ it is automatic that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{f}(a', a_1) \circ \mathbb{A}_b(a_1, a) &= \left(f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a_1) \right) \circ \left(1_{ta} \wedge \mathbb{A}(a_1, a) \right) \\ &\leq \left(f \circ 1_{ta} \right) \wedge \left(\mathbb{A}(a', a_1) \circ \mathbb{A}(a_1, a) \right) \\ &\leq f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \\ &= \widehat{f}(a', a) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\mathbb{A}_{b'}(a'_1, a') \circ \widehat{f}(a', a) \leq \widehat{f}(a', a)$. And second, the inclusion

$$\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_{b'}, \mathbb{A}_b) \longrightarrow \text{Matr}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_{b'}, \mathbb{A}_b): \Phi \mapsto \Phi$$

has both a left and a right adjoint; namely, its left adjoint is $M \mapsto \mathbb{A}_{b'} \circ M \circ \mathbb{A}_b$ and its right adjoint is $M \mapsto [\mathbb{A}_{b'}, \{\mathbb{A}_b, M\}]$. (In both expressions, $\mathbb{A}_{b'}$ and \mathbb{A}_b are viewed as monads in the quantaloid $\text{Matr}(\mathcal{Q})$, and we compute composition, resp.

lifting and extension, of matrices.) Hence both triangles in

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) & \\
f \mapsto \widehat{f} & \swarrow \text{dotted} & \searrow \text{dotted} & f \mapsto \widehat{f} \\
\text{Matr}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) & \xleftrightarrow[\text{M} \mapsto \mathbb{A}_{b'} \circ M \circ \mathbb{A}_b]{\Phi \leftrightarrow \Phi} & \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'})
\end{array}$$

commute and both solid arrows are left adjoints, so it follows that one dashed arrow is a left adjoint if and only if the other one is.

Finally, the only difference between the fourth and the fifth statement is that in the latter it may be that \mathbb{A}_b or $\mathbb{A}_{b'}$ is empty; but then $\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'})$ is a singleton (containing the empty distributor) in which case the right adjoint to (3) always exists. \square

In the statement of the next lemma we shall write

$$\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f \mapsto \widehat{f}} \\ \perp \\ \xleftarrow{\Phi^F \leftarrow \Phi} \end{array} \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) \quad (4)$$

for the adjunctions (one for each pair (b, b') of objects of \mathbb{B}) that 3.1–5 alludes to.

Lemma 3.2 *For a functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ between \mathcal{Q} -categories for which the equivalent conditions in 3.1 hold, the following are equivalent conditions:*

1. condition 1.1–2 holds,
2. for every $a, a'' \in \mathbb{A}$ and $b' \in \mathbb{B}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(*_{ta}, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) \times \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_{b'}, *_{ta''}) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes -} & \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(*_{ta}, *_{ta''}) \\
\uparrow & \geq & \parallel \\
\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', Fa) \times \downarrow \mathbb{B}(Fa'', b') & \xrightarrow{- \circ -} & \downarrow \mathbb{B}(Fa'', Fa) \\
& & \uparrow \mathcal{Q}(ta, ta'')
\end{array} \quad (5)$$

in which the horizontal arrows are given by composition (in $\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})$, resp. \mathcal{Q}), the left vertical arrow is

$$(f, g) \mapsto \left((f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a))_{a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}}, (g \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a'))_{a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}} \right) \quad (6)$$

and the right vertical arrow is as in (1), is lax commutative as indicated,

3. for every $b, b'' \in F(\mathbb{A})$ and $b' \in \mathbb{B}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) \times \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_{b'}, \mathbb{A}_{b''}) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes -} & \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b''}) \\
(\widehat{-}) \times (\widehat{-}) \uparrow & \geq & \uparrow (\widehat{-}) \\
\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) \times \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b'', b') & \xrightarrow{- \circ -} & \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b'', b)
\end{array} \quad (7)$$

is lax commutative as indicated,

4. for every $b, b', b'' \in \mathbb{B}$, the diagram in (7) is lax commutative as indicated,

5. for every $b, b', b'' \in \mathbb{B}$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) \times \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_{b'}, \mathbb{A}_{b''}) & \xrightarrow{- \otimes -} & \text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b''}) \\
(-)^F \times (-)^F \downarrow & \leq & \downarrow (-)^F \\
\downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b) \times \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b'', b') & \xrightarrow{- \circ -} & \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b'', b)
\end{array} \quad (8)$$

is lax commutative as indicated.

Proof: First it is easily verified, in an analogous manner as in the previous proof, that the map in (6) is well-defined, i.e. that we indeed defined *distributors*

$$(f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a))_{a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}}, \text{ resp. } (g \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a'))_{a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}}$$

from $*_{ta}$ to $\mathbb{A}_{b'}$, resp. from $\mathbb{A}_{b'}$ to $*_{ta''}$. Now the equivalence of the first two statements is immediate; the “oplax commutativity” of the diagram in (5) is always true, thus explaining why in 1.1–2 there is an equality instead of an inequality. That the second and the third statement are equivalent, is because all order-theoretic operations on a distributor are done “elementwise”; and the third and fourth are equivalent because in case \mathbb{A}_b or $\mathbb{A}_{b''}$ is empty, $\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b''})$ is a singleton, hence all is trivial. Finally, the equivalence of the two last statements follows from the respective vertical arrows being adjoint. \square

4. Partial products

In this section we link the conditions in 3.1 and 3.2 on a functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ to the existence of so-called partial products in $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ with F : this completes the proof of 1.1.

First recall R. Dyckhoff and W. Tholen’s [1987] definition (which they gave for any morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and any object C in any category \mathcal{C} with finite limits, but

here it is for \mathcal{Q} -categories): the *partial product* of a functor $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ with a \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{C} is a \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{P} together with functors $P: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, $E: \mathbb{P} \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that, for any other \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{P}' and functors $P': \mathbb{P}' \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, $E': \mathbb{P}' \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ there exists a unique functor $K: \mathbb{P}' \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ satisfying $P \circ K = P'$ and $E \circ (K \times_{\mathbb{B}} 1_{\mathbb{A}}) = E'$. The following diagram illustrates this definition:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & E & & \\
 & & \longleftarrow & & \longrightarrow \\
 \mathbb{C} & & & \mathbb{P} \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} & & \mathbb{A} \\
 & & K \times_{\mathbb{B}} 1_{\mathbb{A}} & \nearrow & \\
 & E' & & & \\
 & \longleftarrow & & & \longrightarrow \\
 & & \mathbb{P}' \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow F \\
 & & \mathbb{P} & \xrightarrow{P} & \mathbb{B} \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & \mathbb{P}' & \xrightarrow{P'} & \mathbb{B} \\
 & & \nearrow K & & \\
 & & & &
 \end{array} \tag{9}$$

This is really just the explicit description of the coreflection of \mathbb{C} along the functor “pullback with F ”

$$- \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A}: \text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})/\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q}).$$

Hence $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ admits all partial products with $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ if and only if this functor has a right adjoint. S. Niefield [1982] proved that this in turn is equivalent to the functor “product with F ”

$$- \times F: \text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})/\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})/\mathbb{B}$$

having a right adjoint, i.e. to the *exponentiability* of F .

Suppose now that $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and \mathbb{C} are given, and that we want to construct their partial product (\mathbb{P}, P, E) . Putting $\mathbb{P}' = *_X$ in the diagram in (9) and letting X range over all objects of \mathcal{Q} , the universal property of the partial product dictates at once what the object-set \mathbb{P}_0 and the object-maps $P: \mathbb{P}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_0$ and $E: (\mathbb{P} \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A})_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_0$ must be:

- $\mathbb{P}_0 = \{(b, H) \mid b \in \mathbb{B} \text{ and } H: \mathbb{A}_b \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ is a functor}\}$, with types $t(b, H) = tb$,
- for $(b, H) \in \mathbb{P}_0$, $P(b, H) = b$,
- for $((b, H), a) \in (\mathbb{P} \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A})_0$, $E((b, H), a) = Ha$.

Thus we are left to find a \mathcal{Q} -enrichment of the object-set \mathbb{P}_0 , making it a \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{P} and making P and E functors with the required universal property; the next lemma tells us how to do this.

Lemma 4.1 *If $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ satisfies 3.1–5 and 3.2–5, then $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ admits partial products over $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$.*

Proof: Assuming 3.1–5 it makes sense to define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}((b', H'), (b, H)) &:= \mathbb{C}(H'-, H-)^F \\ &= \text{the outcome of applying the right adjoint to the map} \\ &\quad \text{in (3) on the distributor } \mathbb{C}(H'-, H-): \mathbb{A}_b \dashv\!\!\dashv \mathbb{A}_{b'}. \end{aligned}$$

Whereas the identity inequality

$$1_{t(b, H)} \leq \mathbb{P}((b, H), (b, H))$$

reduces to the fact that $H: \mathbb{A}_b \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a functor, it is the assumed 3.2–5 together with the composition inequality in the \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{C} that assures the composition inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}((b'', H''), (b', H')) \circ \mathbb{P}((b', H'), (b, H)) \leq \mathbb{P}((b'', H''), (b, H)).$$

This construction clearly makes P and E functorial. As for the universal property of (\mathbb{P}, P, E) , given a \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{P}' and functors $P': \mathbb{P}' \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ and $E': \mathbb{P}' \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, it is straightforward to verify that

$$K: \mathbb{P}' \rightarrow \mathbb{P}: x \mapsto K(x) := (P'x, E'(x, -): \mathbb{A}_{P'x} \rightarrow \mathbb{C})$$

is the required unique factorization. \square

Finally we shall show that conditions 3.1–5 and 3.2–5 are not only sufficient but also necessary for $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ to admit partial products over $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$. Thereto we shall use an auxiliary construction concerning distributors between \mathcal{Q} -categories that we better recall beforehand: given a distributor $\Phi: \mathbb{X} \dashv\!\!\dashv \mathbb{Y}$, we shall say that a co-span of functors like

$$\mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{S} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{T} \mathbb{Y}$$

represents Φ when $\Phi = \mathbb{C}(T-, S-)$. Any Φ admits at least one such representing co-span: let $\mathbb{C}_0 = \mathbb{X}_0 \uplus \mathbb{Y}_0$ and for all $a, a' \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $b, b' \in \mathbb{Y}_0$ put $\mathbb{C}(a', a) = \mathbb{X}(a', a)$, $\mathbb{C}(b', b) = \mathbb{Y}(b', b)$, $\mathbb{C}(b, a) = \Phi(b, a)$, $\mathbb{C}(a, b) = 0_{tb, ta}$, so that the co-span of full embeddings

$$\mathbb{X} \xrightarrow{S_{\mathbb{X}}} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{S_{\mathbb{Y}}} \mathbb{Y}$$

surely represents Φ . (This latter co-span is universal amongst all representing co-spans for Φ ; M. Grandis and R. Paré [1999] speak, in the context of double colimits in double categories, of the cotabulator (or gluing, or collage) of Φ . This is however not important for us here; on the contrary, further on it is crucial to consider non-universal representing co-spans.)

Lemma 4.2 *If $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ admits partial products over $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, then $F: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ satisfies 3.1–5 and 3.2–5.*

Proof: For $b, b' \in \mathbb{B}$ and $\Phi: \mathbb{A}_b \dashrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{b'}$, choose a representing co-span

$$\mathbb{A}_b \xrightarrow{S} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{T} \mathbb{A}_{b'}.$$

Considering the partial product of F with \mathbb{C} , say (\mathbb{P}, P, E) , it is a fact that the hom-arrow $\mathbb{P}((b', T), (b, S))$ is a \mathcal{Q} -arrow smaller than $\mathbb{B}(b', b)$. We may thus define a map

$$\text{Dist}(\mathcal{Q})(\mathbb{A}_b, \mathbb{A}_{b'}) \longrightarrow \downarrow \mathbb{B}(b', b): \Phi \mapsto \Phi^F := \mathbb{P}((b', T), (b, S)). \quad (10)$$

Now let $X = tb$ and $Y = tb'$, and $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ an arrow in \mathcal{Q} ; the latter determines a \mathcal{Q} -category¹ \mathbb{P}_f like so:

- objects: $(\mathbb{P}_f)_0 = \{X\} \uplus \{Y\}$ with $tX = X \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $tY = Y \in \mathcal{Q}$,
- hom-arrows: $\mathbb{P}_f(Y, X) = f$, $\mathbb{P}_f(X, X) = 1_X$, $\mathbb{P}_f(Y, Y) = 1_Y$ and $\mathbb{P}_f(X, Y) = 0_{Y, X}$.

The inequality $f \leq \mathbb{B}(b', b)$ holds if and only if

$$P_f: \mathbb{P}_f \longrightarrow \mathbb{B}: X \mapsto b, Y \mapsto b'$$

is a functor; and similarly the collection of inequalities $f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a) \leq \Phi(a', a)$ (one for each $a \in \mathbb{A}_b, a' \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}$) is equivalent to

$$E_f: \mathbb{P}_f \times_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}: (X, a) \mapsto a, (Y, a') \mapsto a'$$

being a functor. Using the universal property of the partial product (\mathbb{P}, P, E) one easily checks that P_f and E_f determine and are determined by the single functor

$$K: \mathbb{P}_f \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}: X \mapsto (b, S), Y \mapsto (b', T),$$

whose functoriality in turn is equivalent to the inequality $f \leq \mathbb{P}((b', T), (b, S))$. This proves that the map in (10) is the right adjoint in (4).

We end by showing that the map in (10) satisfies the lax commutativity of the diagram in (8); thereto it is important that in the map prescription, by uniqueness of adjoints, *any chosen representing co-span for a given distributor will do*.

For $b, b', b'' \in \mathbb{B}$, $\Phi: \mathbb{A}_b \dashrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{b'}$ and $\Psi: \mathbb{A}_{b'} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{b''}$, consider the \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{C} like so:

- objects: $\mathbb{C}_0 = (\mathbb{A}_b)_0 \uplus (\mathbb{A}_{b'})_0 \uplus (\mathbb{A}_{b''})_0$ with “inherited types”,
- hom-arrows: for all $a, a_1 \in \mathbb{A}_b$, $a', a'_1 \in \mathbb{A}_{b'}$ and $a'', a''_1 \in \mathbb{A}_{b''}$, put $\mathbb{C}(a_1, a) = \mathbb{A}_b(a_1, a)$, $\mathbb{C}(a'_1, a') = \mathbb{A}_{b'}(a'_1, a')$, $\mathbb{C}(a''_1, a'') = \mathbb{A}_{b''}(a''_1, a'')$, $\mathbb{C}(a', a) = \Phi(a', a)$, $\mathbb{C}(a'', a) = \Psi(a'', a)$ and $\mathbb{C}(a'', a) = (\Psi \otimes \Phi)(a'', a)$, all other hom-arrows are zero.

¹This is actually an instance of the universal representing co-span, when viewing the \mathcal{Q} -arrow $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ as a one-element distributor $(f): *X \dashrightarrow *Y$ between one-object \mathcal{Q} -categories.

The co-spans of full embeddings

$$\mathbb{A}_b \xrightarrow{S} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{T} \mathbb{A}_{b'} , \mathbb{A}_{b'} \xrightarrow{T} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{U} \mathbb{A}_{b''} , \mathbb{A}_b \xrightarrow{S} \mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{U} \mathbb{A}_{b''}$$

represent respectively Φ , Ψ and $\Psi \otimes \Phi$. Writing (\mathbb{P}, P, E) for the partial product of F and \mathbb{C} , the composition-inequality

$$\mathbb{P}((b'', U), (b', T)) \circ \mathbb{P}((b', T), (b, S)) \leq \mathbb{P}((b'', U), (b, S))$$

says precisely that $\Psi^F \circ \Phi^F \leq (\Psi \otimes \Phi)^F$, as wanted. \square

5. Applications, examples

A \mathcal{Q} -category \mathbb{A} is an exponentiable object of $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$ precisely when the unique functor $\mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}: a \rightarrow ta$ is an exponentible morphism of $\text{Cat}(\mathcal{Q})$; 1.1 tells us that this is the case if and only if

- for all $a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$, $\mathbb{A}(a', a)$ is exponentiable in $\mathcal{Q}(ta, ta')$,
- for all $a, a'' \in \mathbb{A}$ and $f: ta \rightarrow Y$, $g: Y \rightarrow ta''$ in \mathcal{Q} ,

$$(g \circ f) \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a) = \bigvee \{(g \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a')) \circ (f \wedge \mathbb{A}(a', a)) \mid a' \in \mathbb{A}, ta' = Y\}.$$

An interesting *necessary condition* for \mathbb{A} 's exponentiability can be obtained upon letting $f = \top_{ta, Y}$ and $g = \top_{Y, ta''}$ be the top elements of, respectively, $\mathcal{Q}(ta, Y)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(Y, ta'')$:

- for all $a, a'' \in \mathbb{A}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Q}$,

$$(\top_{Y, ta''} \circ \top_{ta, Y}) \wedge \mathbb{A}(a'', a) = \bigvee \{\mathbb{A}(a'', a') \circ \mathbb{A}(a', a) \mid a' \in \mathbb{A}, ta' = Y\}. \quad (11)$$

If the base quantaloid \mathcal{Q} is such that

- (i) each hom-suplattice is a locale, and
- (ii) for any arrows

$$A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f} \\ \xrightarrow{h} \end{array} B \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{g} \\ \xrightarrow{k} \end{array} C$$

the interchange law $(g \circ f) \wedge (k \circ h) = (g \wedge k) \circ (f \wedge h)$ holds,

then the necessary condition (11) for \mathbb{A} 's exponentiability is *also sufficient*.

Example 5.1 In case of a one-object quantaloid \mathcal{Q} satisfying conditions (i–ii) above, every \mathcal{Q} -enriched category is exponentiable, because (11) becomes

$$\mathbb{A}(a'', a) = \bigvee_{a' \in \mathbb{A}} \mathbb{A}(a'', a') \circ \mathbb{A}(a', a)$$

which is automatic. This is in particular true for the one-object suspension of a locale (and *a fortiori* for the one-object suspension of the two-element Boolean algebra, as is well-known: every ordered set is exponentiable).

Example 5.2 So-called *free quantaloids* [Rosenthal, 1991] satisfy conditions (i–ii) above: by definition, the free quantaloid \mathcal{PC} on a (small) category \mathcal{C} has the same objects as \mathcal{C} , the hom-suplattice $\mathcal{PC}(X, Y)$ is the powerset $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{C}(X, Y))$, composition in \mathcal{PC} is done “elementwise” and the identity on an object X is $\{1_X\}$. (This construction is *free* in that it provides a left adjoint to the forgetful functor from quantaloids to categories.) Categories enriched in a free quantaloid have been linked with automata theory and process semantics in [Betti, 1980] (but see [Rosenthal, 1995] for an overview of further developments). More precisely, let \mathbb{A} be a \mathcal{PC} -enriched category; then the objects of \mathbb{A} are the (typed) *states* of a automaton, and the arrows of \mathcal{C} are its (typed) *labels* or *processes*. To have an $f \in \mathbb{A}(a', a)$ is then read as “having a process f to produce a' from a ”; often this is denoted as $f: a \rightsquigarrow a'$. The exponentiability condition (11) for \mathbb{A} can now be rephrased as:

- for any states a and a'' and type $Y \in \mathcal{C}$, if $f: a \rightsquigarrow a''$ and $f = h \circ g$ with $\text{cod}(g) = Y = \text{dom}(h)$ in \mathcal{C} , then there is a state a' of type Y together with $p: a \rightsquigarrow a'$, $q: a' \rightsquigarrow a''$ such that $f = q \circ p$.

In words, if $f: a \rightsquigarrow a''$ factors in \mathcal{C} over some object Y , then it factors in the automaton over some state of type Y (but it is not necessarily the same factorization). This statement is trivial when \mathcal{C} is a one-object category (as already attested in 5.1), i.e. in the case of an untyped automaton; we do not know what rôle it has to play in typed automata theory or process semantics.

For a detailed treatment of generalized metric spaces and non-expansive maps (categories and functors enriched over the quantale of positive real numbers) we refer to [Clementino and Hofmann, 2006]. This example is quite different from the ones given above: the quantale of positive real numbers does not satisfy the interchange law (even though its underlying suplattice is a locale).

References

- [1] [Renato Betti, 1980] Automata and closed categories, *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. B Serie V* **17**, pp. 44–58.
- [2] [Francis Borceux, 1994] *Handbook of Categorical Algebra I*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [3] [Maria Manuel Clementino and Dirk Hofmann, 2006] Exponentiation in \mathcal{V} -categories, *Topology Appl.* **153**, pp. 3113–3128.

- [4] [Roy Dyckhoff and Walter Tholen, 1987] Exponentiable morphisms, partial products and pullback complements, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **49**, pp. 103–116.
- [5] [Marco Grandis and Robert Paré, 1999] Limits in double categories, *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle Catég.* **40**, pp. 162–220.
- [6] [Susan Niefield, 1982] Cartesianness: topological spaces, uniform spaces and affine schemes, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **23**, pp. 147–167.
- [7] [Susan Niefield, 2001] Exponentiable morphisms: posets, spaces, locales, and Grothendieck toposes, *Theory Appl. Categories* **8**, pp. 16–32.
- [8] [Kimmo I. Rosenthal, 1991] Free quantaloids, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **72**, pp. 67–82.
- [9] [Kimmo I. Rosenthal, 1995] Quantaloids, enriched categories and automata theory, *Appl. Categ. Structures* **3**, pp. 279–301.
- [10] [Isar Stubbe, 2005] Categorical structures enriched in a quantaloid: categories, distributors, functors, *Theory Appl. Categories* **14**, pp. 1–45