

Lecture 6

What do adjoint functors preserve?

- let $D: J \rightarrow A$ be a diagram.
- A cone ^(for D) consists of an obj. L and maps $p_i: L \rightarrow D_i$ for $i \in J$ sat.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p_i & \rightarrow & D_i \\ L & \searrow & \downarrow D\alpha \text{ for } \downarrow \alpha \\ p_j & \rightarrow & D_j \end{array}$$

- It is a limit cone (or just that L) if it has universal property:
given a cone $(k_i: A \rightarrow D_i)_{i \in I}$
 $\exists ! k: A \rightarrow L$ such that $p_i \circ k = k_i$ for all i .

- If $U: A \rightarrow B$ is a functor it takes the cone $(p_i: L \rightarrow D_i)_{i \in I}$ to a cone $(Up_i: UL \rightarrow UD_i)_{i \in I}$ for UD .

Def) We say that U preserves the limit L of D if the cone $(UL \xrightarrow{Up_i} UD_i)_{i \in I}$

is a limit cone.

- Similarly, we can speak of a functor preserving colimits.

Theorem

- Consider $A \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{F} \\ \xrightarrow{U} \end{matrix} B$.

- Then the right adjoint U preserves any limits that exist in A ; the left adjoint F preserves any colimits that exist.

Proof

We have bijections $A(Fx, y) \xrightarrow{\cong} B(x, Uy)$
natural in x & y ,

& $(L \xrightarrow{f_i} D_i)_{i \in J}$ a limit cone
for $D: J \rightarrow A$, and must
show $(UL \xrightarrow{uf_i} UD_i)_{i \in J}$ is a limit
cone.

- Consider cone $(x \xrightarrow{k_i} UD_i)_{i \in J}$.
- Using bijections $A(Fx, D_i) \xrightarrow{\cong} B(x, UD_i)$ we obtain maps $Fx \xrightarrow{\psi^{-1}k_i} D_i$ & claim these form a cone to D :

we must show

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \psi^{-1}k_i \rightarrow D_i & & \text{but this is equivalent to} \\
 \downarrow D\alpha & & \text{showing images of these maps} \\
 \psi^{-1}k_j \rightarrow D_j & & \text{under} \\
 & & \text{under} \\
 & & A(Fx, D_j) \xrightarrow{\cong} B(x, UD_j) \\
 & & \text{are equal.}
 \end{array}$$

- Well $\psi \psi^{-1}k_j = k_j$.
- $\psi(D\alpha \circ \psi^{-1}k_i) = UD\alpha \circ \psi \psi^{-1}k_i = UD\alpha \circ k_i$
by naturality of ψ

so their images are the two paths

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 x \xrightarrow{k_i} UD_i & & \text{which agree, since} \\
 \downarrow UD\alpha & & \text{the } k_i \text{ are a cone.} \\
 x \xrightarrow{k_j} UD_j
 \end{array}$$

- Since the maps $\psi^{-1}k_i : Fx \rightarrow D_i$ form a cone we obtain a unique $l : Fx \rightarrow L$ such that $(*)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Fx & \xrightarrow{l} & L \xrightarrow{p_i} D_i \\
 & \searrow \psi^{-1}k_i & \downarrow \\
 & & D_i
 \end{array}$$
 for all i .

- Using the bijection $A(Fx, L) \xrightarrow{\cong} B(x, UL)$ this corresponds to a map

$x \xrightarrow{\varphi_L} UL$ & the equations
 $(*)$ corresp. to the equations
 $(**) \quad x \xrightarrow{\varphi_L} UL \quad \begin{matrix} \uparrow \varphi_i \\ k_i \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \downarrow \varphi_i \\ UD_i \end{matrix}$ using naturality of φ .

- In partic, $\varphi_L : X \rightarrow UL$ is the unique map st. $(**) \text{ commutes}$; therefore $(UL \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} UD_i)_{i \in J}$ is a limit cone. \square

- For example, $U : \text{Grp} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ preserves products, equalisers, terminal object etc. More generally, Forgetful Functors from algebraic cats to Set preserve all limits.

Exercise

Prove that Forgetful functor $U : \text{Grp} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ does not have a right adjoint.

(ie. is not a left adjoint.)

Example

- let $\text{Field} = \text{cat. of fields}$
& homomorphisms: preserve addition, mult., 0 & 1.
- Fields are commutative rings
s.t. $0 \neq 1$ &
 $x \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists y : xy = 1$
- Because of these negative equations, fields are not part of univ algebra
- The cat. of Fields is "bad".
I will show the forgetful
functor $U: \text{Field} \rightarrow \text{Set}$
does not have a left adjoint.
- If it did have left adj F ,
then F would send the
init. ob $\emptyset \in \text{Set}$ to an

init object in Field (as left adjoints preserves colimits). So it suffices to show Field does not have an initial object.

• Firstly, let $F: R \rightarrow S$ be a field homomorphism. We claim F is injective.

Indeed, suppose $Fx = 0$ for $x \neq 0$. Then $x \in \ker f \Leftrightarrow R$ is an ideal of R , non-zero, so as R is a field, $\ker F = R$.

Therefore $F1 = 0$ so $1 = F1 = 0$ which is a contradiction; hence F is injective.

Let \mathbb{Z}_p Field of integers modulo p , so $p \cdot 1 = 0$, for p a prime.

If F is initial, \exists

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{\text{inj}} & \mathbb{Z}_p \\ & \searrow & \\ & \text{inj} & \mathbb{Z}_q \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{for } p, q \\ \text{coprime.} \end{array}$$

- Since $F \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{Z}_q$ are injective they reflect equations

$p \cdot 1 = 0$ & $q \cdot 1 = 0$, so these equations hold in F . But as p, q coprime

$$1 = np + mq, \text{ by}$$

Bezout's identity,
so in F ,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= (p, q) = np + mq \\ &= n(p \cdot 1) + m(q \cdot 1) = \\ &= n \cdot 0 + m \cdot 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

so $1 = 0$ in F ,

contradicting
that F is a field. \square

Note: in universal algebra
all Forgetful Functors
have ^{left}adjoints. \therefore)
No fields in univ. alg.

- We have seen:
right adjoints preserve limits

Proposition

Right adjoints preserve monos.

Proof | let $U: A \rightarrow B$
have left adj. F , and
consider mono $a \rightarrow b \in A$.
Consider
$$x \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{u} \\ \xrightarrow{v} \end{array} Ua \xrightarrow{UF} Ub$$

satisfying $UF \cdot u = UF \cdot v$. We
must show $u = v$.

Then we obtain maps

$$Fx \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1}u} \\ \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1}v} \end{array} a \xrightarrow{F} b \quad \&$$

the diagram commutes by
naturality of φ .

Since F is mono, therefore

$$\eta^{-1}u = \eta^{-1}v$$

Therefore $u = v$ so that
 uF is mono, as claimed.

Remark

If we have a right adjoint U , we know about maps from object X into UY . (e. corr. to maps $FX \rightarrow Y$)

Correspondingly, right adjoints U generally properties & structures defined using maps into an object:
eg. limits, mono.