

Pushing monads forward

Adrián Doña Mateo

15 Apr 2024

University of Edinburgh

Table of Contents

1. Pushforward monads
2. Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$
3. The codensity monad of $\mathbf{Field} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$

Pushforward monads

Pushing a monad forward along a functor

Let T be a monad on \mathcal{C} and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Under what conditions do we get a monad on \mathcal{D} ?

Pushing a monad forward along a functor

Let T be a monad on \mathcal{C} and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Under what conditions do we get a monad on \mathcal{D} ?

Well-known answer

If $F \dashv G$, then GTF is a monad on \mathcal{D} .

If T is the identity monad, then this is the usual monad induced by the adjunction $F \dashv G$.

Pushing a monad forward along a functor

Let T be a monad on \mathcal{C} and $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Under what conditions do we get a monad on \mathcal{D} ?

Well-known answer

If $F \dashv G$, then GTF is a monad on \mathcal{D} .

If T is the identity monad, then this is the usual monad induced by the adjunction $F \dashv G$.

Little-known answer

If a certain Kan extension exists, then we get a monad on \mathcal{D} .

The pushforward monad

Even when $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ doesn't have a left adjoint, we can consider the following right Kan extension.

The pushforward monad

Even when $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ doesn't have a left adjoint, we can consider the following right Kan extension.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \downarrow T & \swarrow \kappa^{G,T} & \downarrow \text{Ran}_G GT \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

The pushforward monad

Even when $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ doesn't have a left adjoint, we can consider the following right Kan extension.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \downarrow T & \swarrow \kappa^{G,T} & \downarrow \text{Ran}_G GT \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

Definition

The **pushforward** of T along G is $G_*T := \text{Ran}_G GT$, when the latter exists.

The pushforward monad

Even when $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ doesn't have a left adjoint, we can consider the following right Kan extension.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \downarrow T & \swarrow \kappa^{G,T} & \downarrow \text{Ran}_G GT \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

Definition

The **pushforward** of T along G is $G_*T := \text{Ran}_G GT$, when the latter exists.

This comes with a monad structure, which I will now describe.

The monad structure

We have a strict monoidal category $\mathcal{K}(G, T)$, where objects are pairs (S, σ) fitting into a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ T \downarrow & \sigma \swarrow & \downarrow S \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

and a morphism $(S, \sigma) \rightarrow (S', \sigma')$ is a natural transformation $\alpha: S \Rightarrow S'$ such that $\sigma = \sigma' \circ \alpha G$.

The monad structure

The monoidal product of (S, σ) and (S', σ') and the monoidal unit are

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \downarrow T & \swarrow \sigma' & \downarrow S' \\
 \mu^T \swarrow \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \downarrow T & \swarrow \sigma & \downarrow S \\
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D}
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\
 \downarrow \eta^T & \swarrow 1_{\mathcal{C}} & \downarrow 1_{\mathcal{D}} \\
 \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D}
 \end{array}$$

The monad structure

The monoidal product of (S, σ) and (S', σ') and the monoidal unit are

$$T \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \downarrow T & \swarrow \sigma' & \downarrow S' \\ \mu^T \swarrow \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \downarrow T & \swarrow \sigma & \downarrow S \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad T \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \\ \eta^T \swarrow & & \downarrow 1_{\mathcal{D}} \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array} \right)$$

$\text{Ran}_G GT$ is, by definition, the terminal object of $\mathcal{K}(G, T)$, and hence it has a unique monoid structure. This gives it a canonical monad structure.

Reconciling with the adjunction situation

Proposition

If G has a left adjoint F , then $G_*T = GTF$.

Reconciling with the adjunction situation

Proposition

If G has a left adjoint F , then $G_* T = GTF$.

Proof sketch. This follows from the fact that right Kan extending along a right adjoint is the same as precomposing with the left adjoint:

$$G_* T = \text{Ran}_G GT = GTF$$

Some easy examples

Recall the limit formula for a right Kan extension:

$$(\mathrm{Ran}_G GT)(d) = \lim_{d \rightarrow Gc} GTc,$$

where the limit is indexed by the comma category $(d \downarrow G)$.

Some easy examples

Recall the limit formula for a right Kan extension:

$$(\mathrm{Ran}_G GT)(d) = \lim_{d \rightarrow Gc} GTc,$$

where the limit is indexed by the comma category $(d \downarrow G)$.

Examples

- Let $G: \mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{D} have a terminal object $\mathbb{1}$. Then G_*1 is constant at $\mathbb{1}$ with its unique monad structure.

Some easy examples

Recall the limit formula for a right Kan extension:

$$(\mathrm{Ran}_G GT)(d) = \lim_{d \rightarrow Gc} GTc,$$

where the limit is indexed by the comma category $(d \downarrow G)$.

Examples

- Let $G: \mathbf{0} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{D} have a terminal object $\mathbb{1}$. Then $G_*\mathbb{1}$ is constant at $\mathbb{1}$ with its unique monad structure.
- Let $d: \mathbf{1} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and \mathcal{D} have powers. Then $A_*\mathbb{1}$ is the *endomorphism monad* of d , given by $d' \mapsto [\mathcal{D}(d', d), d]$.

Codensity monads

Definition

For any functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, if $G_*1_{\mathcal{C}}$ exists, it is called the **codensity monad** of G .

Codensity monads

Definition

For any functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, if $G_*1_{\mathcal{C}}$ exists, it is called the **codensity monad** of G .

Many codensity monads have been studied in the literature.

Examples

- The codensity monad of **FinSet** \hookrightarrow **Set** is the *ultrafilter monad*, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.

Codensity monads

Definition

For any functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, if $G_*1_{\mathcal{C}}$ exists, it is called the **codensity monad** of G .

Many codensity monads have been studied in the literature.

Examples

- The codensity monad of $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is the *ultrafilter monad*, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.
- The codensity monad of $\mathbf{Vect}_k^{\text{fd}} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_k$ is the *double dualisation monad*.

Codensity monads

Definition

For any functor $G: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, if $G_*1_{\mathcal{C}}$ exists, it is called the **codensity monad** of G .

Many codensity monads have been studied in the literature.

Examples

- The codensity monad of $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is the *ultrafilter monad*, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.
- The codensity monad of $\mathbf{Vect}_k^{\text{fd}} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Vect}_k$ is the *double dualisation monad*.
- The codensity monad of $\mathbf{FinGrp} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Grp}$ is the *profinite completion monad*, whose algebras are profinite groups.

A universal property of the pushforward

The comparison transformation $\kappa^{G,T} : G_* T \circ G \rightarrow GT$ of the Kan extension gives a functor $K^{G,T}$ making the following square commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^T & \xrightarrow{K^{G,T}} & \mathcal{D}^{G_* T} \\ \downarrow U^T & & \downarrow U^{G_* T} \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

We can hence see $K^{G,T}$ as an arrow in **CAT**/ \mathcal{D} .

A universal property of the pushforward

The comparison transformation $\kappa^{G,T}: G_*T \circ G \rightarrow GT$ of the Kan extension gives a functor $K^{G,T}$ making the following square commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^T & \xrightarrow{K^{G,T}} & \mathcal{D}^{G_*T} \\ \downarrow U^T & & \downarrow U^{G_*T} \\ \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{D} \end{array}$$

We can hence see $K^{G,T}$ as an arrow in **CAT**/ \mathcal{D} .

Recall that we have a functor **Alg**: **Mnd**(\mathcal{D})^{op} \rightarrow **CAT**/ \mathcal{D} , which sends a monad S on \mathcal{D} to its category of algebras, \mathcal{D}^S . Then:

Theorem

$K^{G,T}$ is a universal arrow from GU^T to **Alg**.

A universal property of the pushforward

Theorem (continued)

More explicitly, we have an isomorphism, natural in S ,

$$\mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{D})(S, G_* T) \cong (\mathbf{CAT}/\mathcal{D}) \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}^T & \mathcal{D}^S \\ \downarrow_{GU^T} & \downarrow_{U^S} \\ \mathcal{D} & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix}$$

sending θ to $\mathbf{Alg}(\theta) \circ K^{G,T}$. Hence, $U^{G_* T}$ is the *universal monadic replacement* of GU^T .

A universal property of the pushforward

Theorem (continued)

More explicitly, we have an isomorphism, natural in S ,

$$\mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{D})(S, G_*T) \cong (\mathbf{CAT}/\mathcal{D}) \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}^T & \mathcal{D}^S \\ \downarrow_{GU^T} & \downarrow_{U^S} \\ \mathcal{D} & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix}$$

sending θ to $\mathbf{Alg}(\theta) \circ K^{G,T}$. Hence, U^{G_*T} is the *universal monadic replacement* of GU^T .

Putting $G \mapsto GU^T$ and $T \mapsto 1$ in the last sentence, we get:

Corollary

$G_*T \cong (GU^T)_*1$, i.e. G_*T is the codensity monad of UG^T .

Some functoriality properties

Proposition

If $G_* T$ exists for all $T \in \mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{C})$, then G_* becomes a functor $\mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{D})$.

This is the case, for example, if \mathcal{C} is small and \mathcal{D} is complete.

Some functoriality properties

Proposition

If $G_* T$ exists for all $T \in \mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{C})$, then G_* becomes a functor $\mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mnd}(\mathcal{D})$.

This is the case, for example, if \mathcal{C} is small and \mathcal{D} is complete.

If we further have $H : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, then:

Proposition

If H preserves limits, or if G is a right adjoint, then

$$(HG)_* T \cong H_*(G_* T),$$

and both of these conditions are sharp.

Pushing forward along $\text{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \text{Set}$

Some monads on **Set** and **FinSet**

Consider the following endofunctors of **Set**:

- For a finite set E , the functor $P_E := (-) + E$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are E -pointed sets.

Some monads on **Set** and **FinSet**

Consider the following endofunctors of **Set**:

- For a finite set E , the functor $P_E := (-) + E$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are E -pointed sets.
- For a finite monoid M , the functor $A_M := M \times (-)$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are (left) M -sets.

Some monads on **Set** and **FinSet**

Consider the following endofunctors of **Set**:

- For a finite set E , the functor $P_E := (-) + E$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are E -pointed sets.
- For a finite monoid M , the functor $A_M := M \times (-)$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are (left) M -sets.
- The covariant powerset functor \mathcal{P} has a monad structure, whose algebras are complete lattices.

Some monads on **Set** and **FinSet**

Consider the following endofunctors of **Set**:

- For a finite set E , the functor $P_E := (-) + E$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are E -pointed sets.
- For a finite monoid M , the functor $A_M := M \times (-)$ has a monad structure, whose algebras are (left) M -sets.
- The covariant powerset functor \mathcal{P} has a monad structure, whose algebras are complete lattices.

Each of these monads preserves finiteness, so they descend to monads on **FinSet**, which we denote P_E^f , A_M^f and \mathcal{P}^f , respectively.

Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$

Let $i: \mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the obvious inclusion. What is $i_* T^f$, for T^f each of the monads in the previous slide?

Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$

Let $i: \mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the obvious inclusion. What is $i_* T^f$, for T^f each of the monads in the previous slide?

The unit η^{T^f} is always a map of monads $1 \rightarrow T^f$. Using the functoriality of i_* , get a map of monads $i_* 1 \rightarrow i_* T^f$.

Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$

Let $i: \mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the obvious inclusion. What is $i_* T^f$, for T^f each of the monads in the previous slide?

The unit η^{T^f} is always a map of monads $1 \rightarrow T^f$. Using the functoriality of i_* , get a map of monads $i_* 1 \rightarrow i_* T^f$. Recall that $U := i_* 1$ is the **ultrafilter monad**, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.

Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$

Let $i: \mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the obvious inclusion. What is $i_* T^f$, for T^f each of the monads in the previous slide?

The unit η^{T^f} is always a map of monads $1 \rightarrow T^f$. Using the functoriality of i_* , get a map of monads $i_* 1 \rightarrow i_* T^f$. Recall that $U := i_* 1$ is the **ultrafilter monad**, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.

Moreover, each T^f is the restriction of a monad T on \mathbf{Set} , which gives a map of monads $T \rightarrow i_* T^f$.

Pushing forward along $\mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$

Let $i: \mathbf{FinSet} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ denote the obvious inclusion. What is $i_* T^f$, for T^f each of the monads in the previous slide?

The unit η^{T^f} is always a map of monads $1 \rightarrow T^f$. Using the functoriality of i_* , get a map of monads $i_* 1 \rightarrow i_* T^f$. Recall that $U := i_* 1$ is the **ultrafilter monad**, whose algebras are compact Hausdorff spaces.

Moreover, each T^f is the restriction of a monad T on \mathbf{Set} , which gives a map of monads $T \rightarrow i_* T^f$.

Intuition

Thus, $i_* T^f$ -algebras have an underlying T -algebra structure and compact Hausdorff topology, which are compatible in some way.

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proposition

U preserves finite coproducts. In particular,

$$UP_E \cong P_E U \quad \text{and} \quad UA_M \cong A_M U.$$

Moreover, these isomorphisms are distributive laws.

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proposition

U preserves finite coproducts. In particular,

$$UP_E \cong P_E U \quad \text{and} \quad UA_M \cong A_M U.$$

Moreover, these isomorphisms are distributive laws.

This makes UP_E and UA_M monads on **Set**, whose algebras are E -pointed compact Hausdorff spaces, and compact Hausdorff spaces with a continuous (left) M -action, respectively.

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proposition

U preserves finite coproducts. In particular,

$$UP_E \cong P_E U \quad \text{and} \quad UA_M \cong A_M U.$$

Moreover, these isomorphisms are distributive laws.

This makes UP_E and UA_M monads on **Set**, whose algebras are E -pointed compact Hausdorff spaces, and compact Hausdorff spaces with a continuous (left) M -action, respectively.

These seem to fit the bill for $i_*P_E^f$ and $i_*A_M^f$ -algebras!

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Theorem

We have isomorphisms of monads

$$i_* P_E^f \cong U P_E \quad \text{and} \quad i_* A_M^f \cong U A_M.$$

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Theorem

We have isomorphisms of monads

$$i_* P_E^f \cong UP_E \quad \text{and} \quad i_* A_M^f \cong UA_M.$$

Proof sketch. A general construction gives a transformation $\alpha: UP_E \rightarrow i_* P_E^f$. For $X \in \mathbf{Set}$, this is

$$\alpha_X: \lim_{P_E X \rightarrow N} N \rightarrow \lim_{X \rightarrow N} P_E N,$$

where, for $f: X \rightarrow N$, we have $\lambda_f \alpha_X = \lambda_{P_E f}$.

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Theorem

We have isomorphisms of monads

$$i_* P_E^f \cong UP_E \quad \text{and} \quad i_* A_M^f \cong UA_M.$$

Proof sketch. A general construction gives a transformation $\alpha: UP_E \rightarrow i_* P_E^f$. For $X \in \mathbf{Set}$, this is

$$\alpha_X: \lim_{P_E X \rightarrow N} N \rightarrow \lim_{X \rightarrow N} P_E N,$$

where, for $f: X \rightarrow N$, we have $\lambda_f \alpha_X = \lambda_{P_E f}$. We will construct an inverse for α_X .

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proof sketch.

$$\alpha_X : \lim_{P_E X \rightarrow N} N \rightarrow \lim_{X \rightarrow N} P_E N.$$

For $f : X \rightarrow N$, we have $\lambda_f \alpha_X = \lambda_{P_E f}$. We will construct an inverse for α_X .

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proof sketch.

$$\alpha_X: \lim_{P_E X \rightarrow N} N \rightarrow \lim_{X \rightarrow N} P_E N.$$

For $f: X \rightarrow N$, we have $\lambda_f \alpha_X = \lambda_{P_E f}$. We will construct an inverse for α_X .

Given $x \in i_* P_E^f X$, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & N \\ & \searrow ! & \downarrow ! \\ & & 1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} P_E N & \ni & \lambda_f x \\ \downarrow P_E ! & & \\ P_E 1 & \ni & \lambda_! x \end{array}$$

We see that $\lambda_f x \in E$ iff $\lambda_! x \in E$.

The case of P_E^f and A_M^f

Proof sketch.

$$\alpha_X: \lim_{P_E X \rightarrow N} N \rightarrow \lim_{X \rightarrow N} P_E N.$$

For $f: X \rightarrow N$, we have $\lambda_f \alpha_X = \lambda_{P_E f}$. We will construct an inverse for α_X .

Given $x \in i_* P_E^f X$, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & N \\ & \searrow ! & \downarrow ! \\ & & 1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} P_E N & \ni & \lambda_f x \\ \downarrow P_E ! & & \\ P_E 1 & \ni & \lambda_! x \end{array}$$

We see that $\lambda_f x \in E$ iff $\lambda_! x \in E$. Hence, either x is constant at $\lambda_! x \in E$, or x can be seen as an element of UX . This gives an element of $P_E UX \cong UP_E X$.

The case of \mathcal{P}^f

There is no distributive law between U and \mathcal{P} . But there is a well known monad on **Set** that restricts to \mathcal{P}^f on **FinSet**, the filter monad F .

The case of \mathcal{P}^f

There is no distributive law between U and \mathcal{P} . But there is a well known monad on **Set** that restricts to \mathcal{P}^f on **FinSet**, the filter monad F . This gives us a map $F \rightarrow i_*\mathcal{P}^f$, and:

Theorem

This map is an isomorphism of monads $F \cong i_*\mathcal{P}^f$.

The case of \mathcal{P}^f

There is no distributive law between U and \mathcal{P} . But there is a well known monad on **Set** that restricts to \mathcal{P}^f on **FinSet**, the filter monad F . This gives us a map $F \rightarrow i_*\mathcal{P}^f$, and:

Theorem

This map is an isomorphism of monads $F \cong i_*\mathcal{P}^f$.

The algebras for F are *continuous lattices*, which are a certain kind of complete lattices with a compatible compact Hausdorff topology.

The codensity monad of $\mathbf{Field} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$

The monad K

For this last section, let $i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$ be the obvious inclusion, and let $K := i_*1$ be its codensity monad.

The monad K

For this last section, let $i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$ be the obvious inclusion, and let $K := i_*1$ be its codensity monad. Recall that i is famously **not monadic** (since, for instance, **Field** doesn't have products). Our general theory tells us that U^K is its monadic replacement.

The monad K

For this last section, let $i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$ be the obvious inclusion, and let $K := i_*1$ be its codensity monad. Recall that i is famously **not monadic** (since, for instance, **Field** doesn't have products). Our general theory tells us that U^K is its monadic replacement.

For $R \in \mathbf{Ring}$, we have

$$KR = \lim_{R \rightarrow k} k.$$

The monad K

For this last section, let $i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}$ be the obvious inclusion, and let $K := i_*1$ be its codensity monad. Recall that i is famously **not monadic** (since, for instance, **Field** doesn't have products). Our general theory tells us that U^K is its monadic replacement.

For $R \in \mathbf{Ring}$, we have

$$KR = \lim_{R \rightarrow k} k.$$

Any map from a ring to a field factors through a fraction field $\mathrm{Frac}(R/\mathfrak{p})$ for a unique prime ideal \mathfrak{p} . This means that:

$$KR \cong \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec} R} \mathrm{Frac}(R/\mathfrak{p}).$$

The monad K

The unit η_R^K *embodies* the philosophy of modern algebraic geometry: it realises an element $r \in R$ as a (dependent) function on $\text{Spec } R$.

The monad K

The unit η_R^K *embodies* the philosophy of modern algebraic geometry: it realises an element $r \in R$ as a (dependent) function on $\text{Spec } R$.

To understand μ_R^K , we need to understand $\text{Spec } KR$.

Proposition

The prime ideals of a product of fields are all maximal, and they correspond to ultrafilters on the indexing set.

The monad K

The unit η_R^K *embodies* the philosophy of modern algebraic geometry: it realises an element $r \in R$ as a (dependent) function on $\text{Spec } R$.

To understand μ_R^K , we need to understand $\text{Spec } KR$.

Proposition

The prime ideals of a product of fields are all maximal, and they correspond to ultrafilters on the indexing set.

The multiplication μ_R^K only depends on those components indexed by $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } KR$ corresponding to *principal ultrafilters*.

The category of K -algebras

What might the K -algebras be?

The category of K -algebras

What might the K -algebras be?

- The functor $K^{i,1}: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}^K$ tells us that each field is a K -algebra.

The category of K -algebras

What might the K -algebras be?

- The functor $K^{i,1} : \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}^K$ tells us that each field is a K -algebra.
- Since \mathbf{Ring} is complete, \mathbf{Ring}^K is complete and the forgetful functor U^K creates limits.

The category of K -algebras

What might the K -algebras be?

- The functor $K^{i,1}: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}^K$ tells us that each field is a K -algebra.
- Since \mathbf{Ring} is complete, \mathbf{Ring}^K is complete and the forgetful functor U^K creates limits.

Field has equalisers, but not products. It turns out that this is all it's missing!

The category of K -algebras

What might the K -algebras be?

- The functor $K^{i,1} : \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ring}^K$ tells us that each field is a K -algebra.
- Since \mathbf{Ring} is complete, \mathbf{Ring}^K is complete and the forgetful functor U^K creates limits.

Field has equalisers, but not products. It turns out that this is all it's missing!

Theorem

There is an isomorphism of categories over \mathbf{Ring}

$$\mathbf{Ring}^K \cong \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field})$$

Pushing forward to Set

Let R denote the free ring monad on **Set**. What happens if we push K forward along U^R ?



Pushing forward to Set

Let R denote the free ring monad on **Set**. What happens if we push K forward along U^R ?

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & U^K & & U^R \\ & \curvearrowright & \rightarrow & \curvearrowright & \rightarrow \\ \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field}) & \top & \mathbf{Ring} & \top & \mathbf{Set} \\ & \curvearrowleft & & \curvearrowleft & \\ & F^K & & F^R & \end{array}$$

Since we are pushing forward along a right adjoint,

$$U_*^R(i_*1) \cong (U^R i)_*1,$$

so this gives the codensity monad of $U^R i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

Pushing forward to Set

Let R denote the free ring monad on **Set**. What happens if we push K forward along U^R ?

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & U^K & & U^R \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \curvearrowright \\ \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field}) & & \top & \mathbf{Ring} & \top & \mathbf{Set} \\ & & \curvearrowleft & & \curvearrowleft \\ & & F^K & & F^R \end{array}$$

Since we are pushing forward along a right adjoint,

$$U_*^R(i_*1) \cong (U^R i)_*1,$$

so this gives the codensity monad of $U^R i: \mathbf{Field} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$.

Proposition

$\mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field})$ has and $U^R U^K$ preserves reflective coequalisers.

Corollary

$U^R U^K : \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is monadic.

Corollary

$U^R U^K : \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is monadic.

Corollary

The theory of products of fields is the ‘smallest’ algebraic theory containing the theory of fields.

Corollary

$U^R U^K : \mathbf{Prod}(\mathbf{Field}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is monadic.

Corollary

The theory of products of fields is the ‘smallest’ algebraic theory containing the theory of fields.

This is an *infinitary theory* with many interesting operations. For example, there are n -ary operations that vanish on all fields with fewer than n algebraically independent elements.

Thank you!

References

- J. F. Kennison and Dion Gildenhuys. **“Equational completion, model induced triples and pro-objects”**. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 1.4 (1971), pp. 317–346.
- Ross Street. **“The formal theory of monads”**. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 2.2 (1972), pp. 149–168.
- Tom Leinster. **“Codensity and the ultrafilter monad”**. In: *Theory and Applications of Categories* 28.13 (July 2013), pp. 332–370.
- Barry Devlin. **“Codensity, compactness and ultrafilters”**. PhD thesis. University of Edinburgh, 2016.
- Richard Garner. **“The Vietoris Monad and Weak Distributive Laws”**. In: *Applied Categorical Structures* 28.2 (2020), pp. 339–354.

Filters and ultrafilters

Definition

A **filter** on a set X is a collection $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}X$ such that

- $X \in \mathcal{F}$;
- if $A \subseteq B$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then $B \in \mathcal{F}$;
- if $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$.

An **ultrafilter** on X is a filter \mathcal{U} such that

- for each $A \subseteq X$, exactly one of A and $X \setminus A$ is in \mathcal{U} .

For example, for $A \subseteq X$, the collection $\uparrow A := \{B \subseteq X \mid A \subseteq B\}$ is a filter on X . For $x \in X$, $\uparrow\{x\}$ is an ultrafilter.

Constants in $\text{Prod}(\text{Field})$

- Constants: $\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{F}_2 \times \mathbb{F}_3 \times \mathbb{F}_5 \times \mathbb{F}_7 \times \cdots$

Given a field k , with $\text{char } k = p$. The constant c in k is just c_p .

Operations in Prod(Field)

- n -ary operations: $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n]} \text{Frac}(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n]/\mathfrak{p})$

Let k be a field, and θ an n -ary operation θ . A choice of n elements of k is equivalent to a ring homomorphism

$h: \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n] \rightarrow k$. Then $\mathfrak{p} := \ker h$ is a prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$, and applying θ to the elements $h(t_1), \dots, h(t_n)$ gives the image of $\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ under the rightmost morphism of

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n] & \xrightarrow{q} & \mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n]/\mathfrak{p} & \xrightarrow{l} & \text{Frac}(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \dots, t_n]/\mathfrak{p}) \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ k & \xlongequal{\quad} & k & \xlongequal{\quad} & k \end{array}$$

Operations in Prod(Field)

Let $\tau \in \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[t]} \text{Frac}(\mathbb{Z}[t]/\mathfrak{p})$ be the unary operation with

- for each $p = 0$ or prime, set $\tau_{(t,p)} = 1$;
- $\tau_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ for every other $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[t]$.

For k a field and $x \in k$, $\tau(x) = 1$ iff x is transcendental over the prime subfield of k .