

Projective Quantaes: A General View

Jan Paseka

Received: 28 November 2006 / Accepted: 14 September 2007 / Published online: 16 October 2007
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2007

Abstract Following B. Banaschewski’s work on so-called \mathbf{K} -flat projective frames, we treat their non-commutative generalization, i.e. \mathbf{K} -flat projective quantaes. Besides a categorical definition of a \mathbf{K} -flat projective quantale we also give an elementary characterization in terms of a binary relation on the quantale, and we prove that \mathbf{K} -flat projective quantaes are precisely the coalgebras for a certain comonad on the category of quantaes. Finally we define and study a natural notion of \mathbf{K} -coherentness for quantaes.

Keywords Quantale · \mathbf{K} -flat projectivity · \mathbf{K} -command

1 Introduction

In this paper we present a general view wrt. the projectivity notion in the category of quantaes.

The issues for this paper were mainly the paper [1] where Banaschewski establishes both the internal and the external characterization of “projective” objects in the category of frames and the article [3] where the characterization of quantaes projective wrt. regular epimorphisms such that their right adjoint is a semigroup homomorphism is given. There is also a study of projective objects in the theory of quantized functional analysis [2] generalizing the Grothendieck’s characterization of $l^1(I)$ spaces for a discrete set I . We will generalize both the results in [1] and [3].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 follows closely the approach introduced in [1]. It starts with a brief introduction to the notion of \mathbf{K} -flat projectivity. For each quantale L we then introduce a binary relation \triangleleft_L on it and we establish basic properties of this relation. We will prove that the \mathbf{K} -flat projective quantaes are exactly such quantaes with

Financial Support of the Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic under the project MSM0021622409 is gratefully acknowledged.

J. Paseka (✉)

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Masaryk University, Janáčkovo nám. 2a, 602 00 Brno,
Czech Republic
e-mail: paseka@math.muni.cz

each element a approximated by the elements x , $x \triangleleft_L a$ and the relation \triangleleft_L being stable wrt. the quantale multiplication on L . Further on, we introduce the notion of a \mathbf{K} -comonad and characterize \mathbf{K} -flat projective quantales as such quantales having a coalgebra structure for the \mathbf{K} -comonad. In Sect. 2, we define and study a notion of \mathbf{K} -coherentness for quantales, and give a general version of coreflection results from [3].

For a general overview on category we recommend [4], for facts concerning quantales in general we refer to [6].

2 \mathbf{K} -Flat Projective Quantales

Generalizing B. Banaschewski’s work in [1] on frames to the non-commutative case, our setting here is the category \mathbf{OSgr} of partially ordered semigroups in which we consider subcategories \mathbf{K} containing the category \mathbf{Quant} of quantales reflectively, subject to a very simple condition:

(C) For any $\varphi : A \rightarrow L$ in \mathbf{K} where L is a quantale and A arbitrary, the corestriction of φ to any subquantale of L containing the image of φ also belongs to \mathbf{K} .

We refer to this by saying that \mathbf{K} is *corestrictive* over \mathbf{Quant} . We now define a quantale L to be *\mathbf{K} -flat projective* if L is projective in \mathbf{Quant} relative to the onto quantale homomorphisms $h : L \rightarrow M$ for which the right adjoint $h_* : M \rightarrow L$ ($h(a) \leq b$ iff $a \leq h_*(b)$) belongs to \mathbf{K} .

Since \mathbf{K} contains the category \mathbf{Quant} reflectively we have, for any object A from \mathbf{K} , the universal map in \mathbf{K} to quantales $\eta_A : A \rightarrow FA$ and, correspondingly, for any quantale L , the quantale homomorphism $\varepsilon_L : FL \rightarrow L$ such that $\varepsilon_L \circ \eta_L = \text{id}_L$. Further, \leq stands for the usual argumentwise partial order of maps between partially ordered sets, which is evidently preserved by the composition of maps in \mathbf{K} .

- Lemma 1** (1) Each FA is generated by the image of η_A .
 (2) $\text{id}_{FL} \leq \eta_L \circ \varepsilon_L$ for any quantale L .
 (3) η_A reflects order that is $f \circ \eta_A \leq g \circ \eta_A$ implies $f \leq g$ for any quantale homomorphisms $f, g : FA \rightarrow L$.
 (4) For any quantale L , if $h : L \rightarrow FL$ is a right inverse to $\varepsilon_L : FL \rightarrow L$ then $h \circ \varepsilon_L \leq \text{id}_{FL}$.

Proof The proof is a direct reformulation of the proof of Lemma 1 in [1]. □

Lemma 2 Let $g : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism in \mathbf{K} and $f : K \rightarrow L$ a morphism in \mathbf{Quant} . Then the following diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{\eta_A} & FA \\
 g \downarrow & & \downarrow Fg \\
 B & \xrightarrow{\eta_B} & FB
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 FK & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_K} & K \\
 Ff \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\
 FL & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_L} & L
 \end{array}$$

commute in the respective categories. Moreover, F preserves the partial order of maps and $F\eta_A$ is left adjoint to ε_{FA} in \mathbf{Quant} .

Proof The first statement is straightforward and the proof of the second statement goes the same way as the proof of Lemma 2 in [1]. □

Remark 3 As in [1], we have that $\varepsilon_L \circ \eta_L = \text{id}_L$ and (2) from Lemma 1 imply that η_L is right adjoint to ε_L . Similarly, if $\varepsilon_L \circ h = \text{id}_L$ for some $h : L \rightarrow FL$ then h is left adjoint to ε_L by (4) from Lemma 1 and consequently unique.

The reflectiveness of **Quant** in **K** determines a binary relation on each quantale L as follows:

$$x \triangleleft_L a \quad \text{iff} \quad a \leq \varepsilon_L(b) \text{ implies } \eta_L(x) \leq b, \text{ for all } b \in FL.$$

Lemma 4 *Let K, L be quantales. Then, for all $x, y, u, v \in K$ and for any quantale homomorphism $f : K \rightarrow L$, we have*

- (1) $x \leq y \triangleleft_K u \leq v$ implies $x \triangleleft_K v$ and $x \leq v$,
- (2) if f is an isomorphism of quantales then $x \triangleleft_K u$ if and only if $f(x) \triangleleft_L f(u)$.

Proof The proof is straightforward. □

Now we may go on our first result concerning **K**-flat projectivity.

Theorem 5 *The following are equivalent for any quantale L .*

- (1) L is **K**-flat projective.
- (2) ε_L has a right inverse.
- (3) L is a retract of some $FA, A \in \mathbf{K}$.
- (4) For each $a \in L, a = \bigvee \{x \in L \mid x \triangleleft_L a\}$; further $x \cdot y \triangleleft_L a \cdot b$ whenever $x \triangleleft_L a$ and $y \triangleleft_L b$.

Proof (1) \implies (2), (2) \implies (3), (3) \implies (1) and (2) \implies (4) can be proved as in [1], Proposition 1.

(4) \implies (2). Let $h_L : L \rightarrow FL$ be the set map defined by $h_L(a) = \bigvee \{\eta_L(x) : x \triangleleft_L a\}$. Then as in [1], Proposition 1 we have that $\varepsilon_L \circ h_L = \text{id}_L, (h_L \circ \varepsilon_L)(b) = \bigvee \{\eta_L(x) : x \triangleleft_L \varepsilon_L(b)\} \leq b, h_L$ preserves arbitrary joins and, for any $a, b \in L, h_L(a) \cdot h_L(b) \leq h_L(a \cdot b)$. To check the converse inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_L(a \cdot b) &= h(\varepsilon_L(h_L(a)) \cdot \varepsilon_L(h_L(b))) = h_L(\varepsilon_L(h_L(a) \cdot h_L(b))) \\ &= (h_L \circ \varepsilon_L)(h_L(a) \cdot h_L(b)) \leq \text{id}_{FL}(h_L(a) \cdot h_L(b)) = h_L(a) \cdot h_L(b). \end{aligned}$$

In all, this shows that h_L is a quantale homomorphism, right inverse to ε_L . □

As in [1], there is a further characterization of **K**-flat projectivity involving the comonad in **Quant** determined by the reflection functor F .

The comonad determined by F (viewed as an endofunctor of **Quant**) is $(F, \varepsilon, F\eta)$, and its coalgebras are the pairs (L, h_L) where the structure map $h_L : L \rightarrow FL$ satisfies the conditions (see [4]):

$$(U) \quad \varepsilon_L \circ h_L = \text{id}_L \quad \text{and} \quad (A) \quad (Fh_L) \circ h_L = (F\eta_L) \circ h_L.$$

Given that it is entirely determined by the extension **K** of **Quant**, we call this comonad the **K**-comonad. The desired result then is

Proposition 6 *A quantale L is \mathbf{K} -flat projective iff it has a coalgebra structure for the \mathbf{K} -comonad.*

Proof The proof follows the proof of Proposition 2 in [1]. □

Similarly as in [1], let us consider the following way of specifying subcategories of \mathbf{OSgr} . For each $A \in \mathbf{OSgr}$, let $\mathcal{S}A$ be a collection of subsets of A such that $\{a \cdot t : t \in S\}$ and $\{t \cdot a : t \in S\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}A$ for each $a \in A$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}A$, and for each $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbf{OSgr} , $f[S] \in \mathcal{S}B$ whenever $S \in \mathcal{S}A$.

Further, let \mathbf{S} be the subcategory of \mathbf{OSgr} consisting of all A such that $\bigvee S$ exists for each $S \in \mathcal{S}A$, $a \cdot \bigvee S = \bigvee \{a \cdot t : t \in S\}$ and $\bigvee S \cdot a = \bigvee \{t \cdot a : t \in S\}$, the maps being the \mathbf{OSgr} -homomorphisms which preserve all $\bigvee S$, $S \in \mathcal{S}A$.

Let us recall the following familiar, particularly significant examples: for each $A \in \mathbf{OSgr}$, $\mathcal{S}A$ consists of

- (1) no S , and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{OSgr}$,
- (2) \emptyset , and \mathbf{S} is the category of lower-bounded partially ordered semigroups.
- (3) all finite subsets, and \mathbf{S} is the category of m-semilattices.
- (4) All (at most) countable subsets, and \mathbf{S} , the category of σ m-semilattices.
- (5) all updirected subsets, and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{PrQuant}$, the category of prequantales, and
- (6) all subsets, and $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{Quant}$.

Recall that any category \mathbf{S} of this kind trivially contains \mathbf{Quant} and is evidently corestrictive over quantales. But as in [1] we have more:

Proposition 7 *For any \mathbf{S} , \mathbf{Quant} is reflective in \mathbf{S} .*

Proof As in [1], we will give an explicit description of the quantale reflection in \mathbf{S} . For any $A \in \mathbf{S}$, let $\mathcal{D}(A)$ be the quantale of all downsets of A , that is, the $U \subseteq A$ such that $a \in U$ whenever $a \leq b$ and $b \in U$ (which includes $U = \emptyset$), and γA the closure system in $\mathcal{D}(A)$ consisting of all downsets U for which $S \subseteq U$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}A$ implies $\bigvee S \in U$.

Note that the principal downsets $\downarrow a = \{x \in A : x \leq a\}$ belong to γA , giving rise to a map $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow \gamma A$ taking a to $\downarrow a$. For any $A \in \mathbf{S}$,

- (i) γA is a quantale, and
- (ii) $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow \gamma A$ is the universal map in \mathbf{S} to quantales.

The proof of (i) and (ii) follows the proof of Proposition 3 in [1]. □

As in [1], in the examples listed above, the reflection γA consists of the following downsets U of A :

- (1) all downsets U ,
- (2) all downsets U containing 0 ,
- (3) the ideals of A ,
- (4) the σ -ideals of A ,
- (5) the Scott-closed downsets U , and
- (6) the principal downsets $\downarrow a$.

For general \mathbf{S} , by the same arguments as in [1], we have that the adjunction map $\varepsilon_L : \gamma L \rightarrow L$, for any quantale L , is the join map.

On the other hand, as in [1], for any $A \in \mathbf{S}$, $x \in A$, and $U \in \gamma A$, $\eta_A(x) = \downarrow x \leq U$ iff $x \in U$, and hence the relation \triangleleft_L now has the following concrete form: $x \triangleleft_L a$ iff $a \leq \bigvee U$ implies $x \in U$, for all $U \in \gamma L$.

3 K-Coherent Quantales

An element $a \in L$ is called **K-compact** if $a \triangleleft_L a$. Let $c_{\mathbf{K}}(L)$ denote all the **K-compact** elements of L . If L satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) for all $a \in L$, $a = \bigvee \{c \in c_{\mathbf{K}}(L) : c \leq a\}$
- (2) if $c_1, c_2 \in c_{\mathbf{K}}(L)$, then $c_1 \cdot c_2 \in c_{\mathbf{K}}(L)$,

then L is called **K-coherent quantale**.

Lemma 8 *Let \mathbf{K} has equalizers coinciding with the equalizers in sets and let L be **K-flat** projective. Then $c_{\mathbf{K}}(L)$ is in \mathbf{K} .*

Proof Evidently, $c_{\mathbf{K}}(L) = \text{equal}(\eta_L, h_L)$ by the Theorem 5. □

Note that \mathbf{K} has equalizers coinciding with the equalizers in sets e.g. in the case when \mathbf{K} is an equationally presentable category i.e. its objects can be prescribed by (a proper class of) operations and equations (see [5]).

Proposition 9 *For any $A \in \mathbf{K}$, FA is **K-coherent**. Moreover, $c_{\mathbf{K}}(FA)$ contains the set $\eta_A(A)$.*

Proof Let $a \in A$. By the Lemma 2, $F\eta_A$ is left adjoint to ε_{FA} in **Quant** and $F\eta_A \circ \eta_A(a) = \eta_{FA} \circ \eta_A(a)$. Hence $h_{FA} = F\eta_A$ and $h_{FA}(\eta_A(a)) = \eta_{FA}(\eta_A(a))$. Therefore $c_{\mathbf{K}}(FA) \supseteq \eta_A(A)$. Since FA is **K-flat** projective and $\eta_A(A)$ is a join-base of FA , FA is **K-coherent**. □

Proposition 10 *Let \mathbf{W} be any subcategory of **K-flat** projective quantales containing the class $F\mathbf{K}$, with those quantale homomorphisms that preserve the relation \triangleleft . Then \mathbf{W} is coreflective in **Quant**, with the coreflection functor F and the coreflection map $\varepsilon_L : FL \rightarrow L$.*

Proof The proof follows the proof of Proposition 3 in [3]. □

We now turn to the list of examples at the end of the previous section; we keep the notations introduced there. Since \mathbf{S} is equationally presentable we have the following:

Proposition 11 *For any $A \in \mathbf{S}$, γA is **S-coherent**. Moreover, $A \simeq \sigma_A(A) = c_{\mathbf{S}}(\gamma A)$.*

Proof Recall that the reflection γA consists of all downsets U of A for which $S \subseteq U$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}A$ implies $\bigvee S \in U$.

The first part follows from the Proposition 9. We know also that $\sigma_A(A) \subseteq c_{\mathbf{S}}(\gamma A)$. Let $U \in \gamma A$. Then $\bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u) \in \gamma(\gamma A)$.

Namely, let $\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \in \mathcal{S}(\gamma A)$, $\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \subseteq \bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u)$. Then, for any $\alpha \in \Lambda$, $I_\alpha \in \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u_\alpha)$ for some $u_\alpha \in U$. Hence $I_\alpha \subseteq \downarrow u_\alpha$. Let us put $v_\alpha = \bigvee I_\alpha \leq u_\alpha$. Since $\varepsilon_{\gamma A} : \gamma(\gamma A) \rightarrow \gamma A$ is in **OSgr**, we have that $\varepsilon_{\gamma A}[\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\}] = \{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \in \mathcal{S}A$. Let $v = \bigvee \{v_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$. Then $v \in U$ and therefore $I_\alpha \subseteq \downarrow v$ and also $I_\alpha \in \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow v)$ for any

$\alpha \in \Lambda$. This gives us that $\{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \subseteq \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow v)$. Hence $\bigvee \{I_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\} \in \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow v) \subseteq \bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u)$.

Now, let $U \triangleleft_{\gamma A} U = \varepsilon_{\gamma A}(\bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u))$. Then $\sigma_{\gamma A}(U) \subseteq \bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u)$. Hence $U \in \bigcup_{u \in U} \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u)$ and therefore $U \in \sigma_{\gamma A}(\downarrow u)$ for some $u \in U$. This implies that $U \subseteq \downarrow u \subseteq U$ i.e. $U = \downarrow u$. It follows that $c_S(\gamma A) \subseteq \sigma_A(A)$. \square

4 Some Closing Comments

We can obtain results on \mathbf{K} -flat projectivity and \mathbf{K} -coherence for unital, or left-sided, or right-sided or idempotent quantales, or any combination of these properties: simply by substituting the enveloping category \mathbf{OSgr} of partially ordered semigroups by the category of unital, or left-sided, or right-sided or idempotent partially ordered semigroups (or the appropriate combination). A frame is precisely a two-sided, idempotent quantale, hence the theory of \mathbf{K} -flat projective frames in [1] is a special case of the more general results outlined here.

In future work, we hope that we will be able to improve the obtained results in a more general form for sup-algebras satisfying prescribed identities. Another related question is to obtain a full characterization of projective quantales, a problem that was started in [3].

We thank the anonymous referee for the very thorough reading and contributions to improve our presentation of the paper.

References

1. Banaschewski, B.: Projective frames: A general view. *Cahiers XLVI*, 301–312 (2005)
2. Blecher, D.P.: The standard dual of an operator space. *Pac. J. Math.* **153**, 15–30 (1992)
3. Yongming, L., Meng, Z., Zihui, L.: Projective and injective objects in the category of quantales. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **176**(3), 249–258 (2002)
4. Mac Lane, S.: *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 5. Springer, Berlin (1971)
5. Manes, E.G.: *Algebraic Theories*. Springer, New York (1980)
6. Rosenthal, K.I.: *Quantales and Their Applications*. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 234. Longman, Essex (1990)