

Category Theory

Part XVII: Contents

67	Objects and morphisms	687
67.1	Motivation: isomorphisms	687
67.2	Categories, and examples thereof	687
67.3	Special objects in categories	691
67.4	Binary products	692
67.5	Monic and epic maps	695
67.6	A few harder problems to think about	697
68	Functors and natural transformations	699
68.1	Many examples of functors	699
68.2	Covariant functors	700
68.3	Covariant functors as indexed family of objects	703
68.4	Contravariant functors	704
68.5	Equivalence of categories	705
68.6	(Optional) Natural transformations	705
68.7	(Optional) The Yoneda lemma	707
68.8	A few harder problems to think about	709
69	Limits in categories (TO DO)	711
69.1	Equalizers	711
69.2	Pullback squares (TO DO)	712
69.3	Limits	712
69.4	A few harder problems to think about	712
70	Abelian categories	713
70.1	Zero objects, kernels, cokernels, and images	713
70.2	Additive and abelian categories	714
70.3	Exact sequences	716
70.4	The Freyd-Mitchell embedding theorem	717
70.5	Breaking long exact sequences	719
70.6	A few harder problems to think about	720

67 Objects and morphisms

I can't possibly hope to do category theory any justice in these few chapters; thus I'll just give a very high-level overview of how many of the concepts we've encountered so far can be re-cast into categorical terms. So I'll say what a category is, give some examples, then talk about a few things that categories can do. For my examples, I'll be drawing from all the previous chapters; feel free to skip over the examples corresponding to things you haven't seen.

If you're interested in category theory (like I was!), perhaps in what surprising results are true for general categories, I strongly recommend [Le14].

§67.1 Motivation: isomorphisms

From earlier chapters let's recall the definition of an *isomorphism* of two objects:

- Two groups G and H are isomorphic if there was a bijective homomorphism: equivalently, we wanted homomorphisms $\phi: G \to H$ and $\psi: H \to G$ which were mutual inverses, meaning $\phi \circ \psi = \mathrm{id}_H$ and $\psi \circ \phi = \mathrm{id}_G$.
- Two metric (or topological) spaces X and Y are isomorphic if there is a continuous bijection $f: X \to Y$ such that f^{-1} is also continuous.
- Two vector spaces V and W are isomorphic if there is a bijection $T: V \to W$ which is a linear map. Again, this can be re-cast as saying that T and T^{-1} are linear maps.
- Two rings R and S are isomorphic if there is a bijective ring homomorphism ϕ ; again, we can re-cast this as two mutually inverse ring homomorphisms.

In each case we have some collections of objects and some maps, and the isomorphisms can be viewed as just maps. Let's use this to motivate the definition of a general *category*.

§67.2 Categories, and examples thereof

Prototypical example for this section: Grp is possibly the most natural example.

Definition 67.2.1. A category \mathcal{A} consists of:

- A class of **objects**, denoted $obj(\mathcal{A})$.
- For any two objects $A_1, A_2 \in obj(\mathcal{A})$, a class of **arrows** (also called **morphisms** or **maps**) between them. We'll denote the set of these arrows by $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)$.
- For any $A_1, A_2, A_3 \in obj(\mathcal{A})$, if $f: A_1 \to A_2$ is an arrow and $g: A_2 \to A_3$ is an arrow, we can compose these arrows to get an arrow $g \circ f: A_1 \to A_3$.

We can represent this in a **commutative diagram**

$$\begin{array}{c} A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2 \\ & \searrow \\ h & \downarrow g \\ & A_3 \end{array}$$

where $h = g \circ f$. The composition operation \circ is part of the data of \mathcal{A} ; it must be associative. In the diagram above we say that h factors through A_2 .

• Finally, every object $A \in obj(\mathcal{A})$ has a special **identity arrow** id_A ; you can guess what it does.¹

Abuse of Notation 67.2.2. From now on, by $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we'll mean $A \in obj(\mathcal{A})$.

Abuse of Notation 67.2.3. You can think of "class" as just "set". The reason we can't use the word "set" is because of some paradoxical issues with collections which are too large; Cantor's Paradox says there is no set of all sets. So referring to these by "class" is a way of sidestepping these issues.

Now and forever I'll be sloppy and assume all my categories are **locally small**, meaning that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)$ is a set for any $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. So elements of \mathcal{A} may not form a set, but the set of morphisms between two *given* objects will always assumed to be a set.

Let's formalize the motivation we began with.

Example 67.2.4 (Basic examples of categories)

- (a) There is a category of groups Grp. The data is
 - The objects of Grp are the groups.
 - The arrows of Grp are the homomorphisms between these groups.
 - The composition \circ in Grp is function composition.
- (b) In the same way we can conceive a category CRing of (commutative) rings.
- (c) Similarly, there is a category **Top** of topological spaces, whose arrows are the continuous maps.
- (d) There is a category Top_* of topological spaces with a *distinguished basepoint*; that is, a pair (X, x_0) where $x_0 \in X$. Arrows are continuous maps $f: X \to Y$ with $f(x_0) = y_0$.
- (e) Similarly, there is a category $Vect_k$ of vector spaces (possibly infinitedimensional) over a field k, whose arrows are the linear maps. There is even a category $FDVect_k$ of *finite-dimensional* vector spaces.
- (f) We have a category **Set** of sets, where the arrows are *any* maps.

And of course, we can now define what an isomorphism is!

Definition 67.2.5. An arrow $A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2$ is an **isomorphism** if there exists $A_2 \xrightarrow{g} A_1$ such that $f \circ g = id_{A_2}$ and $g \circ f = id_{A_1}$. In that case we say A_1 and A_2 are **isomorphic**, hence $A_1 \cong A_2$.

Remark 67.2.6 — Note that in Set, $X \cong Y \iff |X| = |Y|$.

¹To be painfully explicit: if $f: A' \to A$ is an arrow then $id_A \circ f = f$; similarly, if $g: A \to A'$ is an arrow then $g \circ id_A = g$.

Question 67.2.7. Check that every object in a category is isomorphic to itself. (This is offensively easy.)

More importantly, this definition should strike you as a little impressive. We're able to define whether two groups (rings, spaces, etc.) are isomorphic solely by the functions between the objects. Indeed, one of the key themes in category theory (and even algebra) is that

One can learn about objects by the functions between them. Category theory takes this to the extreme by *only* looking at arrows, and ignoring what the objects themselves are.

But there are some trickier interesting examples of categories.

Example 67.2.8 (Posets are categories)


Let \mathcal{P} be a partially ordered set. We can construct a category P for it as follows:

- The objects of P are going to be the elements of \mathcal{P} .
- The arrows of P are defined as follows:
 - For every object $p \in P$, we add an identity arrow id_p , and
 - For any pair of distinct objects $p \leq q$, we add a single arrow $p \rightarrow q$.

There are no other arrows.

• There's only one way to do the composition. What is it?

For example, for the poset \mathcal{P} on four objects $\{a, b, c, d\}$ with $a \leq b$ and $a \leq c \leq d$, we get:



This illustrates the point that

The arrows of a category can be totally different from functions.


In fact, in a way that can be made precise, the term "concrete category" refers to one where the arrows really are "structure-preserving maps between sets", like Grp, Top, or CRing.

Question 67.2.9. Check that no two distinct objects of a poset are isomorphic.

Here's a second quite important example of a non-concrete category.

Example 67.2.10 (Important: groups are one-Object categories)

A group G can be interpreted as a category ${\mathcal G}$ with one object *, all of whose arrows are isomorphisms.



As [Le14] says:

The first time you meet the idea that a group is a kind of category, it's tempting to dismiss it as a coincidence or a trick. It's not: there's real content. To see this, suppose your education had been shuffled and you took a course on category theory before ever learning what a group was. Someone comes to you and says:

"There are these structures called 'groups', and the idea is this: a group is what you get when you collect together all the symmetries of a given thing."

"What do you mean by a 'symmetry'?" you ask.

"Well, a symmetry of an object X is a way of transforming X or mapping X into itself, in an invertible way."

"Oh," you reply, "that's a special case of an idea I've met before. A category is the structure formed by *lots* of objects and mappings between them – not necessarily invertible. A group's just the very special case where you've only got one object, and all the maps happen to be invertible."

Exercise 67.2.11. Verify the above! That is, show that the data of a one-object category with all isomorphisms is the same as the data of a group.

Finally, here are some examples of categories you can make from other categories.

Example 67.2.12 (Deriving categories)

(a) Given a category \mathcal{A} , we can construct the **opposite category** \mathcal{A}^{op} , which is

the same as \mathcal{A} but with all arrows reversed.

(b) Given categories \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , we can construct the **product category** $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ as follows: the objects are pairs (A, B) for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and the arrows from (A_1, B_1) to (A_2, B_2) are pairs

$$\left(A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2, B_1 \xrightarrow{g} B_2\right).$$

What do you think the composition and identities are?

§67.3 Special objects in categories

Prototypical example for this section: Set has initial object \emptyset and final object $\{*\}$. An element of S corresponds to a map $\{*\} \to S$.

Certain objects in categories have special properties. Here are a couple examples.

Example 67.3.1 (Initial object)

An **initial object** of \mathcal{A} is an object $A_{\text{init}} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ (possibly $A = A_{\text{init}}$), there is exactly one arrow from A_{init} to A. For example,

- (a) The initial object of Set is the empty set \emptyset .
- (b) The initial object of Grp is the trivial group $\{1\}$.
- (c) The initial object of CRing is the ring \mathbb{Z} (recall that ring homomorphisms $R \to S$ map 1_R to 1_S).
- (d) The initial object of **Top** is the empty space.
- (e) The initial object of a partially ordered set is its smallest element, if one exists.

We will usually refer to "the" initial object of a category, since:

Exercise 67.3.2 (Important!). Show that any two initial objects A_1 , A_2 of \mathcal{A} are uniquely isomorphic meaning there is a unique isomorphism between them.

Remark 67.3.3 — In mathematics, we usually neither know nor care if two objects are actually equal or whether they are isomorphic. For example, there are many competing ways to define \mathbb{R} , but we still just refer to it as "the" real numbers. Thus when we define categorical notions, we would like to check they are unique up to isomorphism. This is really clean in the language of categories, and definitions often cause objects to be unique up to isomorphism for elegant reasons like the above.

One can take the "dual" notion, a terminal object.

Example 67.3.4 (Terminal object)

A terminal object of \mathcal{A} is an object $A_{\text{final}} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ (possibly $A = A_{\text{final}}$), there is exactly one arrow from A to A_{final} . For example,

- (a) The terminal object of **Set** is the singleton set {*}. (There are many singleton sets, of course, but *as sets* they are all isomorphic!)
- (b) The terminal object of Grp is the trivial group $\{1\}$.
- (c) The terminal object of CRing is the zero ring 0. (Recall that ring homomorphisms $R \to S$ must map 1_R to 1_S).
- (d) The terminal object of **Top** is the single-point space.
- (e) The terminal object of a partially ordered set is its maximal element, if one exists.

Again, terminal objects are unique up to isomorphism. The reader is invited to repeat the proof from the preceding exercise here. However, we can illustrate more strongly the notion of duality to give a short proof.

Question 67.3.5. Verify that terminal objects of \mathcal{A} are equivalent to initial objects of \mathcal{A}^{op} . Thus terminal objects of \mathcal{A} are unique up to isomorphism.

In general, one can consider in this way the dual of *any* categorical notion: properties of \mathcal{A} can all be translated to dual properties of \mathcal{A}^{op} (often by adding the prefix "co" in front).

One last neat construction: suppose we're working in a concrete category, meaning (loosely) that the objects are "sets with additional structure". Now suppose you're sick of maps and just want to think about elements of these sets. Well, I won't let you do that since you're reading a category theory chapter, but I will offer you some advice:

- In Set, arrows from {*} to S correspond to elements of S.
- In Top, arrows from $\{*\}$ to X correspond to points of X.
- In Grp, arrows from \mathbb{Z} to G correspond to elements of G.
- In CRing, arrows from $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ to R correspond to elements of R.

and so on. So in most concrete categories, you can think of elements as functions from special sets to the set in question. In each of these cases we call the object in question a **free object**.

§67.4 Binary products


Prototypical example for this section: $X \times Y$ *in most concrete categories is the set-theoretic product.*

The "universal property" is a way of describing objects in terms of maps in such a way that it defines the object up to unique isomorphism (much the same as the initial and terminal objects). To show how this works in general, let me give a concrete example. Suppose I'm in a category – let's say Set for now. I have two sets X and Y, and I want to construct the Cartesian product $X \times Y$ as we know it. The philosophy of category theory dictates that I should talk about maps only, and avoid referring to anything about the sets themselves. How might I do this?

Well, let's think about maps into $X \times Y$. The key observation is that


A function $A \xrightarrow{f} X \times Y$ amounts to a pair of functions $(A \xrightarrow{g} X, A \xrightarrow{h} Y)$.

Put another way, there is a natural projection map $X \times Y \to X$ and $X \times Y \to Y$:



(We have to do this in terms of projection maps rather than elements, because category theory forces us to talk about arrows.) Now how do I add A to this diagram? The point is that there is a bijection between functions $A \xrightarrow{f} X \times Y$ and pairs (g,h) of functions. Thus for every pair $A \xrightarrow{g} X$ and $A \xrightarrow{h} Y$ there is a *unique* function $A \xrightarrow{f} X \times Y$.

But $X \times Y$ is special in that it is "universal": for any set A, if you give me functions $A \to X$ and $A \to Y$, I can use it build a *unique* function $A \to X \times Y$. Picture:



We can do this in any general category, defining a so-called product.

Definition 67.4.1. Let X and Y be objects in any category \mathcal{A} . The **product** consists of an object $X \times Y$ and arrows π_X , π_Y to X and Y (thought of as projection). We require that for any object A and arrows $A \xrightarrow{g} X$, $A \xrightarrow{h} Y$, there is a *unique* function $A \xrightarrow{f} X \times Y$ such that the above diagram commutes.


Abuse of Notation 67.4.2. Strictly speaking, the product should consist of *both* the object $X \times Y$ and the projection maps π_X and π_Y . However, if π_X and π_Y are understood, then we often use $X \times Y$ to refer to the object, and refer to it also as the product.

Products do not always exist; for example, take a category with just two objects and no non-identity morphisms. Nonetheless:

Proposition 67.4.3 (Uniqueness of products)

When they exist, products are unique up to isomorphism: given two products P_1 and P_2 of X and Y there is an isomorphism between the two objects.

Proof. This is very similar to the proof that initial objects are unique up to unique isomorphism. Consider two such objects P_1 and P_2 , and the associated projection maps. So, we have a diagram



There are unique morphisms f and g between P_1 and P_2 that make the entire diagram commute, according to the universal property.

On the other hand, look at $g \circ f$ and focus on just the outer square. Observe that $g \circ f$ is a map which makes the outer square commute, so by the universal property of P_1 it is the only one. But id_{P_1} works as well. Thus $\mathrm{id}_{P_1} = g \circ f$. Similarly, $f \circ g = \mathrm{id}_{P_2}$ so f and g are isomorphisms.

Abuse of Notation 67.4.4. Actually, this is not really the morally correct theorem; since we've only showed the objects P_1 and P_2 are isomorphic and have not made any assertion about the projection maps. But I haven't (and won't) define isomorphism of the entire product, and so in what follows if I say " P_1 and P_2 are isomorphic" I really just mean the objects are isomorphic.

Exercise 67.4.5. In fact, show the products are unique up to *unique* isomorphism: the f and g above are the only isomorphisms between the objects P_1 and P_2 respecting the projections.

The nice fact about this "universal property" mindset is that we don't have to give explicit constructions; assuming existence, the "universal property" allows us to bypass all this work by saying "the object with these properties is unique up to unique isomorphism", thus we don't need to understand the internal workings of the object to use its properties.


Of course, that's not to say we can't give concrete examples.

Example 67.4.6 (Examples of products)

- (a) In Set, the product of two sets X and Y is their Cartesian product $X \times Y$.
- (b) In Grp, the product of G, H is the group product $G \times H$.
- (c) In Vect_k , the product of V and W is $V \oplus W$.
- (d) In CRing, the product of R and S is appropriately the ring product $R \times S$.
- (e) Let \mathcal{P} be a poset interpreted as a category. Then the product of two objects x and y is the **greatest lower bound**; for example,
 - If the poset is (\mathbb{R}, \leq) then it's min $\{x, y\}$.
 - If the poset is the subsets of a finite set by inclusion, then it's $x \cap y$.
 - If the poset is the positive integers ordered by division, then it's gcd(x, y).


Of course, we can define products of more than just one object. Consider a set of objects $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ in a category \mathcal{A} . We define a **cone** on the X_i to be an object A with some "projection" maps to each X_i . Then the **product** is a cone P which is "universal" in the same sense as before: given any other cone A there is a unique map $A \to P$ making the diagram commute. In short, a product is a "universal cone".

The picture of this is



See also Problem 67C.

One can also do the dual construction to get a **coproduct**: given X and Y, it's the object X + Y together with maps $X \xrightarrow{\iota_X} X + Y$ and $Y \xrightarrow{\iota_Y} X + Y$ (that's Greek iota, think inclusion) such that for any object A and maps $X \xrightarrow{g} A$, $Y \xrightarrow{h} A$ there is a unique f for which



commutes. We'll leave some of the concrete examples as an exercise this time, for example:

Exercise 67.4.7. Describe the coproduct in Set.

Predictable terminology: a coproduct is a universal **cocone**.

Spoiler alert later on: this construction can be generalized vastly to so-called "limits", and we'll do so later on.

§67.5 Monic and epic maps

The notion of "injective" doesn't make sense in an arbitrary category since arrows need not be functions. The correct categorical notion is:

Definition 67.5.1. A map $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ is **monic** (or a monomorphism) if for any commutative diagram

$$A \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{f} Y$$

we must have g = h. In other words, $f \circ g = f \circ h \implies g = h$.

Question 67.5.2. Convince yourself that in a *concrete* category, injective \implies monic. (Technically, we haven't given a formal definition of concrete category yet; you can redo this exercise after you reach Remark 68.2.3 if you prefer to have the official definition.)

Question 67.5.3. Show that the composition of two monic maps is monic.

In most but not all situations, the converse is also true.

Exercise 67.5.4. Show that in Set, Grp, CRing, monic implies injective. (Take $A = \{*\}$, $A = \mathbb{Z}, A = \mathbb{Z}[x]$.)

More generally, as we said before there are many categories with a "free" object that you can use to think of as elements. An element of a set is a function $1 \to S$, and element of a ring is a function $\mathbb{Z}[x] \to R$, et cetera. In all these categories, the definition of monic literally reads "f is injective on $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, X)$ ". So in these categories, "monic" and "injective" coincide.

That said, here is the standard counterexample. An additive abelian group G = (G, +) is called *divisible* if for every $x \in G$ and integer n > 0 there exists $y \in G$ with ny = x. Let DivAbGrp be the category of such groups.

Exercise 67.5.5. Show that the projection $\mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ is monic but not injective in DivAbGrp.

Of course, we can also take the dual notion.

Definition 67.5.6. A map $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ is **epic** (or an epimorphism) if for any commutative diagram

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} A$$

we must have g = h. In other words, $g \circ f = h \circ f \implies g = h$.

This is kind of like surjectivity, although it's a little farther than last time. Note that in concrete categories, surjective \implies epic.

Exercise 67.5.7. Show that in Set, Grp, Ab, $Vect_k$, Top, the notions of epic and surjective coincide. (For Set, take $A = \{0, 1\}$.)

However, there are more cases where it fails. Most notably:

Example 67.5.8 (Epic but not surjective)

- (a) In CRing, for instance, the inclusion $\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is epic (and not surjective). Indeed, if two homomorphisms $\mathbb{Q} \to A$ agree on every integer then they agree everywhere (why?),
- (b) In the category of *Hausdorff* topological spaces (every two points have disjoint open neighborhoods), in fact epic \iff dense image (like $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$).

Thus failures arise when a function $f: X \to Y$ can be determined by just some of the points of X.

§67.6 A few harder problems to think about

Problem 67A. In the category $Vect_k$ of k-vector spaces (for a field k), what are the initial and terminal objects?

Problem 67B[†]. What is the coproduct X + Y in the categories $Vect_k$, and a poset?

Problem 67C. In any category \mathcal{A} where all products exist, show that

$$(X \times Y) \times Z \cong X \times (Y \times Z)$$

where X, Y, Z are arbitrary objects. (Here both sides refer to the objects, as in Abuse of Notation 67.4.2.)

Problem 67D. Consider a category \mathcal{A} with a **zero object**, meaning an object which is both initial and terminal. Given objects X and Y in \mathcal{A} , prove that the projection $X \times Y \to X$ is epic.

68 Functors and natural transformations

Functors are maps between categories; natural transformations are maps between functors.

§68.1 Many examples of functors

Prototypical example for this section: Forgetful functors; fundamental groups; \bullet^{\vee} .

Here's the point of a functor:

Pretty much any time you make an object out of another object, you get a functor.

Before I give you a formal definition, let me list (informally) some examples. (You'll notice some of them have opposite categories \mathcal{A}^{op} appearing in places. Don't worry about those for now; you'll see why in a moment.)

- Given a group G (or vector space, field, ...), we can take its underlying set S; this is a functor from Grp → Set.
- Given a set S we can consider a vector space with basis S; this is a functor from Set → Vect.
- Given a vector space V we can consider its dual space V[∨]. This is a functor Vect_k^{op} → Vect_k.
- Tensor products give a functor from $\mathsf{Vect}_k \times \mathsf{Vect}_k \to \mathsf{Vect}_k$.
- Given a set S, we can build its power set, giving a functor $\mathsf{Set} \to \mathsf{Set}$.
- In algebraic topology, we take a topological space X and build several groups $H_1(X)$, $\pi_1(X)$, etc. associated to it. All these group constructions are functors Top \rightarrow Grp.
- Sets of homomorphisms: let \mathcal{A} be a category.
 - Given two vector spaces V_1 and V_2 over k, we construct the abelian group of linear maps $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$. This is a functor from $\mathsf{Vect}_k^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathsf{Vect}_k \rightarrow \mathsf{AbGrp}$.
 - More generally for any category \mathcal{A} we can take pairs (A_1, A_2) of objects and obtain a set $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)$. This turns out to be a functor $\mathcal{A}^{\operatorname{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \to \operatorname{Set}$.
 - The above operation has two "slots". If we "pre-fill" the first slots, then we get a functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$. That is, by fixing $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we obtain a functor (called H^A) from $\mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$ by sending $A' \in \mathcal{A}$ to $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, A')$. This is called the covariant Yoneda functor (explained later).
 - As we saw above, for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we obtain a functor $H^A \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$. It turns out we can construct a category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathsf{Set}]$ whose elements are functors $\mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$; in that case, we now have a functor $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \to [\mathcal{A}, \mathsf{Set}]$.

That having said, here are some non-functors. Just so that when you see a theorem that says "F is a functor" (in other words, "F is functorial"), you should read it as "F has a deep hidden symmetry behind it! This is very nice!" instead of "this theorem is trivial".

What is that deep symmetry? Keep reading.


- Given a group G, we can build its automorphism group Aut(G). But this is not a functor in any natural way.
- Given a group G, we can build its center Z(G), which is the set of elements in G that commutes with everything in G. Again, this is not a functor in any natural way.¹
- The operation of taking the dual space above is a contravariant functor Vect^{op}_k → Vect_k, but it isn't a covariant functor Vect_k → Vect_k. (Don't worry what a contravariant functor is for now.)

§68.2 Covariant functors

Prototypical example for this section: Forgetful/free functors, ...

Category theorists are always asking "what are the maps?", and so we can now think about maps between categories.

Definition 68.2.1. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be categories. Of course, a **functor** F takes every object of \mathcal{A} to an object of \mathcal{B} . In addition, though, it must take every arrow $A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2$ to an arrow $F(A_1) \xrightarrow{F(f)} F(A_2)$. You can picture this as follows.



(I'll try to use dotted arrows for functors, which cross different categories, for emphasis.) It needs to satisfy the "naturality" requirements:

- Identity arrows get sent to identity arrows: for each identity arrow id_A , we have $F(id_A) = id_{F(A)}$.
- The functor respects composition: if $A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2 \xrightarrow{g} A_3$ are arrows in \mathcal{A} , then $F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f)$.

So the idea is:

Whenever we naturally make an object $A \in \mathcal{A}$ into an object of $B \in \mathcal{B}$, there should usually be a natural way to transform a map $A_1 \to A_2$ into a map $B_1 \to B_2$.

Let's see some examples of this.

¹It is easy to find a counterexample based on properties of functor — in particular, identity maps get sent to identity maps. See https://math.stackexchange.com/q/158438 for a proof.

Example 68.2.2 (Free and forgetful functors)

Note that these are both informal terms, and don't have a rigid definition.

(a) We talked about a **forgetful functor** earlier, which takes the underlying set of a category like $Vect_k$. Let's call it $U: Vect_k \to Set$.

Now, given a map $T: V_1 \to V_2$ in Vect_k , there is an obvious $U(T): U(V_1) \to U(V_2)$ which is just the set-theoretic map corresponding to T.

Similarly there are forgetful functors from Grp, CRing, etc., to Set. There is even a forgetful functor $\mathsf{CRing} \to \mathsf{Grp}$: send a ring R to the abelian group (R, +). The common theme is that we are "forgetting" structure from the original category.

(b) We also talked about a **free functor** in the example. A free functor $F: \mathsf{Set} \to \mathsf{Vect}_k$ can be taken by considering F(S) to be the vector space with basis S. Now, given a map $f: S \to T$, what is the obvious map $F(S) \to F(T)$? Simple: take each basis element $s \in S$ to the basis element $f(s) \in T$.

Similarly, we can define $F \colon \mathsf{Set} \to \mathsf{Grp}$ by taking the free group generated by a set S.

Remark 68.2.3 — There is also a notion of "injective" and "surjective" for functors (on arrows) as follows. A functor $F: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is **faithful** (resp. **full**) if for any A_1, A_2 , $F: \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(FA_1, FA_2)$ is injective (resp. surjective).^{*a*} We can use this to give an exact definition of concrete category: it's a category with

we can use this to give an exact definition of concrete category: It's a category with a faithful (forgetful) functor $U: \mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$.

^{*a*}Again, experts might object that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A_1, A_2)$ or $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(FA_1, FA_2)$ may be proper classes instead of sets, but I am assuming everything is locally small.

Example 68.2.4 (Functors from \mathcal{G})

Let G be a group and $\mathcal{G} = \{*\}$ be the associated one-object category.

- (a) Consider a functor $F: \mathcal{G} \to \mathsf{Set}$, and let S = F(*). Then the data of F corresponds to putting a group action of G on S.
- (b) Consider a functor $F: \mathcal{G} \to \mathsf{FDVect}_k$, and let V = F(*) have dimension n. Then the data of F corresponds to embedding G as a subgroup of the $n \times n$ matrices (i.e. the linear maps $V \to V$). This is one way groups historically arose; the theory of viewing groups as matrices forms the field of representation theory.
- (c) Let H be a group and construct \mathcal{H} the same way. Then functors $\mathcal{G} \to \mathcal{H}$ correspond to homomorphisms $G \to H$.

Exercise 68.2.5. Check the above group-based functors work as advertised.

Here's a more involved example. If you find it confusing, skip it and come back after reading about its contravariant version. Example 68.2.6 (Covariant Yoneda functor)

Fix an $A \in \mathcal{A}$. For a category \mathcal{A} , define the **covariant Yoneda functor** $H^A : \mathcal{A} \to$ **Set** by defining

$$H^A(A_1) \coloneqq \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, A_1) \in \mathsf{Set}.$$

Hence each A_1 is sent to the *arrows from* A to A_1 ; so H^A describes how A sees the world.

Now we want to specify how H^A behaves on arrows. For each arrow $A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2$, we need to specify Set-map $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, A_1) \to \operatorname{Hom}(A, A_2)$; in other words, we need to send an arrow $A \xrightarrow{p} A_1$ to an arrow $A \to A_2$. There's only one reasonable way to do this: take the composition

$$A \xrightarrow{p} A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2.$$

In other words, $H_A(f)$ is $p \mapsto f \circ p$. In still other words, $H_A(f) = f \circ -$; the - is a slot for the input to go into.


As another example:

Question 68.2.7. If \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are posets interpreted as categories, what does a functor from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{Q} represent?

Now, let me explain why we might care. Consider the following "obvious" fact: if G and H are isomorphic groups, then they have the same size. We can formalize it by saying: if $G \cong H$ in Grp and $U: \operatorname{Grp} \to \operatorname{Set}$ is the forgetful functor (mapping each group to its underlying set), then $U(G) \cong U(H)$. The beauty of category theory shows itself: this in fact works for any functors and categories, and the proof is done solely through arrows:

Theorem 68.2.8 (Functors preserve isomorphism) If $A_1 \cong A_2$ are isomorphic objects in \mathcal{A} and $F \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is a functor then $F(A_1) \cong F(A_2)$.

Proof. Try it yourself! The picture is:



You'll need to use both key properties of functors: they preserve composition and the identity map. $\hfill \Box$

This will give us a great intuition in the future, because

- (i) Almost every operation we do in our lifetime will be a functor, and
- (ii) We now know that functors take isomorphic objects to isomorphic objects.

Thus, we now automatically know that basically any "reasonable" operation we do will preserve isomorphism (where "reasonable" means that it's a functor). This is super convenient in algebraic topology, for example; see Theorem 65.6.2, where we get for free that homotopic spaces have isomorphic fundamental groups.

Remark 68.2.9 — This lets us construct a category **Cat** whose objects are categories and arrows are functors.

§68.3 Covariant functors as indexed family of objects

Instead of viewing functor as a *function*, sometimes it is more convenient to view a functor as an *object* (or a family of objects).

For sets A and B, sometimes the notation A^B is used to denote the set Hom(B, A) being the set of all functions from B to A. This notation is natural because, for finite sets A and B, then $|\text{Hom}(B, A)| = |A|^{|B|}$.

That said, the product set $A \times A$ is sometimes also denoted A^2 . Is there a relation? Certainly! We define the set $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$ (or any set of two elements). Then we have $|\mathbf{2}| = 2$. It is not difficult to see there is a correspondence between A^2 and Hom $(\mathbf{2}, A)$.

Now, let \mathcal{A} be a category. Define the category $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^2$ the obvious way:

- The objects of \mathcal{A}^2 are pairs of objects (A_1, A_2) with $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{A}$,
- The morphisms are pairs of morphisms...

Exercise 68.3.1. For $X, Y \in \mathsf{Top}$, we can define the product space $X \times Y \in \mathsf{Top}$. This gives a functor $\mathsf{Top}^2 \to \mathsf{Top}$. Verify this. (From a pair of maps $(f, g) : (X_1, Y_1) \to (X_2, Y_2)$ in Top^2 , how do we get a map $X_1 \times Y_1 \to X_2 \times Y_2$? Check this map is continuous i.e. it is indeed a morphism in Top .)

Similar to above, each object in \mathcal{A}^2 should correspond to some sort of function $f: 2 \to \mathcal{A}$. But a function's codomain must be an object... \mathcal{A} is a category, so f should be a functor!

So we can make a category 2, and we have $F: 2 \to A$. There is only one reasonable way to define 2 that do what we want:²

- The objects are $\{0, 1\}$;
- There is no morphism, except id_0 and id_1 .

More generally,

A functor $F: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ can be viewed as an indexed collection of objects $\{B_A \in \mathcal{B}\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$.

This can be most easily seen for a presheaf: "a contravariant functor $\text{OpenSets}(X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Rings}$ " means "a family of rings indexed by open sets of X, satisfying certain niceness conditions".

In fact, just as \mathcal{A}^2 is a category, the functors $2 \to \mathcal{A}$ also forms a category. We will see this in Section 68.7.

²This is **different** from the category $\mathbf{2}$ that we will define later for natural transformation! Be careful.

§68.4 Contravariant functors

Prototypical example for this section: Dual spaces, contravariant Yoneda functor, etc.

Now I have to explain what the opposite categories were doing earlier. In all the previous examples, we took an arrow $A_1 \to A_2$, and it became an arrow $F(A_1) \to F(A_2)$. Sometimes, however, the arrow in fact goes the other way: we get an arrow $F(A_2) \to F(A_1)$ instead. In other words, instead of just getting a functor $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ we ended up with a functor $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \to \mathcal{B}$.

These functors have a name:

Definition 68.4.1. A contravariant functor from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is a functor $F: \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \to \mathcal{B}$. (Note that we do *not* write "contravariant functor $F: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ ", since that would be confusing; the function notation will always use the correct domain and codomain.)

Pictorially:

$$A \ni \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & B_1 = F(A_1) \\ & & & \\ &$$

For emphasis, a usual functor is often called a **covariant functor**. (The word "functor" with no adjective always refers to covariant.)

Let's see why this might happen.


Example 68.4.2 ($V \mapsto V^{\vee}$ is contravariant)

Consider the functor $\mathsf{Vect}_k \to \mathsf{Vect}_k$ by $V \mapsto V^{\vee}$.

If we were trying to specify a covariant functor, we would need, for every linear map $T: V_1 \to V_2$, a linear map $T^{\vee}: V_1^{\vee} \to V_2^{\vee}$. But recall that $V_1^{\vee} = \operatorname{Hom}(V_1, k)$ and $V_2^{\vee} = \operatorname{Hom}(V_2, k)$: there's no easy way to get an obvious map from left to right. However, there *is* an obvious map from right to left: given $\xi_2: V_2 \to k$, we can easily give a map from $V_1 \to k$: just compose with T! In other words, there is a very natural map $V_2^{\vee} \to V_1^{\vee}$ according to the composition

$$V_1 \xrightarrow{T} V_2 \xrightarrow{\xi_2} k$$

In summary, a map $T: V_1 \to V_2$ induces naturally a map $T^{\vee}: V_2^{\vee} \to V_1^{\vee}$ in the opposite direction. So the contravariant functor looks like:



We can generalize the example above in any category by replacing the field k with any chosen object $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Example 68.4.3 (Contravariant Yoneda functor)

The contravariant Yoneda functor on \mathcal{A} , denoted $H_A: \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathsf{Set}$, is used to describe how objects of \mathcal{A} see A. For each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ it puts

$$H_A(X) \coloneqq \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A) \in \mathsf{Set}.$$

For $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ in \mathcal{A} , the map $H_A(f)$ sends each arrow $Y \xrightarrow{p} A \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Y, A)$ to

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{p} A \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A)$$

as we did above. Thus $H_A(f)$ is an arrow from $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Y, A) \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A)$. (Note the flipping!)

Exercise 68.4.4. Check now the claim that $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \to \text{Set}$ by $(A_1, A_2) \mapsto \text{Hom}(A_1, A_2)$ is in fact a functor.

§68.5 Equivalence of categories

fully faithful and essentially surjective

§68.6 (Optional) Natural transformations


We made categories to keep track of objects and maps, then went a little crazy and asked "what are the maps between categories?" to get functors. Now we'll ask "what are the maps between functors?" to get natural transformations.

It might sound terrifying that we're drawing arrows between functors, but this is actually an old idea. Recall that given two paths $\alpha, \beta \colon [0,1] \to X$, we built a pathhomotopy by "continuously deforming" the path α to β ; this could be viewed as a function $[0,1] \times [0,1] \to X$. The definition of a natural transformation is similar: we want to pull F to G along a series of arrows in the target space \mathcal{B} .

Definition 68.6.1. Let $F, G: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be two functors. A **natural transformation** α from F to G, denoted

$$\mathcal{A} \underbrace{\qquad }_{G} \overset{F}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{B}$$


consists of, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ an arrow $\alpha_A \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(F(A), G(A))$, which is called the **component** of α at A. Pictorially, it looks like this:



These α_A are subject to the "naturality" requirement that for any $A_1 \xrightarrow{f} A_2$, the diagram

commutes.


The arrow α_A represents the path that F(A) takes to get to G(A) (just as in a pathhomotopy from α to β each *point* $\alpha(t)$ gets deformed to the *point* $\beta(t)$ continuously). A picture might help: consider



Here \mathcal{A} is the small category with three elements and two non-identity arrows f, g (I've omitted the identity arrows for simplicity). The images of \mathcal{A} under F and G are the blue and green "subcategories" of \mathcal{B} . Note that \mathcal{B} could potentially have many more objects and arrows in it (grey). The natural transformation α (red) selects an arrow of \mathcal{B} from each F(A) to the corresponding G(A), dragging the entire image of F to the image of G. Finally, we require that any diagram formed by the blue, red, and green arrows is commutative (naturality), so the natural transformation is really "natural".

There is a second equivalent definition that looks much more like the homotopy.

Definition 68.6.2. Let **2** denote the category generated by a poset with two elements $0 \le 1$, that is,




Then a *natural transformation* $\mathcal{A} \underbrace{\qquad}_{G} \overset{F}{\twoheadrightarrow} \mathcal{B}$ is just a functor $\alpha \colon \mathcal{A} \times \mathbf{2} \to \mathcal{B}$ satisfying

$$\alpha(A, 0) = F(A), \ \alpha(f, 0) = F(f) \text{ and } \alpha(A, 1) = G(A), \ \alpha(f, 1) = G(f).$$


More succinctly, $\alpha(-, 0) = F$, $\alpha(-, 1) = G$.

The proof that these are equivalent is left as a practice problem.

Naturally, two natural transformations $\alpha \colon F \to G$ and $\beta \colon G \to H$ can get composed.



Now suppose α is a natural transformation such that α_A is an isomorphism for each A. In this way, we can construct an inverse arrow β_A to it.



In this case, we say α is a **natural isomorphism**. We can then say that $F(A) \cong G(A)$ **naturally** in A. (And β is an isomorphism too!) This means that the functors F and Gare "really the same": not only are they isomorphic on the level of objects, but these isomorphisms are "natural". As a result of this, we also write $F \cong G$ to mean that the functors are naturally isomorphic.

This is what it really means when we say that "there is a natural / canonical isomorphism". For example, I claimed earlier (in Problem 15A^{*}) that there was a canonical isomorphism $(V^{\vee})^{\vee} \cong V$, and mumbled something about "not having to pick a basis" and "God-given". Category theory, amazingly, lets us formalize this: it just says that $(V^{\vee})^{\vee} \cong id(V)$ naturally in $V \in \mathsf{FDVect}_k$. Really, we have a natural transformation

$$\mathsf{FDVect}_k \underbrace{\overset{\mathrm{id}}{\underbrace{\qquad}} \varepsilon}_{(\bullet^{\vee})^{\vee}} \mathsf{FDVect}_k}$$

where the component ε_V is given by $v \mapsto \mathrm{ev}_v$ (as discussed earlier, the fact that it is an isomorphism follows from the fact that V and $(V^{\vee})^{\vee}$ have equal dimensions and ε_V is injective).

Another example can be found in Remark 71.2.8.

§68.7 (Optional) The Yoneda lemma

Now that I have natural transformations, I can define:

Definition 68.7.1. The **functor category** of two categories \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , denoted $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]$, is defined as follows:

- The objects of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}]$ are (covariant) functors $F \colon \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$, and
- The morphisms are natural transformations $\alpha \colon F \to G$.

Question 68.7.2. When are two objects in the functor category isomorphic?

With this, I can make good on the last example I mentioned at the beginning:

Exercise 68.7.3. Construct the following functors:

- $\mathcal{A} \to [\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathsf{Set}]$ by $A \mapsto H_A$, which we call H_{\bullet} .
- $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \to [\mathcal{A}, \mathsf{Set}]$ by $A \mapsto H^A$, which we call H^{\bullet} .

Notice that we have opposite categories either way; even if you like H^A because it is covariant, the map H^{\bullet} is contravariant. So for what follows, we'll prefer to use H_{\bullet} .

The main observation now is that given a category \mathcal{A} , H_{\bullet} provides some *special* functors $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathsf{Set}$ which are already "built" in to the category \mathcal{A} . In light of this, we define:

Definition 68.7.4. A **presheaf** X is just a contravariant functor $\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \to \mathsf{Set}$. It is called **representable** if $X \cong H_A$ for some A.

In other words, when we think about representable, the question we're asking is:

What kind of presheaves are already "built in" to the category \mathcal{A} ?

One way to get at this question is: given a presheaf X and a particular H_A , we can look at the *set* of natural transformations $\alpha \colon X \implies H_A$, and see if we can learn anything about it. In fact, this set can be written explicitly:

Theorem 68.7.5 (Yoneda lemma)

Let \mathcal{A} be a category, pick $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and let H_A be the contravariant Yoneda functor. Let $X \colon \mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathsf{Set}$ be a contravariant functor. Then the map

Natural transformations
$$\mathcal{A}^{\operatorname{op}} \underbrace{\Downarrow^{H_A}}_{X} \operatorname{Set} \left. \right\} \to X(A)$$

defined by $\alpha \mapsto \alpha_A(\mathrm{id}_A) \in X(A)$ is an isomorphism of Set (i.e. a bijection). Moreover, if we view both sides of the equality as functors

$$\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}} \times [\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathsf{Set}] \to \mathsf{Set}$$

then this isomorphism is natural.

This might be startling at first sight. Here's an unsatisfying explanation why this might not be too crazy: in category theory, a rule of thumb is that "two objects of the same type that are built naturally are probably the same". You can see this theme when we defined functors and natural transformations, and even just compositions. Now to look at the set of natural transformations, we took a pair of elements $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $X \in [\mathcal{A}^{\text{op}}, \mathsf{Set}]$ and constructed a *set* of natural transformations. Is there another way we can get a set from these two pieces of information? Yes: just look at X(A). The Yoneda lemma is telling us that our heuristic still holds true here.

Some consequences of the Yoneda lemma are recorded in [Le14]. Since this chapter is already a bit too long, I'll just write down the statements, and refer you to [Le14] for the proofs.

1. As we mentioned before, H^{\bullet} provides a functor

$$\mathcal{A} \rightarrow [\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathsf{Set}]$$

It turns out this functor is in fact *fully faithful*; it quite literally embeds the category \mathcal{A} into the functor category on the right (much like Cayley's theorem embeds every group into a permutation group).

2. If $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ then

$$H_X \cong H_Y \iff X \cong Y \iff H^X \cong H^Y.$$

To see why this is expected, consider $\mathcal{A} = \mathsf{Grp}$ for concreteness. Suppose A, X, Y are groups such that $H_X(A) \cong H_Y(A)$ for all A. For example,

- If $A = \mathbb{Z}$, then |X| = |Y|.
- If $A = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, then X and Y have the same number of elements of order 2.
- ...

Each A gives us some information on how X and Y are similar, but the whole natural isomorphism is strong enough to imply $X \cong Y$.

3. Consider the covariant forgetful functor $U: \operatorname{Grp} \to \operatorname{Set}^3$ It can be represented by $H^{\mathbb{Z}}$, in the sense that

 $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathsf{Grp}}(\mathbb{Z}, G) \cong U(G)$ by $\phi \mapsto \phi(1)$.

That is, elements of G are in bijection with maps $\mathbb{Z} \to G$, determined by the image of +1 (or -1 if you prefer). So a representation of U was determined by looking at \mathbb{Z} and picking +1 $\in U(\mathbb{Z})$.

The generalization of this is a follows: let \mathcal{A} be a category and $X: \mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$ a covariant functor. Then a representation $H^A \cong X$ consists of an object $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and an element $u \in X(A)$ satisfying a certain condition. You can read this off the condition⁴ if you know what the inverse map is in Theorem 68.7.5. In the above situation, X = U, $A = \mathbb{Z}$ and $u = \pm 1$.

§68.8 A few harder problems to think about

Problem 68A. Show that the two definitions of natural transformation (one in terms of $\mathcal{A} \times \mathbf{2} \to \mathcal{B}$ and one in terms of arrows $F(A) \xrightarrow{\alpha_A} G(A)$) are equivalent.

Problem 68B. Let \mathcal{A} be the category of finite sets whose arrows are bijections between sets. For $A \in \mathcal{A}$, let F(A) be the set of *permutations* of A and let G(A) be the set of *orderings* on A.⁵

- (a) Extend F and G to functors $\mathcal{A} \to \mathsf{Set}$.
- (b) Show that $F(A) \cong G(A)$ for every A, but this isomorphism is not natural.

Problem 68C (Proving the Yoneda lemma). In the context of Theorem 68.7.5:

- (a) Prove that the map described is in fact a bijection. (To do this, you will probably have to explicitly write down the inverse map.)
- (b) Prove that the bijection is indeed natural. (This is long-winded, but not difficult; from start to finish, there is only one thing you can possibly do.)

³Actually, you need to apply a dual version. Theorem 68.7.5 uses contravariant functor.

⁴Just for completeness, the condition is: For all $A' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in X(A')$, there's a unique $f \colon A \to A'$ with (Xf)(u) = x.

⁵A permutation is a bijection $A \to A$, and an ordering is a bijection $\{1, \ldots, n\} \to A$, where n is the size of A.

69 Limits in categories (TO DO)

We saw near the start of our category theory chapter the nice construction of products by drawing a bunch of arrows. It turns out that this concept can be generalized immensely, and I want to give a you taste of that here.

write introduction To run this chapter, we follow the approach of [Le14].

§69.1 Equalizers

Prototypical example for this section: The equalizer of $f, g: X \to Y$ is the set of points with f(x) = g(x).

Given two sets X and Y, and maps $X \xrightarrow{f,g} Y$, we define their **equalizer** to be

$$\{x \in X \mid f(x) = g(x)\}.$$

We would like a categorical way of defining this, too.

Consider two objects X and Y with two maps f and g between them:


$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y$$

A cone over this diagram is an object A and arrows over X and Y which make the diagram commute, like so.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} A \\ q \\ \downarrow \\ X \\ \hline g \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} f \circ q = g \circ q \\ f \\ \downarrow \\ f \\ g \\ \end{array} Y$$

As per [Le14], we call this cone a **fork**. The name coming from the shape obtained if one writes $A \to X \rightrightarrows Y$ all in the same line; but to emphasize the cone-ness, we have bent the fork in our pictures.

Effectively, the arrow over Y is just forcing $f \circ q = g \circ q$. In any case, the **equalizer** of f and g is a "universal fork": it is an object E and a map $E \xrightarrow{e} X$ such that for each $A \xrightarrow{q} X$ the diagram



commutes for a unique $A \xrightarrow{h} E$. In other words, any map $A \xrightarrow{q} X$ as above must factor uniquely through E.

Again, the dotted arrows can be omitted, and as before equalizers may not exist. But when they do exist:

Exercise 69.1.1. If $E \xrightarrow{e} X$ and $E' \xrightarrow{e'} X$ are equalizers, show that $E \cong E'$.

Example 69.1.2 (Examples of equalizers)

- (a) In Set, given $X \xrightarrow{f,g} Y$ the equalizer E can be realized as $E = \{x \mid f(x) = g(x)\}$, with the inclusion $e: E \hookrightarrow X$ as the morphism. As usual, by abuse we'll often just refer to E as the equalizer.
- (b) Ditto in Top, Grp. One has to check that the appropriate structures are preserved (e.g. one should check that $\{\phi(g) = \psi(g) \mid g \in G\}$ is a group).
- (c) In particular, given a homomorphism $\phi: G \to H$, the inclusion ker $\phi \hookrightarrow G$ is an equalizer for $\phi: G \to H$ and the trivial homorphism $G \to H$.

According to (c) equalizers let us get at the concept of a kernel if there is a distinguished "trivial map", like the trivial homomorphism in Grp. We'll flesh this idea out in the chapter on abelian categories.

§69.2 Pullback squares (TO DO)

Great example: differentiable functions on (-3, 1) and (-1, 3)

Example 69.2.1

§69.3 Limits

write me

We've defined cones over discrete sets of X_i (to get products) and over pairs of errors (to get forks). It turns out you can also define a cone over any general **diagram** of objects and arrows; we specify a projection from A to each object and require that the projections from A commute with the arrows in the diagram.

If you then demand the cone be universal, you have the extremely general definition of a **limit**. As always, these are unique up to unique isomorphism. We can also define the dual notion of a **colimit** in the same way.

§69.4 A few harder problems to think about

Problem 69A^{*} (Equalizers are monic). Show that the equalizer of any diagram $X \rightrightarrows Y$ is monic.

pushout square gives tenor product p-adic relative Chinese remainder theorem!!

70 Abelian categories

In this chapter I'll translate some more familiar concepts into categorical language; this will require some additional assumptions about our category, culminating in the definition of a so-called "abelian category". Once that's done, I'll be able to tell you what this "diagram chasing" thing is all about.

Throughout this chapter, " \hookrightarrow " will be used for monic maps and " \rightarrow " for epic maps.

§70.1 Zero objects, kernels, cokernels, and images

Prototypical example for this section: In Grp, the trivial group and homomorphism are the zero objects and morphisms. If G, H are abelian then the cokernel of $\phi: G \to H$ is $H/\operatorname{im} \phi$.

A zero object of a category is an object 0 which is both initial and terminal; of course, it's unique up to unique isomorphism. For example, in Grp the zero object is the trivial group, in $Vect_k$ it's the zero-dimensional vector space consisting of one point, and so on.

Question 70.1.1. Show that Set and Top don't have zero objects.

For the rest of this chapter, all categories will have zero objects.

In a category \mathcal{A} with zero objects, any two objects A and B thus have a distinguished morphism

$$A \to 0 \to B$$

which is called the **zero morphism** and also denoted 0. For example, in **Grp** this is the trivial homomorphism.

We can now define:

Definition 70.1.2. Consider a map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$. The **kernel** is defined as the equalizer of this map and the map $A \xrightarrow{0} B$. Thus, it's a map ker $f \colon \text{Ker } f \hookrightarrow A$ such that

$$\operatorname{Ker} f$$


$$\operatorname{ker} f \cap \stackrel{\circ}{\longrightarrow} 0$$

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B$$

commutes, and moreover any other map with the same property factors uniquely through Ker f (so it is universal with this property). By Problem 69A^{*}, ker f is a monic morphism, which justifies the use of " \hookrightarrow ".

Notice that we're using ker f to represent the map and Ker f to represent the object Similarly, we define the cokernel, the dual notion:

Definition 70.1.3. Consider a map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$. The **cokernel** of f is a map coker $f: B \twoheadrightarrow$ Coker f such that



commutes, and moreover any other map with the same property factors uniquely through Coker f (so it is universal with this property). Thus it is the "coequalizer" of this map and the map $A \xrightarrow{0} B$. By the dual of Problem 69A^{*}, coker f is an epic morphism, which justifies the use of " \rightarrow ".


Think of the cokernel of a map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ as "B modulo the image of f".

Example 70.1.4 (Cokernels) Consider the map $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \to D_{12} = \langle r, s \mid r^6 = s^2 = 1, rs = sr^{-1} \rangle$. Then the cokernel of this map in **Grp** is $D_{12}/\langle r \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

This doesn't always work out quite the way we want since in general the image of a homomorphism need not be normal in the codomain. Nonetheless, we can use this to define:

Definition 70.1.5. The **image** of $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is the kernel of coker f. We denote Im f = Ker(coker f). This gives a unique map im $f \colon A \to \text{Im } f$.

When it exists, this coincides with our concrete notion of "image". Picture:



Note that by universality of Im f, we find that there is a unique map $\text{im } f \colon A \to \text{Im } f$ that makes the entire diagram commute.

§70.2 Additive and abelian categories

Prototypical example for this section: Ab, $Vect_k$, or more generally Mod_R .

We can now define the notion of an additive and abelian category, which are the types of categories where this notion is most useful.

Definition 70.2.1. An additive category \mathcal{A} is one such that:

- \mathcal{A} has a zero object, and any two objects have a product.
- More importantly: every $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(A, B)$ forms an *abelian group* (written additively) such that composition distributes over addition:

$$(g+h) \circ f = g \circ f + h \circ f$$
 and $f \circ (g+h) = f \circ g + f \circ h$.

The zero map serves as the identity element for each group.

In short:


In an additive category, you can add two morphisms.

Which is the only definition that makes sense anyway, we cannot talk about elements.

Definition 70.2.2. An **abelian category** \mathcal{A} is one with the additional properties that for any morphism $A \xrightarrow{f} B$,

- The kernel and cokernel exist, and
- The morphism factors through the image so that im(f) is epic.

So, this yields a diagram



Example 70.2.3 (Examples of abelian categories)

- (a) $Vect_k$, Ab are abelian categories, where f + g takes its usual meaning.
- (b) Generalizing this, the category Mod_R of *R*-modules is abelian.
- (c) Grp is not even additive, because there is no way to assign a commutative addition to pairs of morphisms.

From now on, you can basically forget about additive category, we will be working in abelian category.

In general, once you assume a category is abelian, all the properties you would want of these kernels, cokernels, ... that you would guess hold true. For example,

Proposition 70.2.4 (Monic \iff trivial kernel)

A map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is monic if and only if its kernel is $0 \to A$. Dually, $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is epic if and only if its cokernel is $B \to 0$.

Proof. The easy direction is:

Exercise 70.2.5. Show that if $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ is monic, then $0 \to A$ is a kernel. (This holds even in non-abelian categories.)

Of course, since kernels are unique up to isomorphism, monic $\implies 0$ kernel. On the other hand, assume that $0 \rightarrow A$ is a kernel of $A \xrightarrow{f} B$. For this we can exploit the group structure of the underlying homomorphisms now. Assume the diagram

$$Z \xrightarrow{g} A \xrightarrow{f} B$$

commutes. Then $(g - h) \circ f = g \circ f - h \circ f = 0$, and we've arrived at a commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} Z \\ g-h \\ & & & \\ A \xrightarrow{0} & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \end{array} B$$

But since $0 \to A$ is a kernel it follows that g-h factors through 0, so $g-h=0 \implies g=h$, which is to say that f is monic.

Proposition 70.2.6 (Isomorphism \iff monic and epic) In an abelian category, a map is an isomorphism if and only if it is monic and epic.

Proof. Omitted. (The Mitchell embedding theorem presented later implies this anyways for most situations we care about, by looking at a small sub-category.) \Box

§70.3 Exact sequences

Prototypical example for this section: $0 \to G \to G \times H \to H \to 0$ is exact.

Exact sequences will seem exceedingly unmotivated until you learn about homology groups, which is one of the most natural places that exact sequences appear. In light of this, it might be worth trying to read the chapter on homology groups simultaneously with this one.

First, let me state the definition for groups, to motivate the general categorical definition. A sequence of groups

$$G_0 \xrightarrow{f_1} G_1 \xrightarrow{f_2} G_2 \xrightarrow{f_3} \dots \xrightarrow{f_n} G_n$$

is exact at G_k if the image of f_k is the kernel of f_{k+1} . We say the entire sequence is exact if it's exact at k = 1, ..., n - 1.

Example 70.3.1 (Exact sequences)

(a) The sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}/15\mathbb{Z} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \to 0$$

is exact. Actually, $0 \to G \hookrightarrow G \times H \twoheadrightarrow H \to 0$ is exact in general. (Here 0 denotes the trivial group.)

- (b) For groups, the map $0 \to A \to B$ is exact if and only if $A \to B$ is injective.
- (c) For groups, the map $A \to B \to 0$ is exact if and only if $A \to B$ is surjective.

If you look at the prototypical example, actually, a **short exact sequence** (an exact sequence of the form $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$) is the most natural things ever:

It's basically just an equation C = B/A.

Whenever you see "there is a short exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ ", you can mentally translate it to " $C \cong B/A$ "; but there's a slight difference: A group has more structures than a number, so the sequence also contains the information of the maps the map that identifies A with a subgroup of B, and the map that identifies C with the quotient group B/A. **Example 70.3.2** (More exact sequences)

(a) The sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\times 3} \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \to 0$$


is short exact.

(b) So is

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\times 5} \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z} \to 0.$$

As you can see, the written equation " $C \cong B/A$ " is not completely accurate, the map $A \to B$ also matters in determining what C is. This also explains the common notation: the image of the map $\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\times 3} \mathbb{Z}$ is usually written $3\mathbb{Z}$, thus $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} = \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{3\mathbb{Z}}$.

Now, we want to mimic this definition in a general *abelian* category \mathcal{A} . So, let's write down a criterion for when $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ is exact. First, we had better have that $g \circ f = 0$, which encodes the fact that $\operatorname{im}(f) \subseteq \ker(g)$. Adding in all the relevant objects, we get the commutative diagram below.



Here the map $A \to \text{Im } f$ is epic since we are assuming \mathcal{A} is an abelian category. So, we have that

$$0 = (g \circ \iota) \circ \operatorname{im} f = g \circ (\iota \circ \operatorname{im} f) = g \circ f = 0$$

but since im f is epic, this means that $g \circ \iota = 0$. So there is a *unique* map Im $f \to \text{Ker } g$, and we require that this diagram commutes. In short,

Definition 70.3.3. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. The sequence

$$\cdots \to A_{n-1} \xrightarrow{f_n} A_n \xrightarrow{f_{n+1}} A_{n+1} \to \dots$$

is **exact** at A_n if $f_{n+1} \circ f_n = 0$ and the canonical map Im $f_n \to \text{Ker } f_{n+1}$ is an isomorphism. The entire sequence is exact if it is exact at each A_i . (For finite sequences we don't impose condition on the very first and very last object.)

Exercise 70.3.4. Show that, as before, $0 \to A \to B$ is exact $\iff A \to B$ is monic.

§70.4 The Freyd-Mitchell embedding theorem

We now introduce the Freyd-Mitchell embedding theorem, which essentially says that any abelian category can be realized as a concrete one.

Definition 70.4.1. A category is small if $obj(\mathcal{A})$ is a set (as opposed to a class), i.e. there is a "set of all objects in \mathcal{A} ". For example, Set is not small because there is no set of all sets.

Theorem 70.4.2 (Freyd-Mitchell embedding theorem)

Let \mathcal{A} be a small abelian category. Then there exists a ring R (with 1 but possibly non-commutative) and a full, faithful, exact functor onto the category of left R-modules.

Here a functor is **exact** if it preserves exact sequences. This theorem is good because it means

You can basically forget about all the weird definitions that work in any abelian category.

Any time you're faced with a statement about an abelian category, it suffices to just prove it for a "concrete" category where injective/surjective/kernel/image/exact/etc. agree with your previous notions.

Remark 70.4.3 — The "small" condition is a technical obstruction that requires the objects \mathcal{A} to actually form a set. I'll ignore this distinction, because one can almost always work around it by doing enough set-theoretic technicalities.

For example, let's prove:

Lemma 70.4.4 (Short five lemma) In an abelian category, consider the commutative diagram

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{p} B \xrightarrow{q} C \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\cong \downarrow^{\alpha} \qquad \downarrow^{\beta} \cong \downarrow^{\gamma}$$
$$0 \longrightarrow A' \xrightarrow{p'} B' \xrightarrow{q'} C' \longrightarrow 0$$

and assume the top and bottom rows are exact. If α and γ are isomorphisms, then so is β .

Proof. We prove that β is epic (with a similar proof to get monic). By the embedding theorem we can treat the category as *R*-modules over some *R*. This lets us do a so-called "diagram chase" where we move elements around the picture, using the concrete interpretation of our category as *R*-modules.

Let b' be an element of B'. Then $q'(b') \in C'$, and since γ is surjective, we have a c such that $\gamma(c) = b'$, and finally a $b \in B$ such that q(b) = c. Picture:

$$b \in B \xrightarrow{q} c \in C$$

$$\downarrow^{\beta} \qquad \cong \downarrow^{\gamma}$$

$$b' \in B' \xrightarrow{q'} c' \in C'$$

Now, it is not necessarily the case that $\beta(b) = b'$. However, since the diagram commutes we at least have that

$$q'(b') = q'(\beta(b))$$

so $b' - \beta(b) \in \text{Ker } q' = \text{Im } p'$, and there is an $a' \in A'$ such that $p'(a') = b' - \beta(b)$; use α now to lift it to $a \in A$. Picture:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a \in A & b \in B \\ & & \downarrow \\ a' \in A' \longmapsto b' - \beta(b) \in B' \longmapsto 0 \in C \end{array}$$

Then, we have

$$\beta(b+p(a)) = \beta b + \beta pa = \beta b + p'\alpha a = \beta b + (b' - \beta b) = b'$$

so $b' \in \text{Im }\beta$ which completes the proof that β' is surjective.

In general, proofs in the style above (whether or not they use the embedding theorem) are sometimes referred to by the name *diagram chasing*. I'm not sure there's an exact definition for this term, but the following quote is due to Aluffi [A109]:

Proving the snake lemma [Problem $70C^*$] is something that should not be done in public, and it is notoriously useless to write down the details of the verification for others to read: the details are all essentially obvious, but they lead quickly to a notational quagmire. Such proofs are collectively known as the sport of diagram chase, best executed by pointing several fingers at different parts of a diagram on a blackboard, while enunciating the elements one is manipulating and stating their fate.

§70.5 Breaking long exact sequences

Prototypical example for this section: First isomorphism theorem.


In fact, it turns out that any exact sequence breaks into short exact sequences. This relies on:

Proposition 70.5.1 ("First isomorphism theorem" in abelian categories) Let $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ be an arrow of an abelian category. Then there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } f \xrightarrow{\text{ker } f} A \xrightarrow{\text{im } f} \text{Im } f \rightarrow 0.$

Let's analyze this theorem in our two examples of abelian categories:

- (a) In the category of abelian groups, this is basically the first isomorphism theorem.
- (b) In the category $Vect_k$, this amounts to the rank-nullity theorem, Theorem 9.7.7.

Thus, any exact sequence can be broken into short exact sequences, as



where $C_k = \operatorname{im} f_{k-1} = \ker f_k$ for every k.

§70.6 A few harder problems to think about

Problem 70A (Four lemma). In an abelian category, consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccc} A & \stackrel{p}{\longrightarrow} & B & \stackrel{q}{\longrightarrow} & C & \stackrel{r}{\longrightarrow} & D \\ & & & & & & \\ \alpha & & & & & & \\ A' & \stackrel{p}{\longrightarrow} & B' & \stackrel{q}{\longrightarrow} & C' & \stackrel{r}{\longrightarrow} & D' \end{array}$$

where the first and second rows are exact. Prove that if α is epic, and β and δ are monic, then γ is monic.

Problem 70B (Five lemma). In an abelian category, consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccc} A & \stackrel{p}{\longrightarrow} B & \stackrel{q}{\longrightarrow} C & \stackrel{r}{\longrightarrow} D & \stackrel{s}{\longrightarrow} E \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \beta \downarrow \cong & \gamma \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow \cong & \varepsilon \bigcap \\ A' & \stackrel{p'}{\longrightarrow} B' & \stackrel{q'}{\longrightarrow} C' & \stackrel{r'}{\longrightarrow} D' & \stackrel{s'}{\longrightarrow} E' \end{array}$$

where the two rows are exact, β and δ are isomorphisms, α is epic, and ε is monic. Prove that γ is an isomorphism.

Problem 70C^{*} (Snake lemma). In an abelian category, consider the diagram

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \longrightarrow 0$$
$$\downarrow^{a} \qquad \downarrow^{b} \qquad \downarrow^{c}$$
$$0 \longrightarrow A' \xrightarrow{f'} B' \xrightarrow{g'} C'$$

where the first and second rows are exact sequences. Prove that there is an exact sequence

 $\operatorname{Ker} a \to \operatorname{Ker} b \to \operatorname{Ker} c \to \operatorname{Coker} a \to \operatorname{Coker} b \to \operatorname{Coker} c.$

Problem 70D (An additive category that is not abelian). Consider a category, where:

- the objects are pairs of abelian groups (B, A) where A is a subgroup of B.
- the morphisms $(B, A) \to (B', A')$ are maps $f: B \to B'$ where $f^{\text{img}}(A) \subseteq A'$.

(You can think of this similar to the PairTop category, seen in Chapter 73. We use abelian groups here to make the category additive.)

This category can be equivalently viewed as the category of short exact sequences $0 \to A \to B \to B/A \to 0$ of abelian groups.

Show that the arrow $(X, 0) \to (X, X)$ is monic and epic, but not an isomorphism. Conclude that the category is not abelian.