


Weakly-affine monads

Paolo Perrone 

Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford

Fabio Gadducci 

Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Pisa, IT

Davide Trotta 

Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Pisa, IT

Abstract

2012 ACM Subject Classification

Keywords and phrases string diagrams, gs-monoidal categories

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

1 Introduction

For context:

► **Proposition 1.1.** *A monoid $(M, \cdot, 1)$ is a group if and only if the associativity square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \times M \times M & \xrightarrow{\cdot \times \text{id}} & M \times M \\ \downarrow \text{id} \times \cdot & & \downarrow \cdot \\ M \times M & \xrightarrow{\cdot} & M \end{array} \quad (1)$$

is a pullback.

Proof. The square (1) is a pullback, both of sets and of groups, if and only if given $a, g, h, c \in M$ such that $ag = hc$, there exists a unique $b \in M$ such that $g = bc$ and $h = ab$. First, suppose that g is a group. The only possible choice of b is

$$b = a^{-1}h = gc^{-1},$$

which is unique by uniqueness of inverses.

Conversely, suppose that (1) is a pullback. We can set $g, h = e$ and $c = a$ so that $ae = ea = a$. Instantiating the pullback property, there is a unique b such that $ab = e$ and $ba = e$, that is, $b = a^{-1}$. ◀

Recall that a monoidal functor generalizes a monoid object (in turn, generalizing a monoid). Similarly, a *weakly affine monoidal functor* generalizes a group in the sense of the proposition above.

2 Weakly-affine monads

► **Definition 2.1.** Let T be a commutative monad on a category \mathcal{A} with finite products. A triple (X, Y, Z) of objects of \mathcal{A} is said to be **TBA** if the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(X) \times T(Y) \times T(Z) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times c_{Y,Z}} & T(X) \times T(Y \times Z) \\ \downarrow c_{X,Y} \times \text{id} & & \downarrow c_{X,Y \times Z} \\ T(X \times Y) \times T(Z) & \xrightarrow{c_{X \times Y, Z}} & T(X \times Y \times Z) \end{array}$$

is a pullback.

Nome da scegliere e valutare se dare la def per una arbitraria gs

► **Definition 2.2.** Let T be a commutative monad on a category \mathcal{A} with finite products. We say that the monad T is **weakly affine** if the following associativity diagram is a pullback for every X, Y, Z in \mathcal{A} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(X) \times T(Y) \times T(Z) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times c_{Y,Z}} & T(X) \times T(Y \times Z) \\ c_{X,Y} \times \text{id} \downarrow & & \downarrow c_{X,Y \times Z} \\ T(X \times Y) \times T(Z) & \xrightarrow{c_{X \times Y, Z}} & T(X \times Y \times Z) \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Let us derive some general properties before looking at examples. It is a standard fact that for any commutative monad T , the composite arrow

$$T(1) \times T(1) \xrightarrow{c_{1,1}} T(1 \times 1) \xrightarrow{\cong} T(1)$$

equips $T(1)$ with the structure of a commutative monoid internal to \mathcal{A} with unit $\eta_1 : 1 \rightarrow T(1)$.

► **Lemma 2.3.** *If T is weakly affine, then $T(1)$ is a group.*

Proof. If T is weakly affine, then taking $X = Y = Z = 1$ in (2) shows that this monoid must be an abelian group: assuming that \times is a strict monoidal structure for simplicity, we obtain a unique arrow $\iota : T(1) \rightarrow T(1)$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(1) & \xrightarrow{(\text{id}, \eta_1!)} & T(1) \times T(1) \\ \downarrow (\eta_1!, \text{id}) & \searrow (\text{id}, \iota, \text{id}) & \downarrow c_{1,1} \times \text{id} \\ T(1) \times T(1) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times c_{1,1}} & T(1) \times T(1) \\ \downarrow c_{1,1} \times \text{id} & & \downarrow c_{1,1} \\ T(1) \times T(1) & \xrightarrow{c_{1,1}} & T(1) \end{array}$$

and the commutativity shows that ι satisfies the equations making it the inversion map for a group structure. ◀

► **Proposition 2.4.** *Let T be a weakly affine monad. If the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(1) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & T(1) \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \eta_{T1} \\ T(1) & \xrightarrow{T(\eta_1)} & T^2(1) \end{array}$$

commutes, then $T^2(1) \cong T(1)$ in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. To prove the result it is enough to show that $T(1) \cong 1$ in the Kleisli category \mathcal{A}_T . We know from Lemma 2.3 that $T(1)$ is a group in \mathcal{A} , where the arrow $\eta_1 : 1 \rightarrow T(1)$ is the unit of the group, and $\iota : T(1) \rightarrow T(1)$ is the inversion map. Therefore, we have that the composition $\iota \eta_1 : 1 \rightarrow T(1)$ has to be equal to η_1 . Therefore, we can consider the arrows $1 \rightarrow T(1)$ and $T(1) \rightarrow 1$ in the Kleisli category \mathcal{A}_T given by $T(\eta_1)\eta_1$ and ι respectively. The composition $T(\eta_1)\eta_1$ with ι in \mathcal{A}_T is given by $\mu_{1,1}T(\iota)T(\eta_1)\eta_1$. Employing the naturality of η_1 and the fact that $\iota \eta_1 = \eta_1$, it is direct to check that $\mu T(\iota)T(\eta_1)\eta_1 = \eta_1$, that is the identity $1 \rightarrow 1$ in \mathcal{A}_T . Now to show that the other composition gives the identity on $T(1)$ in \mathcal{A}_T , it is enough to show that $T(\eta_1)\iota = \eta_{T(1)}$, but this follows by hypothesis. ◀

(Paolo) Credo che $T(\eta_1)\iota \neq \eta_{T(1)}$ nell'esempio delle misure non zero. Per ogni x in $(0, \infty) = T1$ abbiamo che $\eta_{T(1)}(x) = \delta_x$ (delta di Dirac), mentre $T\eta_1(\iota(x)) = T\eta_1(1/x) = 1/x \delta_1$.

The following result shows that weak affinity occurs frequently. Recall that a strong monad $T: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ on a category \mathcal{A} with finite products is **affine** if $T(1) \cong 1$ (see also Remark ??). Three relevant examples of affine monads are the distribution monad on **Set** (for discrete probability), the Giry monad on the category of measurable spaces (for measure-theoretic probability, see Examples ?? and ??), and the expectation monad, see [?].

► **Proposition 2.5.** *Let T be a commutative monad on a category \mathcal{A} with finite limits. If T is affine, then it is weakly affine.*

Proof. Let $m_{X,Y}: T(X \times Y) \rightarrow TX \times TY$ be the arrow defined as the pairing of $T(\pi_1)$ and $T(\pi_2)$. Then it is known that T is affine if and only if $m_{X,Y}c_{X,Y} = \text{id}_{TX \times TY}$ [?, Lemma 4.2(i)].¹ In particular, $c_{X,Y}$ is a split mono and therefore mono.

To show that (2) is a pullback, we prove the universal property starting with a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{(f_1, f_2)} & TX \times T(Y \times Z) \\
 \text{---} \exists! \text{---} \searrow & & \downarrow c_{X,Y \times Z} \\
 TX \times TY \times TZ & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times c_{Y,Z}} & TX \times T(Y \times Z) \\
 \downarrow c_{X,Y} \times \text{id} & & \downarrow c_{X,Y \times Z} \\
 T(X \times Y) \times TZ & \xrightarrow{c_{X \times Y, Z}} & T(X \times Y \times Z)
 \end{array} \quad (3)$$

where the dashed arrow will be constructed; its uniqueness is clear since $\text{id} \times c_{Y,Z}$ and $c_{X,Y} \times \text{id}$ are mono, so it remains to prove existence. Taking the unlabelled arrows to be (induced by) product projections, we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{(g_1, g_2)} & T(X \times Y) \times TZ & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T(X \times Y \times Z) \\
 \downarrow (f_1, f_2) & & \searrow c_{X,Y \times Z} & & \downarrow \\
 TX \times T(Y \times Z) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & & T(Y \times Z)
 \end{array}$$

where the upper left triangle commutes by assumption, and the lower right triangle commutes by naturality of c with respect to the unique arrow $X \rightarrow 1$ together with $T1 \cong 1$ and the fact that $c_{1,Y \times Z}$ is a coherence isomorphism. By the naturality of c , f_2 can be written as the composite

$$A \xrightarrow{(g_1, g_2)} T(X \times Y) \times TZ \longrightarrow TY \times TZ \xrightarrow{c_{Y,Z}} T(Y \times Z).$$

By analogous reasoning, we identify g_1 with the composite

$$A \xrightarrow{(f_1, f_2)} TX \times T(Y \times Z) \longrightarrow TX \times TY \xrightarrow{c_{X,Y}} T(X \times Y).$$

¹ For probability monads, this equation can be interpreted as stating that the marginals of a product distribution are the original factors [?].

XX:4 Weakly-affine monads

86 Getting back to (3), we take the dashed arrow to be the arrow whose component on TX is
 87 given by f_1 , on TZ by g_2 , and on TY by the diagonal in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f_2} & T(Y \times Z) \\ g_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T(X \times Y) & \longrightarrow & TY \end{array}$$

89 which commutes for similar reasons as above. The fact that this arrow recovers the f_2
 90 component after composition with $\text{id} \times c_{Y,Z}$ and the g_1 component after composition with
 91 $c_{X,Y} \times \text{id}$ follows by the expressions for f_2 and g_1 derived above. The fact that it recovers f_1
 92 and g_2 is by construction. ◀

94 ► **Remark 2.6.** We are not aware of any relation between weakly affine monads in our sense
 95 and Jacobs' *strongly affine* monads [?], other than the fact that strongly affine implies affine
 96 implies weakly affine.

97 ► **Example 2.7.** We present a family of examples of commutative monads that are weakly
 98 affine but not affine. Let A be an abelian group (written multiplicatively). Then the functor
 99 $T_A := A \times -$ on **Set** has a canonical structure of commutative monad, where the lax structure
 100 components $c_{X,Y}$ are given by multiplying elements in A while carrying the elements of X
 101 and Y along.

102 Since $T_A \cong A$, the monad T_A is clearly not affine unless A is the trivial group. However,
 103 T_A is always weakly affine. Indeed, in order to show that (2) is a pullback, it suffices to show
 104 that the associativity square of A

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times A \times A & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times \cdot} & A \times A \\ \downarrow \cdot \times \text{id} & & \downarrow \cdot \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{\cdot} & A \end{array}$$

106 is a pullback. Using element-wise reasoning, this amounts to showing that the system of
 107 equations $ax = c$ and $xb = d$ has a solution for $x \in A$ if and only if $cb = ad$, and in this case
 108 the solution is unique. But this is indeed the case with $x = a^{-1}c = db^{-1}$. (Note that this
 109 argument does not even require A to be abelian, but we need to require this in order for T_A
 110 to be commutative.)

111 ► **Example 2.8.** Many monads in categorical measure theory are weakly affine but not affine.
 112 Let e.g. $M^* : \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be the monad assigning to every set the set of finitely supported
 113 discrete *nonzero* measures on M^* , or equivalently let $M^*(X)$ for any set X be the set of
 114 nonzero finitely supported functions $X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. The monad structure is defined in terms of
 115 the same formulas as for the distribution monad on **Set** and the components $c_{X,Y}$ are also
 116 given by the formation of product measures, or equivalently point-wise products of functions
 117 $X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$.

118 Since $M^*1 \cong (0, \infty)$, this monad is clearly not affine. However, it is weakly affine, and
 119 we limit ourselves to a sketch of the proof. Indeed to prove that (2) is a pullback, we again
 120 reason in terms of elements. If all measures are normalised, then we are back in the situation
 121 of the distribution monad, which is affine and the claim follows. In the general case, one
 122 can reduce to the normalised case by showing that the normalisation of the desired element
 123 of $M^*(Y)$ is uniquely determined. This works in the same way as in Example 2.7 with
 124 $A = (0, \infty)$.

125 On the other hand, if the zero measure is included, then we obtain a commutative monad
126 M which can be seen as the monad of semimodules for the semiring of nonnegative reals.
127 Since $M1 \cong [0, \infty)$ is not a group under multiplication, M is not weakly affine.

128 The previous two examples and Lemma 2 suggest the following problem.

129 ► **Problem 2.9.** Let T be a commutative monoid such that $T(1)$ is an abelian group. Does
130 it follow that T is weakly affine?