

INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON REAL-ENRICHED CATEGORIES

DEXUE ZHANG

ABSTRACT. Real-enriched categories are categories with real numbers as enrichment. Precisely, a real-enriched category is a category enriched over the commutative and unital quantale composed of the unit interval and a continuous t-norm. These notes present a brief introduction to real-enriched categories, focusing on the presheaf monad and its submonads in the category of such categories.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Galois connection and domains	2
3. Continuous t-norm	12
4. Real-enriched categories	21
5. The Yoneda lemma	25
6. Colimit and limit	30
7. Tensor and cotensor	36
8. Cauchy completeness	41
9. Yoneda completeness	48
10. Flat completeness	61
11. Smyth completeness	66
12. The presheaf monad	68
13. Categories of \mathbb{T} -algebras	76
14. Continuous \mathbb{T} -algebras	83
15. Real-enriched domains	90
16. Saturation	106
References	109

1. INTRODUCTION

Real-enriched categories are a very special kind of enriched categories, namely, those categories of which the enrichment are real numbers. Precisely, a real-enriched category is a category enriched over the unital quantale composed of the the interval $[0, 1]$ and a continuous t-norm. To require enrichment be real numbers limits drastically the scope of the theory, but the benefit is also apparent. First, real numbers posses much richer structures than a general quantale or more generally, a symmetric and monoidal closed category, one expects more can be said about such categories because of the richer structures of the enrichment. Second, the study of such categories is closely related to many-valued logic. In 1973 Lawvere [51] pointed

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 18B35, 18C15, 18C20, 18D15, 18D20.

Key words and phrases. Real-enriched category, functor, distributor, Cauchy completeness, Yoneda completeness, class of weights, monad, real-enriched domain.

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12371463).

out a deep connection between enriched categories and *generalized pure logic*. For real-enriched categories, this “generalized pure logic” is the Basic Logic, called the *BL-logic*, developed by Hájek [24]. As shown in Hájek [24] and Cignoli, Esteva, Godo and Torrens [12], BL-logic is a *logic of continuous t-norms*. In particular, real-enriched categories may be viewed as many-valued ordered sets, a viewpoint emphasized in these notes.

Though being a narrow class, real-enriched categories are sufficiently general to provide a common framework for ordered sets and quasi-metric spaces, they are natural objects for Quantitative Domain Theory, see e.g. America and Rutten [4], Antoniuk and Waszkiewicz [5], Bonsangue, van Breugel and Rutten [9], Flagg [16], Flagg and Kopperman [17], Gutierrez and Hofmann [22], Hofmann and Waszkiewicz [32, 33], Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40], Künzi and Schellekens [41], and etc.

There are many texts on enriched categories, e.g. Eilenberg and Kelly [15], Lawvere [51], the book of Kelly [36], Chapter 6 in the Handbook of Borceux [11], and the works of Stubbe [72, 73, 74] on quantaloid-enriched categories. The aim of these notes is to explain basic ideas about real-enriched categories, focusing on the presheaf monad and its submonads. Special attention is paid to how the logic structure of the truth-value set affects mathematical results, see e.g. Proposition 12.8, Theorem 14.10, Theorem 15.27. Many topics are not covered here. Mac Neille completion of real-enriched categories, Formal Concept Analysis of fuzzy contexts (see Bělohlávek [6]) are not touched; topology of real-enriched categories, except the notion of open ball topology, is not touched either, interested readers are referred to Goubault-Larrecq [20], Hofmann [27], Lowen [53, 54], and the book [30] edited by Hofmann, Seal and Tholen.

These notes are arranged into four parts. The first part consists of Section 2 and Section 3. This part recalls, for convenience of the reader, some basic ideas in theories of ordered sets and continuous t-norms. Many notions for real-enriched categories find their roots in the theory of ordered sets; the interval $[0, 1]$ together with a continuous t-norm is our truth-value set. The second part consists of Section 4 – Section 7. This part deals with basic structures of real-enriched categories, including (adjoint) functors, (adjoint) distributors, Yoneda lemma, weighted limits and weighted colimits. The third part consists of Section 8 – Section 11, focusing on special kinds of colimits and limits. The last 5 sections constitute the fourth part, dealing with the presheaf monad in the category of real-enriched categories, its submonads and algebras.

2. GALOIS CONNECTION AND DOMAINS

This section recalls some basic ideas in order theory, and fixes some notations. The materials can be found in many places, e.g. Davey and Priestley [13], Gierz, Hofmann, Keimel et al [19], and Goubault-Larrecq [20].

Definition 2.1. Let X be a set. An order (or a preorder) on X is a binary relation \leq on X such that, for all $x, y, z \in X$,

- (i) $x \leq x$,
- (ii) $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$ imply $x \leq z$.

These conditions are referred to, respectively, as reflexivity and transitivity. A set X equipped with an order relation \leq is called an ordered set (or a preordered set). Usually we say simply “ X is an ordered set”. When it is necessary to specify the order relation we write (X, \leq) . If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, we say that x and y are equivalent and write $x \cong y$.

A partial order on a set X is an order that satisfies additionally the axiom of antisymmetry:

(iii) $x \cong y$ implies $x = y$.

Example 2.2. (i) The identity relation on a set X is a partial order, called the discrete order on X .

(ii) For each set X , the inclusion relation \subseteq is a partial order on the powerset $2^X := \{A \mid A \subseteq X\}$ of X .

(iii) The smaller than or equal to relation \leq is a partial order on the set \mathbb{R} of real numbers. But, the strict smaller than relation $<$ on \mathbb{R} is not an order since it is not reflexive.

(iv) The divisibility relation \sqsubseteq , defined by $m \sqsubseteq n$ if $m = kn$ for some natural number k , is a partial order on the set \mathbb{N} of natural numbers.

If \leq is an order on a set X , then the opposite relation \leq^{op} , given by $x \leq^{\text{op}} y$ if $y \leq x$, is also an order on X , called the *opposite* of \leq .

Suppose X is an ordered set, A is a subset and x is an element of X . We say that x is an *upper bound* of subset A if $a \leq x$ for all $a \in A$. We say that x is a *join*, or a *supremum*, of A if x is the least upper bound of A ; that means, x is an upper bound of A and $x \leq y$ whenever y is an upper bound of A . It is clear that any two joins of a subset A are equivalent, hence every subset of an ordered set has at most one join, up to isomorphism. So, we will speak of *the join* of a subset. Dually, x is a *lower bound* of A if $x \leq a$ for all $a \in A$. The greatest lower bound of A , if exists, is called the *meet*, or the *infimum*, of A .

Definition 2.3. Suppose X is an ordered set and $A \subseteq X$. We say that A is

- (i) a lower set if $x \in A$ and $y \leq x$ imply $y \in A$;
- (ii) an upper set if $x \in A$ and $x \leq y$ imply $y \in A$.

For a subset A of an ordered set X , let

$$\uparrow A = \{x \in X \mid \exists a \in A, a \leq x\}$$

and

$$\downarrow A = \{x \in X \mid \exists a \in A, x \leq a\}.$$

Then $\uparrow A$ and $\downarrow A$ are, respectively, the smallest upper set and the smallest lower set containing A . So, $\downarrow A$ is the lower set and $\uparrow A$ the upper set generated by A , respectively. When A is a singleton set $\{a\}$, we write $\uparrow a$ and $\downarrow a$. A lower set of the form $\downarrow a$ is called a *principal lower set*. Likewise, an upper set of the form $\uparrow a$ is called a *principal upper set*.

Example 2.4. For each topological space (X, τ) , define a relation \leq_τ on the set X by

$$x \leq_\tau y \iff x \in \overline{\{y\}}.$$

Then \leq_τ is an order on X , called the *specialization order* of the space (X, τ) . The specialization order \leq_τ is antisymmetric if and only if (X, τ) is T_0 ; \leq_τ is the discrete order if and only if (X, τ) is T_1 . Every open set is an upper set and every closed set is a lower set with respect to the specialization order. For each $x \in X$, the principal lower set $\downarrow x$ is the closure of $\{x\}$, i.e. $\downarrow x = \overline{\{x\}}$.

Suppose X is an ordered set and $A \subseteq X$. Let

$$\text{ub } A = \{x \in X \mid \forall a \in A, a \leq x\}$$

and

$$\text{lb } A = \{x \in X \mid \forall a \in A, x \leq a\}.$$

In other words, $\text{ub } A$ and $\text{lb } A$ are the set of all upper bounds and the set of all lower bounds of A , respectively. Then, $\text{ub } A$ is an upper set and $\text{lb } A$ is a lower set; A has a join if and only if $\text{ub } A$ is a principal upper set; A has a meet if and only if $\text{lb } A$ is a principal lower set.

Definition 2.5. Suppose X is an ordered set.

- (i) A subset D of X is directed if D is not empty and for all $x, y \in D$, there is some $z \in D$ such that $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$. A directed lower set of X is called an ideal of X .
- (ii) A subset F of X is filtered if F is not empty and for all $x, y \in F$, there is some $z \in F$ such that $z \leq x$ and $z \leq y$. A filtered upper set of X is called a filter of X .

In particular, an ordered set X is *directed* if it is a directed subset of itself. This means that X is not empty and every pair of elements in X has an upper bound.

Example 2.6. Suppose X is an ordered set.

- (i) For each $x \in X$, the principal lower set $\downarrow x$ is an ideal.
- (ii) For each $x \in X$, the principal upper set $\uparrow x$ is a filter.
- (iii) Let X be a topological space. Then for each $x \in X$, the family $\mathcal{N}_x = \{U \subseteq X \mid x \in U^\circ\}$ of all neighborhoods of x is a filter of $(2^X, \subseteq)$.
- (iv) For each set X , the family of finite subsets of X is an ideal of $(2^X, \subseteq)$.

Definition 2.7. Suppose X is an ordered set. We say that X is

- (i) bounded if it has a least and a greatest element.
- (ii) a join semilattice if it is antisymmetric and every pair of elements x, y in X has a join, denoted by $x \vee y$.
- (iii) a meet semilattice if it is antisymmetric and every pair of elements x, y in X has a meet, denoted by $x \wedge y$.
- (iv) a lattice if it is at the same time a join semilattice and a meet semilattice.

If X is a lattice, then so is the opposite X^{op} of X . The ordered set (\mathbb{R}, \leq) is a lattice, but not bounded.

Lemma 2.8. For each ordered set X , the following are equivalent:

- (1) Every subset of X , including the empty one, has a join.
- (2) Every subset of X , including the empty one, has a meet.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) We show that each subset A of X has a meet. For this consider the set $\text{lb } A$ of lower bounds of A . By assumption, $\text{lb } A$ has a join, say x . If we could show that x is a lower bound of A , then it would be the greatest lower bound, hence the meet of A . Since every element $a \in A$ is an upper bound of $\text{lb } A$, it follows that A is a set of upper bounds of $\text{lb } A$. Since x , being the join of $\text{lb } A$, is the least element of $\text{ub}(\text{lb } A)$, then $x \leq a$ for all $a \in A$, hence x is a lower bound of A .

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Similar. \square

Definition 2.9. Suppose X is an ordered set. We say that X is

- (i) complete if it satisfies the equivalent conditions in Lemma 2.8.
- (ii) a complete lattice if it is complete and antisymmetric.

The empty subset of an ordered set X has a join (meet, respectively) if and only if X has a least (greatest, respectively) element. So, every complete ordered set is bounded.

For each set X , $(2^X, \subseteq)$ is a complete lattice. For any $a \leq b$ in \mathbb{R} , the partially ordered set $([a, b], \leq)$ is a complete lattice. For each ordered set X , the set $\mathcal{P}X$ of all lower sets of X ordered by inclusion is a complete lattice. In particular, if (X, \leq) is discrete then $(\mathcal{P}X, \subseteq)$ coincides with the complete lattice $(2^X, \subseteq)$.

Definition 2.10. Suppose X, Y are ordered sets and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map. We say that

- (i) f preserves order if $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$.

- (ii) f reflects order if $f(x_1) \leq f(x_2) \implies x_1 \leq x_2$.
- (iii) f preserves joins (meets, resp.) if for each subset A of X and each join (meet, resp.) a of A , $f(a)$ is a join (meet, resp.) of $\{f(x) \mid x \in A\}$.

The identity map on any ordered set is order-preserving; the composite of order-preserving maps is order-preserving. So with ordered sets and order-preserving maps we have a category **Ord**.

It is clear that an order isomorphism (i.e. an isomorphism in the category **Ord**) preserves both joins and meets. A map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is called an *order-reversing isomorphism* if $f: X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow Y$ is an order isomorphism, or equivalently, $f: X \rightarrow Y^{\text{op}}$ is an order isomorphism. Every order-reversing isomorphism transforms joins to meets and meets to joins.

Suppose $\{X_i\}_{i \in J}$ is a family of ordered sets. Define a binary relation on the product set $\prod_{i \in J} X_i$ by

$$(x_i)_i \leq (y_i)_i \text{ if for each } i, x_i \leq y_i \text{ in } X_i.$$

Then \leq is an order on $\prod_i X_i$ and for each j , the projection $p_j: \prod_i X_i \rightarrow X_j$ preserves order.

Example 2.11. Suppose X is an ordered set.

- (i) The diagonal map

$$\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X, \quad \Delta(x) = (x, x)$$

preserves and reflects order.

- (ii) The map

$$y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X, \quad x \mapsto \downarrow x$$

preserves and reflects order, where $\mathcal{P}X$ is the set of all lower sets of X ordered by inclusion. This is a special case of *Yoneda embedding* in category theory.

- (iii) The map

$$y^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X, \quad x \mapsto \uparrow x$$

preserves and reflects order, where $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is the set of all upper sets of X ordered by converse inclusion. This is a special case of *coYoneda embedding* in category theory.

Galois connection

Definition 2.12. Suppose X, Y are ordered sets; $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \rightarrow X$ are a pair of maps. We say that f is left adjoint to g , or g is right adjoint to f , and write $f \dashv g$, if for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ it holds that

$$f(x) \leq y \iff x \leq g(y).$$

In this case, the pair (f, g) is called a Galois connection, or an adjunction, with f being the left adjoint and g the right adjoint.

If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is an order isomorphism, then f is both left and right adjoint to its inverse f^{-1} .

Lemma 2.13. *If both $f_1: X \rightarrow Y$ and $f_2: X \rightarrow Y$ are left adjoint to $g: Y \rightarrow X$, then $f_1(x) \cong f_2(x)$ for all $x \in X$.*

Therefore, the left adjoints of a map, if exist, are essentially unique; likewise for right adjoints. So, we shall speak of *the left adjoint* and *the right adjoint*.

Lemma 2.14. *Left adjoints and right adjoints preserve order.*

Proof. Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $g: Y \rightarrow X$. We show that both f and g preserve order. Assume that $x_1 \leq x_2$. Since $f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$, then $x_2 \leq gf(x_2)$, so $x_1 \leq gf(x_2)$, hence $f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$. This shows that f preserves order. Likewise, g preserves order. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Each composite of left adjoints is a left adjoint. Dually, each composite of right adjoints is a right adjoint.*

Example 2.16. Suppose X is a topological space, $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is the set of open sets and $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is the set of closed sets. Then the interior operator $(-)^{\circ}: 2^X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(X)$ is right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{O}(X) \rightarrow 2^X$; the closure operator $(-)^{-}: 2^X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X)$ is left adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{C}(X) \rightarrow 2^X$.

Example 2.17. Suppose X is an ordered set; $\mathcal{P}X$ and $\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$ are the ordered sets of lower sets and upper sets of X , respectively, as in Example 2.11. For all $A \in \mathcal{P}X$ and $B \in \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$, it holds that

$$\text{ub } A \supseteq B \iff \forall x \in A, \forall y \in B, x \leq y \iff A \subseteq \text{lb } B,$$

so $\text{ub}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$ is left adjoint to $\text{lb}: \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.

Example 2.18. Suppose X, Y are sets and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map. Let

$$f_{\exists}: 2^X \rightarrow 2^Y$$

be the map that sends each subset A of X to its image $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$; let

$$f^{-1}: 2^Y \rightarrow 2^X$$

be the map that sends each subset B of Y to its preimage $\{x \in X \mid f(x) \in B\}$. Then f_{\exists} is left adjoint to f^{-1} . The map f^{-1} also has a right adjoint, given by

$$f_{\forall}: 2^X \rightarrow 2^Y, \quad f_{\forall}(A) = \{y \in Y \mid f^{-1}(y) \subseteq A\}.$$

Thus, we have a string of adjunctions:

$$f_{\exists} \dashv f^{-1} \dashv f_{\forall}: 2^X \rightarrow 2^Y.$$

Example 2.19. Suppose X, Y are ordered sets and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves order. For each lower set $B \subseteq Y$, the inverse image $f^{-1}(B)$ is a lower set of X , so we have an order-preserving map

$$f^{-1}: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X.$$

For each lower set $A \subseteq X$, let

$$f_{\exists}(A) = \{y \in Y \mid y \leq f(a) \text{ for some } a \in A\}.$$

Then

$$f_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$$

is order-preserving and it is left adjoint to f^{-1} . The map f^{-1} also has a right adjoint

$$f_{\forall}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$$

given by

$$f_{\forall}(A) = \{y \in Y \mid f^{-1}(\downarrow y) \subseteq A\}.$$

Thus, we have a string of adjunctions:

$$f_{\exists} \dashv f^{-1} \dashv f_{\forall}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y.$$

If both X and Y are discrete ordered sets, then this string of adjunctions reduces to that in the above example.

Theorem 2.20. *Suppose X, Y are ordered sets; $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \rightarrow X$ preserve order. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $f \dashv g$.

- (2) $\text{id}_X \leq gf$ and $fg \leq \text{id}_Y$.
- (3) For each $x \in X$, $f(x)$ is a least element in $g^{-1}(\uparrow x)$.
- (4) For each $y \in Y$, $g(y)$ is a greatest element in $f^{-1}(\downarrow y)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) For each $x \in X$, since $f(x) \leq f(x)$, then $x \leq gf(x)$, so $\text{id}_X \leq gf$. For each $y \in Y$, since $g(y) \leq g(y)$, then $fg(y) \leq y$, so $fg \leq \text{id}_Y$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) First, since $x \leq gf(x)$, then $f(x) \in g^{-1}(\uparrow x)$. Second, for each $y \in g^{-1}(\uparrow x)$, since $x \leq g(y)$, then $f(x) \leq fg(y) \leq y$. So $f(x)$ is the least element in $g^{-1}(\uparrow x)$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $f(x) \leq y$. Since $f(x) \in g^{-1}(\uparrow x)$, then $x \leq gf(x) \leq g(y)$. Conversely, suppose $x \leq g(y)$. Since $fg(y)$ is the least element in $g^{-1}(\uparrow g(y))$ and $y \in g^{-1}(\uparrow g(y))$, then $f(x) \leq fg(y) \leq y$. Therefore, f is left adjoint to g .

That (2) \Rightarrow (4) \Rightarrow (1) can be proved in a similar way. \square

Proposition 2.21. *Suppose X, Y are partially ordered sets; $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $g: Y \rightarrow X$. Then $f = ffg$ and $g = gfg$, hence both $gf: X \rightarrow X$ and $fg: Y \rightarrow Y$ are idempotent.*

Proposition 2.22. *Suppose X, Y are partially ordered sets, $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $g: Y \rightarrow X$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) g is surjective.
- (2) $f(x) = \min g^{-1}(x)$ for all $x \in X$.
- (3) $gf = 1_X$.
- (4) f is injective.

Likewise, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1*) g is injective.
- (2*) $g(y) = \max f^{-1}(y)$ for all $y \in Y$.
- (3*) $fg = 1_Y$.
- (4*) f is surjective.

Theorem 2.23. *Every left adjoint $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves joins. Conversely, if X is complete and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves joins, then f is a left adjoint.*

Proof. Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ has a right adjoint, say $g: Y \rightarrow X$. We show that for any subset A of X , $f(\sup A)$ is a join of $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$ whenever $\sup A$ exists. Since f preserves order, then $f(\sup A)$ is an upper bound of $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$. If y is an upper bound of $\{f(a) \mid a \in A\}$, then $a \leq g(y)$ for all $a \in A$, so $\sup A \leq g(y)$, hence $f(\sup A) \leq y$.

Conversely, suppose X is complete and $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves joins. Since f preserves joins, for each $y \in Y$ the join of $f^{-1}(\downarrow y)$ is also a member of $f^{-1}(\downarrow y)$. Assigning to y the join of $f^{-1}(\downarrow y)$ yields a right adjoint of f . \square

Dually, every right adjoint preserves meets. Conversely, if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves meets and X is complete then f is a right adjoint.

Galois connections are of fundamental importance in order theory. Many concepts in order theory are postulated, or can be characterized, in terms of Galois connections.

Proposition 2.24. *For each ordered set X , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) X is complete.
- (2) The Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ has a left adjoint.
- (3) The coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ has a right adjoint.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) If $s: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$ is left adjoint to y , then for all $x \in X$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$A \subseteq \downarrow x \iff s(A) \leq x,$$

which says that x is an upper bound of A if and only if $x \geq s(A)$. So $s(A)$ is a least upper bound of A .

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose that X is complete. Let $s: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$ be a map such that $s(A)$ is a join of A for each $A \in \mathcal{P}X$. Then s is a left adjoint of y .

The equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) is verified in a similar way. \square

Proposition 2.25. *Suppose X is a partially ordered set.*

- (i) X is a meet semilattice if and only if the diagonal map $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ has a right adjoint.
- (ii) X is a join semilattice if and only if the diagonal map $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ has a left adjoint.
- (iii) X is a lattice if and only if the diagonal map $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \times X$ has, at the same time, a left and a right adjoint; that is, there is a string of adjunctions: $\vee \dashv \Delta \dashv \wedge: X \times X \rightarrow X$.

Quantales provide another kind of interesting examples. Here we only include the definition of commutative and unital quantales, standard reference for quantales is Rosenthal [64]. A *commutative and unital quantale*

$$\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{Q}, \&, k)$$

is a commutative monoid with k being the unit, such that the underlying set \mathbf{Q} is a complete lattice and for each $x \in \mathbf{Q}$, the map $x \& -: \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ has a right adjoint $x \rightarrow -: \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$. This is equivalent to that $\&$ distributes over joins. In particular, a *frame* is a complete lattice L such that $(L, \wedge, 1)$ is a quantale; or equivalently, for each $a \in L$ the meet operator $a \wedge -: L \rightarrow L$ distributes over joins.

Completely distributive lattices

Suppose X is a partially ordered set. By Proposition 2.24, X is a complete lattice if and only if the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ has a left adjoint $\text{sup}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$, which sends each subset A of X to its join $\text{sup } A$.

Definition 2.26. A complete lattice X is completely distributive if the left adjoint of the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ also has a left adjoint; that means, there is a string of adjunctions

$$\Downarrow \dashv \text{sup} \dashv y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X.$$

Lattices satisfying the requirement in the above definition are also said to be *constructively completely distributive*, see e.g. Wood [80], because, compared with the complete distributivity law (see Theorem 2.27), it does not resort to the Axiom of Choice.

To characterize completely distributive lattices, we need the notion of totally below relation. Suppose x, y are elements of a complete lattice X . We say that x is *totally below* y , in symbols $x \triangleleft y$, if for each subset A of X ,

$$y \leq \text{sup } A \implies x \leq a \text{ for some } a \in A.$$

The following facts are easy to check:

- If $x \triangleleft y$ then $x \leq y$.
- $x \triangleleft y$ if and only if $x \in \bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{P}X \mid y \leq \text{sup } A\}$.
- If $a \leq x \triangleleft y \leq b$ then $a \triangleleft b$.
- If $x \triangleleft \text{sup}_{i \in I} y_i$ then $x \triangleleft y_i$ for some $i \in I$.

Theorem 2.27. *For each complete lattice X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is completely distributive.

(2) For each family $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ of lower sets of X ,

$$\sup \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i = \inf_{i \in I} \sup A_i.$$

(3) Every element x of X is the join of the elements totally below it, i.e. $x = \sup\{z \in X \mid z \triangleleft x\}$.

(4) X satisfies the complete distributivity law: for any family $\{x_{i,j} \mid i \in I, j \in J_i\}$ of elements of X ,

$$\inf_{i \in I} \sup_{j \in J_i} x_{i,j} = \sup_{f \in \prod_{i \in I} J_i} \inf_{i \in I} x_{i,f(i)}.$$

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) This follows from that $\sup: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$ is a right adjoint.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) This follows from that an element z is totally below x if and only if

$$z \in \bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{P}X \mid x \leq \sup A\}.$$

(3) \Rightarrow (4) Let

$$x = \inf_{i \in I} \sup_{j \in J_i} x_{i,j}$$

and suppose $z \triangleleft x$. By definition of the totally below relation, for each $i \in I$, there is some element in J_i , say $g(i)$, such that $z \leq x_{i,g(i)}$. Thus

$$z \leq \sup_{f \in \prod_{i \in I} J_i} \inf_{i \in I} x_{i,f(i)}$$

and consequently,

$$\inf_{i \in I} \sup_{j \in J_i} x_{i,j} \leq \sup_{f \in \prod_{i \in I} J_i} \inf_{i \in I} x_{i,f(i)}$$

by arbitrariness of z . The converse inequality is obvious.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) For each $x \in X$, let

$$\Downarrow x = \bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{P}X \mid x \leq \sup A\}.$$

We show that for all $x \in X$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$\Downarrow x \subseteq A \iff x \leq \sup A,$$

which entails that

$$\Downarrow: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$$

is left adjoint to

$$\sup: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X.$$

To this end, we check that each $x \in X$ is the join of $\Downarrow x$, i.e. $\sup \Downarrow x = x$.

Index the family $\{A \in \mathcal{P}X \mid x \leq \sup A\}$ as $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$; for each i , index the elements of A_i as $\{x_{i,j} \mid j \in J_i\}$. Since each A_i is a lower set, it follows that for each $f \in \prod_{i \in I} J_i$,

$$\inf_{i \in I} x_{i,f(i)} \in \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Then, from the complete distributivity law it follows that x is the join of $\Downarrow x$ which is, by definition, the intersection $\bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$. \square

Corollary 2.28. *The totally below relation in a completely distributive lattice X is interpolative in the sense that if $x \triangleleft y$ then there is some $z \in X$ such that $x \triangleleft z \triangleleft y$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that the map $\Downarrow: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$, being a left adjoint, preserves joins. \square

For each ordered set X , the set $\mathcal{P}X$ of all lower sets of X ordered by inclusion is a completely distributive lattice. That $(\mathcal{P}X, \subseteq)$ is a complete lattice is trivial. For each $A \in \mathcal{P}X$, it is clear that for every $x \in A$, the lower set $\downarrow x$ is totally below A , and A is the join of $\{\downarrow x \mid x \in A\}$, so, $\mathcal{P}X$ is a completely distributive lattice.

Proposition 2.29. *The complete distributivity law is self dual in the sense that if X is a completely distributive lattice, then so is X^{op} .*

Proof. By Theorem 2.27, it suffices to check that for each family $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ of upper sets in X ,

$$\inf \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i = \sup \inf_{i \in I} A_i.$$

We only need to check that the left side is smaller than or equal to the right side. To this end, we check that if x is totally below $\inf \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$, then $x \leq \inf A_i$ for some $i \in I$. Suppose on the contrary that $x \not\leq \inf A_i$ for any $i \in I$. Take some z such that $x \triangleleft z \triangleleft \inf \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$; for each i take some $a_i \in A_i$ with $x \not\leq a_i$. Since each A_i is an upper set, it follows that

$$\sup_{i \in I} a_i \in \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Thus, $z \not\leq \sup_{i \in I} a_i$, contradicting that $z \leq \inf \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$. \square

Domains

Suppose X is an ordered set and $\text{Idl } X$ is the set of ideals (= directed lower sets) of X ordered by inclusion. Since for each $x \in X$, the principal lower set $\downarrow x$ is an ideal, the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ factors through $\text{Idl } X$. We also use the symbol y to denote the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\text{Idl } X$. This will cause no confusion, it is easily detected from the context which one is meant.

Let x, y be elements of a partially ordered X . We say that x is *way below* y , in symbols $x \ll y$, if for each directed set D of X with a join,

$$y \leq \sup D \implies x \leq d \text{ for some } d \in D.$$

The following facts are easily verified:

- If $x \ll y$ then $x \leq y$.
- $x \ll y$ if and only if $x \in \bigcap \{I \in \text{Idl } X \mid I \text{ has a join and } y \leq \sup I\}$.
- If $a \leq x \ll y \leq b$ then $a \ll b$.

Definition 2.30. Suppose X is a partially ordered set. We say that

- (i) X is a directed complete partially ordered set, a *dcpo* for short, if every directed subset of X has a join.
- (ii) X is a continuous partially ordered set if for each $x \in X$, the set $\{y \in X \mid y \ll x\}$ is directed and has x as a join.
- (iii) X is a domain if X is a continuous dcpo.

We say that a map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between ordered sets is *Scott continuous* if it preserves directed joins. With dcpo's and Scott continuous maps we have a category

dcpo.

Theorem 2.31. *Suppose X is a partially ordered set.*

- (i) X is a dcpo if and only if the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \text{Idl } X$ has a left adjoint, which is denoted by $\sup: \text{Idl } X \rightarrow X$.
- (ii) X is continuous if and only if for each $x \in X$, there is a directed set D consisting of elements that are way below x such that $x = \sup D$.

- (iii) X is a domain if and only if the left adjoint $\text{sup}: \text{Idl } X \rightarrow X$ of $\text{y}: X \rightarrow \text{Idl } X$ has a left adjoint, which is denoted by $\downarrow: X \rightarrow \text{Idl } X$. In this case, $\downarrow x = \{z \in X \mid z \ll x\}$.

Therefore, a partially ordered set X is a domain if there is a string of adjunctions

$$\downarrow \dashv \text{sup} \dashv \text{y}: X \rightarrow \text{Idl } X.$$

Corollary 2.32. *The way below relation in a continuous partially ordered set X is interpolative in the sense that $x \ll y$ implies that $x \ll z \ll y$ for some $z \in X$.*

Example 2.33. For each ordered set X , the set $\text{Idl } X$ of all ideals of X ordered by inclusion is a domain. For each directed family $\{I_d\}_{d \in D}$ of ideals in X , the union $\bigcup_{d \in D} I_d$ is an ideal in X , and it is the join of $\{I_d\}_{d \in D}$ in $(\text{Idl } X, \subseteq)$, hence $(\text{Idl } X, \subseteq)$ is directed complete. For each ideal I of X , it is clear that I is the join of the directed family $\{\downarrow x \mid x \in I\}$ of ideals. Since for each $x \in I$, the principal ideal $\downarrow x$ is way below I in $(\text{Idl } X, \subseteq)$, it follows that $\text{Idl } X$ is a domain.

Definition 2.34. (Scott [68]) A partially ordered set is a continuous lattice if it is at the same time a domain and a complete lattice.

It is clear that a subset A of a join semilattice X is an ideal if and only if A is a lower set and closed under binary joins. So, the intersection of a family of ideals in a bounded lattice is also an ideal, though the (set-theoretic) intersection of a family of ideals in a partially ordered may fail to be so.

For a bounded lattice X , the set of ideals $\text{Idl } X$ is closed under meets in $\mathcal{P}X$, so it is a complete lattice and the inclusion $\text{Idl } X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ has a left adjoint. In particular, if X is a completely distributive lattice, then the composite of $\downarrow: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ and the left adjoint of the inclusion $\text{Idl } X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is left adjoint to $\text{sup}: \text{Idl } X \rightarrow X$. This shows that every completely distributive lattice is continuous.

Theorem 2.35. *For each complete lattice X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is continuous.
- (2) The map $\text{sup}: \text{Idl } X \rightarrow X$ is a right adjoint.
- (3) X satisfies the directed distributivity law: for any family $\{x_{t,s} \mid t \in T, s \in S_t\}$ of elements of X such that $\{x_{t,s} \mid s \in S_t\}$ is directed for each $t \in T$, it holds that

$$\inf_{t \in T} \sup_{s \in S_t} x_{t,s} = \sup_{f \in \prod_{t \in T} S_t} \inf_{t \in T} x_{t,f(t)}.$$

Definition 2.36. Suppose X is a lattice and $x \in X$. We say that

- (i) x is meet-irreducible if, $a \wedge b = x \implies x = a$ or $x = b$.
- (ii) x is prime if, $a \wedge b \leq x \implies a \leq x$ or $b \leq x$.
- (iii) x is join-irreducible if, $x = a \vee b \implies x = a$ or $x = b$.
- (iv) x is coprime if, $x \leq a \vee b \implies x \leq a$ or $x \leq b$.

It is clear that x is meet-irreducible in X if and only if x is join-irreducible in X^{op} ; x is prime in X if and only if x is coprime in X^{op} . Every prime element is meet-irreducible, but the converse is not true.

Proposition 2.37. *Every meet-irreducible element in a distributive lattice is prime.*

Proposition 2.38. *Suppose x and y are elements of a continuous lattice X with $x \not\leq y$. Then there is a meet-irreducible element p with $y \leq p$ and $x \not\leq p$.*

Proof. Since X is a continuous lattice and $x \not\leq y$, there is some $z \ll x$ such that $z \not\leq y$. By interpolation property of the way below relation, there is a sequence of elements $\{z_n\}_n$ with

$$z \ll \cdots \ll z_n \ll z_{n-1} \ll \cdots \ll z_1 = x.$$

Let $U = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \uparrow z_n$. It is clear that U is an upper set and closed under finite meets.

Pick a maximal chain C in $X \setminus U$ that contains y and set $p = \sup C$. We claim that p is not in U , hence maximal in $X \setminus U$. Otherwise, there is some n such that $z_n \leq p$. Since $z_{n+1} \ll z_n$ and C is a chain, it follows that $z_{n+1} \leq c$ for some $c \in C$, contradicting that $c \notin U$. It is obvious that $y \leq p$ and $x \not\leq p$, so, it remains to check that p is meet-irreducible. Suppose that $p = a \wedge b$. Since U is closed under finite meets, either $a \notin U$ or $b \notin U$. Finally, since p is maximal in $X \setminus U$, it follows that $p = a$ or $p = b$. \square

The above conclusion shows that each element in a continuous lattice is the meet of a family of meet-irreducible elements. In other words, every continuous lattice has enough meet-irreducible elements.

We say that a complete lattice X has enough coprimes if every element of X is the join of a set of coprimes.

Theorem 2.39. *For each complete lattice X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is a completely distributive.
- (2) X is distributive and both X and X^{op} are continuous lattices.
- (3) X is continuous and has enough coprimes.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) First, it follows from the complete distributivity law that X is distributive. Second, since complete distributivity is self-dual and every completely distributive lattice is continuous, it follows that both X and X^{op} are continuous lattices.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Apply Proposition 2.38 to X^{op} .

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Since X is continuous and has enough coprimes, for each $x \in X$,

$$x = \sup\{z \in X \mid z \ll x\} = \sup\{z \in X \mid z \text{ is coprime and } z \ll x\}.$$

Since for each coprime z , z is way below x implies z is totally below x , the conclusion thus follows. \square

3. CONTINUOUS T-NORM

The interval $[0, 1]$ together with a continuous t-norm is our truth-value set. So, the structure of continuous t-norms is of fundamental importance in the development of real-enriched categories. For sake of self-containment and convenience of the reader, proofs of the well-known characterization of continuous Archimedean t-norms (Theorem 3.20) and the ordinal sum decomposition of continuous t-norms (Theorem 3.25) are included. Standard references for continuous t-norms are the monographs: Alsina, Frank, Schweizer [3], and Klement, Mesiar, Pap [38].

Definition 3.1. A triangular norm (a t-norm for short) on an interval $[a, b]$, where a is allowed to be $-\infty$ and b is allowed to be ∞ , is a binary operator $\&$ such that for all $x, y, z \in [a, b]$,

- (T1) $x \& y = y \& x$;
- (T2) $(x \& y) \& z = x \& (y \& z)$;
- (T3) $x \& y \leq x \& z$ whenever $y \leq z$;
- (T4) $x \& b = x$.

From (iii) and (iv) we immediately obtain that $a \& x = a$ for all $x \in [a, b]$.

In the vocabulary of lattice theory, a t-norm on $[a, b]$ is a binary operator $\&$ such that $([a, b], \&, b)$ is a commutative lattice-ordered monoid, see e.g. Birkhoff [8]. In the language of category theory, a t-norm is a binary operator $\&$ such that $([a, b], \&, b)$ is a commutative monoid in the category of ordered sets and order-preserving maps, see e.g. Mac Lane [55].

Suppose $\&_1$ is a t-norm on $[a_1, b_1]$ and $\&_2$ is a t-norm on $[a_2, b_2]$. We say that $\&_1$ is *isomorphic* to $\&_2$ if there is an order-preserving bijection $f: [a_1, b_1] \rightarrow [a_2, b_2]$ such that for all $x, y \in [a_1, b_1]$,

$$f(x \&_1 y) = f(x) \&_2 f(y).$$

Given a t-norm $\&$ on $[c, d]$ and an order isomorphism $f: [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$, the binary operator

$$\&_f: [a, b] \times [a, b] \rightarrow [a, b], \quad x \&_f y = f^{-1}(f(x) \& f(y))$$

is a t-norm on $[a, b]$ and isomorphic to $\&$. This fact shows that we only need to consider t-norms on the unit interval $[0, 1]$.

Example 3.2. Some basic t-norms on $[0, 1]$:

- (i) The Gödel t-norm: $x \& y = \min\{x, y\}$.
- (ii) The product t-norm: $x \& y = x \cdot y$.
- (iii) The Łukasiewicz t-norm: $x \& y = \max\{x + y - 1, 0\}$.
- (iv) The nilpotent minimum t-norm:

$$x \& y = \begin{cases} 0 & x + y \leq 1, \\ \min\{x, y\} & x + y > 1. \end{cases}$$

- (v) The drastic product t-norm:

$$x \& y = \begin{cases} 0 & x, y < 1, \\ \min\{x, y\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that every t-norm on $[0, 1]$ lies between the drastic product and the Gödel t-norm.

Example 3.3. The addition $+$ is a t-norm on the interval $[-\infty, 0]$. The correspondence $x \mapsto e^x$ defines an isomorphism $([-\infty, 0], +, 0) \rightarrow ([0, 1], \cdot, 1)$.

Example 3.4 (Truncated addition). For each $a \in (-\infty, 0)$, the truncated addition

$$+_a: [a, 0] \times [a, 0] \rightarrow [a, 0], \quad x +_a y = \max\{a, x + y\}$$

is a t-norm on $[a, 0]$.

Example 3.5 (Truncated product). For each $b \in (0, 1)$, the truncated product

$$\cdot_b: [b, 1] \times [b, 1] \rightarrow [b, 1], \quad x \cdot_b y = \max\{b, x \cdot y\}$$

is a t-norm on $[b, 1]$.

Proposition 3.6. For all $a \in (-\infty, 0)$ and $b \in (0, 1)$, the following t-norms are isomorphic to each other:

- (i) The truncated addition on $[a, 0]$.
- (ii) The truncated product on $[b, 1]$.
- (iii) The Łukasiewicz t-norm on $[0, 1]$.

Proof. It is clear that the truncated addition on $[a, 0]$ is isomorphic to the truncated addition on $[-2, 0]$ and the truncated product on $[b, 1]$ is isomorphic to the truncated product on $[1/4, 1]$, so it suffices to show that both the truncated addition on $[-2, 0]$ and the truncated product on $[1/4, 1]$ are isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm on $[0, 1]$.

The map

$$f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [1/4, 1], \quad f(x) = 2^{2(x-1)}$$

defines an isomorphism between the Łukasiewicz t-norm on $[0, 1]$ and the truncated product on $[1/4, 1]$; the map

$$g: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-2, 0], \quad g(x) = 2(x - 1)$$

defines an isomorphism between the Łukasiewicz t-norm on $[0, 1]$ and the truncated addition on $[-2, 0]$. The proof is thus completed. \square

Given a t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ and $x \in [0, 1]$, the powers (with respect to $\&$) is defined recursively by

$$x^1 = x \quad \text{and} \quad x^{n+1} = x^n \& x$$

for all positive integers n . For all x and n , $x^{n+1} \leq x^n$, so $\{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence. By associativity of $\&$ we have

$$x^{m+n} = x^m \& x^n = x^n \& x^m \quad \text{and} \quad x^{mn} = (x^m)^n = (x^n)^m$$

for all $m, n \geq 1$.

Definition 3.7. Suppose $\&$ is a t-norm on $[0, 1]$ and $x \in [0, 1]$. We say that

- (i) x is idempotent if $x \& x = x$;
- (ii) x is nilpotent if $x^n = 0$ for some $n \geq 1$.

The Gödel t-norm and the product t-norm have only one nilpotent element. Every element in $[0, 1)$ is nilpotent for the Łukasiewicz t-norm and the drastic t-norm. For the nilpotent minimum t-norm, every $x \in [0, 1/2]$ is nilpotent.

Definition 3.8. A t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ is Archimedean if for all $x, y \in (0, 1)$, there is some n such that $x^n < y$.

Both the product t-norm and the Łukasiewicz t-norm are Archimedean.

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose $\&$ is an Archimedean t-norm. If $\&$ has a nonzero nilpotent element, then all $x \in [0, 1)$ are nilpotent.*

Proof. Suppose that $a > 0$ is a nilpotent element of $\&$. Then $a^m = 0$ for some $m \geq 1$. For each $x < 1$, since $\&$ is Archimedean, there is some n such that $x^n < a$. Then $x^{nm} \leq a^m = 0$. \square

A t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ is *left continuous on the first variable* if for each y and each increasing sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $[0, 1]$,

$$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (x_n \& y) = (\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} x_n) \& y.$$

By commutativity of $\&$, left continuity on the first variable implies left continuity on the second variable.

Definition 3.10. Let $\&$ be a t-norm on $[0, 1]$. We say that

- (i) $\&$ is left continuous if it is left continuous on each variable;
- (ii) $\&$ is continuous if it is a continuous map $[0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with respect to the usual topology.

Said differently, a left continuous t-norm is a binary operator $\&$ on the unit interval such that $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ is a commutative and unital quantale. Every continuous t-norm is left continuous. The Gödel t-norm, the product t-norm and the Łukasiewicz t-norm are all continuous; the nilpotent minimum t-norm is left continuous but not continuous; the drastic product t-norm is not left continuous.

Suppose $\&$ is a left continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$. For each $x \in [0, 1]$, the map

$$x \& -: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

has a right adjoint

$$x \rightarrow -: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1].$$

For all $x, y, z \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$x \& y \leq z \iff y \leq x \rightarrow z.$$

Because of this property, in fuzzy logic left continuous t-norms and their right adjoints are employed to model the logic connectives “conjunction” and “implication”, respectively. So, the binary operator

$$\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad (x, y) \mapsto x \rightarrow y$$

is called the *implication* of the t-norm $\&$.

Example 3.11. (i) The implication operator of the Gödel t-norm:

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y, \\ y & x > y. \end{cases}$$

It is continuous on $[0, 1]^2 \setminus \{(x, x) \mid x < 1\}$.

(ii) The implication operator of the product t-norm:

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y, \\ y/x & x > y. \end{cases}$$

It is continuous except at $(0, 0)$.

(iii) The implication operator of the Łukasiewicz t-norm:

$$x \rightarrow y = \min\{1, 1 - x + y\}.$$

It is continuous on $[0, 1]^2$.

(iv) The implication operator of the nilpotent minimum t-norm is given by

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y, \\ \max\{1 - x, y\} & x > y. \end{cases}$$

It is continuous on $[0, 1]^2 \setminus \{(x, x) \mid x < 1\}$.

Proposition 3.12. (Hájek [24]) *For each left continuous t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\&$ is continuous.
- (2) $\&$ is divisible in the sense that if $x \leq y$, then $x = y \& z$ for some $z \in [0, 1]$.
- (3) For all $x, y \in [0, 1]$, $x \& (x \rightarrow y) = \min\{x, y\}$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose that $x \leq y$. Since $y \& 0 = 0$ and $y \& 1 = y$, by continuity of $\&$, the function $y \& -$ maps $[0, 1]$ onto $[0, y]$, then there is some $z \in [0, 1]$ such that $x = y \& z$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) The equality is trivial if $x \leq y$. Assume that $x > y$. Since $\&$ is divisible, $y = x \& z$ for some $z \in [0, 1]$. Then, by definition of \rightarrow , $z \leq x \rightarrow y$, hence

$$y = x \& z \leq x \& (x \rightarrow y) \leq y,$$

and consequently, $x \& (x \rightarrow y) = \min\{x, y\}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) It suffices to show that $\&$ is separately continuous. Suppose on the contrary that there is some y such that $y \& -: [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ is not continuous. Since $y \& -$ preserves joins, there must exist some x such that

$$y \& x < \inf_{z > x} (y \& z).$$

Pick some b with

$$y \& x < b < \inf_{z > x} (y \& z).$$

Then $b < y$ and $y \& z \neq b$ for all $z \in [0, 1]$, contradicting $y \& (y \rightarrow b) = b$. \square

Corollary 3.13. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$ and b is an idempotent element. Then*

- (i) $y \& x = \min\{x, y\} = x$ whenever $x \leq b \leq y$.
- (ii) $y \rightarrow x = x$ whenever $x < b \leq y$.

Proof. (i) Since $b \& b = b$, then

$$x = b \& (b \rightarrow x) = b \& b \& (b \rightarrow x) \leq b \& x \leq x,$$

hence

$$x = b \& x \leq y \& x \leq x,$$

so $x = y \& x$.

(ii) Since $\&$ is continuous, then $y \& (y \rightarrow x) = x < b$, so we must have $y \rightarrow x < b$. Thus, by (i) we have

$$x = y \& (y \rightarrow x) = y \rightarrow x. \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.14. *Let $\&$ be a continuous t -norm on $[0, 1]$. Then for any idempotent elements a and b with $a < b$, the restriction of $\&$ on $[a, b]$ is a continuous t -norm on the interval $[a, b]$.*

Continuous Archimedean t -norm

Proposition 3.15. *A continuous t -norm $\&$ is Archimedean if and only if it has no idempotent element other than 0 and 1.*

Proof. Necessity is clear. For sufficiency, we show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = 0$ for each $x < 1$. Since $\{x^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence, the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n$ exists. Let $b = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n$. From continuity of $\&$ one infers that $b \& b = b$, so b is idempotent and $b = 0$. \square

Proposition 3.16. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t -norm on $[0, 1]$.*

- (i) *If $x^n > 0$ then $x^n > x^{n+1}$.*
- (ii) *If $x^n > 0$ then $x^n > y^n$ whenever $x > y$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose on the contrary that $x^n = x^n \& x$. By induction we have $x^n = x^n \& x^m$ for all $m \geq 1$. So,

$$x^n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} (x^n \& x^m) = x^n \& \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} x^m = x^n \& 0 = 0,$$

contradicting that $x^n > 0$.

(ii) Suppose on the contrary that $x^n \leq y^n$. Since $\&$ is divisible, $y = x \& z$ for some $z < 1$. Then

$$x^n \leq y^n = y^{n-1} \& x \& z \leq x^n \& z.$$

Consequently,

$$x^n \leq x^n \& \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} z^m = x^n \& 0 = 0,$$

contradicting that $x^n > 0$. \square

Suppose $t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ is continuous and strictly increasing and $t(1) = 0$. Since t preserves meets, it has a left adjoint

$$t^{-1}: [-\infty, 0] \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad t^{-1}(x) = \begin{cases} t^{-1}(x) & x \in [t(0), 0], \\ 0 & x < t(0). \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3.17. *The left adjoint $t^{-1}: [-\infty, 0] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfies:*

- (i) $t^{-1} \circ t(x) = x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$.
- (ii) $t \circ t^{-1}(x) = x$ for all $x \in [t(0), 0]$.
- (iii) t^{-1} is continuous and is strictly increasing on $[t(0), 0]$.

Proposition 3.18. *Suppose $t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ is continuous and strictly increasing and $t(1) = 0$. Define a binary operator $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ by*

$$x \& y = t^{-1}(t(x) + t(y)),$$

where t^{-1} is the left adjoint of t . Then

- (i) $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm.
- (ii) $\&$ has a nonzero nilpotent element if and only if $t(0) > -\infty$.
- (iii) $\&$ is isomorphic to the truncated addition on $[t(0), 0]$.

The function $t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ is called an additive generator of the t-norm $\&$.

Proof. (i) The verification of that $\&$ is a continuous t-norm is routine. To see that $\&$ is Archimedean, suppose $0 < x < y < 1$. Since t is strictly increasing, then $0 > t(y) > t(x) > -\infty$. Pick some $n \geq 1$ with $nt(y) < t(x)$, then

$$y^n = t^{-1}(nt(y)) < t^{-1}(t(x)) = x.$$

(ii) Suppose $t(0) > -\infty$. For each $x < 1$, since $t(x) < 0$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $nt(x) \leq t(0)$, then $x^n = t^{-1}(nt(x)) = 0$, hence every $x < 1$ is a nilpotent element of $\&$. Now suppose $t(0) = -\infty$. For each $x < 1$, since $t(x) > -\infty$ and t^{-1} is strictly increasing on $[-\infty, 0]$, it follows that for all $n \geq 1$,

$$x^n = t^{-1}(nt(x)) > t^{-1}(-\infty) = 0,$$

so $\&$ has no nilpotent element other than 0.

(iii) By definition. □

Example 3.19. (i) The function

$$t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0], \quad t(x) = \ln x$$

is an additive generator of the product t-norm.

(ii) The function

$$t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0], \quad t(x) = x - 1$$

is an additive generator of the Łukasiewicz t-norm.

(iii) For each $p > 0$, the function

$$t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0], \quad t(x) = x^p - 1$$

is continuous and strictly increasing and $t(1) = 0$. The t-norm $\&_p$ with t as additive generator is given by

$$x \&_p y = (\max\{x^p + y^p - 1, 0\})^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The Gödel t-norm is the limit of $\&_p$ when p tends to 0; the drastic product is the limit of $\&_p$ when p tends to infinity.

Theorem 3.20. *Every continuous Archimedean t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ has an additive generator. That means, there exists a continuous and strictly increasing function $t: [0, 1] \rightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ with $t(1) = 0$ such that for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$,*

$$x \& y = t^{-1}(t(x) + t(y)),$$

where t^{-1} is the left adjoint of t .

We make some preparations first. Under the assumption of Theorem 3.20, define for each natural number $n \geq 1$ a function

$$f_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

by

$$f_n(x) = x^n.$$

Then $f_n(0) = 0$, $f_n(1) = 1$, f_n is continuous and is strictly increasing whenever it is positive. In particular, $f_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ preserves joins, so it has a right adjoint

$$g_n: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1],$$

which sends each $x > 0$ to the unique y with $y^n = x$.

Lemma 3.21. For each $n \geq 1$, let

$$a_n = g_n(0) = \sup\{x \in [0, 1] \mid f_n(x) = 0\}.$$

Then for all $n, m \geq 1$, we have:

- (i) $f_n(a_n) = 0$ and f_n is continuous and strictly increasing on $[a_n, 1]$.
- (ii) $g_n(0) = a_n$ and g_n is continuous and strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$.
- (iii) For all $x \in [0, 1]$, $f_n \circ g_n(x) = x$; for all $x \in [a_n, 1]$, $g_n \circ f_n(x) = x$.
- (iv) $f_n(x) \geq f_{n+1}(x)$ and $g_n(x) \geq g_{n+1}(x)$.
- (v) $f_n \circ f_m(x) = f_{nm}(x) = f_m \circ f_n(x)$.
- (vi) $g_n \circ g_m(x) = g_{nm}(x) = g_m \circ g_n(x)$.
- (vii) For each natural number $k \geq 1$, $f_{kn} \circ g_{km} = f_n \circ g_m$.

Proof. (i)-(v) are left to the reader. (vi) follows from the fact that all of the functions $g_n \circ g_m$, g_{nm} and $g_m \circ g_n$ are right adjoint to f_{nm} . As for (vii), since $f_{kn} \circ g_{km} = f_n \circ f_k \circ g_k \circ g_m$ by (v) and (vi), the conclusion follows from (iii) immediately. \square

For each rational number $r = -n/m < 0$, define

$$f_r: [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$$

by

$$f_r = f_n \circ g_m.$$

Lemma 3.21 (vii) ensures that f_r is well-defined.

Lemma 3.22. Fix some $c \in (0, 1)$. Define a function

$$h: \mathbb{Q} \cap (-\infty, 0] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$$

by

$$h(0) = 1, \quad h(r) = f_r(c) \text{ for all } r < 0.$$

Then

- (i) If $r < s$ and $h(s) > 0$, then $h(r) < h(s)$.
- (ii) For all $r, s \in (-\infty, 0]$, $h(r + s) = h(r) \& h(s)$.
- (iii) $\lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} h(r) = 0$.
- (iv) h is uniformly continuous.

Proof. (i) Assume that $r = -m/k$, $s = -n/k$ and $m > n$. Then

$$h(s) = f_n \circ g_k(c) = g_k(c)^n > g_k(c)^{n+1} \geq g_k(c)^m = f_m \circ g_k(c) = h(r).$$

(ii) Assume that $r = -m/k$, $s = -n/k$. Then

$$h(r) \& h(s) = (f_m \circ g_k(c)) \& (f_n \circ g_k(c)) = g_k(c)^{m+n} = f_{m+n} \circ g_k(c) = h(r + s).$$

(iii) This follows from (i) and that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(-n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(c) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^n = 0$.

(iv) It suffices to show that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a rational number $l > 0$ such that for all $r \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-\infty, 0]$,

$$h(r + l) - \epsilon \leq h(r) \leq h(r - l) + \epsilon,$$

where we agree that $h(r + l) = 1$ if $r + l > 0$.

Since $\&$ is continuous and $[0, 1]^2$ is compact, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$|x \& y - u \& v| < \epsilon$$

whenever $|x - u| < \epsilon$ and $|y - v| < \epsilon$. Since $g_n(c)$ tends to 1 when n tends to infinity, there is a natural number N such that $1 - g_N(c) < \delta$. Let $l = 1/N$. Then

$$1 - h(-l) = 1 - f_1 \circ g_N(c) = 1 - g_N(c) < \delta.$$

We claim that l satisfies the requirement.

Since

$$h(r) - h(r - l) = |h(r) \& 1 - h(r) \& h(-l)| \leq \epsilon,$$

it follows that $h(r) \leq h(r - l) + \epsilon$. As for the inequality $h(r + l) - \epsilon \leq h(r)$, we proceed with two cases. If $r + l \leq 0$, then

$$h(r + l) - h(r) = |h(r + l) \& 1 - h(r + l) \& h(-l)| \leq \epsilon.$$

If $r + l > 0$, then

$$h(r + l) - h(r) = 1 - h(r) \leq 1 - h(-l) \leq \epsilon.$$

In either case we have $h(r + l) - \epsilon \leq h(r)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.20. Consider the function

$$h: \mathbb{Q} \cap (-\infty, 0] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$$

given in Lemma 3.22. Since h is uniformly continuous and $\lim_{r \rightarrow -\infty} h(r) = 0$, then h can be extended to a continuous function

$$\bar{h}: [-\infty, 0] \longrightarrow [0, 1].$$

By continuity of $\&$ and Lemma 3.22 (ii), for all $u, v \in [-\infty, 0]$ we have

$$\bar{h}(u + v) = \bar{h}(u) \& \bar{h}(v).$$

Moreover, if $u < v$ and $\bar{h}(v) > 0$, then $\bar{h}(u) < \bar{h}(v)$ by Lemma 3.22 (i).

Since $\bar{h}: [-\infty, 0] \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ preserves joins, it has a right adjoint

$$t: [0, 1] \longrightarrow [-\infty, 0].$$

We claim that t satisfies the requirement.

By definition \bar{h} is the left adjoint of t , i.e. $t^{-1} = \bar{h}$. It is readily verified that $t(1) = 0$ and that t is continuous and strictly increasing, in particular, t is injective. Then by Proposition 2.22, $t^{-1}(t(x)) = x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} x \& y &= t^{-1}(t(x)) \& t^{-1}(t(y)) \\ &= \bar{h}(t(x)) \& \bar{h}(t(y)) \\ &= \bar{h}(t(x) + t(y)) \\ &= t^{-1}(t(x) + t(y)), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.20 is the following conclusion which asserts that there are essentially only two continuous Archimedean t -norms: the product and the Łukasiewicz.

Corollary 3.23. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t -norm on $[0, 1]$.*

- (i) *If $\&$ has a nonzero nilpotent element, then $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t -norm.*
- (ii) *If $\&$ has no nonzero nilpotent element, then $\&$ is isomorphic to the product t -norm.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.20 there is a continuous and strictly increasing function $t: [0, 1] \longrightarrow [-\infty, 0]$ with $t(1) = 0$ such that

$$x \& y = t^{-1}(t(x) + t(y))$$

for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$.

(i) If $\&$ has a nonzero nilpotent element, we must have $t(0) > -\infty$. Then $\&$ is isomorphic to the truncated addition on $[t(0), 0]$, hence to the Łukasiewicz t -norm on $[0, 1]$.

(ii) If $\&$ has no nonzero nilpotent element, we must have $t(0) = -\infty$. Then $\&$ is isomorphic to the addition on $[-\infty, 0]$, hence to the product t-norm on $[0, 1]$. \square

Suppose $\&$ is a left continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$. We say that $([0, 1], \&, 1)$ (or simply $\&$) satisfies the *law of double negation* if

$$(x \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0 = x$$

for all $x \in [0, 1]$.

Both the Łukasiewicz t-norm and the nilpotent minimum satisfy the law of double negation.

Proposition 3.24. *Let $\&$ be a continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$. Then $\&$ satisfies the law of double negation if and only if $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm.*

Proof. First we show that $\&$ is Archimedean. Otherwise it has a nontrivial idempotent element, say b . Then by Corollary 3.13, $b \rightarrow 0 = 0$, hence $(b \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0 = 1$, contradicting that $\&$ satisfies the law of double negation. Next, since the product does not satisfy the law of double negation, then by Corollary 3.23, $\&$ must be isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. \square

Ordinal sum decomposition theorem

Suppose $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a countable set of pairwise disjoint open intervals in $[0, 1]$ and for each $i \in I$, $\&_i$ is a t-norm on the closed interval $[a_i, b_i]$. It is readily verified that

$$\&: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow [0, 1], \quad x \& y = \begin{cases} x \&_i y & (x, y) \in [a_i, b_i]^2, \\ \min\{x, y\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a t-norm on $[0, 1]$, called the *ordinal sum* of $\{\&_i\}_{i \in I}$. Each $\&_i$ is called a *summand* of $\&$. The ordinal sum is (left) continuous if and only if so is each of its summands. In the case that the ordinal sum $\&$ is left continuous, its implication operator is given by

$$x \rightarrow y = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq y, \\ x \rightarrow_i y & a_i \leq y < x \leq b_i \text{ for some } i, \\ y & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where \rightarrow_i is the implication operator of the t-norm $\&_i$ on $[a_i, b_i]$.

A fundamental result says that every continuous t-norm is an ordinal sum of continuous Archimedean t-norms. To see this, let $\&$ be a continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$ and let E be the set of idempotent elements of $\&$. Then E is a closed set by continuity of $\&$. The open set $[0, 1] \setminus E$ is a countable union of disjoint open intervals $\bigcup_{i \in I} (a_i, b_i)$. By Corollary 3.14, the restriction of $\&$ on each $[a_i, b_i]$ is a continuous t-norm without nontrivial idempotent elements, hence a continuous Archimedean t-norm. By Corollary 3.13, $x \& y = \min\{x, y\}$ whenever $(x, y) \notin \bigcup_{i \in I} [a_i, b_i]^2$. This proves the following *ordinal sum decomposition theorem* for continuous t-norms.

Theorem 3.25. (Mostert and Shields [61, Theorem B]) *Every continuous t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$ is an ordinal sum of continuous Archimedean t-norms. This means, for each continuous t-norm $\&$ on $[0, 1]$, there exists a countable set of disjoint open intervals $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i \in I}$ in $[0, 1]$ such that*

- (i) *for each $i \in I$, both a_i and b_i are idempotent and the restriction of $\&$ on the closed interval $[a_i, b_i]$ is Archimedean;*
- (ii) *$x \& y = \min\{x, y\}$ whenever $(x, y) \notin \bigcup_{i \in I} [a_i, b_i]^2$.*

Each $[a_i, b_i]$ with the restriction of $\&$ is called an Archimedean block of $\&$.

Proposition 3.26. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous t-norm on $[0, 1]$. For each $p \in [0, 1]$, let p^- be the greatest idempotent element in $[0, p]$ and let p^+ be the least idempotent element in $[p, 1]$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *For each non-idempotent element $p \in [0, 1]$, the restriction of $\&$ on $[p^-, p^+]$ is isomorphic to the product t-norm on $[0, 1]$ whenever $p^- > 0$.*
- (2) *The implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal $\{(x, x) \mid x \in [0, 1]\}$.*
- (3) *For each $p \in (0, 1]$, the function $p \rightarrow -: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous on the interval $[0, p)$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) It suffices to show that \rightarrow is continuous at each point (x, y) with $x > y$. If there is some idempotent element b satisfying $y < b < x$, then $(b, 1] \times [0, b)$ is a neighborhood of (x, y) such that $x' \rightarrow y' = y'$ for all $(x', y') \in (b, 1] \times [0, b)$, hence \rightarrow is continuous at (x, y) . If there is no idempotent element between x and y , then x and y belong to the same block by the ordinal sum decomposition theorem. That means, there exists a non-idempotent p such that $p^- \leq y < x \leq p^+$ and that the restriction of $\&$ on $[p^-, p^+]$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm. Now we proceed with two cases.

Case 1. $p^- = 0$. Then the conclusion follows from the fact that the implication operator of a continuous Archimedean t-norm on $[0, 1]$ is continuous except possibly at $(0, 0)$.

Case 2. $p^- \neq 0$. In this case, the restriction of $\&$ on $[p^-, p^+]$ is isomorphic to the product t-norm on $[0, 1]$. We only need to show that for all $x > p^-$, the function $x \rightarrow -: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at p^- . Since $x \rightarrow z = z$ for each $z < p^-$, the right limit of $x \rightarrow -$ at p^- is equal to p^- , then $\lim_{z \rightarrow p^-} (x \rightarrow z) = p^- = x \rightarrow p^-$, hence $x \rightarrow -$ is continuous at p^- .

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Obvious.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose on the contrary that there is some non-idempotent element p for which $p^- > 0$ and the restriction of $\&$ on $[p^-, p^+]$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. Then the function $p \rightarrow -: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is not continuous at p^- , a contradiction. \square

Thus, for a continuous t-norm $\&$, the implication operator

$$\rightarrow: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

is continuous at every point off the diagonal $\{(x, x) \mid x \in [0, 1]\}$ if and only if it is *almost Łukasiewicz free* in the sense that $\&$ has at most one Archimedean block that is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm and that block should start at 0. Such t-norms are first studied by Morsi [59, 60].

Convention. From now on, we always assume that $\&$ is a continuous t-norm on the interval $[0, 1]$.

4. REAL-ENRICHED CATEGORIES

Suppose X, Y are sets. A $[0, 1]$ -relation $r: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a map $r: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the value $r(x, y)$ is interpreted as the degree that x is related to y . For a $[0, 1]$ -relation $r: X \dashrightarrow Y$, the $[0, 1]$ -relation

$$r^{\text{op}}: Y \dashrightarrow X, \quad r^{\text{op}}(x, y) = r(y, x)$$

is called the opposite of r .

$[0, 1]$ -relations can be composed. Given $[0, 1]$ -relations $r: X \dashrightarrow Y$ and $s: Y \dashrightarrow Z$, the composite $s \circ r$ is the $[0, 1]$ -relation $X \dashrightarrow Z$ given by

$$s \circ r(x, z) = \sup_{y \in Y} s(y, z) \& r(x, y).$$

For each set X , write $\text{id}_X: X \rightarrow X$ for the $[0, 1]$ -relation given by

$$\text{id}_X(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x = y, \\ 0 & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

Then id_X is a unit for the composition of $[0, 1]$ -relations; that is, $r \circ \text{id}_X = r = \text{id}_Y \circ r$ for each $[0, 1]$ -relation $r: X \rightarrow Y$. So, we call id_X the identity relation on X .

The composition of $[0, 1]$ -relations is associative. Therefore, with sets as objects and $[0, 1]$ -relations as arrows we obtain a category

$$[0, 1]\text{-Rel}.$$

The category $[0, 1]\text{-Rel}$ has an important property: for all objects X, Y , the hom-set

$$[0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Y)$$

is a complete lattice under the pointwise order, the composition of $[0, 1]$ -relations preserves joins in both variables.

Proposition 4.1. *For all sets X, Y, Z , the composition*

$$\circ: [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(Y, Z) \times [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Y) \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Z)$$

preserves joins on each variable.

Therefore, $[0, 1]\text{-Rel}$ is a quantaloid in the sense of [65, 72]. This fact has far-reaching consequences, it plays a crucial role in the calculus of $[0, 1]$ -relations, as we see now.

For each $[0, 1]$ -relation $r: X \rightarrow Y$, since \circ preserves joins in each variable, the map

$$- \circ r: [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(Y, Z) \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Z)$$

has a right adjoint

$$- \swarrow r: [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Z) \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(Y, Z).$$

Explicitly, for each $t: X \rightarrow Z$, the $[0, 1]$ -relation $t \swarrow r: Y \rightarrow Z$ is computed as follows:

$$(t \swarrow r)(y, z) = \inf_{x \in X} (r(x, y) \rightarrow t(x, z)).$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{r} & Y \\ \downarrow t & \begin{array}{c} \geq \\ \swarrow \\ \searrow \end{array} & \\ Z & & \end{array}$$

Likewise, for each $[0, 1]$ -relation $s: Y \rightarrow Z$, the map

$$s \circ -: [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Y) \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Z)$$

has a right adjoint

$$s \searrow -: [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Z) \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Rel}(X, Y)$$

given by

$$(s \searrow t)(x, y) = \inf_{z \in Z} (s(y, z) \rightarrow t(x, z))$$

for all $t: X \rightarrow Z$ and $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{s} & Z \\ \swarrow s \searrow t & \begin{array}{c} \leq \\ \swarrow \\ \searrow \end{array} & \uparrow t \\ & & X \end{array}$$

Some basic properties of the $[0, 1]$ -relation calculus are listed below:

- (i) For all $[0, 1]$ -relations $r: X \rightarrow Y$, $s: Y \rightarrow Z$ and $t: X \rightarrow Z$,

$$s \leq t \swarrow r \iff s \circ r \leq t \iff r \leq s \searrow t.$$

- (ii) For all $r: X \rightarrow Y$ and $s: X \rightarrow Y$,

$$\text{id}_X \leq r \searrow s \iff r \leq s \iff \text{id}_Y \leq s \swarrow r.$$

- (iii) For all $r: X \rightarrow Y$, $s: Y \rightarrow Z$ and $t: X \rightarrow W$,

$$t \swarrow (s \circ r) = (t \swarrow r) \swarrow s.$$

- (iv) For all $r: X \rightarrow Y$, $s: Y \rightarrow Z$ and $t: W \rightarrow Z$,

$$(s \circ r) \searrow t = r \searrow (s \searrow t).$$

- (v) For all $r: X \rightarrow Y$, $s: W \rightarrow Z$ and $t: X \rightarrow Z$,

$$(s \searrow t) \swarrow r = s \searrow (t \swarrow r).$$

Definition 4.2. A real-enriched category is a pair (X, α) , where X is a set and $\alpha: X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a function such that

- (i) $\alpha(x, x) = 1$ for all $x \in X$;
(ii) $\alpha(y, z) \& \alpha(x, y) \leq \alpha(x, z)$ for all $x, y, z \in X$.

If we interpret the value $\alpha(x, y)$ as the truth degree that x is smaller than or equal to y , then (i) is reflexivity and (ii) is transitivity. So, real-enriched categories can be viewed as many-valued ordered sets.

To ease notations, for a real-enriched category (X, α) , we often omit the symbol α and write $X(x, y)$ for $\alpha(x, y)$.

Two elements x and y of a real-enriched category X are *isomorphic* if $X(x, y) = 1 = X(y, x)$. A real-enriched category X is *separated* if its isomorphic elements are identical.

Example 4.3. (i) The pair $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is a separated real-enriched category, where for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha_L(x, y) = x \rightarrow y$. The opposite of $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is denoted by $([0, 1], \alpha_R)$; that means, $\alpha_R(x, y) = y \rightarrow x$. In the language of enriched category theory, α_L is the *internal hom* of (the truth-value set) $([0, 1], \&, 1)$. In the sequel we write \mathbf{V} for $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$, hence \mathbf{V}^{op} for $([0, 1], \alpha_R)$. Both \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{V}^{op} play an important role in the theory of real-enriched categories.

- (ii) For each set X , $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X)$ is a separated real-enriched category, where for all $\lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]^X$,

$$\text{sub}_X(\lambda, \mu) = \inf_{x \in X} \lambda(x) \rightarrow \mu(x).$$

If we, following Zadeh [85], view λ and μ as fuzzy subsets of X , then the value $\text{sub}_X(\lambda, \mu)$ measures the truth degree that λ is contained in μ , so the category $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X)$ is also known as the *enriched powerset* of X .

Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories. A functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map such that $X(x, y) \leq Y(f(x), f(y))$ for all $x, y \in X$. The category of real-enriched categories and functors is denoted by

$$[0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

Given an ordered set (X, \leq) , define a map $\omega(\leq): X \times X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by $\omega(\leq)(x, y) = 1$ if $x \leq y$, and $\omega(\leq)(x, y) = 0$ otherwise. Then $(X, \omega(\leq))$ is a real-enriched category. In this way we obtain a full and faithful functor

$$\omega: \mathbf{Ord} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

The functor ω has both a left and a right adjoint. We spell out the right adjoint here. For each real-enriched category X , define a binary relation \sqsubseteq on X by $x \sqsubseteq y$ if $X(x, y) = 1$. Then \sqsubseteq is a reflexive and transitive relation, hence an order on X , called the *underlying order* of X . We write X_0 for the ordered set (X, \sqsubseteq) . The assignment $X \mapsto X_0$ defines a functor

$$(-)_0: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Ord},$$

a right adjoint of ω .

Definition 4.4. Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories, $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \longrightarrow X$ are functors. We say that f is left adjoint to g , or g is right adjoint to f , and write $f \dashv g$, if for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,

$$Y(f(x), y) = X(x, g(y)).$$

The pair (f, g) is called an adjunction, or a(n enriched) Galois connection.

This is an extension of Galois connections between ordered sets; and a special case of adjunction in the theory of enriched categories.

Theorem 4.5. *For each pair of maps $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \longrightarrow X$ between real-enriched categories, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Both f and g are functors, and f is left adjoint to g .*
- (2) *Both f and g are functors, and $f: X_0 \longrightarrow Y_0$ is left adjoint to $g: Y_0 \longrightarrow X_0$.*
- (3) *For all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, $Y(f(x), y) = X(x, g(y))$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Obvious.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Since $f(x) \sqsubseteq f(x)$, then $x \sqsubseteq gf(x)$, hence $1 \leq X(x, gf(x))$ for all $x \in X$. Likewise, $1 \leq Y(fg(y), y)$ for all $y \in Y$. So we have

$$X(x, g(y)) \leq Y(fg(y), y) \& Y(f(x), fg(y)) \leq Y(f(x), y)$$

and

$$Y(f(x), y) \leq X(gf(x), g(y)) \& X(x, gf(x)) \leq X(x, g(y)).$$

Therefore $X(x, g(y)) = Y(f(x), y)$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) It suffices to check that f and g are functors. For all $x_1, x_2 \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} X(x_1, x_2) &\leq Y(f(x_2), f(x_2)) \& X(x_1, x_2) \\ &= X(x_2, gf(x_2)) \& X(x_1, x_2) \\ &\leq X(x_1, gf(x_2)) \\ &= Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)), \end{aligned}$$

it follows that f is a functor. Likewise, g is a functor. □

Example 4.6. Suppose X, Y are set, $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ is a map. Then,

$$f^{-1}: ([0, 1]^Y, \text{sub}_Y) \longrightarrow ([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X), \quad f^{-1}(\mu) = \mu \circ f$$

is a functor, it has both a left adjoint and a right adjoint. The left adjoint

$$f_{\exists}: ([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X) \longrightarrow ([0, 1]^Y, \text{sub}_Y)$$

is given by

$$f_{\exists}(\lambda)(y) = \sup\{\lambda(x) \mid f(x) = y\};$$

the right adjoint

$$f_{\forall}: ([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X) \longrightarrow ([0, 1]^Y, \text{sub}_Y)$$

is given by

$$f_{\forall}(\lambda)(y) = \inf\{\lambda(x) \mid f(x) = y\}.$$

Therefore, we have a string of adjunctions

$$f_{\exists} \dashv f^{-1} \dashv f_{\forall}.$$

5. THE YONEDA LEMMA

Definition 5.1. Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories. A distributor ϕ from X to Y , written $\phi: X \multimap Y$, is a map $\phi: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that

- (i) for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and $y \in Y$, $\phi(x_2, y) \& X(x_1, x_2) \leq \phi(x_1, y)$;
- (ii) for all $x \in X$ and $y_1, y_2 \in Y$, $Y(y_1, y_2) \& \phi(x, y_1) \leq \phi(x, y_2)$.

If ϕ is a distributor from X to Y , then $\phi^{\text{op}}(y, x) := \phi(x, y)$ is a distributor from Y^{op} to X^{op} . As we have agreed, for each real-enriched category X , the symbol “ X ” also denotes the real-enriched category structure on X . So, a distributor $\phi: X \multimap Y$ is a $[0, 1]$ -relation $\phi: X \multimap Y$ such that $\phi \circ X \leq \phi$ and $Y \circ \phi \leq \phi$, or equivalently, $\phi \circ X = \phi = Y \circ \phi$.

Let $\phi: X \multimap Y$ be a distributor. Fixing the first argument x gives a functor

$$\phi(x, -): Y \rightarrow \mathbf{V}, \quad y \mapsto \phi(x, y),$$

where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$; fixing the second argument y gives a functor

$$\phi(-, y): X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}, \quad x \mapsto \phi(x, y).$$

Example 5.2. Every functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ induces a pair of distributors:

$$f_*: X \multimap Y, \quad f_*(x, y) = Y(f(x), y)$$

and

$$f^*: Y \multimap X, \quad f^*(y, x) = Y(y, f(x)).$$

The distributors f_* and f^* are called, respectively, the graph and the cograph of f .

A functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is *fully faithful* if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$,

$$X(x_1, x_2) = Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)).$$

We leave it to the reader to check that a functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is fully faithful if and only if $f^* \circ f_* = X$.

For every pair of real-enriched categories X and Y , the set of distributors from X to Y is a subset of the $[0, 1]$ -relations from X to Y . The following proposition says that this subset is closed with respect to various operations on $[0, 1]$ -relations.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose X, Y, Z are real-enriched categories.*

- (i) *For any distributors $\phi: X \multimap Y$ and $\psi: Y \multimap Z$, the composite $\psi \circ \phi$ is a distributor $X \multimap Z$.*
- (ii) *For each family $\{\phi_i\}_i$ of distributors $X \multimap Y$, both the pointwise join $\sup_i \phi_i$ and the pointwise meet $\inf_i \phi_i$ are distributor $X \multimap Y$.*
- (iii) *For any distributors $\phi: X \multimap Y$, $\psi: Y \multimap Z$ and $\xi: X \multimap Z$, both of the $[0, 1]$ -relations $\xi \triangleleft \phi$ and $\psi \searrow \xi$ are distributors.*

With real-enriched categories as objects and distributors as morphisms we have a category, indeed a quantaloid

$$[0, 1]\text{-Dist},$$

called the category of distributors.

Definition 5.4. Let $\phi: Y \multimap X$ and $\psi: X \multimap Y$ be a pair of distributors. We say ϕ is right adjoint to ψ , or ψ is left adjoint to ϕ , and write $\psi \dashv \phi$, if $X \leq \phi \circ \psi$ and $\psi \circ \phi \leq Y$.

Example 5.5. For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$, the graph $f_*: X \multimap Y$ is left adjoint to the cograph $f^*: Y \multimap X$.

The following lemma, contained in Heymans [25, Proposition 2.3.4], is very useful in the calculus of distributors.

Lemma 5.6. Suppose $\psi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $\phi: Y \dashrightarrow X$.

- (i) For each distributor $\xi: Y \dashrightarrow Z$, $\xi \circ \psi = \xi \swarrow \phi$. In particular, $\psi = Y \swarrow \phi$.
- (ii) For each distributor $\lambda: W \dashrightarrow Y$, $\phi \circ \lambda = \psi \searrow \lambda$. In particular, $\phi = \psi \searrow Y$.

Proof. We prove (i) for example. On the one hand, since $\xi \circ \psi \circ \phi \leq \xi \circ Y = \xi$, then $\xi \circ \psi \leq \xi \swarrow \phi$. On the other hand, since $(\xi \swarrow \phi) \circ \phi \circ \psi \leq \xi \circ \psi$, then $\xi \swarrow \phi \leq \xi \circ \psi$. \square


In particular, a distributor has at most one right (left, resp.) adjoint. So, we shall speak of *the right (left, resp.) adjoint* of a distributor.

Proposition 5.7. Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: Y \rightarrow X$ are functors. The following are equivalent:

- (1) f is left adjoint to g .
- (2) $f_* = g^*$.
- (3) As distributors, g_* is left adjoint to f_* .
- (4) As distributors, g^* is left adjoint to f^* .


Suppose X is a real-enriched category. A *weight* of X is defined to be a distributor $\phi: X \dashrightarrow \star$ from X to the terminal real-enriched category \star . In other words, a weight of X is a functor $\phi: X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. Weights of X constitute a real-enriched category $\mathcal{P}X$ with

$$\mathcal{P}X(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \phi_2 \swarrow \phi_1 = \text{sub}_X(\phi_1, \phi_2).$$



Dually, a distributor of the form $\star \dashrightarrow X$ is called a *coweight* of X . In other words, a coweight of X is a functor $\psi: X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. All coweights of X constitute a real-enriched category $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ with

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger X(\psi_1, \psi_2) = \psi_2 \searrow \psi_1 = \text{sub}_X(\psi_2, \psi_1).$$



Convention. Every functor $f: X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ determines a distributor $\star \dashrightarrow X$, $(\star, x) \mapsto f(x)$; conversely, every distributor $\psi: \star \dashrightarrow X$ determines a functor $X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, $x \mapsto \psi(\star, x)$. So, sometimes we'll view a functor $X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ as a distributor $\star \dashrightarrow X$, and vice versa. To avoid confusion of notations, we make an agreement here.

- (i) For each functor $f: X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, f^\sharp denotes the distributor $\star \dashrightarrow X$, $(\star, x) \mapsto f(x)$. For each distributor $\psi: \star \dashrightarrow X$, ψ^\sharp denotes the corresponding functor $X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, $x \mapsto \psi(\star, x)$.
- (ii) For each functor $g: X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, g^\sharp denotes the distributor $X \dashrightarrow \star$, $(x, \star) \mapsto g(x)$. For each distributor $\phi: X \dashrightarrow \star$, ϕ^\sharp denotes the corresponding functor $X^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$, $x \mapsto \phi(x, \star)$.

Remark 5.8. For each real-enriched category X , the underlying order of $\mathcal{P}X$ coincides with the (pointwise) order on $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}(X, \star)$, while the underlying order of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is the reverse order on $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}(\star, X)$. That is to say, for any weights $\phi_1, \phi_2: X \dashv\rightarrow \star$,

$$\phi_1 \sqsubseteq \phi_2 \text{ in } (\mathcal{P}X)_0 \iff \forall x \in X, \phi_1(x) \leq \phi_2(x);$$

while for any coweights $\psi_1, \psi_2: \star \dashv\rightarrow X$,

$$\psi_1 \sqsubseteq \psi_2 \text{ in } (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)_0 \iff \forall x \in X, \psi_1(x) \geq \psi_2(x).$$

Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories, $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a functor. The map

$$f^{-1}: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X, \quad f^{-1}(\gamma) = \gamma \circ f_*$$

is readily verified to be a functor. The functor f^{-1} has at the same time a left adjoint f_\exists and a right adjoint f_\forall . The left adjoint is given by

$$f_\exists: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y, \quad f_\exists(\phi) = \phi \circ f^*;$$

the right adjoint is given by

$$f_\forall: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y, \quad f_\forall(\phi) = \phi \swarrow f_*.$$

In the vocabulary of category theory, f_\exists and f_\forall are called the left and the right Kan extension of f , respectively.

Dually, the functor

$$f^{-1}: \mathcal{P}^\dagger Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X, \quad f^{-1}(\mu) = f^* \circ \mu$$

also has a left adjoint f_\forall^\dagger and a right adjoint f_\exists^\dagger . Before spelling out the left adjoint and the right adjoint, we would like to remind the reader that the underlying order of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is opposite to the pointwise order of coweights. The left adjoint of f^{-1} is

$$f_\forall^\dagger: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger Y, \quad f_\forall^\dagger(\psi) = f^* \searrow \psi;$$

the right adjoint is

$$f_\exists^\dagger: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger Y, \quad f_\exists^\dagger(\psi) = f_* \circ \psi.$$

Proposition 5.9. For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we have

$$f_\exists \dashv f^{-1} \dashv f_\forall: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$$

and

$$f_\forall^\dagger \dashv f^{-1} \dashv f_\exists^\dagger: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger Y.$$

Proposition 5.10. Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a fully faithful functor.

- (i) For all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$, $f^{-1} \circ f_\exists(\phi) = \phi = f^{-1} \circ f_\forall(\phi)$.
- (ii) For all $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, $f^{-1} \circ f_\exists^\dagger(\psi) = \psi = f^{-1} \circ f_\forall^\dagger(\psi)$.

Proof. (i) Since f is fully faithful, $f^* \circ f_* = X$, then for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$f^{-1} \circ f_\exists(\phi) = \phi \circ f^* \circ f_* = \phi$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1} \circ f_\forall(\phi) &= (\phi \swarrow f_*) \circ f_* \\ &= (\phi \swarrow f_*) \swarrow f^* && (f_* \dashv f^*) \\ &= \phi \swarrow (f^* \circ f_*) \\ &= \phi. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Similar. □

Assigning to each $f: X \rightarrow Y$ the functor

$$\mathcal{P}f := f_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$$

defines a functor

$$\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat},$$

called the *presheaf functor*.¹ This functor plays a central role in the theory of real-enriched categories. Dually, we have a *copresheaf functor*

$$\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

that maps $f: X \rightarrow Y$ to

$$\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}f := f_{\exists}^{\dagger}: \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}Y, \quad \psi \mapsto f_* \circ \psi.$$

For an element a of a real-enriched category X , we write $y(a)$ for the weight

$$X \multimap \star, \quad x \mapsto X(x, a),$$

write $y^{\dagger}(a)$ for the coweight

$$\star \multimap X, \quad x \mapsto X(a, x).$$

Weights of the form $y(a)$ and coweights of the form $y^{\dagger}(a)$ are said to be *representable*. As distributors, the representable coweight $y^{\dagger}(a): \star \multimap X$ is left adjoint to the representable weight $y(a): X \multimap \star$.

The following lemma, a special case of the Yoneda lemma in the theory of enriched categories, implies that for each real-enriched category X , both of

$$y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X, \quad a \mapsto y(a)$$

and

$$y^{\dagger}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X, \quad a \mapsto y^{\dagger}(a)$$

are fully faithful functors.

Lemma 5.11 (Yoneda lemma). *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $a \in X$.*

- (i) *For each $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$, $\mathcal{P}X(y(a), \phi) = \phi(a)$.*
- (ii) *For each $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$, $\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X(\psi, y^{\dagger}(a)) = \psi(a)$.*

Proof. (i) Since

$$\phi(a) = \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& X(a, x) = \phi \circ y^{\dagger}(a)$$

and $y(a)$ is right adjoint to $y^{\dagger}(a)$, by Lemma 5.6 we have

$$\phi(a) = \phi \circ y^{\dagger}(a) = \phi \swarrow y(a) = \mathcal{P}X(y(a), \phi).$$

- (ii) Since $\psi(a) = y(a) \circ \psi$ and $y^{\dagger}(a)$ is left adjoint to $y(a)$, by Lemma 5.6 we have

$$\psi(a) = y(a) \circ \psi = y^{\dagger}(a) \searrow \psi = \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X(\psi, y^{\dagger}(a)). \quad \square$$

From the Yoneda lemma one infers that for each real-enriched category X , the functor $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is fully faithful, so, it is called the *Yoneda embedding*. Dually, the fully faithful functor $y^{\dagger}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$ is called the *coYoneda embedding*.

Proposition 5.12. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category.*

- (i) $(y_X)_{\forall} = y_{\mathcal{P}X}$, *i.e.* $(y_X)_{\forall}(\phi) = \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi)$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$.
- (ii) $(y_X^{\dagger})_{\forall}^{\dagger} = y_{\mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X}^{\dagger}$, *i.e.* $(y_X^{\dagger})_{\forall}^{\dagger}(\psi) = \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X(\psi, -)$ for all $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^{\dagger}X$.

¹The terminology comes from the fact that, in category theory, a contravariant functor from a category to the category of sets is called a presheaf of that category.

Proof. (i) For all $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\forall}(\phi)(\gamma) &= (\phi \swarrow y_*)(\gamma) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} (\mathcal{P}X(y(x), \gamma) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} (\gamma(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \\ &= \mathcal{P}X(\gamma, \phi). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Similar to (i). \square

Yoneda embeddings constitute a natural transformation

$$y: \text{id} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}$$

from the identity functor to the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} . Dually, coYoneda embeddings constitute a natural transformation

$$y^\dagger: \text{id} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger$$

from the identity functor to the copresheaf functor \mathcal{P}^\dagger .

There exist natural connections between $\mathcal{P}X$ and $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$. We present two examples here. The first is the Isbell adjunction. For $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, let

$$\text{ub } \phi = X \swarrow \phi, \quad \text{lb } \psi = \psi \searrow X.$$

Proposition 5.13 (Isbell adjunction). *The functor $\text{ub}: \mathcal{P}X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is left adjoint to the functor $\text{lb}: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.*

Proof. Because

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger X(\text{ub } \phi, \psi) = \psi \searrow (X \swarrow \phi) = (\psi \searrow X) \swarrow \phi = \mathcal{P}X(\phi, \text{lb } \psi). \quad \square$$

The second is the distributor

$$\circ: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \multimap \mathcal{P}X$$

that assigns to each pair $(\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \times \mathcal{P}X$ the real number $\phi \circ \psi$. A close look at this distributor in a special case may help us understand its role in the theory of real-enriched categories. Let X be a set, viewed as a discrete real-enriched category. Then, $\mathcal{P}X$ is $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X)$ and $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X^{\text{op}})$. For each $\phi \in [0, 1]^X$, the functor

$$\phi \circ -: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

obtained by fixing the second argument of $\circ: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \multimap \mathcal{P}X$ turns out to be the functor

$$\phi \circ -: ([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X) \longrightarrow ([0, 1], \alpha_L), \quad \psi \mapsto \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x).$$

Intuitively, the value $\phi \circ \psi = \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x)$ measures the truth degree that ϕ and ψ have a common point.

Suppose ϕ is a weight and ψ is a coweight of a real-enriched category X . For all $p \in [0, 1]$, write $\psi \rightarrow p$ for the weight $\star_p \swarrow \psi$ and write $\phi \rightarrow p$ for the coweight $\phi \searrow \star_p$ of X , where \star_p denotes the distributor $\star \multimap \star$ with value p .

Lemma 5.14. *Let X be a real-enriched category.*

(i) *For all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$, $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ and $p \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{P}X(\phi, \psi \rightarrow p) = \phi \circ \psi \rightarrow p$.*

- (ii) For all $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, $\phi \circ \psi = \inf_{p \in [0,1]} (\mathcal{P}X(\phi, \psi \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p)$.
(iii) For all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{P}X$, $\mathcal{P}X(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \inf_{p \in [0,1]} ((\phi_1 \circ (\phi_2 \rightarrow p)) \rightarrow p)$.

6. COLIMIT AND LIMIT

A *colimit* of a weight $\phi: X \dashv\!\!\dashv \star$ is an element $\text{colim } \phi$ of X such that for all $x \in X$,

$$X(\text{colim } \phi, x) = \mathcal{P}X(\phi, y(x)).$$

It is clear that each weight has, up to isomorphism, at most one colimit. So, we shall speak of *the* colimit of a weight.

Since

$$\mathcal{P}X(\phi, y(x)) = y_X(x) \swarrow \phi = (X \swarrow \phi)(x)$$

for all $x \in X$, it follows that ϕ has a colimit if and only if the coweight $X \swarrow \phi$ is representable. A colimit of ϕ is then a representation of the coweight $X \swarrow \phi$, i.e. $X(\text{colim } \phi, -) = X \swarrow \phi$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \star \\ \downarrow X & \geq & \swarrow X \swarrow \phi \\ X & & \end{array}$$

For each functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ and each weight ϕ of K , the colimit of $\phi \circ f^*$, when exists, is called the *colimit of f weighted by ϕ* . In particular, $\text{colim } \phi$ is the colimit of the identity functor $X \rightarrow X$ weighted by ϕ .

We write $\text{colim}_\phi f$ for the colimit of f weighted by ϕ . By definition, b is a colimit of $f: K \rightarrow X$ weighted by $\phi: K \dashv\!\!\dashv \star$ if and only if for all $x \in X$,

$$X(b, x) = \mathcal{P}X(\phi \circ f^*, X(-, x)) = \mathcal{P}K(\phi, X(f(-), x)).$$

Example 6.1. Suppose $f: X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ is a functor, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. Then for each weight $\phi: X \dashv\!\!\dashv \star$, the colimit of f weighted by ϕ exists and is equal to the composite $\phi \circ f^\sharp$, i.e. $\text{colim}_\phi f = \phi \circ f^\sharp$, where $f^\sharp: \star \dashv\!\!\dashv X$ is the distributor corresponding to f . To see this we calculate: for all $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}\mathbf{V}(\phi \circ f^*, \mathbf{V}(-, r)) &= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, \mathbf{V}(f(-), r)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \rightarrow (f(x) \rightarrow r)) \\ &= \left(\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& f(x) \right) \rightarrow r \\ &= \mathbf{V}(\phi \circ f^\sharp, r), \end{aligned}$$

hence $\phi \circ f^\sharp$ is a colimit of f weighted by ϕ .

Definition 6.2. A real-enriched category X is cocomplete if every weight of X has a colimit.

It is readily seen that X is cocomplete if and only if all weighted colimits of functors to X exist; that means, for each functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ and each weight ϕ of K , the colimit of f weighted by ϕ exists.

Proposition 6.3. A real-enriched category X is cocomplete if and only if the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ has a left adjoint.

Proof. If X is cocomplete, the correspondence $\phi \mapsto \text{colim } \phi$ defines a left adjoint of $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$. Conversely, any left adjoint of $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ must send a weight ϕ of X to a colimit of ϕ . \square

Example 6.4. Example 6.1 shows that $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is cocomplete. The left adjoint of $y: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathbf{V}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{P}\mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}, \quad \phi \mapsto \phi(1).$$

Or equivalently, for each weight ϕ of \mathbf{V} , $\text{colim } \phi = \phi(1)$.

In fact, since for all $z \in [0, 1]$, $z = 1 \rightarrow z \leq \phi(z) \rightarrow \phi(1)$, then

$$\phi(1) = \sup_{z \in [0, 1]} \phi(z) \ \& \ z = \text{colim } \phi,$$

the second equality holds by Example 6.1.

Example 6.5. For each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{P}X$ is cocomplete. For this consider the Yoneda embedding $y_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$. Since

$$(y_X)_\exists \dashv y_X^{-1} \dashv (y_X)_\forall$$

and $(y_X)_\forall = y_{\mathcal{P}X}$ (5.9 and 5.12), it follows that $y_{\mathcal{P}X}$ has a left adjoint, so $\mathcal{P}X$ is cocomplete. For each weight $\Phi: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \star$ of $\mathcal{P}X$, the colimit of Φ is $y_X^{-1}(\Phi)$, i.e. $\text{colim } \Phi = \Phi \circ (y_X)_*$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{(y_X)_*} & \mathcal{P}X \\ & \searrow \text{colim } \Phi & \downarrow \Phi \\ & & \star \end{array}$$

Since $\mathcal{P}y_X = (y_X)_\exists$, $y_X^{-1} = \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}X}$ and $(y_X)_\forall = y_{\mathcal{P}X}$, we obtain a string of adjunctions

$$\mathcal{P}y_X \dashv \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}X} \dashv y_{\mathcal{P}X}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X.$$

Example 6.6. For each real-enriched category X , the real-enriched category $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is cocomplete. We check that for each weight Φ of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, the coweight $(y^\dagger)^* \swarrow \Phi$ of X is a colimit of Φ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{P}^\dagger X & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \star \\ \downarrow (y^\dagger)^* & \searrow \geq & \downarrow \text{colim } \Phi \\ X & & \end{array}$$

First we note that for all $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$,

$$\psi \searrow (y^\dagger)^* = \inf_{x \in X} (\psi(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(-, y^\dagger(x))) = \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(-, \psi).$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \star & \xrightarrow{\psi} & X \\ \swarrow \psi \searrow (y^\dagger)^* & \leq & \downarrow (y^\dagger)^* \\ & & \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \end{array}$$

Thus for all $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^\dagger X((y^\dagger)^* \swarrow \Phi, \psi) &= \psi \searrow ((y^\dagger)^* \swarrow \Phi) \\ &= (\psi \searrow (y^\dagger)^*) \swarrow \Phi \\ &= \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)(\Phi, \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(-, \psi)), \end{aligned}$$

showing that $(y^\dagger)^* \swarrow \Phi$ is a colimit of Φ .

In particular, for each weight ϕ of X , the colimit of the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ weighted by ϕ is $X \swarrow \phi$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{colim}_\phi y^\dagger &= \operatorname{colim} \phi \circ (y^\dagger)^* \\ &= (y^\dagger)^* \swarrow (\phi \circ (y^\dagger)^*) \\ &= ((y^\dagger)^* \swarrow (y^\dagger)^*) \swarrow \phi \\ &= ((y^\dagger)^* \circ (y^\dagger)_*) \swarrow \phi && ((y^\dagger)_* \dashv (y^\dagger)^*) \\ &= X \swarrow \phi. && (y^\dagger \text{ is fully faithful}) \end{aligned}$$

The dual notion of colimit is limit. Precisely, a *limit* of a coweight $\psi: \star \dashv \rightarrow X$ is an element $\lim \psi$ in X such that for all $x \in X$,

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger X(y^\dagger(x), \psi) = X(x, \lim \psi).$$

It is obvious that each coweight has at most one limit up to isomorphism.

Since

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger X(y^\dagger(x), \psi) = \psi \searrow y^\dagger(x) = (\psi \searrow X)(x),$$

it follows that ψ has a limit if and only if the weight $\psi \searrow X$ is representable.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \star & \xrightarrow{\psi} & X \\ & \swarrow & \uparrow \\ & \psi \searrow X & X \\ & & \downarrow \\ & & X \end{array}$$

Remark 6.7. Let X be a real-enriched category and let $\psi: \star \dashv \rightarrow X$ be a coweight of X . Then, $a \in X$ is a colimit of ψ^{op} of the weight ψ^{op} of X^{op} if and only if for all $x \in X$,

$$X^{\text{op}}(a, x) = \mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}})(\psi^{\text{op}}, X^{\text{op}}(-, x)).$$

Since

$$\mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}})(\psi^{\text{op}}, X^{\text{op}}(-, x)) = \inf_{z \in X} (\psi(z) \rightarrow X(x, z)),$$

it follows that a is a colimit of ψ^{op} if and only if

$$X(x, a) = \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(y^\dagger(x), \psi).$$

Therefore, a limit of a coweight ψ of X is precisely a colimit of the weight ψ^{op} of X^{op} .

For each functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ and each coweight ψ of K , the limit of $f \dashv (\psi)$, when exists, is called the *limit of f weighted by ψ* . In particular, $\lim \psi$ is the limit of the identity functor $X \rightarrow X$ weighted by ψ . We write $\lim_\psi f$ for the limit of f weighted by ψ .

Example 6.8. Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ is a functor. Then, for each coweight ψ of X , the limit of f weighted by ψ exists and is given by $\lim_\psi f = \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(f^\sharp, \psi)$, where $f^\sharp: \star \dashv \rightarrow X$ is the distributor corresponding to f . To see this we calculate: for all $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V}(y^\dagger(r), f_* \circ \psi) &= \psi \searrow (f_* \searrow \mathbf{V}(r, -)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} (\psi(x) \rightarrow (r \rightarrow f(x))) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} (r \rightarrow (\psi(x) \rightarrow f(x))) \\ &= \mathbf{V}(r, \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(f^\sharp, \psi)), \end{aligned}$$

so $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X(f^\sharp, \psi)$ is a limit of f weighted by ψ .

Definition 6.9. A real-enriched category X is complete if each coweight of X has a limit.

It is readily seen that X is complete if and only if for any functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ and any coweight ψ of K , the limit of f weighted by ψ exists. Dual to Proposition 6.3, we have the following:

Proposition 6.10. A real-enriched category X is complete if and only if the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ has a right adjoint.

Example 6.11. The real-enriched category $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is complete. For each coweight ψ of \mathbf{V} , by Example 6.8, $\inf_{z \in [0, 1]} (\psi(z) \rightarrow z)$ is a limit of ψ .

Example 6.12. For each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is complete. For this consider the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$. Since

$$(y^\dagger_X)^\dagger_{\mathbf{V}} \dashv (y^\dagger_X)^{-1} \dashv (y^\dagger_X)^\dagger_{\mathbf{X}}$$

and $(y^\dagger_X)^\dagger_{\mathbf{V}} = y^\dagger_{\mathcal{P}^\dagger X}$ (5.9 and 5.12), it follows that $y^\dagger_{\mathcal{P}^\dagger X}$ has a right adjoint, so $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is complete. For each coweight $\Psi: \star \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, the limit of Ψ is $(y^\dagger_X)^{-1}(\Psi)$, i.e. $\lim \Psi = (y^\dagger_X)^* \circ \Psi$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \star & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \\ & \searrow & \downarrow (y^\dagger_X)^* \\ & \lim \Psi & X \end{array}$$

Thus, we have a string of adjunctions

$$y^\dagger_{\mathcal{P}^\dagger X} \dashv \lim_{\mathcal{P}^\dagger X} \dashv \mathcal{P}^\dagger y^\dagger_X: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathcal{P}^\dagger X.$$

Example 6.13. For each real-enriched category X , the real-enriched category $\mathcal{P}X$ is complete. For each coweight Ψ of $\mathcal{P}X$, the weight $\Psi \searrow y_*$ of X is a limit of Ψ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \star & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & \mathcal{P}X \\ & \searrow & \uparrow y_* \\ & \lim \Psi & X \end{array}$$

In particular, for each coweight ψ of X , the limit of the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by ψ is $\psi \searrow X$, i.e. $\lim_\psi y = \psi \searrow X$.

Theorem 6.14. (Stubbe [72]) A real-enriched category is complete if and only if it is cocomplete.

Proof. Let X be a complete real-enriched category. We show that each weight ϕ of X has a colimit, so X is cocomplete. Consider the coweight $X \swarrow \phi$ of X . Since X is complete, there is some $a \in X$ such that

$$X(-, a) = (X \swarrow \phi) \searrow X.$$

Then

$$X(a, -) = X \swarrow X(-, a) = X \swarrow ((X \swarrow \phi) \searrow X) = X \swarrow \phi,$$

showing that ϕ has a colimit. Likewise for the converse implication. \square

In the following we examine the relation between functors, colimits of weights and limits of coweights. First of all, for any functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and any weight ϕ of X , if both $\text{colim} \phi$ and $\text{colim}_\phi f$ exist, then $\text{colim}_\phi f \sqsubseteq f(\text{colim} \phi)$, because

$$1 = X(\text{colim} \phi, \text{colim} \phi)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, X(-, \operatorname{colim}\phi)) \\
&\leq \mathcal{P}X(\phi, Y(f(-), f(\operatorname{colim}\phi))) \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, Y(-, f(\operatorname{colim}\phi)) \circ f_*) \\
&= \mathcal{P}Y(\phi \circ f^*, Y(-, f(\operatorname{colim}\phi))) \quad (- \circ f^* \dashv - \circ f_*) \\
&= Y(\operatorname{colim}_\phi f, f(\operatorname{colim}\phi)).
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a functor. We say that f *preserves the colimit of a weight* ϕ of X , if $f(\operatorname{colim}\phi)$ is a colimit of f weighted by ϕ , i.e. $f(\operatorname{colim}\phi) = \operatorname{colim}_\phi f$, whenever $\operatorname{colim}\phi$ exists. Likewise, f *preserves the limit of a coweight* ψ of X if $f(\operatorname{lim}\psi)$ is a limit of f weighted by ψ whenever $\operatorname{lim}\psi$ exists.

We say that a functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ *preserves colimits* if it preserves all colimits that exist. Likewise, f *preserves limits* if it preserves all limits that exist.

Theorem 6.15. *Each left adjoint preserves colimits. Dually, each right adjoint preserves limits.*

Proof. Suppose that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $g: Y \rightarrow X$. We show that f preserves colimits and g preserves limits.

Assume that $\phi: X \rightarrow \star$ has a colimit. Since for all $y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(f(\operatorname{colim}\phi), y) &= X(\operatorname{colim}\phi, g(y)) && (f \dashv g) \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, X(-, g(y))) && (\text{definition of } \operatorname{colim}\phi) \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, Y(f(-), y)) && (f \dashv g) \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, Y(-, y) \circ f_*) \\
&= \mathcal{P}Y(\phi \circ f^*, Y(-, y)), && (- \circ f^* \dashv - \circ f_*)
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that $f(\operatorname{colim}\phi)$ is a colimit of f weighted by ϕ .

By duality, g preserves limits. \square

Theorem 6.16. *If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ preserves colimits and X is cocomplete, then f is a left adjoint.*

Proof. Since X is cocomplete, the Yoneda embedding $y_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ has a left adjoint $\operatorname{colim}_X: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$. Let g be the composite

$$Y \xrightarrow{y_Y} \mathcal{P}Y \xrightarrow{f^{-1}} \mathcal{P}X \xrightarrow{\operatorname{colim}_X} X;$$

that is, $g(y) = \operatorname{colim}_X Y(f(-), y)$. We claim that g is a right adjoint of f .

By Theorem 4.5, we need to check that for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, $f(x) \sqsubseteq y$ if and only if $x \sqsubseteq g(y)$. If $f(x) \sqsubseteq y$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &\leq Y(f(x), y) \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(X(-, x), Y(f(-), y)) && (\text{Yoneda lemma}) \\
&\leq X(\operatorname{colim}_X X(-, x), \operatorname{colim}_X Y(f(-), y)) && (\operatorname{colim}_X \text{ is a functor}) \\
&= X(x, g(y)), && (\text{definition of } g)
\end{aligned}$$

showing that $x \sqsubseteq g(y)$.

For the converse implication, first we show that $1 \leq Y(f(g(y)), y)$ for all $y \in Y$. Since f preserves colimits and $g(y) = \operatorname{colim}_X (Y(-, y) \circ f_*)$, then

$$f(g(y)) = \operatorname{colim}_Y (Y(-, y) \circ f_* \circ f^*) \leq \operatorname{colim}_Y Y(-, y) \cong y,$$

so $1 \leq Y(f(g(y)), y)$.

Now, suppose that $x \sqsubseteq g(y)$. Then

$$1 \leq X(x, g(y)) \leq Y(f(g(y)), y) \& Y(f(x), f(g(y))) \leq Y(f(x), y),$$

hence $f(x) \sqsubseteq y$. \square

Proposition 6.17. *The Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ preserves limits; the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ preserves colimits.*

Proof. For the first conclusion, we need to show that for each coweight ψ of X , if $\lim \psi$ exists, then $y(\lim \psi)$ is the limit of $y_* \circ \psi$ in $\mathcal{P}X$, i.e. $y(\lim \psi) = \lim_{\mathcal{P}X} (y_* \circ \psi)$. To see this, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim(y_* \circ \psi) &= (y_* \circ \psi) \searrow y_* && \text{(Example 6.13)} \\
&= \psi \searrow (y_* \searrow y_*) \\
&= \psi \searrow (y^* \circ y_*) && (y_* \dashv y^*) \\
&= \psi \searrow X && (y \text{ is fully faithful}) \\
&= X(-, \lim \psi) && \text{(definition of } \lim \psi) \\
&= y(\lim \psi).
\end{aligned}$$

The second conclusion follows by duality. \square

A functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is *colimit-dense* if for each $y \in Y$, there is a weight ϕ of X such that y is a colimit of f weighted by ϕ . Likewise, f is *limit-dense* if for each $y \in Y$, there is a coweight ψ of X such that y is a limit of f weighted by ψ .

There is a nice characterization of colimit-dense and limit-dense functors.

Proposition 6.18. (Lai and Shen [43]) *Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a functor.*

- (i) *f is colimit-dense if and only if $f_* \swarrow f_* = Y$.*
- (ii) *f is limit-dense if and only if $f^* \searrow f^* = Y$.*

Proof. (i) Assume that f is colimit-dense. We wish to show $f_* \swarrow f_* = Y$. For this it suffices to show that for each y of Y , $(f_* \swarrow f_*)(y, -) \leq Y(y, -)$. Since f is colimit-dense, $y = \text{colim}_\phi f$ for some weight ϕ of X . So,

$$Y(y, -) = Y \swarrow (\phi \circ f^*) = (Y \swarrow f^*) \swarrow \phi = f_* \swarrow \phi,$$

hence $\phi \leq f_*(-, y)$. Therefore,

$$(f_* \swarrow f_*)(y, -) = f_* \swarrow f_*(-, y) \leq f_* \swarrow \phi = Y(y, -).$$

Conversely, suppose that $f_* \swarrow f_* = Y$. Then for each y of Y ,

$$Y(y, -) = (f_* \swarrow f_*)(y, -) = (Y \swarrow f^*) \swarrow f_*(-, y) = Y \swarrow (f_*(-, y) \circ f^*),$$

showing that y is a colimit of f weighted by $f_*(-, y)$, hence f is colimit-dense.

- (ii) Similar to (i). \square

Proposition 6.19. *For each real-enriched category, the Yoneda embedding is colimit-dense and the coYoneda embedding is limit-dense.*

Proof. For each $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$, by Example 6.5 we have

$$\text{colim}_\phi y = \text{colim } \phi \circ y^* = \phi \circ y^* \circ y_* = \phi,$$

the last equality holds since y is fully faithful, hence $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is colimit-dense. \square

Theorem 6.20. (Kelly [36]) *For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y separated and cocomplete, there is a unique left adjoint $\bar{f}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f = \bar{f} \circ y_X$.*

Proof. Let \bar{f} be the composite of left adjoints

$$\mathcal{P}X \xrightarrow{f_\exists} \mathcal{P}Y \xrightarrow{\text{colim}_Y} Y,$$

where $\text{colim}_Y: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow Y$ is the left adjoint of $y_Y: Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$. Then \bar{f} satisfies the requirement. This proves the existence. For uniqueness, suppose \bar{f} satisfies

the conditions. For each $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$, since ϕ is the colimit of the Yoneda embedding $y_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by ϕ and \bar{f} preserves colimits, then

$$\bar{f}(\phi) = \bar{f}(\operatorname{colim}_\phi y_X) = \operatorname{colim}_\phi(\bar{f} \circ y_X) = \operatorname{colim}_\phi f,$$

showing that \bar{f} is unique. \square

7. TENSOR AND COTENSOR

Cocompleteness of a real-enriched category X requires that every weight of X has a colimit. The aim of this subsection is to show that in order that a real-enriched category X be cocomplete, it suffices to require certain subclass of weights of X have colimits.

Let X be a real-enriched category. For each $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$, the *tensor of r with x* , denoted by $r \otimes x$, is an element of X such that for all $y \in X$,

$$X(r \otimes x, y) = r \rightarrow X(x, y).$$

Tensors are a special kind of colimits. Actually, $r \otimes x$ is the colimit of the functor $s_x: \star \rightarrow X$ weighted by r_\star , where, s_x is the functor sending the unique object of \star to x , and r_\star is the weight of \star with value r . Said differently,

$$r \otimes x = \operatorname{colim}(r \& y(x)).$$

For each $y \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$, the *cotensor of r with y* , denoted by $r \multimap y$, is an element of X such that for all $x \in X$,

$$X(x, r \multimap y) = r \rightarrow X(x, y).$$

The cotensor $r \multimap y$ is the limit of the functor $s_y: \star \rightarrow X$ weighted by r_\star . Said differently,

$$r \multimap y = \lim(r \& y^\dagger(y)).$$

Definition 7.1. A real-enriched category X is *tensorable* if the tensor $r \otimes x$ exists for all $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$; X is *cotensorable* if the cotensor $r \multimap y$ exists for all $y \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$.

It is clear that X is tensorable if and only if its opposite X^{op} is cotensorable. Every complete (hence cocomplete) real-enriched category is both tensorable and cotensorable.

If X is both tensorable and cotensorable, then for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} r \otimes x \sqsubseteq y \text{ in } X_0 &\iff r \leq X(x, y) \\ &\iff x \sqsubseteq r \multimap y \text{ in } X_0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$r \otimes -: X_0 \longrightarrow X_0$$

is left adjoint to

$$r \multimap -: X_0 \longrightarrow X_0.$$

This shows that in a both tensorable and cotensorable real-enriched category, tensors and cotensors are determined by each other.

Example 7.2. The real-enriched category $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is tensorable and cotensorable. For each $r \in [0, 1]$ and each $x \in \mathbf{V}$,

$$r \otimes x = r \& x, \quad r \multimap x = r \rightarrow x.$$

The real-enriched category $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$ is also tensorable and cotensorable. For each $r \in [0, 1]$ and each $y \in \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}$,

$$r \otimes y = r \rightarrow y, \quad r \multimap y = y \& r.$$

Example 7.3. Let X be a real-enriched category. In $\mathcal{P}X$, the tensor and cotensor of $r \in [0, 1]$ with $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$ are, respectively, $r \& \phi$ and $r \rightarrow \phi$. In $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$, the tensor and cotensor of $r \in [0, 1]$ with $\psi \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ are $r \rightarrow \psi$ and $r \& \psi$, respectively.

Let $\mathcal{B}X$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}X$ consisting of weights of the form $r \& y(x)$; that is,

$$\mathcal{B}X = \{r \& y(x) \mid x \in X, r \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Since for each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$, each $x \in X$ and each $r \in [0, 1]$, $f_\exists(r \& y_X(x)) = r \& y_Y(f(x))$, it follows that the assignment $X \mapsto \mathcal{B}X$ defines a subfunctor of the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} , through which the natural transformation $y: \text{id} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ factors.

Write $i: \mathcal{B}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ for the inclusion functor and $t: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}X$ for the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{B}X$. It is clear that $y = i \circ t$.

Proposition 7.4. *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is tensored.
- (2) The functor $t: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}X$ has a left adjoint.
- (3) For each $x \in X$, the functor $X(x, -): X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ is a right adjoint, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$.

In this case, $X(x, -): X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ is right adjoint to $- \otimes x: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow X$.

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) This follows from the fact that the tensor $r \otimes x$ of r with x , if exists, is precisely the colimit of the weight $r \& y(x)$.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3) A restatement of the equality $X(r \otimes x, y) = r \rightarrow X(x, y)$. \square

Dual conclusions hold for cotensored real-enriched categories. We spell them out for later use. Let $\mathcal{B}^\dagger X$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ consisting of coweights of the form $r \& y^\dagger(y)$, $y \in X, r \in [0, 1]$.

Write $i^\dagger: \mathcal{B}^\dagger X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ for the inclusion functor and $t^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^\dagger X$ for the coYoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{B}^\dagger X$.

Proposition 7.5. *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is cotensored.
- (2) The map $t^\dagger: X \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^\dagger X$ has a right adjoint.
- (3) For each $y \in X$, the map $X(-, y): X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}$ is a left adjoint, where $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = [0, 1], \alpha_R)$.

In this case, $X(-, y): X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}$ is left adjoint to $- \multimap y: \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow X$.

Proposition 7.6. *Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map between real-enriched categories.*

- (i) *If both X and Y are tensored, then f is a functor if and only if $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$ preserves order and $r \otimes f(x) \sqsubseteq f(r \otimes x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$.*
- (ii) *If both X and Y are cotensored, then f is a functor if and only if $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$ is order-preserving and $f(r \multimap y) \sqsubseteq r \multimap f(y)$ for all $y \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. We prove (i) for example. Suppose f is a functor. First, it is trivial that $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$ preserves order. Next, let $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in X$. Since X is tensored and $k \leq X(r \otimes x, r \otimes x)$, it follows that $r \leq X(x, r \otimes x)$, then $r \leq Y(f(x), f(r \otimes x))$ and consequently, $r \otimes f(x) \leq f(r \otimes x)$. This proves the necessity.

Now we prove the sufficiency. Let $x, y \in X$. Since $X(x, y) \leq X(x, y)$, it follows that $X(x, y) \otimes x \leq y$, then

$$X(x, y) \otimes f(x) \leq f(X(x, y) \otimes x) \leq f(y),$$

and consequently $X(x, y) \leq Y(f(x), f(y))$, so f is a functor. \square

A weight ϕ of X is *conical* if there is a functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ such that $\phi = !_* \circ f^*$, where $!_*$ is the graph of the unique functor $!: K \rightarrow \star$. Dually, a coweight ψ of X is *conical* if there is a functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ such that $\psi = f_* \circ !^*$, where $!^*$ is the cograph the unique functor $!: K \rightarrow \star$. It is easily verified that a weight ϕ is conical if and only if

$$\phi = \sup_{a \in A} y(a)$$

for a subset A of X ; a coweight ψ is conical if and only if

$$\psi = \sup_{b \in B} y^\dagger(b)$$

for a subset B of X .

Definition 7.7. (Kelly [36], Stubbe [73]) Suppose X is a real-enriched category. We say that

- (i) X is conically cocomplete if every conical weight of X has a colimit.
- (ii) X is conically complete if every conical coweight of X has a limit.
- (iii) X is order-complete if the underlying ordered set X_0 is complete.

Theorem 7.8. (Kelly [36], Stubbe [73]) *For each real-enriched category X , the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) X is cocomplete.
- (2) X is complete.
- (3) X is tensored and conically cocomplete.
- (4) X is cotensored and conically complete.
- (5) X is order-complete, tensored and cotensored.

Proof. By duality and Theorem 6.14 we only need to check that (1), (3) and (5) are equivalent.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Obvious.

(3) \Rightarrow (5) First we show that X is order-complete. Suppose A is a subset of X . We show that each colimit of the conical weight $\phi = \sup_{x \in A} y(x)$ is a join of A in X_0 . For all $x \in A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X(x, \text{colim } \phi) &= X(\text{colim } \phi, -) \searrow X(x, -) && \text{(Yoneda lemma)} \\ &= (X \swarrow \phi) \searrow X(x, -) && \text{(definition of colim } \phi) \\ &\geq (X \swarrow X(-, x)) \searrow X(x, -) && (x \in A) \\ &= X(x, -) \searrow X(x, -) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\text{colim } \phi$ is an upper bound of A in X_0 . Suppose that y is another upper bound of A in X_0 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} X(\text{colim } \phi, y) &= X(-, y) \swarrow \phi \\ &= \inf_{x \in A} (X(-, y) \swarrow X(-, x)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in A} X(x, y) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\text{colim } \phi \sqsubseteq y$ in X_0 . Therefore, $\text{colim } \phi$ is a join of A in X_0 .

Next we show that X is cotensored. For each $r \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in X$, let

$$A = \{a \in X \mid r \leq X(a, y)\}.$$

We show that the colimit of the conical weight $\phi = \sup_{a \in A} y(a)$ is the cotensor of r with y ; that is, $X(x, \text{colim } \phi) = r \rightarrow X(x, y)$ for all $x \in X$. For all $s \in [0, 1]$,

$$s \leq r \rightarrow X(x, y) \iff r \leq s \rightarrow X(x, y)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iff r \leq X(s \otimes x, y) \\
&\iff s \otimes x \sqsubseteq \operatorname{colim} \phi \quad (\operatorname{colim} \phi \text{ is a join of } A \text{ in } X_0) \\
&\iff s \leq X(x, \operatorname{colim} \phi),
\end{aligned}$$

hence $\operatorname{colim} \phi$ is the cotensor of r with y .

(5) \Rightarrow (1) For a weight ϕ of X , let a be the join in X_0 of the set $A = \{\phi(x) \otimes x \mid x \in X\}$. We show that a is a colimit of ϕ , hence X is cocomplete. For all $y \in X$, since a is a join of A in X_0 , then

$$\begin{aligned}
X(a, y) &= \inf_{z \in A} X(z, y) && \text{(Proposition 7.5 (3))} \\
&= \inf_{z \in A} (X(-, y) \swarrow X(-, z)) && \text{(Yoneda lemma)} \\
&= X(-, y) \swarrow \sup_{z \in A} X(-, z) \\
&= X(-, y) \swarrow \sup_{x \in X} X(-, \phi(x) \otimes x) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} (X(-, y) \swarrow X(-, \phi(x) \otimes x)) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} X(\phi(x) \otimes x, y) && \text{(Yoneda lemma)} \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \rightarrow X(x, y)) && \text{(definition of tensor)} \\
&= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, y(y)),
\end{aligned}$$

hence a is a colimit of ϕ . \square

Corollary 7.9. *Let X, Y be cocomplete real-enriched categories. Then a functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a left adjoint if and only if*

- (i) $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$ preserves joins;
- (ii) f preserves tensors in the sense that $f(r \otimes x) = r \otimes f(x)$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in X$.

Proof. Necessity is trivial since tensors are a special kind of colimits. For sufficiency, let $g: Y \rightarrow X$ be the map such that $g: Y_0 \rightarrow X_0$ is right adjoint to $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$. We claim that $g: Y \rightarrow X$ is a right adjoint of $f: X \rightarrow Y$. By Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 7.6, we only need to check that $r \otimes g(y) \leq g(r \otimes y)$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in Y$. Since

$$f(r \otimes g(y)) = r \otimes f(g(y)) \leq r \otimes y,$$

it follows that $r \otimes g(y) \leq g(r \otimes y)$, as desired. \square

Corollary 7.10. *Let X be a complete real-enriched category. Then for each functor $f: K \rightarrow X$ and each weight ϕ of K , the colimit of f weighted by ϕ is given by the join of $\{\phi(z) \otimes f(z) \mid z \in K\}$ in X_0 . Dually, for each coweight ψ of K , the limit of f weighted by ψ is given by the meet of $\{\psi(z) \multimap f(z) \mid z \in K\}$ in X_0 .*

Proof. Since $\phi \circ f^*$ is the join in $(\mathcal{P}X)_0$ of the subset $\{\phi(z) \& X(-, f(z)) \mid z \in K\}$, the functor $\operatorname{colim}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow X$ preserves colimits, it follows that

$$\operatorname{colim}_\phi f = \operatorname{colim} \phi \circ f^* = \sup_{z \in K} \operatorname{colim}(\phi(z) \& X(-, f(z))) = \sup_{z \in K} \phi(z) \otimes f(z).$$

The second conclusion follows by duality. \square

Corollary 7.11. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $f: K \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is a functor.*

- (i) For each weight ϕ of K , $\operatorname{colim}_\phi f = \sup_{z \in K} \phi(z) \& f(z)$.
- (ii) For each coweight ψ of K , $\lim_\psi f = \sup_{z \in K} (\psi(z) \rightarrow f(z))$.

Since $\mathcal{P}\star = \mathbf{V}$, Example 6.1 and Example 6.8 are then special case of the above corollary. The following conclusion, proved in Lai and Zhang [46], extends the Tarski fixed point theorem, which says that every order-preserving map from a complete lattice to itself has a fixed point, to the enriched context.

Theorem 7.12. *If X is a complete real-enriched category and $f: X \rightarrow X$ is a functor, then the subcategory*

$$\text{Fix}(f) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \cong x\}$$

of X composed of fixed points of f is complete.

Proof. First we show that the subcategory

$$Y = \{x \in X \mid x \sqsubseteq f(x)\}$$

of X is complete. Let $i: Y \rightarrow X$ denote the inclusion. Then for each weight ϕ of Y , the join

$$a = \sup\{\phi(x) \otimes x \mid x \in Y\}$$

in X_0 is a colimit of the functor i weighted by ϕ . Since f is a functor,

$$f(a) \sqsupseteq \sup\{f(\phi(x) \otimes x) \mid x \in Y\} \sqsupseteq \sup\{\phi(x) \otimes f(x) \mid x \in Y\} \sqsupseteq a,$$

which shows that $a \in Y$. Therefore, Y is closed in X under formation of colimits. In particular, Y is cocomplete, hence complete.

Next, restricting the domain and codomain of f to Y we obtain a functor $f: Y \rightarrow Y$. A similar argument shows that

$$Z = \{y \in Y \mid f(y) \sqsubseteq y\}$$

is closed in Y under formation of limits, hence a complete real-enriched category. It is clear that $\text{Fix}(f) = Z$, the conclusion thus follows. \square

Definition 7.13. Suppose X is a partially ordered set. A (left) action of $[0, 1]$ on X is a map $\otimes: [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow X$ subject to the following conditions: for all $x \in X$ and $r, s \in [0, 1]$,

- (i) $1 \otimes x = x$;
- (ii) $s \otimes (r \otimes x) = (s \&r) \otimes x$;
- (iii) $r \otimes -: X \rightarrow X$ is a left adjoint;
- (iv) $- \otimes x: [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is a left adjoint.

By the condition (iv) one sees that for each $x \in X$, $0 \otimes x$ is a bottom element of X . By (iii), the map $0 \otimes -: X \rightarrow X$ has a right adjoint, which is denoted by $r \multimap -: X \rightarrow X$. Then, for each $x \in X$, $0 \multimap x$ is a top element of X . So, the partially ordered set X is bounded; that is to say, it has both a bottom element and a top element.

A *lax morphism* $f: (X, \otimes) \rightarrow (Y, \otimes)$ between $[0, 1]$ -actions is an order-preserving map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$r \otimes f(x) \leq f(r \otimes x)$$

for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in X$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [0, 1] \times X & \xrightarrow{\otimes} & X \\ \downarrow 1 \times f & \leq & \downarrow f \\ [0, 1] \times Y & \xrightarrow{\otimes} & Y \end{array}$$

Let X be a separated, tensored and cotensored real-enriched category X . Assigning to each pair (r, x) the tensor $r \otimes x$ defines a $[0, 1]$ -action on the partially

ordered set X_0 . Proposition 7.6 says that $X \mapsto (X_0, \otimes)$ is a functor from the full subcategory of $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** consisting of separated, tensored and cotensored real-enriched categories to the category of $[0, 1]$ -actions and lax morphisms. This functor is indeed an isomorphism of categories.

Proposition 7.14. *Suppose \otimes is an action of $[0, 1]$ on a partially ordered set (X, \leq) . For all $x, y \in X$, let*

$$\alpha_{\otimes}(x, y) = \sup\{r \in [0, 1] \mid r \otimes x \leq y\}.$$

Then (X, α_{\otimes}) is a separated, tensored and cotensored real-enriched category with \leq being its underlying order.

Proof. First of all, it is clear that for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x, y \in X$,

$$r \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y) \iff r \otimes x \leq y.$$

Since $1 \otimes x = x$, then $\alpha_{\otimes}(x, x) \geq 1$ for all $x \in X$. If $r \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y)$ and $s \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(y, z)$, then

$$(s \& r) \otimes x = s \otimes (r \otimes x) \leq s \otimes y \leq z,$$

which shows that $s \& r \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, z)$, hence $\alpha_{\otimes}(y, z) \& \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y) \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, z)$ and consequently, (X, α_{\otimes}) is a real-enriched category. It remains to show that (X, α_{\otimes}) is tensored, cotensored, separated, and has \leq as underlying order

For all $r, s \in [0, 1]$ and $x, y \in X$, since

$$\begin{aligned} s \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(r \otimes x, y) &\iff s \otimes (r \otimes x) \leq y \\ &\iff s \& r \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y) \\ &\iff s \leq r \rightarrow \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

then $r \otimes x$ is a tensor of r with x in (X, α_{\otimes}) , hence (X, α_{\otimes}) is tensored.

For each $r \in [0, 1]$, let $r \multimap - : X \rightarrow X$ be the right adjoint of $r \otimes - : X \rightarrow X$. For all $x, y \in X$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$, since

$$\begin{aligned} s \leq X(x, r \multimap y) &\iff s \otimes x \leq r \multimap y \\ &\iff r \otimes (s \otimes x) \leq y \\ &\iff (r \& s) \otimes x \leq y \\ &\iff r \& s \leq X(x, y) \\ &\iff s \leq r \rightarrow X(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

then $r \multimap y$ is a cotensor of r with y in (X, α_{\otimes}) , hence (X, α_{\otimes}) is cotensored.

Finally, since

$$1 \leq \alpha_{\otimes}(x, y) \iff 1 \otimes x \leq y \iff x \leq y,$$

it follows that (X, α_{\otimes}) is separated with \leq being its underlying order. \square

Proposition 7.15. *The category of $[0, 1]$ -actions and lax morphisms is isomorphic to the full subcategory of $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** consisting of separated, tensored and cotensored real-enriched categories.*

8. CAUCHY COMPLETENESS

A weight $\phi: X \multimap \star$ of a real-enriched category X is *Cauchy* if it is a right adjoint, as a distributor. That means, there is a distributor $\psi: \star \multimap X$ such that $\phi \circ \psi \geq 1$ and $\psi(y) \& \phi(x) \leq X(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$.

Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a functor between real-enriched categories and let ϕ be a weight of X . If ϕ is a Cauchy weight, as a composite of right adjoints, $\phi \circ f^*$ is a right

adjoint, hence a Cauchy weight of Y . So, assigning to each real-enriched category X the subcategory $\mathcal{C}X$ of $\mathcal{P}X$ composed of Cauchy weights defines a subfunctor

$$\mathcal{C}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

of the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} . Since each representable weight is Cauchy, the natural transformation from the identity functor to \mathcal{P} with Yoneda embeddings as components factors through the functor \mathcal{C} .

The following conclusion is a special case of the characterization of Cauchy weights of enriched categories in Street [71].

Proposition 8.1. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and ϕ is a weight of X . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) ϕ is Cauchy.
- (2) The colimit $\text{colim}_\phi f$ of any functor $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ weighted by ϕ , when exists, is preserved by every functor $g: Y \longrightarrow Z$, i.e. $g(\text{colim}_\phi f) = \text{colim}_\phi(g \circ f)$.

In particular, every Cauchy weight with a colimit is representable.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Since $\text{colim}_\phi f$, when exists, is the colimit of the Cauchy weight $\phi \circ f^*$ of Y , it suffices to show that if b is a colimit of a Cauchy weight ξ of Y , then for every functor $g: Y \longrightarrow Z$, $g(b)$ is a colimit of g weighted by ξ , i.e. $g(b) = \text{colim}_\xi g$. By definition of colimit we have $Y \swarrow \xi = Y(b, -)$. Since $Y \swarrow \xi$ is left adjoint to ξ by Lemma 5.6, then

$$\xi = Y(b, -) \searrow Y = Y(-, b).$$

This shows in particular that ξ is representable. Since

$$\xi \circ g^* = Y(-, b) \circ g^* = Z(-, g(b)),$$

it follows that $g(b)$ is a colimit of $\xi \circ g^*$, i.e. $g(b) = \text{colim}_\xi g$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) We show that the coweight $\psi := X \swarrow \phi$ is left adjoint to ϕ . Consider the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ and the functor

$$g: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}, \quad \xi \mapsto \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(\psi, \xi),$$

where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. On the one hand, by Example 6.6 we have

$$\text{colim}_\phi y^\dagger = X \swarrow \phi = \psi,$$

so $g(\text{colim}_\phi y^\dagger) = 1$. On the other hand, since for each $x \in X$,

$$g \circ y^\dagger(x) = \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(\psi, X(x, -)) = \psi(x),$$

i.e. $g \circ y^\dagger = \psi^\sharp: X \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$, then by Example 6.1 we have

$$\text{colim}_\phi(g \circ y^\dagger) = \text{colim}_\phi \psi^\sharp = \phi \circ \psi.$$

Therefore, $\phi \circ \psi = 1$. The inequality $\psi \circ \phi \leq X$ is trivial, so ψ is left adjoint to ϕ , as desired. \square

The next characterization of Cauchy weights is a special case of that in Kelly and Schmitt [37].

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and ϕ is a weight of X . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) ϕ is Cauchy.
- (2) The functor $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -): \mathcal{P}X \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves colimits.
- (3) The functor $\phi \circ -: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves limits.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) If ψ is a left adjoint of ϕ , then for all $\xi \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$\text{sub}_X(\phi, \xi) = \xi \swarrow \phi = \xi \circ \psi,$$

from which one deduces that $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -): \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves colimits.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Assume that the functor $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -)$ preserves colimits. We show that $\psi := X \swarrow \phi$ is left adjoint to ϕ , hence ϕ is Cauchy. It suffices to check that $\phi \circ \psi \geq 1$. Since $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -)$ preserves colimits and

$$\phi = \text{colim}_{\phi} y = \sup_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \otimes y(x)),$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \circ \psi &= \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \& \text{sub}_X(\phi, y(x))) \\ &= \text{sub}_X(\phi, \phi) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

(1) \Rightarrow (3) If ψ is a left adjoint of ϕ , then for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$,

$$\phi \circ \lambda = \psi \searrow \lambda = \mathcal{P}^\dagger X(\lambda, \psi),$$

from which one infers that $\phi \circ -: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves limits.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Assume that the functor $\phi \circ -: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves limits. We show that $\psi := X \swarrow \phi$ is left adjoint to ϕ . It suffices to check that $\phi \circ \psi \geq 1$. Since

$$X \swarrow \phi = \inf_{y \in X} (\phi(y) \rightarrow X(y, -))$$

and $\phi \circ -: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves limits, it follows that

$$\phi \circ \psi = \inf_{y \in X} (\phi(y) \rightarrow \phi \circ X(y, -)) = \inf_{y \in X} (\phi(y) \rightarrow \phi(y)) = 1.$$

The proof is completed. \square

Definition 8.3. A real-enriched category X is Cauchy complete if it is separated and all of its Cauchy weights are representable.

In other words, X is Cauchy complete if each of its Cauchy weight has a unique colimit. Suppose $\phi: X \dashv \star$ is a Cauchy weight of X , and $\psi: \star \dashv X$ is a left adjoint of ϕ . Then $\psi^{\text{op}}: X^{\text{op}} \dashv \star$ is a Cauchy weight of X^{op} . Since all Cauchy weights of X^{op} arise in this way, it follows that the notion of Cauchy completeness is self-dual; that is, if X is Cauchy complete, then so is its opposite X^{op} .

Each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ generates an adjunction of distributors $f_* \dashv f^*$. The following proposition shows that when Y is Cauchy complete, every such adjunction arises in this way.

Proposition 8.4. (Lawvere [51]) *Suppose Y is a real-enriched category. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) Y is Cauchy complete.
- (2) For any pair of distributors $\phi: X \dashv Y$ and $\psi: Y \dashv X$, if ϕ is left adjoint to ψ , then there is a unique functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\phi = f_*$ and $\psi = f^*$.

Proof. It suffices to observe that if $\phi: X \dashv Y$ is left adjoint to $\psi: Y \dashv X$, then for each $x \in X$, the distributor $\phi(x, -): \star \dashv Y$ is left adjoint to $\psi(-, x): Y \dashv \star$. \square

For a real-enriched category X , let $\mathcal{C}X$ be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}X$ composed of Cauchy weights. Let $\mathbf{i}: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ be the inclusion functor, and let $\mathbf{c}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ be the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{C}X$. The composite $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{c}$ is then the Yoneda embedding $\mathbf{y}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.

Lemma 8.5. (Stubbe [72]) *Suppose X is a real-enriched category. Then*

$$\mathbf{c}_* \circ \mathbf{c}^* = \mathcal{C}X \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}^* \circ \mathbf{c}_* = X.$$

Therefore, X is isomorphic to $\mathcal{C}X$ in the category of distributors.

Proof. The equality $\mathbf{c}^* \circ \mathbf{c}_* = X$ follows from that $\mathbf{c}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ is fully faithful. For the equality $\mathbf{c}_* \circ \mathbf{c}^* = \mathcal{C}X$, let $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{C}X$. Since $X \swarrow \phi$ is left adjoint to ϕ by Lemma 5.6, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_* \circ \mathbf{c}^*(\phi, \psi) &= \sup_{x \in X} \mathbf{c}_*(x, \psi) \& \mathbf{c}^*(\phi, x) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} \mathcal{C}X(y(x), \psi) \& \mathcal{C}X(\phi, y(x)) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} \psi(x) \& (X(-, x) \swarrow \phi) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} \psi(x) \& (X \swarrow \phi)(x) \\ &= \psi \circ (X \swarrow \phi) \\ &= \psi \swarrow \phi \\ &= \mathcal{C}X(\phi, \psi). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Theorem 8.6. (Kelly [36]) *Suppose X is a real-enriched category.*

- (i) $\mathcal{C}X$ is Cauchy complete.
- (ii) For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y Cauchy complete, there is a unique functor $\bar{f}: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow Y$ that extends f . Furthermore, if f is fully faithful, then so is \bar{f} .

Proof. (i) We show that for each Cauchy weight Φ of $\mathcal{C}X$, the colimit ϕ of the inclusion functor $\mathbf{i}: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by Φ is a Cauchy weight of X , which implies that X is Cauchy complete. In other words, we show that $\mathcal{C}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under formation of colimits of Cauchy weights. Since the composite $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{c}$ is the Yoneda embedding, from Example 6.5 it follows that

$$\phi = \text{colim}_{\Phi} \mathbf{i} = \text{colim} \Phi \circ \mathbf{i}^* = \Phi \circ \mathbf{i}^* \circ \mathbf{i}_* \circ \mathbf{c}_* = \Phi \circ \mathbf{c}_*.$$

Let ψ be the coweight

$$\mathbf{c}^* \circ \Psi: * \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow X,$$

where $\Psi: * \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ is the left adjoint of $\Phi: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow *$. We claim that ψ is a left adjoint of ϕ , hence ϕ is Cauchy.

On the one hand, since $\mathbf{c}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ is fully faithful, we have

$$\psi \circ \phi = \mathbf{c}^* \circ \Psi \circ \Phi \circ \mathbf{c}_* \leq \mathbf{c}^* \circ \mathbf{c}_* = X.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 8.5, we have

$$\phi \circ \psi = \Phi \circ \mathbf{c}_* \circ \mathbf{c}^* \circ \Psi = \Phi \circ \Psi \geq 1.$$

Therefore, ψ is left adjoint to ϕ , as claimed.

- (ii) It is readily verified that the functor

$$\bar{f}: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow Y, \quad \phi \mapsto \text{colim}_{\phi} f$$

extends f . Uniqueness follows from that each Cauchy weight ϕ is the colimit of $\mathbf{c}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ weighted by ϕ and that colimits of Cauchy weights are preserved by all functors.

Finally, we check that if f is fully faithful, then so is \bar{f} ; that is, $\mathcal{C}X(\phi_1, \phi_2) = Y(\bar{f}(\phi_1), \bar{f}(\phi_2))$ for all Cauchy weights ϕ_1, ϕ_2 of X . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_1, \phi_2) &\leq \mathcal{P}Y(\phi_1 \circ f^*, \phi_2 \circ f^*) \\ &\leq \mathcal{P}X(\phi_1 \circ f^* \circ f_*, \phi_2 \circ f^* \circ f_*) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathcal{P}X(\phi_1, \phi_2),$$

it follows that

$$\mathcal{C}X(\phi_1, \phi_2) = \mathcal{P}Y(\phi_1 \circ f^*, \phi_2 \circ f^*) = Y(\overline{f}(\phi_1), \overline{f}(\phi_2)),$$

where the last equality holds because for $i = 1, 2$, the weight $\phi_i \circ f^*$ is Cauchy, hence represented by $\overline{f}(\phi_i)$. \square

An immediate corollary of the above theorem is that the full subcategory of $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** composed of Cauchy complete real-enriched categories is reflective, with reflection given by $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$. The real-enriched category $\mathcal{C}X$ is called the *Cauchy completion* of X .

Corollary 8.7. *Cauchy completion is idempotent in the sense that $\mathcal{C}X = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}X)$ for every real-enriched category X .*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{C}X$ is Cauchy complete, all of its Cauchy weights are representable, then the conclusion follows. \square

The following characterization of Cauchy completion is taken from Hofmann [28], Hofmann and Tholen [31].

Proposition 8.8. *For each real-enriched category X , the Cauchy completion of X is the equalizer in $[0, 1]$ -**Cat** of the parallel pair*

$$\mathcal{P}X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}y_X} \\ \xrightarrow{y_{\mathcal{P}X}} \end{array} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X$$

Proof. We show that a weight ϕ of X is Cauchy if and only if $\mathcal{P}y_X(\phi) = y_{\mathcal{P}X}(\phi)$.

For sufficiency consider the coweight $\psi = X \swarrow \phi = y_X^* \swarrow \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi)$. We wish to show that ϕ is right adjoint to ψ , hence a Cauchy weight. Since $\mathcal{P}y_X(\phi) = y_{\mathcal{P}X}(\phi) = \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \circ \psi &= \phi \circ (X \swarrow \phi) \\ &= \phi \circ (y_X^* \swarrow \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi)) \\ &= \mathcal{P}y_X(\phi) \circ \mathcal{P}X(\phi, -) \\ &= \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi) \circ \mathcal{P}X(\phi, -) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality $\psi \circ \phi \leq X$ is trivial. Thus, ϕ is right adjoint to ψ .

For necessity suppose ϕ is a Cauchy weight. Then $\psi := X \swarrow \phi$ is left adjoint to ϕ , hence

$$1 = \phi \circ \psi = \phi \circ y_X^* \circ \mathcal{P}X(\phi, -) = \mathcal{P}y_X(\phi) \circ \mathcal{P}X(\phi, -),$$

therefore

$$y_{\mathcal{P}X}(\phi) = \mathcal{P}y_X(\phi) \circ \mathcal{P}X(\phi, -) \circ \mathcal{P}X(-, \phi) = \mathcal{P}y_X(\phi). \quad \square$$

In the following we characterize Cauchy completeness in terms of topological property. Let X be a real-enriched category. For each $x \in X$ and $r < 1$, the set

$$B(x, r) := \{y \in X \mid X(x, y) > r\}$$

is called the *open ball* of X with center x and radius r . The collection $\{B(x, r) \mid x \in X, r < 1\}$ is a base for a topology on X , the resulting topology is called the *open ball topology* of X .

For each real-enriched category (X, α) , the *symmetrization* of (X, α) refers to the symmetric (in an evident sense) real-enriched category $(X, S(\alpha))$, where $S(\alpha)(x, y) = \min\{\alpha(x, y), \alpha(y, x)\}$.

It is clear that the open ball topology of the symmetrization of X is the least common refinement of the open ball topology of X and that of X^{op} .

Proposition 8.9. *A net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of a real-enriched category X converges to x w.r.t the open ball topology if and only if $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) = 1$.*

Assigning open ball topology to real-enriched categories yields a functor from enriched categories to topological spaces.

Definition 8.10. Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a net and a is an element of a real-enriched category X . We say that

(i) $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is Cauchy (also called biCauchy) if

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j, k \geq i} X(x_j, x_k) = 1.$$

(ii) a is a bilimit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ if for all $x \in X$,

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) = X(x, a), \quad \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) = X(a, x).$$

It is clear that a net has at most one bilimit up to isomorphism.

Lemma 8.11. *Let $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ be a Cauchy net and a be an element of a real-enriched category X . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) a is a bilimit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$.
- (2) $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(a, x_j) = 1$ and $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, a) = 1$.
- (3) $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ converges to a in the open ball topology of the symmetrization of X .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) trivial.

(2) \Leftrightarrow (3) This follows from Proposition 8.9 and the fact that the requirement in (2) is equivalent to that

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \min\{X(a, x_j), X(x_j, a)\} = 1.$$

(2) \Rightarrow (1) For all $x \in X$, we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} X(x, a) &= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(a, x_j) \right) \& X(x, a) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(a, x_j) \& X(x, a) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \\ &= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, a) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \\ &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, a) \& X(x, x_j) \\ &\leq X(x, a), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) = X(x, a)$. The other equality is verified likewise. So a is a bilimit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$. \square

Proposition 8.9 implies that if a net of X converges in the open ball topology of the symmetrization of X , then it is a Cauchy net of X .

Example 8.12. Let $\&$ be the product t-norm. Consider the real-enriched category $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. Then, a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy if and only if it is eventually constant with value 0 or converges in the usual sense to some point other than 0. Likewise for $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$.

Proposition 8.13. *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) Every Cauchy weight of X has a colimit.
- (2) Every Cauchy net of X has a bilimit.

(3) *Every Cauchy sequence of X has a bilimit.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a Cauchy net of X . Then the weight

$$\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$$

is Cauchy with a left adjoint given by the coweight

$$\psi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, -).$$

Actually, a slightly stronger conclusion will be proved in Proposition 9.8. Let a be a colimit of the Cauchy weight ϕ . Then $\phi(x) = X(x, a)$ and $\psi(x) = X(a, x)$ for all $x \in X$, which implies that a is a bilimit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $\phi: X \dashrightarrow \star$ is a Cauchy weight, with a left adjoint $\psi: \star \dashrightarrow X$. Then, $\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x) \geq 1$ and $\psi(y) \& \phi(x) \leq X(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$.

For each $n \geq 1$, pick some x_n such that

$$\phi(x_n) \& \psi(x_n) \geq 1 - 1/n.$$

Since for all $n, m \geq 1$ we have

$$X(x_n, x_m) \geq \psi(x_m) \& \phi(x_n) \geq (1 - 1/m) \& (1 - 1/n),$$

then $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence, hence has a bilimit, say a . This means that for all $x \in X$,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(x, x_m) = X(x, a), \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(x_m, x) = X(a, x).$$

We claim that a is a colimit of ϕ . For this it suffices to show that

$$\phi = \sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(-, x_m).$$

For all $x \in X$ and $k \geq 1$, since

$$(1 - 1/k) \& \sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(x, x_m) \leq \sup_{n \geq k} \inf_{m \geq n} \phi(x_m) \& X(x, x_m) \leq \phi(x),$$

it follows that

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(x, x_m) \leq \phi(x)$$

by arbitrariness of k . On the other hand, since

$$X(x, x_m) \geq \psi(x_m) \& \phi(x) \geq (1 - 1/m) \& \phi(x)$$

for all $m \geq 1$, then

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} X(x, x_m) \geq \sup_{n \geq 1} \inf_{m \geq n} (1 - 1/m) \& \phi(x) \geq \phi(x). \quad \square$$

The following conclusion was first observed by Lawvere [51] for metric spaces.

Theorem 8.14. *A real-enriched category X is Cauchy complete if and only if each of its Cauchy sequences converges uniquely in the open ball topology of its symmetrization.*

9. YONEDA COMPLETENESS

This section deals with an important notion in the theory of real-enriched categories, that of Yoneda completeness. Yoneda complete enriched categories may be viewed as analogue of directed partially ordered sets in the enriched context.

The following definition is taken from Bonsangue, van Breugel and Rutten [9], and Wagner [77].

Definition 9.1. Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a net and b is an element of a real-enriched category X . We say that

- (i) $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy if

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq j \geq i} X(x_j, x_k) = 1.$$

- (ii) b is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ if for all $y \in X$,

$$X(b, y) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j} X(x_j, y).$$

Every Cauchy net is forward Cauchy; every bilimit is a Yoneda limit; and every net has at most one Yoneda limit up to isomorphism. The following proposition says that for Cauchy nets, Yoneda limits coincides with bilimits.

Proposition 9.2. *Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a Cauchy net and b is an element of a real-enriched category X . Then b of X is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ if and only if it is a bilimit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$.*

Proof. Sufficiency is trivial, for necessity we show $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(b, x_j) \geq 1$. Since b is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(b, x_j) &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} X(x_k, x_j) \\ &\geq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k, j \geq i} X(x_k, x_j) \\ &\geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Definition 9.3. A real-enriched category is Yoneda complete if each of its forward Cauchy nets has a unique Yoneda limit. A functor between real-enriched categories (not necessarily Yoneda complete) is Yoneda continuous if it preserves Yoneda limits of all forward Cauchy nets.

It is clear that X is Yoneda complete if it is separated and every forward Cauchy net of X has a Yoneda limit.

Suppose (X, \leq) is an ordered set, $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a net and b is an element of X . It is readily verified that

- (i) $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy in the real-enriched category $\omega(X, \leq)$ if and only if it is eventually monotone.
(ii) b is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ if and only if it is the least eventual upper bound of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$.

Therefore, $\omega(X, \leq)$ is Yoneda complete whenever (X, \leq) is a dcpo. Furthermore, an order-preserving map $f: (X, \leq) \rightarrow (Y, \leq)$ is Scott continuous if and only if $f: \omega(X, \leq) \rightarrow \omega(Y, \leq)$ is Yoneda continuous.

Lemma 9.4. *Suppose $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $\mathbb{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$.*

- (i) $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$, so \mathbb{V} is Yoneda complete.
(ii) $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is order convergent; that is, $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j = \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j$.

Proof. The first conclusion is contained in Wagner [77], the second in Lai, D & G Zhang [49].

(i) We wish to show that for each $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \rightarrow x = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (a_j \rightarrow x).$$

Since $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{k \geq j} (a_j \rightarrow a_k) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \sup_{l \in D} \inf_{k \geq l} (a_j \rightarrow a_k) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \left[a_j \rightarrow \left(\sup_{l \in D} \inf_{k \geq l} a_k \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \rightarrow x &\leq \left[\left(\sup_{l \in D} \inf_{k \geq l} a_k \right) \rightarrow x \right] \& \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \left[a_j \rightarrow \left(\sup_{l \in D} \inf_{k \geq l} a_k \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (a_j \rightarrow x). \end{aligned}$$

For the converse inequality, since the index set D is directed, then

$$\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (a_j \rightarrow x) \right) \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \& (a_j \rightarrow x) \leq x,$$

hence

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (a_j \rightarrow x) \leq \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \rightarrow x.$$

(ii) Since $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$, it follows that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \rightarrow x = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (a_j \rightarrow x) \leq \left(\inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \rightarrow x.$$

Putting $x = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j$ we obtain that

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j \geq \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j.$$

The converse inequality is trivial. \square

The following lemma, from Lai, D & G Zhang [49], is not the dual of Lemma 9.4.

Lemma 9.5. *Suppose $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$.*

- (i) $\inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$, so \mathbf{V}^{op} is Yoneda complete.
- (ii) $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is order convergent; that is, $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j = \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j$.

Proof. (i) We wish to show that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$x \rightarrow \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow a_j).$$

Since $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of \mathbf{V}^{op} ,

$$1 \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq j \geq i} \alpha_R(a_j, a_k) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq j \geq i} (a_k \rightarrow a_j),$$

then

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \left[\sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} (a_k \rightarrow a_j) \right] \geq 1,$$

hence

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \left[\left(\inf_{h \in D} \sup_{k \geq h} \right) \rightarrow a_j \right] \geq 1,$$

and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j &\leq \left[x \rightarrow \inf_{h \in D} \sup_{k \geq h} a_k \right] \& \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \left[\left(\inf_{h \in D} \sup_{k \geq h} \right) \rightarrow a_j \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow a_j). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since for each $i \in D$ we always have

$$\sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} (x \rightarrow a_k) \leq x \rightarrow \sup_{j \geq i} a_j,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} x \rightarrow \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j &= \inf_{i \in D} \left(x \rightarrow \sup_{j \geq i} a_j \right) \\ &\geq \sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} (x \rightarrow a_k) \\ &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow a_j). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ in \mathbf{V}^{op} .

(ii) Since $\inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{a_i\}$ in $([0, 1], \alpha_R)$, it follows that for all $x \in [0, 1]$,

$$x \rightarrow \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow a_j) \leq x \rightarrow \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j.$$

Putting $x = 1$ we obtain that

$$\inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} a_j \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} a_j.$$

The converse inequality is trivial. \square

Remark 9.6. Lemma 9.4 implies that every forward Cauchy net of $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is order convergent; Lemma 9.5 implies that every forward Cauchy net of $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$ is order convergent too. But, \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{V}^{op} may have different forward Cauchy nets. For example, in the case that $\&$ is the product t-norm, the sequence $\{1/n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V}^{op} but not in \mathbf{V} .

Lemma 9.7. (Wagner [77]) *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $\mathcal{P}X$. Then, $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \phi_j$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in D}$. In particular, $\mathcal{P}X$ is Yoneda complete.*

Proof. We wish to show that for each $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$,

$$\mathcal{P}X \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \phi_j, \phi \right) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_j, \phi).$$

For each $x \in X$, it is clear that $\{\phi_i(x)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$, hence

$$\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \phi_j(x) \right) \rightarrow \phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (\phi_j(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)).$$

Thus, we only need to check that

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (\phi_j(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_j, \phi).$$

Since $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy,

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (\phi_j(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \\ &\leq \left[\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} (\phi_k(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \right] \& \left[\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{k \geq j} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_j, \phi_k) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{x \in X} \left[\left(\sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} (\phi_k(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \right) \& \left(\inf_{k \geq j} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_j, \phi_k) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{x \in X} \sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h, j} (\phi_k(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \& (\phi_j(x) \rightarrow \phi_k(x)) \\
&\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{x \in A} (\phi_j(x) \rightarrow \phi(x)) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(\phi_j, \phi).
\end{aligned}$$

The converse inequality is trivial. \square

Proposition 9.8. *A forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of a real-enriched category X is Cauchy if and only if the weight $\phi := \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$ is Cauchy.*

Proof. The conclusion is contained in Hofmann and Reis [29], Li and Zhang [52]. Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a Cauchy net. We show that ϕ is right adjoint to

$$\psi := \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, -);$$

that is, $\phi \circ \psi \geq 1$ and $\psi \circ \phi(x, y) \leq X(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. For this we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi \circ \psi &= \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x) \\
&= \sup_{x \in X} \left[\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \right] \\
&= \sup_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in D} \left[\left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \& \left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \right] & (D \text{ is directed}) \\
&\geq \sup_{i \in D} \left[\left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_i, x_j) \right) \& \left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x_i) \right) \right] & (\text{let } x = x_i \text{ for each } i) \\
&= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_i, x_j) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x_i) \right) & (D \text{ is directed}) \\
&= 1; & (\{x_i\}_{i \in D} \text{ is Cauchy})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi \circ \phi(x, y) &= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \left[\left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y) \right) \& \left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \right] & (D \text{ is directed}) \\
&\leq \sup_{i \in D} X(x_i, y) \& X(x, x_i) \\
&\leq X(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

Conversely, suppose ϕ is a Cauchy weight. By Proposition 5.6, the left adjoint of ϕ is $\psi := X \swarrow \phi$. By Lemma 9.7, ϕ is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{X(-, x_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of $\mathcal{P}X$, then for all $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(x) &= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, X(-, x)) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(X(-, x_k), X(-, x)) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq i} X(x_k, x).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k, j \geq i} X(x_k, x_j) &\geq \sup_{x \in X} \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k, j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \& X(x_k, x) \\
&\geq \sup_{x \in X} \left[\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq i} X(x_k, x) \right) \right] \\
&= \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \& \psi(x) \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is Cauchy. \square

In the following we show that Yoneda limits of forward Cauchy nets can be characterized as colimits of a special kind of weights — ideals of real-enriched categories.

We say that a functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between real-enriched categories *preserves finite colimits* if for any finite real-enriched category K (that means, K has a finite number of objects), any functor $h: K \rightarrow X$, and any weight ϕ of K , $f(\text{colim}_\phi h)$ is a colimit of $f \circ h$ weighted by ϕ whenever $\text{colim}_\phi h$ exists; that is to say, $f(\text{colim}_\phi h) = \text{colim}_\phi(f \circ h)$.

Definition 9.9. Let X be a real-enriched category. A weight ϕ of X is called an ideal if the functor

$$\text{sub}_X(\phi, -): \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

preserves finite colimits, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$.

The term *ideal* is chosen because of the fact that an ideal of an ordered set P (i.e. a directed lower set of P) is exactly a non-empty join-irreducible element in the set of lower sets of P .

Every Cauchy weight is clearly an ideal; in particular, every representable weight is an ideal. Since $\mathcal{P}X$ is complete, it follows from Corollary 7.10 that a weight ϕ of X is an ideal if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:

(I1) $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -): \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves tensors; that is,

$$\text{sub}_X(\phi, r \& \lambda) = r \& \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda)$$

for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}X$ and all $r \in [0, 1]$.

(I2) $\text{sub}_X(\phi, -): (\mathcal{P}X)_0 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ preserves finite joins; that is,

$$\text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda \vee \mu) = \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda) \vee \text{sub}_X(\phi, \mu)$$

for all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}X$.

Suppose that ϕ is an ideal of X . Since $\text{sub}_X(\phi, 1_X) = 1$, then $\text{sub}_X(\phi, p_X) = p$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$ and ϕ is *inhabited* in the sense that $\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) = 1$.

For each real-enriched category X , let

$$\mathcal{I}X$$

be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}X$ composed of ideals of X . Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a functor. Making use of the equality $\text{sub}_Y(f_\exists(\phi), \mu) = \text{sub}_X(\phi, f^{-1}(\mu))$ for every weight ϕ of X and every weight μ of Y , one readily verifies that if ϕ is an ideal, then so is $f_\exists(\phi)$. Thus, the assignment $X \mapsto \mathcal{I}X$ defines a functor

$$\mathcal{I}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat},$$

a subfunctor of the presheaf functor $\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.

Proposition 8.13 shows that for each real-enriched category X , the following conditions are equivalent:

- Every Cauchy weight of X has a colimit.
- Every Cauchy net of X has a bilimit.

A parallel result holds for Yoneda limits and colimits of ideals.

Theorem 9.10. *Let X be a real-enriched category. Then, every forward Cauchy net of X has a Yoneda limit if and only if every ideal of X has a colimit. Therefore, X is Yoneda complete if and only if each of its ideals has a unique colimit.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Lemma 9.11 and Proposition 9.13 below. \square

The following lemma, from Flagg, Sünderhauf and Wagner [18], relates Yoneda limits of forward Cauchy nets to colimits of weights.

Lemma 9.11. *Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of a real-enriched category X . Then, an element of X is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ if and only if it is a colimit of the weight $\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$.*

Proof. Since $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is fully faithful, $\{X(-, x_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $\mathcal{P}X$. By Lemma 9.7, the weight

$$\phi := \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$$

is a Yoneda limit of $\{X(-, x_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Then for each $y \in X$,

$$\mathcal{P}X(\phi, X(-, x)) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(X(-, x_j), X(-, x)) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x).$$

Therefore, for each b of X ,

$$\begin{aligned} & b \text{ is a Yoneda limit of } \{x_i\}_{i \in D} \\ \iff & \forall x \in X, X(b, x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \\ \iff & \forall x \in X, X(b, x) = \mathcal{P}X(\phi, X(-, x)) \\ \iff & b \text{ is a colimit of } \phi. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

For every dcpo (X, \leq) , the real-enriched category $\omega(X, \leq)$ is Yoneda complete. Conversely, as a consequence of the above lemma we show that the underlying order of a Yoneda complete real-enriched category is directed complete.

Corollary 9.12. *The underlying ordered set of each Yoneda complete real-enriched category is a dcpo.*

Proof. Suppose X is Yoneda complete, D is a directed subset of X_0 . We view D as a forward Cauchy net of X and let b be its Yoneda limit. By Lemma 9.11, b is a colimit of the weight $\sup_{x \in D} \inf_{y \geq x} X(-, y)$. Since $\inf_{y \geq x} X(-, y) = X(-, x)$ for every $x \in D$, it follows that b is a colimit of the conical weight $\sup_{x \in D} X(-, x)$, hence a join of D in X_0 by the argument of Theorem 7.8. \square

To state and prove Proposition 9.13, we need the notion of formal balls of a real-enriched category. Suppose X is a real-enriched category. A *formal ball* of X is a pair (x, r) with $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$, x is called the center and r the radius. For formal balls (x, r) and (y, s) , define

$$(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, s) \quad \text{if } r \leq s \ \& \ X(x, y).$$

The relation \sqsubseteq is reflexive and transitive, hence an order on the set of formal balls. We write BX for the set of formal balls of X ordered by \sqsubseteq . It is obvious that $(x, 0) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, so any formal ball with radius 0 is a bottom element of BX .

The ordered set of formal balls is introduced by Weihrauch and Schreiber [79] for metric spaces. It has been extended to quasi-metric spaces and quantale-enriched categories in general, and has been investigated extensively, see e.g. Edalat and Heckmann [14], Goubault-Larrecq and Ng [21], Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40], Rutten [67].

The ordered set BX of formal balls is closely related to $\mathcal{P}X$. For all $x, y \in X$ and $r, s \in [0, 1]$, since

$$\mathcal{P}X(r \ \& \ y(x), s \ \& \ y(y)) = r \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X(y(x), s \ \& \ y(y)) = r \rightarrow (s \ \& \ X(x, y)),$$

it follows that

$$(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, s) \iff 1 \leq \mathcal{P}X(r \ \& \ y(x), s \ \& \ y(y)).$$

So, if we identify a formal ball (x, r) with the weight $r \ \& \ y(x)$, then the order relation between formal balls is essentially the order relation inherited from $(\mathcal{P}X)_0$.

The following proposition, from Yu and Zhang [84], is an improvement of related results in Lai, D & G Zhang [49]. It shows that ideals of a real-enriched category X are precisely those weights generated by forward Cauchy nets of X .

Proposition 9.13. *For each weight ϕ of a real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) ϕ is an ideal.
- (2) $\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) = 1$ and $B\phi := \{(x, r) \in BX \mid \phi(x) > r\}$ is a directed subset of BX .
- (3) $\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$ for some forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of X .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) We only need to check that $(B\phi, \sqsubseteq)$ is directed. For (x, r) and (y, s) of $B\phi$, consider the weights

$$\phi_1 = X(x, -) \rightarrow r \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2 = X(y, -) \rightarrow s.$$

Since ϕ is an ideal, it holds that

$$\mathcal{P}X(\phi, \phi_1 \vee \phi_2) = \mathcal{P}X(\phi, \phi_1) \vee \mathcal{P}X(\phi, \phi_2) = (\phi(x) \rightarrow r) \vee (\phi(y) \rightarrow s).$$

Since

$$(\phi(x) \rightarrow r) \vee (\phi(y) \rightarrow s) < 1,$$

there exists $z \in X$ such that

$$\phi(z) > (X(x, z) \rightarrow r) \vee (X(y, z) \rightarrow s).$$

Pick $t \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\phi(z) > t > (X(x, z) \rightarrow r) \vee (X(y, z) \rightarrow s).$$

Then $(z, t) \in B\phi$. We assert that (z, t) is an upper bound of (x, r) and (y, s) , hence $(B\phi, \sqsubseteq)$ is directed. To see this, let $u = X(x, z) \rightarrow r$. Then u is, by definition, the largest element of $[0, 1]$ with $u \& X(x, z) \leq r$. Since $t > u$, it follows that $r < t \& X(x, z)$, then $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (z, t)$. Likewise, $(y, s) \sqsubseteq (z, t)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Index the directed set $(B\phi, \sqsubseteq)$ by itself as $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$; that means, $(x_i, r_i) \sqsubseteq (x_j, r_j)$ if and only if $i \leq j$. We show in two steps that the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ satisfies the requirement.

Step 1. $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy.

Let $r < 1$. Pick $(x_i, r_i) \in B\phi$ with $r_i > r$. Then

$$r \leq r_i \leq r_j \leq r_k \& X(x_j, x_k) \leq X(x_j, x_k)$$

whenever $i \leq j \leq k$. Thus, $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy by arbitrariness of r .

Step 2. For all $x \in X$,

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j).$$

If $r < \phi(x)$, then $(x, r) \in B\phi$, so $(x, r) = (x_k, r_k)$ for some $k \in D$. Therefore,

$$r \leq \inf_{j \geq k} X(x_k, x_j) \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_i, x_j),$$

and consequently,

$$\phi(x) \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j)$$

by arbitrariness of r .

Conversely, if

$$r < \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j),$$

then there exist $k \in D$ and $s \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$r < s \leq \inf_{j \geq k} X(x, x_j).$$

Since $\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) = 1$, there is $l \in D$ such that $r \leq s \& r_l$. Take an upper bound (x_h, r_h) of (x_k, r_k) and (x_l, r_l) . Then

$$r \leq s \& r_l \leq s \& r_h \leq X(x, x_h) \& \phi(x_h) \leq \phi(x).$$

Therefore,

$$\phi(x) \geq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j)$$

by arbitrariness of r .

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of X . We wish to show that

$$\phi := \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$$

is an ideal.

Step 1. We show that for each weight λ of X ,

$$\text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda) = \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \lambda(x_j).$$

Since λ is a weight, $\{\lambda(x_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of \mathbf{V}^{op} , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda) &= \text{sub}_X\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j), \lambda\right) \\ &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathcal{P}X(X(-, x_j), \lambda) && \text{(Lemma 9.7)} \\ &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \lambda(x_j) && \text{(Yoneda lemma)} \\ &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \lambda(x_j). && \text{(Lemma 9.5 (ii))} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}X$ and all $r \in [0, 1]$, $\text{sub}_X(\phi, r \& \lambda) = r \& \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda)$.

By Step 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sub}_X(\phi, r \& \lambda) &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} r \& \lambda(x_j) \\ &= r \& \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \lambda(x_j) && \text{(\& is continuous)} \\ &= r \& \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. For all weights λ, μ of X , $\text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda \vee \mu) = \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda) \vee \text{sub}_X(\phi, \mu)$.

For this we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda) \vee \text{sub}_X(\phi, \mu) \\ &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \lambda(x_j) \vee \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \mu(x_j) && \text{(Step 1)} \\ &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} (\lambda(x_j) \vee \mu(x_j)) \\ &= \text{sub}_X(\phi, \lambda \vee \mu). && \text{(Step 1)} \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. \square

Suppose $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX . If r_i tends to 1, the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is clearly forward Cauchy. Such nets are said to be *weightable* in Goubault-Larrecq [20].

We list here some consequences of Lemma 9.11 and Proposition 9.13.

- (i) A functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is Yoneda continuous if and only if it preserves colimits of all ideals.
- (ii) For each forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, there is a weightable forward Cauchy net $\{y_j\}_{j \in E}$ such that $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ and $\{y_j\}_{j \in E}$ have the same Yoneda limits. In particular, a real-enriched category is Yoneda complete if and only if each of its weightable forward Cauchy nets has a unique Yoneda limit.

Another consequence of Proposition 9.13 is that for real-enriched categories, ideals in the sense of Definition 9.9 coincide with those in the sense of Flagg, Sünderhauf and Wagner [18, Definition 10].

Corollary 9.14. *Suppose ϕ is a weight of a real-enriched category X . Then ϕ is an ideal of X if and only if it satisfies the following conditions:*

- (i) $\sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) = 1$.
- (ii) *If $r < 1$, $s_1 < \phi(x_1)$ and $s_2 < \phi(x_2)$, then there exists $x \in X$ such that $r < \phi(x)$, $s_1 < X(x_1, x)$ and $s_2 < X(x_2, x)$.*

Corollary 9.15. (i) *A weight ϕ of $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is an ideal if and only if either $\phi(x) = x \rightarrow a$ for some $a \in [0, 1]$ or $\phi(x) = \sup_{b < a} (x \rightarrow b)$ for some $a > 0$.*

- (ii) *A weight ψ of $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$ is an ideal if and only if either $\psi(x) = a \rightarrow x$ for some $a \in [0, 1]$ or $\psi(x) = \sup_{b > a} (b \rightarrow x)$ for some $a < 1$.*

Proof. We prove (i) for example. Sufficiency is easy since the weight $\sup_{b < a} (x \rightarrow b)$ is generated by the forward Cauchy sequence $\{a - 1/n\}_{n \geq 1}$. For necessity suppose ϕ is an ideal of $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. Then there is a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ such that

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow x_j).$$

Let $a = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} x_j$. Then

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (x \rightarrow x_j) = \sup_{i \in D} \left(x \rightarrow \inf_{j \geq i} x_j \right),$$

hence either $\phi(x) = x \rightarrow a$ or $\phi(x) = \sup_{b < a} (x \rightarrow b)$. \square

Corollary 9.16. *Every functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with X symmetric is Yoneda continuous.*

Proof. Let b be a Yoneda limit of a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of X . From symmetry of X one infers that $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a Cauchy net, hence $\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$ is a Cauchy weight by Proposition 9.8 and consequently, f preserves the colimit of ϕ by Proposition 8.1. \square

Theorem 9.17. *Let X be a real-enriched category. Then*

- (i) *$\mathcal{I}X$ is Yoneda complete.*
- (ii) *For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y Yoneda complete, there is a unique Yoneda continuous functor $\bar{f}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow Y$ that extends f .*

Proof. Write $\mathbf{i}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ for the inclusion functor and write $\mathbf{t}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}X$ for the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{I}X$. The composite $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{t}$ is then the Yoneda embedding $\mathbf{y}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.

(i) We show that $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under formation of colimits of ideals. That means, for each ideal Λ of $\mathcal{I}X$, the colimit of the inclusion functor $\mathbf{i}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by Λ is an ideal of X . Since the composite $\mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{t}$ is the Yoneda embedding $\mathbf{y}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$, from Example 6.5 it follows that

$$\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i} = \text{colim } \Lambda \circ \mathbf{i}^* = \Lambda \circ \mathbf{i}^* \circ \mathbf{i}_* \circ \mathbf{t}_* = \Lambda \circ \mathbf{t}_*,$$

hence for each weight ϕ of X ,

$$\text{sub}_X(\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}, \phi) = \text{sub}_X(\Lambda \circ \mathbf{t}_*, \phi) = \text{sub}_{\mathcal{I}X}(\Lambda, \text{sub}_X(-, \phi)).$$

Then, for each weight ϕ of X and each $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sub}_X(\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}, r \& \phi) &= \text{sub}_{\mathcal{I}X}(\Lambda, \text{sub}_X(-, r \& \phi)) \\ &= \text{sub}_{\mathcal{I}X}(\Lambda, r \& \text{sub}_X(-, \phi)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= r \& \text{sub}_{\mathcal{I}X}(\Lambda, \text{sub}_X(-, \phi)) \\
&= r \& \text{sub}_X(\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}, \phi),
\end{aligned}$$

showing that $\text{sub}_X(\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}, -)$ preserves tensor. In the same fashion one verifies that $\text{sub}_X(\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}, -)$ preserves finite join. So $\text{colim}_{\Lambda} \mathbf{i}$ is an ideal of X , as desired.

(ii) The functor

$$\bar{f}: \mathcal{I}X \longrightarrow Y, \quad \phi \mapsto \text{colim}_{\phi} f$$

clearly extends f . It remains to check that \bar{f} preserves colimits of ideals. It is clear that \bar{f} is equal to the composite $\text{colim} \circ f_{\exists}: \mathcal{I}X \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}Y \longrightarrow Y$. Since $\text{colim}: \mathcal{I}Y \longrightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $\mathbf{t}: Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}Y$, it preserves colimits. Since $\mathcal{I}X$ and $\mathcal{I}Y$ are, respectively, closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ and $\mathcal{P}Y$ under formation of colimits of ideals, and $f_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ preserves all colimits, it follows that the composite \bar{f} preserves colimits of all ideals. Uniqueness of \bar{f} follows from that each ideal ϕ of X is the colimit of $\mathbf{t}: X \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}X$ weighted by ϕ . \square

Proposition 9.13 shows that forward Cauchy nets are closely related to directed subsets of the set of formal balls. Actually, there exist interesting interactions between Yoneda completeness of a real-enriched category and directed completeness of its set of formal balls.

In the following, we agree by convention that a directed subset $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of BX is always indexed by itself; that means, $(x_i, r_i) \sqsubseteq (x_j, r_j)$ if and only if $i \leq j$.

Lemma 9.18. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX with $r_i > 0$ for some $i \in D$.*

- (i) *If $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$, then the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy.*
- (ii) *If $\&$ is Archimedean, then the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy.*

Proof. (i) Since $r_i \leq r_j \& X(x_i, x_j)$ whenever $i \leq j$, it follows that

$$1 = \sup_{i \in D} r_i \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j} r_j \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j \leq k} X(x_j, x_k),$$

then $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy.

(ii) Since $\&$ is Archimedean, it is readily verified that for all $r, s, t \in [0, 1]$,

$$0 < r \leq s \& t \implies t \geq s \rightarrow r.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that $r_i > 0$ for all $i \in D$. Since $r_i \leq r_j \& X(x_i, x_j)$ whenever $i \leq j$, then $X(x_i, x_j) \geq r_j \rightarrow r_i$ whenever $i \leq j$. Since the net $\{r_i\}_{i \in D}$ converges to its join and the implication operator of an Archimedean continuous \mathbf{t} -norm is continuous except possibly at $(0, 0)$, it follows that $X(x_i, x_j)$ tends to 1, so $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy. \square

We say that a real-enriched category X has *property (R)* if, for each pair (s, t) of elements of $[0, 1]$ with $0 < s \leq t$, there exists $r < 1$ such that

$$(x, t \& r') \sqsubseteq (y, s) \iff (x, r') \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s)$$

for all $x, y \in X$ and all $r' \geq r$.

Lemma 9.19. *Let X be a real-enriched category with property (R). Then for all $x, y \in X$, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $(x, 1) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$.
- (2) $(x, s) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$ for all $s \neq 0$.
- (3) $(x, s) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$ for some $s \neq 0$.

Proof. It suffices to check (3) \implies (1). Since $0 < s \leq s$, there is some $r < 1$ such that

$$(x, s \& r') \sqsubseteq (y, s) \iff (x, r') \sqsubseteq (y, s \rightarrow s)$$

whenever $r' \geq r$. Putting $r' = 1$ gives that $(x, 1) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$. \square

Proposition 9.20. (Yang and Zhang [81]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The continuous t-norm $\&$ is Archimedean.*
- (2) *Every real-enriched category has property (R).*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Since $\&$ is Archimedean, it is either isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm or to the product t-norm. In the following we check the conclusion for the case that $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm, leaving the other case to the reader. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\&$ is, not only isomorphic to, the Łukasiewicz t-norm; that is, $r \& s = \max\{0, r + s - 1\}$.

Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $0 < s \leq t$. If $t = 1$, it is trivial that

$$(x, t \& r') \sqsubseteq (y, s) \iff (x, r') \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s)$$

for all $r' > 0$ and $x, y \in X$, so each $r > 0$ satisfies the requirement. If $t < 1$, pick $r \in (1 - t, 1)$. Then for all $r' \geq r$ and $x, y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} (x, t \& r') \sqsubseteq (y, s) &\iff r' + t - 1 \leq s + X(x, y) - 1 \\ &\iff r' \leq s - t + X(x, y) \\ &\iff (x, r') \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that r satisfies the requirement.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) We wish to show that $\&$ has no nontrivial idempotent element. It suffices to show that for all $s \neq 0$ and $q \in [0, 1]$, if $s \leq s \& q$ then $q = 1$. Consider the real-enriched category $X = \{x, y\}$ with $X(x, x) = X(y, y) = 1$ and $X(x, y) = q = X(y, x)$. Since $(x, s) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$ and X has property (R), then $(x, 1) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$, hence $1 \leq 1 \& X(x, y) = q$. \square

Corollary 9.21. *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *X has property (R).*
- (2) *For all $x, y \in X$, if $X(x, y) \geq p$ for some idempotent element $p > 0$, then $X(x, y) = 1$.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose $X(x, y) \geq p > 0$ with p idempotent. Let $s = t = p$. Since $t = p = s \& X(x, y)$, it follows that $(x, p) \sqsubseteq (y, p)$. Then by property (R) one gets that $(x, 1) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$, hence $X(x, y) = 1$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) By Proposition 9.20 we may assume that $\&$ is non-Archimedean with a nontrivial idempotent q . Let X be a real-enriched category such that $X(x, y) = 1$ whenever $X(x, y) \geq p$ for some idempotent element $p > 0$. We wish to show that X has property (R). For this we show that if $0 < s \leq t$ and $r > q$, then

$$(x, t \& r) \sqsubseteq (y, s) \iff (x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s)$$

for all $x, y \in X$. The direction \Leftarrow is trivial. For the other direction, suppose $(x, t \& r) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$. We proceed with two cases. If $q \leq t$, then $q \leq t \& r \leq s \& X(x, y)$, so $X(x, y) = 1$ by assumption, hence $t \& r \leq s$. Therefore $r \leq t \rightarrow s$ and consequently, $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s)$. If $q > t$, then $t = t \& r \leq s \& X(x, y)$, so $t = s$ and $X(x, y) \geq p$, where p is the least idempotent element in $[t, 1]$. By assumption we have $X(x, y) = 1$, then $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, t \rightarrow s)$. \square

Lemma 9.22. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category with property (R), $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX . If*

- (i) $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$,
- (ii) $(b, 1)$ is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, and
- (iii) for each $t > 0$, the directed set $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a join,

then b is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$.

Proof. We wish to show that for all $y \in X$,

$$X(b, y) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y).$$

Fix $i \in D$. For each $j \geq i$, since $(x_j, r_j) \sqsubseteq (b, 1)$, then

$$r_i \& X(b, y) \leq r_j \& X(b, y) \leq X(x_j, b) \& X(b, y) \leq X(x_j, y),$$

hence

$$r_i \& X(b, y) \leq \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y).$$

Therefore,

$$X(b, y) = \sup_{i \in D} (r_i \& X(b, y)) \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y).$$

For the converse inequality, let

$$t = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, y).$$

We show that $t \leq X(b, y)$. We assume $t > 0$ and finish the proof in two steps.

Step 1. (b, t) is a join of $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

By assumption $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a join, say (z, s) . We only need to show that (b, t) is equivalent to (z, s) . Since (b, t) is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then $(z, s) \sqsubseteq (b, t)$, hence $s \leq t$. Since r_i tends to 1 and $t \& r_i \leq s \& X(x_i, z)$ for all $i \in D$, it follows that $t \leq s$. Therefore $0 < s = t$. Since r_i tends to 1, we may assume that all r_i are large enough. Since (z, t) is a join of $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, $t \& r_i \leq t \& X(x_i, z)$ for all $i \in D$, then by property (R) of X , $r_i \leq (t \rightarrow t) \& X(x_i, z) = X(x_i, z)$ for all $i \in D$. This shows that $(z, 1)$ is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, so $(b, 1) \sqsubseteq (z, 1)$, and then $(b, t) \sqsubseteq (z, t)$. Therefore, (b, t) is equivalent to (z, s) .

Step 2. $t \leq X(b, y)$.

For each $i \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned} r_i \& t &= r_i \& \sup_{k \in D} \inf_{j \geq k} X(x_j, y) \\ &= r_i \& \sup_{k \geq i} \inf_{j \geq k} X(x_j, y) \\ &= \sup_{k \geq i} \inf_{j \geq k} r_i \& X(x_j, y) \\ &\leq \sup_{k \geq i} \inf_{j \geq k} r_j \& X(x_i, x_j) \& X(x_j, y) \\ &\leq X(x_i, y), \end{aligned}$$

then $(x_i, t \& r_i) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$. This shows that $(y, 1)$ is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then $(b, t) \sqsubseteq (y, 1)$ and $t \leq X(b, y)$, as desired. \square

The condition (iii) in Lemma 9.22 cannot be dropped.

Example 9.23. (Yang and Zhang [81]) Suppose $\&$ is the Łukasiewicz t-norm or the product t-norm. Consider the real-enriched category X , where $X = \{1\} \cup \{1 - 1/n \mid n \geq 2\}$ and

$$X(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & x = 1, y \neq 1, \\ x \rightarrow y & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We assert that X is not Yoneda complete, but every directed subset $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of BX with $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$ has a join.

The sequence $\{1 - 1/n\}_{n \geq 2}$ is forward Cauchy but has no Yoneda limit, so X is not Yoneda complete. Now we show that every directed subset $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of BX with $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$ has a join. Since $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy, either $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is eventually constant or $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ converges to 1 (in the usual sense).

Case 1. $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ converges to 1. Then we claim that $(1, 1)$ is the only upper bound, hence a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Since $X(z, 1) = 1$ for all $z \in X$, then $r_i \leq 1 = 1 \& X(x_i, 1)$ for all $i \in D$, hence $(1, 1)$ is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Let (y, s) be an upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Then $s = 1$ and $r_i \leq X(x_i, y)$ for all $i \in D$. Since both $\{r_i\}_{i \in D}$ and $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ converge to 1, we must have $y = 1$. Therefore, $(1, 1)$ is the only upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

Case 2. $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is eventually constant. Then there is some $b \in X$ and some $i \in D$ such that $x_j = b$ whenever $j \geq i$. It is clear that $(b, 1)$ is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

Lemma 9.24. (Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40]) *Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX . If $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net with x being a Yoneda limit, then (x, r) is a join of the directed set $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, where $r = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$.*

Proof. First, we show that (x, r) is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$; that is, $r_i \leq r \& X(x_i, x)$ for all $i \in D$.

For each $i \in D$ and each $\epsilon < r_i$, by continuity of $\&$ and that

$$1 = X(x, x) = \sup_{k \in D} \inf_{j \geq k} X(x_j, x),$$

there is some $k \in D$ such that $\epsilon \leq r_i \& X(x_j, x)$ whenever $j \geq k$. Thus, for all $j \geq i, k$, we have

$$\epsilon \leq r_i \& X(x_j, x) \leq r_j \& X(x_i, x_j) \& X(x_j, x) \leq r \& X(x_i, x).$$

By arbitrariness of ϵ we obtain that $r_i \leq r \& X(x_i, x)$.

Next we show that $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$ whenever (y, s) is an upper bound of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Since (y, s) is an upper bound, then $r_i \leq r_j \leq s \& X(x_j, y)$ whenever $i \leq j$, hence

$$r = \sup_{i \in D} r_i \leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} s \& X(x_j, y) = s \& X(x, y),$$

which shows that $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y, s)$, as desired. \square

Theorem 9.25. *If the continuous t-norm $\&$ is Archimedean, then for each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every forward Cauchy net of X has a Yoneda limit.*
- (2) *The ordered set BX of formal balls is directed complete.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ be a directed subset of BX . If $r_i = 0$ for all $i \in D$, then $(x, 0)$ is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ for any $x \in X$. If $r_i > 0$ for some $i \in D$, by Lemma 9.18 (ii) the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy, so it has a Yoneda limit, say x . By Lemma 9.24, (x, r) is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, where $r = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$. This shows that BX is directed complete.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) We show that every ideal ϕ of X has a colimit. By Proposition 9.13, there is a directed subset $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of BX such that $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$ and

$$\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j).$$

By assumption $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a join, say $(b, 1)$. By Proposition 9.20 and Lemma 9.22, b is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, hence a colimit of ϕ by Lemma 9.11. \square

Theorem 9.25 shows that, when $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm, Yoneda completeness of a real-enriched category is equivalent to directed completeness of its set of formal balls. This is proved in Edalat and Heckmann [14] for metric spaces, then extended to quasi-metric spaces in Ali-Akbari, Honari, Pourmahdian and Rezaii [2] and Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40]. The form stated here appears in Yang and Zhang [81]. The following examples show that the requirement that $\&$ is Archimedean is indispensable.

Example 9.26. (Yang and Zhang [81]) This example shows that if $\&$ is non-Archimedean, then there is a real-enriched category that is Yoneda complete, but its set of formal balls is not directed complete. Since $\&$ is continuous and non-Archimedean, there is some $b \in (0, 1)$ such that $b \& b = b$. Consider the real-enriched category X , where $X = (0, b)$ and

$$X(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x = y, \\ \min\{x \rightarrow y, y \rightarrow x\} & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

Since $X(x, y) \leq b$ whenever $x \neq y$, every forward Cauchy net of X is eventually constant, so X is Yoneda complete. In the following we show that BX is not directed complete. Pick a strictly increasing sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $(0, b)$ that converges to b . For each n let $r_n = x_n$. We claim that the subset $(x_n, r_n)_{n \geq 1}$ of BX is directed and has no join.

By continuity of $\&$, for all $n \leq m$, we have

$$r_n = x_n = x_m \& (x_m \rightarrow x_n) = r_m \& X(x_n, x_m),$$

so $(x_n, r_n) \sqsubseteq (x_m, r_m)$ and consequently, $(x_n, r_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is directed.

Next we show that $(x_n, r_n)_{n \geq 1}$ does not have a join. Suppose on the contrary that (x, r) is a join of $(x_n, r_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Since $x < b$, there is some n_0 such that $x < x_m$ whenever $m \geq n_0$. Since (x, r) is an upper bound of $(x_n, r_n)_{n \geq 1}$, for each $m \geq n_0$ we have

$$r_m \leq r \& X(x_m, x) \leq x_m \rightarrow x,$$

this is impossible since the left side tends to b , while the right side tends to x .

Example 9.27. (Yang and Zhang [81]) If $\&$ is the Gödel t-norm, then there is a real-enriched category that is not Yoneda complete, but its set of formal balls is directed complete. Consider the real-enriched category X , where $X = \{1\} \cup \{1 - 1/n \mid n \geq 2\}$ and

$$X(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & x = y, \\ 1/3 & x = 1, y \neq 1, \\ \min\{x, y\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We claim that X is not Yoneda complete, but BX is directed complete.

For each $n \geq 2$, let $x_n = 1 - 1/n$. It is readily verified that the sequence $(x_n)_{n \geq 2}$ is forward Cauchy and has no Yoneda limit, so X is not Yoneda complete. It remains to check that BX is directed complete. Let $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ be a directed subset of BX . Then $\{r_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a monotone net of real numbers. Let $r = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. The net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is eventually constant; that is, there exist $b \in X$ and $i \in D$ such that $x_j = b$ whenever $j \geq i$. In this case (b, r) is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

Case 2. The net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is not eventually constant. Then for each i there is some $j \geq i$ such that $x_i \neq x_j$, hence

$$r_i \leq r_j \& X(x_i, x_j) \leq \min\{r_j, x_i, x_j\} \leq x_i.$$

Let $b = \min\{x \in X \mid r \leq x\}$. Then (b, r) is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

10. FLAT COMPLETENESS

Definition 10.1. Suppose ϕ is a weight of a real-enriched category X .

- (i) ϕ is conically flat if the functor $\phi \circ - : (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ preserves limits of finite conical coweights, where $\mathbb{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$.
- (ii) ϕ is flat if $\phi \circ - : (\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ preserves all finite limits.

The definition of flat weights is based on the notion of *flat distributors* in Bénabou [7, Section 6] and the characterization of flat functors in Borceux [10]. When the continuous t-norm is isomorphic to the product t-norm, conically flat weights appear as *flat left modules of quasi-metric spaces* in Vickers [76].

As we shall see below, in contrast to the characterization of Cauchy weights in Proposition 8.2, flat weights and ideals are not the same things in general.

We remind the reader that the underlying order of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ is opposite to the pointwise order of coweights, the underlying order of $(\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}}$ agrees with the pointwise order, the cotensor of r with ψ in $(\mathcal{P}^\dagger X)^{\text{op}}$ is given by $r \rightarrow \psi$.

Consider the following conditions:

- (a) $1 = \phi \circ 1_X = \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x)$; that is, ϕ is inhabited.
- (b) For all coweights ψ_1 and ψ_2 of X , $\phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = (\phi \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\phi \circ \psi_2)$.
- (c) For all $r \in [0, 1]$ and all coweights ψ of X , $\phi \circ (r \rightarrow \psi) = r \rightarrow \phi \circ \psi$.

Then, ϕ is conically flat if and only if it satisfies (a) and (b); ϕ is flat if and only if it satisfies (a)–(c).

The following characterization of conically flat weights is due to Gutiérrez García, Höhle and Kubiak [23].

Proposition 10.2. *Suppose ϕ is a weight of a real-enriched category X . Then, ϕ is conically flat if and only if it is inhabited and*

$$(p_1 \& \phi(x_1)) \wedge (p_2 \& \phi(x_2)) = \sup_{x \in X} ((p_1 \& X(x_1, x)) \wedge (p_2 \& X(x_2, x))) \& \phi(x)$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$ and all $p_1, p_2 \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Necessity is obvious, sufficiency follows from that

$$\psi = \sup_{x \in X} \psi(x) \& X(x, -)$$

for each coweight ψ of X . □

We leave it to the reader to check that when the continuous t-norm $\&$ is the Gödel t-norm, ϕ is conically flat if and only if it is inhabited and satisfies

$$\phi(x_1) \wedge \phi(x_2) = \sup_{x \in X} X(x_1, x) \wedge X(x_2, x) \wedge \phi(x).$$

Proposition 8.2 shows that every Cauchy weight is flat. The following conclusion, due to Lai, D & G Zhang [49], says that every ideal is conically flat.

Proposition 10.3. *Every ideal is conically flat.*

Proof. Suppose ϕ is an ideal of a real-enriched category X . We wish to show that ϕ is conically flat. Since every ideal is inhabited, we only need to check that for all coweights ψ_1 and ψ_2 of X , $\phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = (\phi \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\phi \circ \psi_2)$.

By Proposition 9.13 there is a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ such that

$$\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j).$$

We claim that for each coweight ψ of X ,

$$\phi \circ \psi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi(x_j).$$

Since ψ is a coweight, $\{\psi(x_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \circ \psi &= \inf_{p \in [0, 1]} (\text{sub}_X(\phi, \psi \rightarrow p) \rightarrow p) && \text{(Lemma 5.14)} \\ &= \inf_{p \in [0, 1]} \left(\text{sub}_X \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j), \psi \rightarrow p \right) \rightarrow p \right) \\ &= \inf_{p \in [0, 1]} \left(\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \text{sub}_X(X(-, x_j), \psi \rightarrow p) \right) \rightarrow p \right) && \text{(Lemma 9.7)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \inf_{p \in [0,1]} \left(\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (\psi(x_j) \rightarrow p) \right) \rightarrow p \right) && \text{(Yoneda lemma)} \\
&= \inf_{p \in [0,1]} \left(\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi(x_j) \rightarrow p \right) \rightarrow p \right) && \text{(Lemma 9.4)} \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Now for any coweights ψ_1 and ψ_2 of X , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\phi \circ \psi_2) &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi_1(x_j) \wedge \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi_2(x_j) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (\psi_1(x_j) \wedge \psi_2(x_j)) \\
&= \phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

In 2005, Vickers [76] proved that every flat left module of a generalized metric space is generated by a forward Cauchy net. Said differently, when the continuous t-norm is isomorphic to the product t-norm, a weight of a real-enriched category is conically flat if and only if it is an ideal. The following theorem, from Lai, D & G Zhang [49], says that a necessary and sufficient condition for ideals, flat weights, and conically flat weights to coincide with each other is that the continuous t-norm is Archimedean.

Theorem 10.4. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The continuous t-norm $\&$ is Archimedean.*
- (2) *Every ideal is a flat weight.*
- (3) *Every conically flat weight is an ideal.*

In this case, ideals, flat weights, and conically flat weights coincide with each other.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) It suffices to show that if ϕ is an ideal of a real-enriched category X , then $\phi \circ (r \rightarrow \psi) = r \rightarrow \phi \circ \psi$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and all coweights ψ of X . First we note that when $\&$ is continuous and Archimedean, for each $r \in [0, 1]$ the function $r \rightarrow - : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous. Pick a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ such that

$$\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j).$$

Then by the argument of Proposition 10.3 we have

$$\phi \circ (r \rightarrow \psi) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (r \rightarrow \psi(x_j)) = r \rightarrow \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \psi(x_j) = r \rightarrow \phi \circ \psi,$$

the second equality holds due to the continuity of $r \rightarrow - : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose on the contrary that $\&$ is not Archimedean. Take an idempotent element b of $\&$ other than 0 and 1, consider the ideal

$$\phi = \sup_{x < b} \alpha_L(-, x)$$

and the coweight $\psi = \alpha_L(b, -)$ of $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$. Then

$$\phi \circ (b \rightarrow \psi) = \sup_{x < b} (b \rightarrow (b \rightarrow x)) = b < 1 = b \rightarrow \sup_{x < b} x = b \rightarrow \phi \circ \psi,$$

contradicting that ϕ is flat.

(1) \Rightarrow (3) Since a continuous Archimedean t-norm is either isomorphic to the product t-norm or isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm, one readily verifies

- if $0 < r \& s$, then $\&$ is strictly monotone at (r, s) ;
- if $0 < t \leq r \& s$, then $r \rightarrow t \leq s$.

Suppose ϕ is a flat weight of a real-enriched category X . Let

$$B\phi = \{(x, r) \in X \times (0, 1] \mid \phi(x) > r\}.$$

We assert that $B\phi$ is a directed subset of the ordered set BX of formal balls of X .

It is clear that $B\phi$ is not empty. For (x, r) and (y, s) of $B\phi$, consider the coweights

$$\psi_1 = \max\{r \rightarrow 0, s\} \& X(x, -) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_2 = \max\{s \rightarrow 0, r\} \& X(y, -).$$

Since

$$\phi \circ \psi_1 = \max\{r \rightarrow 0, s\} \& \phi(x) > r \& s$$

and

$$\phi \circ \psi_2 = \max\{s \rightarrow 0, r\} \& \phi(y) > r \& s,$$

it follows that

$$\phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) > r \& s.$$

So, there exists $z \in X$ such that

$$\min\{\phi(z) \& \psi_1(z), \phi(z) \& \psi_2(z)\} > r \& s,$$

which implies that

$$\phi(z) \& (\max\{r \rightarrow 0, s\} \& X(x, z)) > r \& s$$

and

$$\phi(z) \& (\max\{s \rightarrow 0, r\} \& X(y, z)) > r \& s.$$

Let t be the larger one of

$$(\max\{r \rightarrow 0, s\} \& X(x, z)) \rightarrow (r \& s)$$

and

$$(\max\{s \rightarrow 0, r\} \& X(y, z)) \rightarrow (r \& s).$$

Then

$$\phi(z) > t, \quad r \leq t \& X(x, z), \quad s \leq t \& X(y, z),$$

which implies that (z, t) is an upper bound of (x, r) and (y, s) . So, $B\phi$ is directed.

Index the directed set $B\phi$ by itself as $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Then by the argument in Proposition 9.13 one sees that the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy and

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j)$$

for all $x \in X$, hence ϕ is an ideal.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose on the contrary that b is a non-trivial idempotent element of $\&$. Pick $a \in (0, b)$. Consider the weight ϕ of \mathbb{V} given by $\phi(x) = b \vee (x \rightarrow a)$. Since neither $\phi(x) \leq b$ for all x nor $\phi(x) \leq x \rightarrow a$ for all x , then ϕ is not an ideal. In the following we derive a contradiction by showing that ϕ is conically flat.

It is clear that ϕ is inhabited. It remains to check that for all coweights ψ_1, ψ_2 of \mathbb{V} , $\phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = (\phi \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\phi \circ \psi_2)$. Since b is idempotent and ψ_i ($i = 1, 2$) is monotone, then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \circ \psi_i &= \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} ((b \& \psi_i(x)) \vee ((x \rightarrow a) \& \psi_i(x))) \\ &= (b \wedge \psi_i(1)) \vee \psi_i(a) \\ &= (b \vee \psi_i(a)) \wedge \psi_i(1), \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\phi \circ \psi_2) &= (b \vee \psi_1(a)) \wedge \psi_1(1) \wedge (b \vee \psi_2(a)) \wedge \psi_2(1) \\ &= (b \vee (\psi_1(a) \wedge \psi_2(a))) \wedge (\psi_1(1) \wedge \psi_2(1)) \\ &= \phi \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 10.5. A real-enriched category is (conically, resp.) flat complete if it is separated and each of its (conically, resp.) flat weights has a colimit.

For each real-enriched category X , let

$$\mathcal{F}X$$

be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}X$ composed of flat weights of X . The assignment $X \mapsto \mathcal{F}X$ defines a functor $\mathcal{F}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, which is a subfunctor of the presheaf functor $\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.

Theorem 10.6. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category. Then*

- (i) $\mathcal{F}X$ is flat complete.
- (ii) For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y flat complete, there is a unique functor $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}X \rightarrow Y$ that extends f and preserves colimits of flat weights.

Proof. Write $i: \mathcal{F}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ for the inclusion functor and $t: X \rightarrow \mathcal{F}X$ for the functor obtained by restricting the codomain of the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ to $\mathcal{F}X$. It is clear that the composite $i \circ t$ is the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.

(i) We show that $\mathcal{F}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under formation of colimits of flat weights. That means, for each flat weight Φ of $\mathcal{F}X$, the colimit of the inclusion functor $i: \mathcal{F}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by Φ is a flat weight of X . Since the composite $i \circ t$ is the Yoneda embedding, by Example 6.5 it holds that

$$\text{colim}_{\Phi} i = \Phi \circ i^* \circ i_* \circ t_* = \Phi \circ t_*.$$

We wish to show that $\Phi \circ t_*$ is a flat weight of X .

Step 1. $\Phi \circ t_*$ is inhabited. This is easy, since

$$\sup_{x \in X} \Phi \circ t_*(x) = \sup_{x \in X} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}X} \Phi(\phi) \& \phi(x) = \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}X} \left(\Phi(\phi) \& \sup_{x \in X} \phi(x) \right) = 1.$$

Step 2. For any coweights ψ_1 and ψ_2 of X ,

$$\Phi \circ t_* \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) = (\Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi_2).$$

To see this, for each coweight ψ of X consider the coweight

$$- \circ \psi: \mathcal{F}X \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

of $\mathcal{F}X$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \circ (- \circ \psi) &= \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}X} \left(\Phi(\phi) \& \sup_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \& \psi(x)) \right) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{F}X} (\Phi(\phi) \& \phi(x)) \& \psi(x) \\ &= \sup_{x \in X} (\Phi \circ t_*)(x) \& \psi(x) \\ &= \Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi. \end{aligned}$$

Since Φ is flat and each element of $\mathcal{F}X$ is flat, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi \circ t_* \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) &= \Phi \circ (- \circ (\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2)) \\ &= \Phi \circ ((- \circ \psi_1) \wedge (- \circ \psi_2)) \\ &= (\Phi \circ (- \circ \psi_1)) \wedge (\Phi \circ (- \circ \psi_2)) \\ &= (\Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi_1) \wedge (\Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi_2). \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. Similar to Step 2, one verifies that for all r of $[0, 1]$ and all coweight ψ of X , it holds that

$$\Phi \circ t_* \circ (r \rightarrow \psi) = r \rightarrow \Phi \circ t_* \circ \psi.$$

Therefore, $\Phi \circ t_*$ is a flat weight of X .

(ii) The functor

$$\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}X \longrightarrow Y, \quad \phi \mapsto \operatorname{colim}_\phi f$$

clearly extends f . It remains to check that \bar{f} preserves colimits of flat weights. It is clear that \bar{f} is the composite $\operatorname{colim} \circ f_\exists: \mathcal{F}X \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}Y \longrightarrow Y$. Since $\operatorname{colim}: \mathcal{F}Y \longrightarrow Y$ is left adjoint to $\mathfrak{t}: Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}Y$, it preserves colimits. Since $\mathcal{F}X$ and $\mathcal{F}Y$ are closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ and $\mathcal{P}Y$ under formation of colimits of flat weights, respectively, and $f_\exists: \mathcal{P}X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ preserves all colimits, it follows that the composite \bar{f} preserves colimits of all flat weights. Uniqueness of \bar{f} follows from that each flat weight ϕ of X is the colimit of $\mathfrak{t}: X \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}X$ weighted by ϕ . \square

For conically flat weights, there is a similar result. For each real-enriched category X , let

$$\mathcal{F}_c X$$

be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}X$ composed of conically flat weights of X . The assignment $X \mapsto \mathcal{F}_c X$ defines a functor $\mathcal{F}_c: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, which is a subfunctor of the presheaf functor $\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.

Theorem 10.7. *Suppose X is a real-enriched category. Then*

- (i) $\mathcal{F}_c X$ is conically flat complete.
- (ii) For each functor $f: X \longrightarrow Y$ with Y conically flat complete, there is a unique functor $\bar{f}: \mathcal{F}_c X \longrightarrow Y$ that extends f and preserves colimits of conically flat weights.

11. SMYTH COMPLETENESS

Smyth completeness originated in the works of Smyth [69, 70] on quasi-uniform spaces. The following postulation is a direct extension of that for Smyth complete quasi-metric spaces given in Goubault-Larrecq [20], Künzi and Schellekens [41].

Definition 11.1. A real-enriched category is Smyth complete if each of its forward Cauchy nets converges uniquely in the open ball topology of its symmetrization.

Proposition 8.9 implies that if a net of X converges in the open ball topology of its symmetrization, then it is a Cauchy net of X . Therefore,

Proposition 11.2. *If a real-enriched category X is Smyth complete, then it is separated and all of its forward Cauchy nets are Cauchy.*

Example 11.3. This example concerns Smyth completeness of the real-enriched categories $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ and $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. The continuous t-norm $\&$ is not Archimedean. Pick some $a \in [0, 1]$ with $0 < a \leq a^+ < 1$, where a^+ is the least idempotent element in $[a, 1]$. Since $\sup_{x < a} (a \rightarrow x) \leq a^+$, then $[a, 1]$ is open in \mathbf{V} and $[0, a]$ is open in \mathbf{V}^{op} , hence the singleton set $\{a\}$ is open in the symmetrization of \mathbf{V} . Since $\{a - 1/n\}_n$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V} and $\{a + 1/n\}_n$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V}^{op} , it follows that neither \mathbf{V} nor \mathbf{V}^{op} is Smyth complete.

Case 2. $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. In this case, the open ball topology of \mathbf{V} is $\{\emptyset, [0, 1]\} \cup \{(a, 1] \mid a < 1\}$, the open ball topology of \mathbf{V}^{op} is $\{\emptyset, [0, 1]\} \cup \{[0, a) \mid a > 0\}$. It is easily seen that a net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V} if and only if it is Cauchy in the usual sense, if and only if it is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V}^{op} , so, both \mathbf{V} and \mathbf{V}^{op} are Smyth complete.

Case 3. $\&$ is isomorphic to the product t-norm. In this case, the open ball topology of \mathbf{V} is $\{\emptyset, [0, 1]\} \cup \{(a, 1] \mid a < 1\}$, the open ball topology of \mathbf{V}^{op} is $\{\emptyset, \{0\}, [0, 1]\} \cup \{[0, a) \mid a > 0\}$. Since the sequence $\{1/n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V}^{op} , but not convergent in its symmetrization, \mathbf{V}^{op} is not Smyth complete. Since a net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is forward Cauchy in \mathbf{V} if and only if it is eventually constant or

converges (in the usual sense) to some element other than 0, it follows that \mathbb{V} is Smyth complete.

The following theorem says that Smyth completeness of a real-enriched category can be characterized purely in terms of its categorical structure, without resort to its symmetrization and open ball topology.

Theorem 11.4. (Yu and Zhang [84]) *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Smyth complete.
- (2) Every forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of X has a unique bilimit.
- (3) X is separated and every ideal of X is representable.
- (4) X is Cauchy complete and every ideal of X is a Cauchy weight.

In this case, X is Yoneda complete.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) By Proposition 11.2, every forward Cauchy net of a Smyth complete real-enriched category is a Cauchy net, then the conclusion follows from Lemma 8.11.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) It suffices to show that every ideal ϕ of X is a Cauchy weight and has a colimit. By Proposition 9.13 there is a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of X such that

$$\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j).$$

By assumption, there is some $a \in X$ such that for all $x \in X$,

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) = X(x, a), \quad \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) = X(a, x).$$

Putting $x = a$ one sees that $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a Cauchy net of X , then ϕ is a Cauchy weight by Lemma 9.8, and consequently, a is a colimit of ϕ by the argument of Proposition 8.13.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) Obvious.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of X . Since every ideal of X is a Cauchy weight, by Lemma 9.8 the net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is Cauchy, so it has a unique bilimit by Cauchy completeness of X and the argument of Proposition 8.13, then by Lemma 8.11, it converges uniquely in the open ball topology of the symmetrization of X . \square

Corollary 11.5. *A Yoneda complete real-enriched category X is Smyth complete if and only if $\gamma: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}X$ is Yoneda continuous.*

Corollary 11.6. *For each real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Cauchy complete.
- (2) The symmetrization of X is Smyth complete.
- (3) The symmetrization of X is Cauchy complete.

A separated real-enriched category X is *Smyth completable* if there is a fully faithful functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y Smyth complete.

Proposition 11.7. (Yu and Zhang [84]) *For a separated real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Smyth completable.
- (2) Every ideal of X is a Cauchy weight.
- (3) Every forward Cauchy net of X is a Cauchy net.
- (4) Every ideal of $\mathcal{I}X$ is representable, hence $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{I}X) = \mathcal{I}X$.

Proof. The equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows from Proposition 9.13 and Lemma 9.8.

(1) \Rightarrow (2) Suppose $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is fully faithful with Y being Smyth complete. Let ϕ be an ideal of X . Then $\phi \circ f^*$ is an ideal, hence a Cauchy weight of Y . Let $\psi: \star \rightarrow Y$ be a left adjoint of $\phi \circ f^*: Y \rightarrow \star$. We show that $f^* \circ \psi: \star \rightarrow X$ is a left adjoint of $\phi: X \rightarrow \star$. First, since $\psi \dashv \phi \circ f^*$, then $\phi \circ (f^* \circ \psi) = (\phi \circ f^*) \circ \psi \geq 1$. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi \dashv \phi \circ f^* &\implies \psi \circ \phi \circ f^* \leq Y \\ &\implies \psi \circ \phi \leq f_* && (f^* \circ f_* = X) \\ &\implies (f^* \circ \psi) \circ \phi \leq X. && (f^* \circ f_* = X) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $f^* \circ \psi$ is a left adjoint of ϕ .

(2) \Rightarrow (4) Since $\mathcal{I}X = \mathcal{C}X$ by assumption, it suffices to check that every ideal of $\mathcal{C}X$ is representable. Suppose $\phi: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow \star$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{C}X$. By Lemma 8.5, $c_*: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$ is an isomorphism in the category of distributors, it follows that $\phi \circ c_*: X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow \star$ is an ideal, hence a Cauchy weight of X . Again by that c_* is an isomorphism, ϕ is a Cauchy weight of $\mathcal{C}X$. Therefore, ϕ is representable since $\mathcal{C}X$ is Cauchy complete.

(4) \Rightarrow (1) Since every ideal of $\mathcal{I}X$ is representable, then $\mathcal{I}X$ is Smyth complete and consequently, X is Smyth completable. \square

Corollary 11.8. *A separated real-enriched category is Smyth completable if and only if its Cauchy completion is Smyth complete.*

Proof. Sufficiency is clear, for necessity assume that $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a fully faithful functor with Y Smyth complete. Since Y is Cauchy complete, there is a unique functor $\bar{f}: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow Y$ that extends f . It is not hard to check that \bar{f} is also fully faithful, hence $\mathcal{C}X$ is Smyth completable. By Theorem 11.7 every ideal of $\mathcal{C}X$ is Cauchy, hence representable by Cauchy completeness of $\mathcal{C}X$, and consequently, $\mathcal{C}X$ is Smyth complete. \square

12. THE PRESHEAF MONAD

In this section we show that the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} is a monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, the subfunctors \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{I} are its submonads.

For each real-enriched category X , let m_X be the functor

$$\text{colim}: \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$$

that maps each weight Φ of $\mathcal{P}X$ to its colimit. Then, m is a natural transformation $\mathcal{P}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ and the triple

$$\mathbb{P} = (\mathcal{P}, m, y)$$

is a monad, where y denotes the natural transformation from the identity functor to \mathcal{P} given by Yoneda embeddings. We call \mathbb{P} the presheaf monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. Instead of checking directly that (\mathcal{P}, m, y) satisfies the requirements for a monad, we show that it arises from an adjunction.

Let

$$[0, 1]\text{-Sup}$$

denote the category with separated and cocomplete real-enriched categories as objects and left adjoints as morphisms.

Theorem 6.20 implies that the assignment

$$f: X \rightarrow Y \mapsto f_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$$

defines a functor

$$\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Sup}$$

that is left adjoint to the forgetful functor

$$U: [0, 1]\text{-Sup} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

The monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ defined by the adjunction $\mathcal{P} \dashv U$ is precisely the presheaf monad $\mathbb{P} = (\mathcal{P}, m, y)$.

The monad \mathbb{P} is a typical example of KZ-monads in a locally ordered category. A category \mathcal{C} is *locally ordered* if the home-set $\mathcal{C}(A, B)$ is an ordered set for any objects A and B , and the composition preserves order. A 2-functor between locally ordered categories is a functor that preserves order on the hom-sets. For 2-categories and 2-functors we refer to Borceux [10] or Lack [42]. The functor $\mathcal{P}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \longrightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is clearly a 2-functor.

In a locally ordered category, we say that a morphism $f: A \longrightarrow B$ is left adjoint to a morphism $g: B \longrightarrow A$ if $g \circ f \geq 1_A$ and $f \circ g \leq 1_B$. In this case, we write $f \dashv g$. The following proposition, extracted from Kock [39] and Zöberlein [86], is taken from Hofmann [28].

Proposition 12.1. *Let (T, m, e) be a monad in a locally ordered category \mathcal{C} with T a 2-functor. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $Te_X \leq e_{TX}$ for all objects X .
- (2) $Te_X \dashv m_X$ for all objects X .
- (3) $m_X \dashv e_{TX}$ for all objects X .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Since $m_X \circ Te_X = 1_{TX}$, it remains to check that $Te_X \circ m_X \leq 1_{T^2X}$. This is easy since

$$Te_X \circ m_X = m_{TX} \circ T^2e_X \leq m_{TX} \circ Te_{TX} = 1_{T^2X}.$$

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Since $Te_X \dashv m_X$, then

$$Te_X = Te_X \circ m_X \circ e_{TX} \leq 1_{T^2X} \circ e_{TX} = e_{TX}.$$

(1) \Leftrightarrow (3) Similar to (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). □

A monad in a locally-ordered category is of *Kock-Zöberlein type*, or a KZ-monad, if it satisfies one (hence all) of the equivalent conditions in Proposition 12.1. A KZ-monad is also called a *KZ-doctrine* in the literature.

Proposition 12.2. *Suppose (T, m, e) is a KZ-monad in a locally ordered category. Then, for any object X and any morphism $h: TX \longrightarrow X$, the pair (X, h) is a T -algebra if and only if $h \circ e_X = 1_X$; in which case $h \dashv e_X$.*

Proof. If (X, h) is a T -algebra, then $h \circ e_X = 1_X$ by definition of T -algebra. Conversely, suppose that $h \circ e_X = 1_X$. Then

$$h \circ Th \leq h \circ Th \circ e_{TX} \circ m_X = h \circ e_X \circ h \circ m_X = h \circ m_X.$$

Since T is a KZ-monad, it follows that $Te_X \circ m_X \leq 1_{TX}$, hence

$$h \circ Th \geq h \circ Th \circ Te_X \circ m_X = h \circ T(h \circ e_X) \circ m_X = h \circ m_X.$$

Therefore, $h \circ Th = h \circ m_X$ and consequently, (X, h) is a T -algebra.

It remains to check that $h \dashv e_X$ for each T -algebra (X, h) . Since T is of Kock-Zöberlein type,

$$e_X \circ h = Th \circ e_{TX} \geq Th \circ Te_X = T(h \circ e_X) = 1_{TX}.$$

Therefore $h \dashv e_X$, as desired. □

Proposition 12.3. *The presheaf monad $\mathbb{P} = (\mathcal{P}, m, y)$ is a KZ-monad in the locally ordered category $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.*

Proof. By Example 6.5, for each real-enriched category X we have

$$\mathcal{P}y_X \dashv \mathbf{m}_X \dashv y_{\mathcal{P}X},$$

the conclusion thus follows. \square

Since $(\mathcal{P}, \mathbf{m}, y)$ is a KZ-monad, for each real-enriched category A , the following are equivalent:

- (1) There is a functor $h: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow A$ such that (A, h) is a \mathbb{P} -algebra.
- (2) The Yoneda embedding $y_A: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ has a left inverse.
- (3) A is separated and the Yoneda embedding y_A has a left adjoint.

In this case, the \mathbb{P} -algebra structure map $h: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow A$ is a left adjoint of y_A , hence h maps each weight of A to its colimit. Therefore, a \mathbb{P} -algebra is a separated and cocomplete real-enriched category; a \mathbb{P} -homomorphism is a left adjoint between separated cocomplete real-enriched categories. All told,

$$\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} = [0, 1]\text{-Sup}.$$

From this fact one immediately infers:

Proposition 12.4. *The forgetful functor $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is monadic.*

The forgetful functor $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is also monadic. This can be proved with the criterion of Beck directly. Here we present a proof via the characterization of \mathbb{P} -algebras as $[0, 1]$ -modules.

Definition 12.5. (Joyal and Tierney [35]) A (left) $[0, 1]$ -module is a pair (X, \otimes) , where X is a complete lattice and \otimes is a $[0, 1]$ -action on X . A $[0, 1]$ -module homomorphism $f: (X, \otimes) \rightarrow (Y, \otimes)$ is a join-preserving map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $r \otimes f(x) = f(r \otimes x)$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in X$.

With $[0, 1]$ -modules and $[0, 1]$ -module homomorphisms we have a category

$$[0, 1]\text{-Mod}.$$

Theorem 12.6. (Stubbe [73]) *The category $[0, 1]\text{-Mod}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$.*

Proof. If X is a \mathbb{P} -algebra, then the $[0, 1]$ -action (X_0, \otimes) is a $[0, 1]$ -module. If $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a homomorphism between \mathbb{P} -algebras, then $f: (X_0, \otimes) \rightarrow (Y_0, \otimes)$ is a $[0, 1]$ -module homomorphism since any left adjoint preserves tensors. Conversely, if (X, \otimes) is a $[0, 1]$ -module, then the real-enriched category (X, α_\otimes) is separated, order-complete, tensored and cotensored, hence a \mathbb{P} -algebra. If $f: (X, \otimes) \rightarrow (Y, \otimes)$ is a $[0, 1]$ -module homomorphism, then the map $f: (X, \alpha_\otimes) \rightarrow (Y, \alpha_\otimes)$ preserves tensors and joins (with respect to the underlying order), hence a left adjoint by Corollary 7.9. The conclusion thus follows. \square

For each set X , consider the action

$$\otimes: [0, 1] \times [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1]^X, \quad (r, \lambda) \mapsto r \& \lambda.$$

Then $([0, 1]^X, \otimes)$ is a $[0, 1]$ -module. The assignment $X \mapsto ([0, 1]^X, \otimes)$ defines a functor

$$F: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Mod}$$

that is left adjoint to the forgetful functor

$$G: [0, 1]\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}.$$

The monad

$$(T, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{e})$$

in the category of sets defined by the adjunction $F \dashv G$ is given as follows:

- for each map $f: X \rightarrow Y$, $T(f): [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1]^Y$ sends each $\gamma \in [0, 1]^X$ to $f(\gamma)$;

- for each set X , the unit $e_X: X \rightarrow [0, 1]^X$ sends each $x \in X$ to 1_x ;
- for each set X , the multiplication $m_X: [0, 1]^{[0, 1]^X} \rightarrow [0, 1]^X$ sends each $\Lambda: [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ to $\sup_{\gamma \in [0, 1]^X} \Lambda(\gamma) \& \gamma$.

This monad is called the $[0, 1]$ -enriched powerset monad in **Set** [26, 56], it contains the usual (covariant) powerset monad in **Set** as a submonad.

Suppose (X, h) is an algebra of (T, m, e) . Then X together with the restriction of h on $2^X \subseteq [0, 1]^X$ is an algebra of the usual powerset monad, hence X is a complete lattice and h maps each subset of X to its join (see e.g. Mac Lane [55, page 142]). Define $\otimes: [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow X$ by $r \otimes x = h(r_x)$. Then (X, \otimes) is a $[0, 1]$ -module. Therefore, an algebra of (\exp, m, e) is essentially a $[0, 1]$ -module, hence a \mathbb{P} -algebra. This proves:

Corollary 12.7. (Pedicchio and Tholen [62]) *The forgetful functor $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is monadic.*

Every \mathbb{P} -algebra A is clearly a quotient of the free algebra $\mathcal{P}A$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$. The following result shows that whether every \mathbb{P} -algebra is a subalgebra of a free one depends on the structure of the truth-value set $([0, 1], \&, 1)$.

Proposition 12.8. (Lai and Zhang [46]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The continuous t-norm $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm.*
- (2) *Each \mathbb{P} -algebra A is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}X$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$ for some real-enriched category X .*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Let A be a \mathbb{P} -algebra. Since the coYoneda embedding $y^\dagger: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger A$ is a fully faithful left adjoint, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{P}^\dagger A$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}A$. Since $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm, it is readily verified that

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A, \quad \psi \mapsto \psi \rightarrow 0$$

is an isomorphism.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) It suffices to show that $(r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0 \leq r$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$. Consider the \mathbb{P} -algebra $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$. By assumption, there is a real-enriched category X and a fully faithful left adjoint $f: \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$. Note that 1 is the least element of \mathbf{V}_0^{op} . Since f is a left adjoint, $f(1)$ must be the least element of $(\mathcal{P}X)_0$, i.e. the weight 0_X of X with constant value 0 . Since f preserves tensor and the tensor of r with x in \mathbf{V}^{op} is $r \rightarrow x$, it follows that for each $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$r \otimes f(r) = f(r \rightarrow r) = f(1) = 0_X,$$

where \otimes denotes tensor in $\mathcal{P}X$. Thus, $f(r) \leq r \rightarrow 0_X$ and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} f(((r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow r) &= ((r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0) \otimes f(r) \\ &\leq ((r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0) \otimes (r \rightarrow 0_X) \\ &\leq 0_X, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because $r \rightarrow 0_X$ is the constant function with value $r \rightarrow 0$. Since f is injective, one has $((r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow r = 1$, hence $(r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0 \leq r$, as desired. \square

By a *class of weights* we mean a subfunctor \mathcal{T} of the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} through which the natural transformation $y: \text{id} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ factors. Explicitly, a class of weights is a functor

$$\mathcal{T}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

subject to the following conditions:

- (i) for each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{T}X$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}X$ together with category structure inherited from $\mathcal{P}X$;

- (ii) for each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{T}X$ contains all representable weights of X ;
- (iii) for each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and each $\phi \in \mathcal{T}X$, $\mathcal{T}(f)(\phi) = f_{\exists}(\phi)$.

Condition (ii) implies that for each real-enriched category X , the Yoneda embedding $y_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ factors through $\mathcal{T}X$.

Suppose \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ and $i: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is the inclusion (natural transformation). If the natural transformation $m \circ (i * i)$ factors (uniquely) through i , where $i * i$ is the horizontal composite of i with itself, then we say that \mathcal{T} is *closed under multiplication*.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T}^2 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T} \\ \downarrow i * i & & \downarrow i \\ \mathcal{P}^2 & \xrightarrow{m} & \mathcal{P} \end{array}$$

In this case, we also use the symbol m to denote the unique natural transformation $\mathcal{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ that makes the above square commutative.

If \mathcal{T} is closed under multiplication, then (\mathcal{T}, m, y) is a submonad of (\mathcal{P}, m, y) , with the inclusion transformation i being a monad morphism, see e.g. Manes [57]. In this case, we also say simply that \mathcal{T} is a submonad of (\mathcal{P}, m, y) .

Proposition 12.9. *Suppose \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{T} is closed under multiplication, hence a submonad (\mathcal{P}, m, y) .
- (2) For each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{T}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under formation of \mathcal{T} -colimits; that is, for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}X$, the colimit of the inclusion functor $i_X: \mathcal{T}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by Φ belongs to $\mathcal{T}X$.
- (3) For each real-enriched category X and each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}X$, it holds that $\Phi \circ y_* \in \mathcal{T}X$, where $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}X$ is the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{T}X$.

Proof. This follows directly from that for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}X$,

$$(i * i)_X(\Phi) = \Phi \circ i_X^*$$

and that

$$\text{colim}_{\Phi} i_X = \text{colim}(\Phi \circ i_X^*) = \Phi \circ i_X^* \circ (i_X)_* \circ y_* = \Phi \circ y_*. \quad \square$$

Definition 12.10. A class of weights $\mathcal{T}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is saturated if it satisfies one, hence all, of the equivalent conditions in Proposition 12.9.

In other words, a saturated class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is a submonad of the presheaf monad $\mathbb{P} = (\mathcal{P}, m, y)$. For a saturated class of weights \mathcal{T} , we write $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$ for the corresponding monad, which is a submonad of the presheaf monad. The monad \mathbb{T} is of Kock-Zöberlein type since so is \mathbb{P} . Therefore, for the Eilenberg-Moore category $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$:

- (i) an object is a separated real-enriched category A such that every $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$ has a colimit;
- (ii) a morphism is a functor that preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits.

Proposition 12.11. *Suppose \mathcal{T} is a saturated class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. Then, every retract of a \mathbb{T} -algebra in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is a \mathbb{T} -algebra, where \mathbb{T} denotes the monad (\mathcal{T}, m, y) .*

Proof. Suppose that B is a \mathbb{T} -algebra; $s: A \rightarrow B$ and $r: B \rightarrow A$ are functors with $r \circ s = 1_A$. We wish to show that A is a \mathbb{T} -algebra. Let $y_A: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ be the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{T}A$; and let colim_A be the composite

$$\mathcal{T}A \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}s} \mathcal{T}B \xrightarrow{\text{colim}_B} B \xrightarrow{r} A.$$

Then

$$\text{colim}_A \circ y_A = r \circ \text{colim}_B \circ \mathcal{T}s \circ y_A = r \circ \text{colim}_B \circ y_B \circ s = r \circ s = 1_A,$$

hence colim_A is a left inverse of y_A and consequently, A is a \mathbb{T} -algebra. \square

For each real-enriched category X , since $\mathcal{T}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ with respect to \mathcal{T} -colimits, it follows that $\mathcal{T}X$ is a \mathbb{T} -algebra and the assignment

$$f: X \rightarrow Y \mapsto f_{\exists}: \mathcal{T}X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}Y$$

defines a functor

$$\mathcal{T}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}.$$

Proposition 12.12. *Suppose \mathcal{T} is a saturated class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. Then, the functor*

$$\mathcal{T}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$$

is left adjoint to the forgetful functor

$$U: \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

Hence for each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{T}X$ is the free \mathcal{T} -cocompletion of X .

Proof. Let $f: X \rightarrow Y$ be a functor with Y a \mathbb{T} -algebra. It is readily verified that

$$\bar{f}: \mathcal{T}X \rightarrow Y, \quad \phi \mapsto \text{colim}_{\phi} f$$

is the unique \mathbb{T} -homomorphism that makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{y} & \mathcal{T}X \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow \bar{f} \\ & & Y \end{array}$$

commutative, the conclusion thus follows. \square

The monad defined by the adjunction $\mathcal{T} \dashv U$ is precisely $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$. Furthermore, the forgetful functor $U: \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ is monadic.

Example 12.13. (i) By Theorem 8.6 the class of Cauchy weights is saturated. The resulting submonad $\mathbb{C} = (\mathcal{C}, m, y)$ of $\mathbb{P} = (\mathcal{P}, m, y)$ is called the *Cauchy weight monad* in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. A \mathbb{C} -algebra is a Cauchy complete real-enriched category; a \mathbb{C} -homomorphism is just a functor between Cauchy complete real-enriched categories (colimits of Cauchy weights are preserved by all functors).

(ii) By Theorem 9.17, ideals of real-enriched categories constitute a saturated class of weights. The monad $\mathbb{I} = (\mathcal{I}, m, y)$ is called the *ideal monad* in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. An algebra of \mathbb{I} is a Yoneda complete real-enriched category; an \mathbb{I} -homomorphism is a Yoneda continuous functor between Yoneda complete real-enriched categories. Corollary 9.12 shows that restricting domains and codomains of the functors ω and $(-)_0$ gives us an adjunction between the category of dcpo's and that of \mathbb{I} -algebras.

- (iii) By Theorem 10.6 the class of flat weights is saturated. The resulting submonad $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ is called the *flat weight monad* in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. An \mathbb{F} -algebra is a flat complete real-enriched category; an \mathbb{F} -homomorphism is a functor between flat complete real-enriched categories that preserves colimits of flat weights. Likewise, by Theorem 10.7 the class of flat weights is saturated. The resulting submonad $\mathbb{F}_c = (\mathcal{F}_c, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ is called the *conically flat weight monad* in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.
- (iv) For each real-enriched category X , let $\mathcal{B}X = \{r \& y(x) \mid x \in X, r \in [0, 1]\}$. Then \mathcal{B} is a saturated class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. To see this, it suffices to observe that for all $x \in X$ and all $r, s \in [0, 1]$, the colimit of the inclusion functor $\mathcal{B}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by $s \& \mathcal{B}X(-, r \& y(x))$ is the weight $(s \& r) \& y(x)$ of X . Write $\mathbb{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ for the resulting monad. A \mathbb{B} -algebra is precisely a separated and tensored real-enriched category; a \mathbb{B} -homomorphism is a functor between separated and tensored real-enriched categories that preserves tensors.
- (v) (Stubbe [75]) The class of conical weights is saturated, algebras for the resulting monad are the separated and conically cocomplete real-enriched categories.

Theorem 12.14 (Morita equivalence). (Kelly [36]) *For all real-enriched categories X and Y , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is isomorphic to Y in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{C}X$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{C}Y$ in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, hence in $\mathbb{C}\text{-Alg}$.
- (3) $\mathcal{P}X$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}Y$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$.

We make some preparations first. Suppose $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a distributor. Since the functor

$$\phi_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X, \quad \xi \mapsto \xi \circ \phi$$

is left adjoint to

$$\phi_{\forall}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y, \quad \lambda \mapsto \lambda \swarrow \phi,$$

it follows that the assignment

$$\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y \mapsto \phi_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$$

defines a functor

$$\mathfrak{P}: ([0, 1]\text{-Dist})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}.$$

Lemma 12.15. *The functor $\mathfrak{P}: ([0, 1]\text{-Dist})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$ is full and faithful.*

Proof. Since for each distributor $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$, each $x \in X$ and each $y \in Y$,

$$\phi_{\exists}(y_Y(y))(x) = y_Y(y) \circ \phi(x) = \phi(x, y),$$

it follows that \mathfrak{P} is faithful.

To see that \mathfrak{P} is full, assume that $f: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is a left adjoint. Define a distributor $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ by $\phi = y_Y^* \circ f^* \circ (y_X)_*$; that is,

$$\phi(x, y) = f(y_Y(y))(x).$$

Then, for all $y \in Y$,

$$\phi_{\exists}(y_Y(y)) = y_Y(y) \circ \phi = f(y_Y(y)).$$

Since the Yoneda embedding $y_Y: Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ is colimit-dense and both ϕ_{\exists} and f preserve colimits, it follows that $f = \phi_{\exists}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 12.14. First, we show that (1) is equivalent to (2). If $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$, then

$$- \circ \phi: \mathcal{C}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{C}X$$

is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. Conversely, if $f: \mathcal{C}X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}Y$ is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, then the composite

$$X \xrightarrow{(y_X)^*} \mathcal{C}X \xrightarrow{f_*} \mathcal{C}Y \xrightarrow{y_Y^*} Y$$

is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$, where y_X is the Yoneda embedding for X with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{C}X$; likewise for y_Y .

Next, we show that (1) is equivalent to (3). If $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$, then

$$\phi_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$.

Conversely, assume that $f: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ is an isomorphism in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$. Since the functor \mathfrak{P} is full, there exist distributors $\phi: Y \dashrightarrow X$ and $\psi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ such that $f = \phi_{\exists}$ and $f^{-1} = \psi_{\exists}$. Since the functor \mathfrak{P} is faithful, it follows that $\psi \circ \phi = Y$ and $\phi \circ \psi = X$. Therefore X and Y are isomorphic in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$. \square

The Morita equivalence can be strengthened to the following:

Theorem 12.16. (Kelly and Schmitt [37]) *Suppose \mathcal{T} is a saturated class of weights that contains all Cauchy weights. Then, for all real-enriched categories X and Y , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is isomorphic to Y in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{T}X$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{T}Y$ in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Consider the isomorphism

$$\psi_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y, \quad \xi \mapsto \xi \circ \psi$$

in the proof of Theorem 12.14. If we can prove that $\xi \circ \psi \in \mathcal{T}Y$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{T}X$, then restricting the domain and the codomain of ψ_{\exists} would yield an isomorphism $\mathcal{T}X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}Y$.

For each $x \in X$, let $f(x)$ be the weight $\psi(-, x)$ of Y . Since ψ is an isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$, $f(x)$ is a Cauchy weight. Hence we obtain a functor $f: X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}Y$. Since \mathcal{T} is saturated, the colimit of the composite functor $\mathbf{i}_Y \circ f: X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ weighted by ξ belongs to $\mathcal{T}Y$, then

$$\xi \circ \psi = \sup_{x \in X} \xi(x) \& \psi(-, x) = \sup_{x \in X} \xi(x) \& f(x) = \text{colim}_{\xi} (\mathbf{i}_Y \circ f) \in \mathcal{T}Y,$$

as desired.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) We say that a distributor $\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y$ is of type \mathcal{T} if $\phi(-, y) \in \mathcal{T}X$ for all $y \in Y$. In particular, a weight $\xi: X \dashrightarrow *$ is of type \mathcal{T} if and only if $\xi \in \mathcal{T}X$. Since \mathcal{T} contains Cauchy weights, every isomorphism in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$ is of type \mathcal{T} . Since \mathcal{T} is saturated, \mathcal{T} -distributors of type \mathcal{T} are closed under composition. Therefore, they form a subcategory of $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$, denoted by $\mathcal{T}\text{-Dist}$. A slight improvement of the argument in Lemma 12.15 shows that the correspondence

$$\phi: X \dashrightarrow Y \mapsto - \circ \phi: \mathcal{T}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{T}X$$

defines a full and faithful functor

$$(\mathcal{T}\text{-Dist})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg},$$

which implies that if $\mathcal{T}X$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{T}Y$ in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$, then X isomorphic to Y in $[0, 1]\text{-Dist}$. \square

The characterization of Cauchy completion in Proposition 8.8 can be strengthened as follows. Suppose \mathcal{T} is a saturated class of weights that contains all Cauchy

weights. For each real-enriched category X , let $t_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}X$ be the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{T}X$. Then, by commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T}X & \xrightleftharpoons[t_{\mathcal{T}X}]{\mathcal{T}t_X} & \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}X \\ \downarrow i_X & & \downarrow (i \star i)_X \\ \mathcal{P}X & \xrightleftharpoons[y_{\mathcal{P}X}]{\mathcal{P}y_X} & \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}X \end{array}$$

one sees that the Cauchy completion of X is the equalizer in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ of $\mathcal{T}t_X$ and $t_{\mathcal{T}X}$.

13. CATEGORIES OF \mathbb{T} -ALGEBRAS

In this section, unless otherwise specified, \mathcal{T} always denotes a saturated class of weights, $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ denotes the corresponding submonad of the presheaf monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. This section concerns function spaces in the category $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$ of \mathbb{T} -algebras.

For any real-enriched categories X and Y , let $[X, Y]$ denote the set of all functors from X to Y . For $f, g \in [X, Y]$, let

$$[X, Y](f, g) = \inf_{x \in X} Y(f(x), g(x)).$$

Then $[X, Y]$ becomes a real-enriched category, called the functor category.

For any functors $f: X_2 \rightarrow X_1$ and $g: Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$, the assignment $h \mapsto g \circ h \circ f$ defines a functor $[X_1, Y_1] \rightarrow [X_2, Y_2]$. In this way we obtain a bifunctor

$$[-, -]: ([0, 1]\text{-Cat})^{\text{op}} \times [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

For any real-enriched categories X and Y , it is readily verified

$$\alpha: X \times Y \rightarrow X \times Y, \quad \alpha((x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2)) = X(x_1, x_2) \& Y(y_1, y_2)$$

is a real-enriched category structure on the product set $X \times Y$. The resulting category $(X \times Y, \alpha)$ is called the tensor product of X and Y and is denoted by $X \otimes Y$.² The assignment $(X, Y) \mapsto X \otimes Y$ defines a bifunctor

$$\otimes: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \times [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

It is not hard to check that the tensor product is symmetric and has the terminal real-enriched category \star as unit, and that for each real-enriched category X , the functor

$$- \otimes X: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

is left adjoint to

$$[X, -]: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}.$$

Therefore, the triple $([0, 1]\text{-Cat}, \otimes, \star)$ is a symmetric monoidal closed category.

Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories, $\phi \in \mathcal{P}X$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}Y$. The function

$$\phi \otimes \psi: X \times Y \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (x, y) \mapsto \phi(x) \& \psi(y)$$

is a weight of $X \otimes Y$. By continuity of the t-norm $\&$ one verifies that the assignment $(\phi, \psi) \mapsto \phi \otimes \psi$ defines a functor $\mathcal{P}X \otimes \mathcal{P}Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X \otimes Y)$. So, the presheaf functor \mathcal{P} is a lax functor on the symmetric monoidal closed category $([0, 1]\text{-Cat}, \otimes, \star)$.

²The symbol \otimes is used to denote both the tensor in a real-enriched category (i.e. $r \otimes x$) and the tensor product of real-enriched categories. Fortunately, it is easy to detect from the context which one is meant.

Theorem 13.1. (Lai and Zhang [45]) *Assigning to each pair (X, Y) of \mathbb{T} -algebras the subcategory $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ of $[X, Y]$ composed of \mathbb{T} -homomorphisms gives rise to a bifunctor*

$$\text{hom}: (\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg})^{\text{op}} \times \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}.$$

Lemma 13.2. *Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories and Y is \mathcal{T} -cocomplete.*

- (i) *$[X, Y]$ is \mathcal{T} -cocomplete and \mathcal{T} -colimits in $[X, Y]$ are computed pointwise; that means, for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}[X, Y]$, the map*

$$h: X \longrightarrow Y, \quad h(x) = \text{colim}_{\Phi}[x]$$

is a colimit of Φ , where $[x]$ is the projection $[X, Y] \longrightarrow Y$, $f \mapsto f(x)$.

- (ii) *The subcategory $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ of $[X, Y]$ consisting of functors that preserve \mathcal{T} -colimits is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits, hence \mathcal{T} -cocomplete.*

Proof. (i) We prove the conclusion in two steps.

Step 1. *h is a functor. Let $x_1, x_2 \in X$. For each $y \in Y$, since*

$$\Phi \circ [x_1]^*(y) = \sup_{f \in [X, Y]} \Phi(f) \& [x_1]^*(y, f) = \sup_{f \in [X, Y]} \Phi(f) \& Y(y, f(x_1)),$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi \circ [x_1]^*(y) \rightarrow \Phi \circ [x_2]^*(y) \\ & \geq \inf_{f \in [X, Y]} (\Phi(f) \& Y(y, f(x_1)) \rightarrow \Phi(f) \& Y(y, f(x_2))) \\ & \geq \inf_{f \in [X, Y]} (Y(y, f(x_1)) \rightarrow Y(y, f(x_2))) \\ & \geq X(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(h(x_1), h(x_2)) &= Y(\text{colim}_{\Phi}[x_1], \text{colim}_{\Phi}[x_2]) \\ &\geq \mathcal{P}Y(\Phi \circ [x_1]^*, \Phi \circ [x_2]^*) \\ &= \inf_{y \in Y} (\Phi \circ [x_1]^*(y) \rightarrow \Phi \circ [x_2]^*(y)) \\ &\geq X(x_1, x_2), \end{aligned}$$

so h is a functor.

Step 2. *h is a colimit of Φ . For each $g \in [X, Y]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} [X, Y](h, g) &= \inf_{x \in X} Y(h(x), g(x)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} Y(\text{colim}_{\Phi}[x], g(x)) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \mathcal{P}Y(\Phi \circ [x]^*, Y(-, g(x))) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \mathcal{P}[X, Y](\Phi, Y(-, g(x)) \circ [x]_*) \quad (- \circ [x]^* \dashv - \circ [x]_*) \\ &= \inf_{x \in X} \inf_{f \in [X, Y]} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow Y(f(x), g(x))) \\ &= \inf_{f \in [X, Y]} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow [X, Y](f, g)) \\ &= [X, Y](-, g) \swarrow \Phi, \end{aligned}$$

so h is a colimit of Φ .

- (ii) We prove that for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T} \text{hom}(X, Y)$, the functor

$$h: X \longrightarrow Y, \quad h(x) = \text{colim}_{\Phi}[x]$$

preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits, where $[x]$ denotes the projection

$$\text{hom}(X, Y) \longrightarrow Y, \quad f \mapsto f(x).$$

Let $\phi \in \mathcal{TX}$ and a be a colimit of ϕ . We check by calculation that $h(a)$ is a colimit of $h_{\exists}(\phi)$. On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y(h(a), y) &= Y(\text{colim}_{\Phi}[a], y) \\
&= \mathcal{P}Y(\Phi \circ [a]^*, Y(-, y)) \\
&= \mathcal{P}(\text{hom}(X, Y))(\Phi, Y(-, y) \circ [a]_*) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow Y(f(a), y)) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow Y(\text{colim}_{\phi} f, y)) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y(\phi \circ f^*, Y(-, y))) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X(\phi, Y(-, y) \circ f_*)) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} \inf_{x \in X} (\Phi(f) \rightarrow (\phi(x) \rightarrow Y(f(x), y))) \\
&= \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} \inf_{x \in X} (\Phi(f) \& \phi(x) \rightarrow Y(f(x), y)).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}Y(h_{\exists}(\phi), Y(-, y)) &= \mathcal{P}X(\phi, h^{-1}(Y(-, y))) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \rightarrow Y(h(x), y)) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y(\Phi \circ [x]^*, Y(-, y))) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} (\phi(x) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\text{hom}(X, Y))(\Phi, Y(-, y) \circ [x]_*)) \\
&= \inf_{x \in X} \inf_{f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)} (\Phi(f) \& \phi(x) \rightarrow Y(f(x), y)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $Y(h(a), y) = \mathcal{P}Y(h_{\exists}(\phi), Y(-, y))$, so, $h(a)$ is a colimit of $h_{\exists}(\phi)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 13.1. By lemma 13.2 (ii), it suffices to show that

- (i) for any \mathbb{T} -algebras X, Y, Z and any \mathbb{T} -homomorphism $f: Y \rightarrow Z$, the functor

$$\text{hom}(X, f): \text{hom}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{hom}(X, Z), \quad h \mapsto f \circ h$$

preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits;

- (ii) for any \mathbb{T} -algebras X, Y, Z and any \mathbb{T} -homomorphism $g: X \rightarrow Y$, the functor

$$\text{hom}(g, Z): \text{hom}(Y, Z) \rightarrow \text{hom}(X, Z), \quad h \mapsto h \circ g$$

preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits.

For (i), assume that $\Phi \in \mathcal{T} \text{hom}(X, Y)$. For each $x \in X$ and each $h \in \text{hom}(X, Y)$, since

$$[x] \circ \text{hom}(X, f)(h) = f \circ h(x) = f \circ [x](h)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{hom}(X, f)(\text{colim}_{\Phi}(x)) &= f \circ \text{colim}_{\Phi}(x) \\
&= f(\text{colim}_{\Phi}[x]) && \text{(definition of colim } \Phi) \\
&= \text{colim}_{\Phi}(f \circ [x]), && \text{(} f \text{ preserves } \mathcal{T}\text{-colimits)}
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{colim}_{\Phi} \text{hom}(X, f))(x) &= \text{colim}_{\Phi}([x] \circ \text{hom}(X, f)) \\
&= \text{colim}_{\Phi}(f \circ [x]) \\
&= \text{hom}(X, f)(\text{colim}_{\Phi}(x)),
\end{aligned}$$

hence $\operatorname{colim}_{\Phi} \operatorname{hom}(X, f) = \operatorname{hom}(X, f)(\operatorname{colim} \Phi)$, as desired.

The assertion (ii) can be verified in a similar way. \square

Theorem 13.1 leads to an interesting question in the theory of real-enriched categories:

Question 13.3. Does there exist a bifunctor

$$\square: \mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg} \times \mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$$

and a bijection

$$\operatorname{hom}(Z \square X, Y) \cong \operatorname{hom}(Z, \operatorname{hom}(X, Y))$$

natural in all variables X, Y and Z ?

If the answer is positive and \square has a unit, say I , then the triple $(\mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}, \square, I)$ is a monoidal closed category. A general problem is to find subcategories \mathcal{A} of $\mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$ that satisfy the following conditions:

(i) Restricting the domain of the bifunctor

$$\operatorname{hom}: (\mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg})^{\operatorname{op}} \times \mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg} \longrightarrow \mathbb{T}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$$

yields a bifunctor

$$\operatorname{hom}: \mathcal{A}^{\operatorname{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}.$$

That means, for any objects X, Y, Z and any morphisms $f: Y \longrightarrow Z$, $g: X \longrightarrow Y$ of \mathcal{A} ,

- the real-enriched category $\operatorname{hom}(X, Y)$ composed of \mathcal{A} -morphisms belongs to \mathcal{A} ;
- both

$$\operatorname{hom}(X, f): \operatorname{hom}(X, Y) \longrightarrow \operatorname{hom}(X, Z), \quad h \mapsto f \circ h$$

and

$$\operatorname{hom}(g, Z): \operatorname{hom}(Y, Z) \longrightarrow \operatorname{hom}(X, Z), \quad h \mapsto h \circ g$$

are morphisms of \mathcal{A} .

(ii) There exists a bifunctor

$$\square: \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

and a bijection

$$\operatorname{hom}(Z \square X, Y) \cong \operatorname{hom}(Z, \operatorname{hom}(X, Y))$$

natural in all variables X, Y and Z .

By a result in category theory, see e.g. Mac Lane [55, page 102, Theorem 3], in the presence of (i), condition (ii) is equivalent to that for each object X of \mathcal{A} , the functor

$$\operatorname{hom}(X, -): \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$$

has a left adjoint.

For the class of Cauchy weights, the class of ideals, and the largest class of weights, the answer to Question 13.3 is positive, as we see below.

Proposition 13.4. *The triple $(\mathbb{C}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}, \otimes, \star)$ is a symmetric monoidal closed category.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{C}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$ is a full subcategory of the closed category $([0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}, \otimes, \star)$ and the terminal real-enriched category \star is Cauchy complete, we only need to check that for all Cauchy complete real-enriched categories X and Y , both the tensor product $X \otimes Y$ and the functor category $[X, Y]$ are Cauchy complete. Cauchy completeness of $[X, Y]$ follows from Theorem 13.1. In the following we use the

characterizations in Proposition 8.13 to verify that $X \otimes Y$ is Cauchy complete. Suppose $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence of $X \otimes Y$. It is clear that $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence of X and $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence of Y . Suppose $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to a and $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to b . It is readily verified that $\{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to (a, b) , so $X \otimes Y$ is Cauchy complete. \square

Theorem 13.5. (Lai and Zhang [47]) *The triple $(\mathbb{I}\text{-Alg}, \otimes, \star)$ is a symmetric monoidal closed category.*

Proof. Since $([0, 1]\text{-Cat}, \otimes, \star)$ is a monoidal closed category and \star is Yoneda complete, it suffices to show that for all Yoneda complete real-enriched categories X, Y, Z , it holds that

- (i) $X \otimes Y$ is Yoneda complete;
- (ii) the subset $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ of $[X, Y]$ consisting of Yoneda continuous maps is Yoneda complete;
- (iii) $f: X \otimes Y \rightarrow Z$ is Yoneda continuous if and only if $f: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ is Yoneda continuous separately.

Assertion (ii) is contained in Theorem 13.1. Assertions (i) and (iii) are contained, respectively, in Lemma 13.6 and Lemma 13.7 below. \square

The following fact will be used in Lemma 13.6 and Lemma 13.7. Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories and $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a net of $X \otimes Y$. Then $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $X \otimes Y$ if and only if $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of X and $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of Y , in which case,

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} X(x_j, x_l) \& Y(y_k, y_l) = 1,$$

where “ $i \leq j, k \leq l$ ” means “ $i \leq j \leq l$ and $i \leq k \leq l$ ”

Lemma 13.6. *If both of the real-enriched categories X and Y are Yoneda complete, then so is the tensor product $X \otimes Y$.*

Proof. We prove that for any real-enriched categories X and Y and any forward Cauchy net $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of $X \otimes Y$, if a is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ and b is a Yoneda limit of $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$, then (a, b) is a Yoneda limit of $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$. For this we check that for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,

$$X \otimes Y((a, b), (x, y)) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \& Y(y_j, y).$$

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} X \otimes Y((a, b), (x, y)) &= X(a, x) \& Y(b, y) \\ &= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} Y(y_j, y) \right) \\ &= \sup_{i \in D} \left[\left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \& \left(\inf_{j \geq i} Y(y_j, y) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \& Y(y_j, y). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since both $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$ are forward Cauchy, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \& Y(y_j, y) \\ &= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \& Y(y_j, y) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} X(x_j, x_l) \& Y(y_k, y_l) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} X(x_l, x) \& Y(y_l, y) \& X(x_j, x_l) \& Y(y_k, y_l) \\ &\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{k \geq i} X(x_j, x) \& Y(y_k, y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{i \in D} \left[\left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \& \left(\inf_{k \geq i} Y(y_k, y) \right) \right] \\
&= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq i} Y(y_k, y) \right) \\
&= X(a, x) \& Y(b, y) \\
&= X \otimes Y((a, b), (x, y)). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 13.7. *Suppose X, Y, Z are Yoneda complete real-enriched categories. Then, a functor $f: X \otimes Y \rightarrow Z$ is Yoneda continuous if and only if $f: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ is Yoneda continuous separately.*

Proof. For necessity we check that f is Yoneda continuous in the first variable for example. Let $b \in Y$ and let $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ be a forward Cauchy net of X with a Yoneda limit a . We show that $f(a, b)$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{f(x_i, b)\}_{i \in D}$. Because $f: X \otimes Y \rightarrow Z$ is Yoneda continuous, it suffices to check that (a, b) is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{(x_i, b)\}_{i \in D}$ of $X \otimes Y$. This follows from that for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}
X \otimes Y((a, b), (x, y)) &= X(a, x) \& Y(b, y) \\
&= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, x) \right) \& Y(b, y) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} (X(x_j, x) \& Y(b, y)) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X \otimes Y((x_j, b), (x, y)).
\end{aligned}$$

For sufficiency suppose $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $X \otimes Y$ and (a, b) is a Yoneda limit of $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$. We show that $f(a, b)$ is a Yoneda limit of $\{f(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Since Z is Yoneda complete, $\{f(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a Yoneda limit, say c . We wish to show that c is isomorphic to $f(a, b)$.

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
Z(c, f(a, b)) &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} Z(f(x_j, y_j), f(a, b)) \\
&\geq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X \otimes Y((x_j, y_j), (a, b)) \\
&= X \otimes Y((a, b), (a, b)) \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that $c \sqsubseteq f(a, b)$. It remains to check that $f(a, b) \sqsubseteq c$. On the one hand, since $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of X and $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of Y , by Yoneda completeness of X, Y and Lemma 13.6 one sees that a is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, b is a Yoneda limit of $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
Z(f(a, b), c) &= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} Z(f(x_j, b), c) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \sup_{h \in D} \inf_{k \geq h} Z(f(x_j, y_k), c) \\
&\geq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{k \geq i} Z(f(x_j, y_k), c).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net of $X \otimes Y$ and c is a Yoneda limit of the net $\{f(x_i, y_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= Z(c, c) \\
&= \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{l \geq i} Z(f(x_l, y_l), c) \\
&= \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{l \geq i} Z(f(x_l, y_l), c) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} X \otimes Y((x_j, y_k), (x_l, y_l)) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{l \geq i} Z(f(x_l, y_l), c) \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} Z(f(x_j, y_k), f(x_l, y_l)) \right) \\
&\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{i \leq j, k \leq l} Z(f(x_l, y_l), c) \& Z(f(x_j, y_k), f(x_l, y_l)) \\
&\leq \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \inf_{k \geq i} Z(f(x_j, y_k), c).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Z(f(a, b), c) = 1$ and consequently, $f(a, b) \sqsubseteq c$. \square

Proposition 13.4 and Theorem 13.5 show that the category $\mathbb{C}\text{-Alg}$ of \mathbb{C} -algebras and the the category $\mathbb{I}\text{-Alg}$ of \mathbb{I} -algebras are closed in the monoidal closed category $([0, 1]\text{-Cat}, \otimes, \star)$ with respect to various operations, so they are themselves monoidal closed categories. But, the situation for the largest class of weights, i.e. the class \mathcal{P} of all weights, is quite different, as we see below.

Example 13.8. Let $\&$ be the product t-norm on $[0, 1]$. Then the tensor product $\mathbb{V} \otimes \mathbb{V}$ of the complete real enriched category $\mathbb{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ with itself is not tensored. Otherwise, there is some $(a, b) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, the tensor of $1/2$ with $(1/2, 1/2)$, such that

$$\mathbb{V} \otimes \mathbb{V}((a, b), (x, y)) = 1/2 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}(1/2, x) \& \mathbb{V}(1/2, y)$$

for all $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. Putting $x = 1/4$ and $y = 1/2$ gives that $a \leq 1/4$; putting $x = 1/2$ and $y = 1/4$ gives that $b \leq 1/4$. Then

$$\mathbb{V} \otimes \mathbb{V}((a, b), (1/4, 1/4)) = (a \rightarrow 1/4) \& (b \rightarrow 1/4) = 1,$$

but

$$1/2 \rightarrow \mathbb{V}(1/2, 1/4) \& \mathbb{V}(1/2, 1/4) = 1/2,$$

a contradiction.

Theorem 13.9. (Joyal and Tierney [35, page 9]) *For each \mathbb{P} -algebra X , the functor $\text{hom}(X, -): \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$ has a left adjoint.*

Lemma 13.10. *For all \mathbb{P} -algebras X and Y , the real-enriched categories $\text{hom}(X, Y)$ and $\text{hom}(Y^{\text{op}}, X^{\text{op}})$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. For each $f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)$, let $G(f): Y^{\text{op}} \rightarrow X^{\text{op}}$ be the opposite of the right adjoint of f . We claim that $G: \text{hom}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{hom}(Y^{\text{op}}, X^{\text{op}})$ is an isomorphism. For this we check that G preserves tensors and joins (w.r.t. the underlying order).

We check that G preserves tensors for example. Let $f \in \text{hom}(X, Y)$ and $r \in [0, 1]$. It is readily verified that if $g: Y \rightarrow X$ is a right adjoint of f , the correspondence $y \mapsto r \multimap g(y)$ defines a right adjoint of $r \otimes f$, which shows that G preserves tensors. \square

Proof of Theorem 13.9. First of all, we note that

$$\text{hom}(Z, \text{hom}(X, Y)) \cong \text{hom}(X, \text{hom}(Z, Y))$$

for all \mathbb{P} -algebras X, Y and Z .

For each \mathbb{P} -algebra Y , let

$$Y \square X = \text{hom}(Y, X^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}}.$$

For each morphism $f: Y \rightarrow Z$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$, let

$$f \square \text{id}_X: Y \square X \rightarrow Z \square X$$

be the opposite of the right adjoint of

$$\text{hom}(f, X^{\text{op}}): \text{hom}(Z, X^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow \text{hom}(Y, X^{\text{op}}).$$

The correspondence $f \mapsto f \square \text{id}_X$ gives rise to a functor

$$-\square X: \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}.$$

We claim that this functor is left adjoint to

$$\mathrm{hom}(X, -): \mathbb{P}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}.$$

To see this, we show that for any Y, Z of $\mathbb{P}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$, there is a bijection

$$\mathrm{hom}(Z \square X, Y) \cong \mathrm{hom}(Z, \mathrm{hom}(X, Y))$$

natural in both Y and Z . The correspondence $f \mapsto \bar{f}$ displayed below exhibits one such:

$$\begin{aligned} f: Z \square X &\longrightarrow Y \\ f: \mathrm{hom}(Z, X^{\mathrm{op}})^{\mathrm{op}} &\longrightarrow Y && \text{definition of } Z \square X \\ g: Y &\longrightarrow \mathrm{hom}(Z, X^{\mathrm{op}})^{\mathrm{op}} && \text{the right adjoint of } f \\ g^{\mathrm{op}}: Y^{\mathrm{op}} &\longrightarrow \mathrm{hom}(Z, X^{\mathrm{op}}) && \text{the opposite of } g \\ h: Z &\longrightarrow \mathrm{hom}(Y^{\mathrm{op}}, X^{\mathrm{op}}) && \text{switch } Y^{\mathrm{op}} \text{ and } Z \\ \bar{f}: Z &\longrightarrow \mathrm{hom}(X, Y) && \mathrm{hom}(Y^{\mathrm{op}}, X^{\mathrm{op}}) \cong \mathrm{hom}(X, Y) \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The bifunctor \square is symmetric, associative, and has $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ as unit. All told,

Proposition 13.11. *The triple $(\mathbb{P}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}, \square, \mathbf{V})$ is a symmetric monoidal closed category.*

Let \mathbb{F} be the monad $(\mathcal{F}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ in $[0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}$. As a special case of Question 13.3 we ask the following:

Question 13.12. Is the category $\mathbb{F}\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}$ of \mathbb{F} -algebras monoidal closed?

14. CONTINUOUS \mathbb{T} -ALGEBRAS

As in the previous section, unless otherwise specified, in this subsection \mathcal{T} always denotes a saturated class of weights on $[0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}$, and \mathbb{T} denotes the corresponding submonad of the presheaf monad in $[0, 1]\text{-}\mathbf{Cat}$.

Definition 14.1. Suppose A is a \mathbb{T} -algebra. We say that A is continuous if the left adjoint $\mathrm{colim}: \mathcal{T}A \longrightarrow A$ of $\mathbf{y}: A \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ has a left adjoint. In other words, A is continuous if there exists a string of adjunctions

$$\downarrow \dashv \mathrm{colim} \dashv \mathbf{y}: A \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}A.$$

Suppose A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. We claim that $\mathrm{colim} \downarrow x = x$ for each $x \in A$. On the one hand, since

$$A(x, \mathrm{colim} \downarrow x) = \mathcal{T}(\downarrow x, \downarrow x) = 1,$$

then $x \sqsubseteq \mathrm{colim} \downarrow x$, where \sqsubseteq is the underlying order of A . On the other hand, since

$$A(\mathrm{colim} \downarrow x, x) = \mathcal{T}A(\downarrow x, \mathbf{y}(x)) = A(x, \mathrm{colim} \mathbf{y}(x)) = A(x, x) = 1,$$

then $\mathrm{colim} \downarrow x \sqsubseteq x$. Therefore, $\mathrm{colim} \downarrow x = x$ since A is separated.

Example 14.2. Consider the saturated class \mathcal{C} of Cauchy weights and the monad $\mathbb{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$. Then every \mathbb{C} -algebra A is continuous, because every Cauchy weight of A is representable, so $\mathbf{y}: A \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}A$ is an isomorphism.

Proposition 14.3. *For every real-enriched category A , the \mathbb{T} -algebra $\mathcal{T}A$ is a continuous.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ is a KZ-monad, for every real-enriched category A , there is a string of adjunctions

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}A} \dashv \mathbf{m}_A \dashv \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{T}A}: \mathcal{T}A \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}A,$$

which shows that $\mathcal{T}A$ is continuous. \square

For a \mathbb{T} -algebra A , the distributor

$$\mathfrak{t} := \text{colim}^* \searrow y_* : A \multimap A$$

is called the \mathcal{T} -below distributor on A .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_*} & \mathcal{T}A \\ & \searrow \mathfrak{t} & \uparrow \text{colim}^* \\ & & A \end{array}$$

Explicitly, for all $x, y \in A$,

$$\mathfrak{t}(y, x) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{T}A} (A(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi(y)).$$

Putting $\phi = y(x)$ gives that $\mathfrak{t}(y, x) \leq A(y, x)$.

Suppose X, Y are real-enriched categories. For each functor $f: Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$, the distributor

$$X \multimap Y, \quad (x, y) \mapsto f(y)(x)$$

is called the *transpose* of f . In particular, the transpose of the Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is the identity distributor $X \multimap X$. Conversely, for each distributor $\phi: X \multimap Y$, the assignment $y \mapsto \phi(-, y)$ defines a functor $Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$, called the *transpose* of ϕ . Taking transpose defines a natural bijection between functors $Y \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ and distributors $X \multimap Y$.

Proposition 14.4. *Suppose A is a \mathbb{T} -algebra. Then A is continuous if and only if for all $x \in A$, the weight $\mathfrak{t}(-, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}A$ and has x as colimit. In this case, the left adjoint $\downarrow: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ and the \mathcal{T} -below distributor $\mathfrak{t}: A \multimap A$ are transpose of each other.*

Proof. We prove the necessity first. Given a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra A , we show that for each $x \in A$, $\mathfrak{t}(-, x) = \downarrow x$, so $\mathfrak{t}(-, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}A$ and has x as colimit. On the one hand, since $\text{colim } \downarrow x = x$, then

$$\mathfrak{t}(-, x) \leq A(x, \text{colim } \downarrow x) \rightarrow \downarrow x = \downarrow x.$$

On the other hand, since for all $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$ we have

$$A(x, \text{colim } \phi) \& \downarrow x = \mathcal{T}A(\downarrow x, \phi) \& \downarrow x \leq \phi,$$

it follows that $\downarrow x \leq A(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$, hence $\downarrow x \leq \mathfrak{t}(-, x)$.

As for the sufficiency, we show that the assignment $x \mapsto \downarrow x := \mathfrak{t}(-, x)$ defines a left adjoint of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow A$. Let $x \in A$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$. By definition of $\mathfrak{t}(-, x)$, we have $\downarrow x \leq A(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi$, so $A(x, \text{colim } \phi) \leq \mathcal{T}A(\downarrow x, \phi)$. Since colim is a functor and $\text{colim } \downarrow x = x$, then $\mathcal{T}A(\downarrow x, \phi) \leq A(\text{colim } \downarrow x, \text{colim } \phi) = A(x, \text{colim } \phi)$. Therefore, \downarrow is a left adjoint of colim and A is continuous. \square

Proposition 14.5. *Suppose A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. Then the \mathcal{T} -below distributor $\mathfrak{t}: A \multimap A$ interpolates in the sense that $\mathfrak{t} \circ \mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}$.*

Proof. Before proving the conclusion, we would like to note that the conclusion (or for some specific class of weights) has been proved in several places, e.g. Hofmann and Waskiewicz [32, 33], Stubbe [74], and Waskiewicz [78].

Since \mathfrak{t} is the transpose of the left adjoint $\downarrow: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$, it suffices to show that for all $x \in A$,

$$\downarrow x = \sup_{z \in A} \downarrow x(z) \& \downarrow z.$$

Since A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra, $\text{colim} \downarrow x = x$ for all $x \in A$. Since $\downarrow: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ is a left adjoint, it preserves colimits, so $\downarrow x$ is the colimit of the functor $\downarrow: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ weighted by $\downarrow x$, i.e.

$$\downarrow x = \text{colim}_{\downarrow x} \downarrow.$$

Since $\mathcal{T}A$ is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits in $\mathcal{P}A$, then $\text{colim}_{\downarrow x} \downarrow = \text{colim}_{\downarrow x} (\text{id} \circ \downarrow)$, where $\text{id}: \mathcal{T}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is the inclusion functor. Thus, by Corollary 7.11,

$$\downarrow x = \text{colim}_{\downarrow x} (\text{id} \circ \downarrow) = \sup_{z \in A} \downarrow x(z) \& \downarrow z. \quad \square$$

Proposition 14.6. *Every retract of a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$ is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. Furthermore, a \mathbb{T} -algebra A is continuous if and only if it is a retract of $\mathcal{T}A$ in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$.*

Proof. Suppose B is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra; $s: A \rightarrow B$ and $r: B \rightarrow A$ are \mathbb{T} -homomorphisms with $r \circ s = 1_A$. We show that

$$\downarrow_A := \mathcal{T}r \circ \downarrow_B \circ s: A \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mathcal{T}B \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$$

is left adjoint to $\text{colim}_A: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow A$, so A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra.

On the one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{colim}_A \circ \downarrow_A &= \text{colim}_A \circ \mathcal{T}r \circ \downarrow_B \circ s \\ &= r \circ \text{colim}_B \circ \downarrow_B \circ s && (r \text{ is a } \mathbb{T}\text{-homomorphism}) \\ &= r \circ s && (\text{colim}_B \circ \downarrow_B = \text{id}_B) \\ &= 1_A. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \downarrow_A \circ \text{colim}_A &= \mathcal{T}r \circ \downarrow_B \circ s \circ \text{colim}_A \\ &= \mathcal{T}r \circ \downarrow_B \circ \text{colim}_B \circ \mathcal{T}s && (s \text{ is a } \mathbb{T}\text{-homomorphism}) \\ &\leq \mathcal{T}r \circ \mathcal{T}s && (\downarrow_B \dashv \text{colim}_B) \\ &= 1_{\mathcal{T}A}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, \downarrow_A is left adjoint to colim_A , as desired.

The second conclusion follows from that $\text{colim}_A \circ \downarrow_A = \text{id}_A$ for every continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra A . \square

Corollary 14.7. *Suppose A, B are separated real-enriched categories, $g: A \rightarrow B$ is a right adjoint that preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits.*

- (i) *If g is surjective and A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra, then so is B .*
- (ii) *If g is injective and B is continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra, then so is A .*

Proof. (i) Let $f: B \rightarrow A$ be the left adjoint of g . Then $g \circ f = 1_B$, so B is a \mathbb{T} -algebra by Proposition 12.11, hence a retract of A in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$, and consequently, a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra by the above proposition.

(ii) Let $f: B \rightarrow A$ be the left adjoint of g . Then $f \circ g = 1_A$, so A is a retract of B in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$, hence a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. \square

Definition 14.8. A continuous \mathbb{P} -algebra is called a real-enriched completely distributive lattice.

Continuous \mathbb{P} -algebras are said to be *totally continuous* in Stubbe [74], they are a special case of completely (totally) distributive categories in the sense of Marmolejo, Rosebrugh and Wood [58]. As a special case of Proposition 14.3, we obtain that the real-enriched category $\mathcal{P}X$ is completely distributive for every real-enriched category X . In particular, $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is completely distributive.

Proposition 14.9. *A \mathbb{P} -algebra is a real-enriched completely distributive lattice if and only if it is a retract of some power of $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$.*

Proof. For each set X , the power \mathbf{V}^X in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}X$ when X is viewed as a discrete real-enriched category. Then sufficiency follows from Propositions 14.3 and 14.6. Necessity follows from that each real-enriched completely distributive lattice A is a retract of $\mathcal{P}A$ and that $\mathcal{P}A$ is a retract of $\mathcal{P}|A|$, where $|A|$ is the discrete real-enriched category with the same objects as those of A . \square

Proposition 2.29 says that for complete lattices, the notion of complete distributivity is self-dual. But, this is in general not true in the enriched context.

Theorem 14.10. (Lai and Shen [44]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The continuous t-norm $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm.*
- (2) *If X is a real-enriched completely distributive lattice, then so is X^{op} .*
- (3) *The real-enriched category \mathbf{V}^{op} is completely distributive.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) First, since $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm, it is readily verified that for each real-enriched category X , the map

$$\neg: (\mathcal{P}X)^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}}), \quad \phi \mapsto \phi \rightarrow 0$$

is an isomorphism of real-enriched categories. Next, let X be a real-enriched completely distributive lattice. Then the Yoneda embedding $\mathbf{y}: X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is a right adjoint and its left adjoint $\text{colim}: \mathcal{P}X \longrightarrow X$ is also a right adjoint. The left adjoints

$$\text{colim} \circ \neg: \mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}X)^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow X^{\text{op}}$$

and

$$\neg \circ \mathbf{y}: X^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{P}X)^{\text{op}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}})$$

exhibit X^{op} as a retract of $\mathcal{P}(X^{\text{op}})$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$, so, by Proposition 14.3 and Proposition 14.6, X^{op} is completely distributive.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Trivial, since $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is completely distributive.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Since \mathbf{V}^{op} is completely distributive, the functor

$$\text{colim}_{\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}}: \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}$$

is a right adjoint. Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}}) = (\mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V})^{\text{op}}$, it follows that

$$\lim_{\mathbf{V}}: \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V} \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

is a left adjoint. So the functor $\lim_{\mathbf{V}}: \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V} \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$ preserves tensors. Since the tensor of r with (the constant coweight) $0_{\mathbf{V}}$ in $\mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathbf{V}$ is given by

$$(r \multimap 0_{\mathbf{V}})(x) = r \rightarrow 0$$

for all $x \in [0, 1]$, then for all $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} r &= r \& \lim_{\mathbf{V}} 0_{\mathbf{V}} & & (\lim_{\mathbf{V}} 0_{\mathbf{V}} = 1) \\ &= \lim_{\mathbf{V}} (r \multimap 0_{\mathbf{V}}) \\ &= \inf_{x \in [0, 1]} ((r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow x) \\ &= (r \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. \square

Since every \mathbb{P} -algebra is a \mathbb{T} -algebra, it is natural to ask whether every real-enriched completely distributive lattice is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. The answer depends on whether the copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over the monad \mathbb{T} (to be explained below). First of all, we have the following:

Proposition 14.11. *Every real-enriched completely distributive lattice is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra if and only if for every real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{P}X$ is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra.*

Proof. Necessity is trivial. For sufficiency assume that A is a real-enriched completely distributive lattice. By Proposition 14.6 we know that A is a retract of $\mathcal{P}A$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$, hence a retract of $\mathcal{P}A$ in $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$. Since $\mathcal{P}A$ is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra by assumption, then so is A again by Proposition 14.6. \square

Theorem 14.12. (Lai and Zhang [48]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every real-enriched completely distributive lattice is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra.*
- (2) *The copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathbb{T} .*

Before proving this theorem, we make some preparations first.
For each real-enriched category X , let

$$m_X^\dagger: \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$$

be the functor that sends each coweight of $\mathcal{P}^\dagger X$ to its limit. Then

$$m^\dagger: (\mathcal{P}^\dagger)^2 \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger$$

is a natural transformation and

$$\mathbb{P}^\dagger = (\mathcal{P}^\dagger, m^\dagger, y^\dagger)$$

is a monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, called the copresheaf monad. The copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger is a co-KZ-monad in the locally ordered category $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ in the sense that

$$\mathcal{P}^\dagger y_X^\dagger \vdash m_X^\dagger \vdash y_{\mathcal{P}^\dagger X}^\dagger: \mathcal{P}^\dagger X \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathcal{P}^\dagger X$$

for each real-enriched category X .

Since \mathbb{P}^\dagger is co-KZ, a \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra is a separated real-enriched category A such that the coYoneda embedding $y_A^\dagger: A \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}^\dagger A$ has a right adjoint. Therefore, the category

$$\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$$

of \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebras and \mathbb{P}^\dagger -homomorphisms is precisely the category of separated and complete real-enriched categories and right adjoint functors.

Mapping each $f: A \longrightarrow B$ in $\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg}$ to its right adjoint $\bar{f}: B \longrightarrow A$ defines an isomorphism of categories

$$(\mathbb{P}\text{-Alg})^{\text{op}} \cong \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}.$$

Let \mathcal{A} be a subcategory (not necessarily full) of $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. If

- for each morphism $f: A \longrightarrow B$ of \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{T}f: \mathcal{T}A \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}B$ is a morphism of \mathcal{A} ; and
- for each object A of \mathcal{A} , the Yoneda embedding y_A with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{T}A$ is a morphism of \mathcal{A} ,

then we say that (the restriction of) \mathcal{T} is a *class of weights* on \mathcal{A} .

Proposition 14.13. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The restriction of \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$.*
- (2) *For each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , $\mathcal{T}A$ is a \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra.*
- (3) *For each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , the inclusion $\mathcal{T}A \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is a right adjoint.*

In this case, $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$ is a monad in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ and the forgetful functor $\mathbb{T}\text{-ConLat} \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ is monadic, where $\mathbb{T}\text{-ConLat}$ denotes the category with complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebras as objects and right adjoint \mathbb{T} -homomorphisms as morphisms.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Obvious.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) By the dual of Corollary 7.9, it suffices to check that $\mathcal{T}A$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}A$ with respect to cotensors and meets. For $r \in [0, 1]$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$, let $r \multimap \phi$ be the cotensor of r and ϕ in $\mathcal{T}A$. Then for all $x \in A$,

$$(r \multimap \phi)(x) = \mathcal{T}A(y(x), r \multimap \phi) = r \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A(y(x), \phi) = r \rightarrow \phi(x),$$

thus, $\mathcal{T}A$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}A$ with respect to cotensors. Let ϕ be the meet of a subset $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in I}$ of $\mathcal{T}A$. Since $\mathcal{T}A$ is complete, by Proposition 7.4 for all $x \in A$,

$$\phi(x) = \mathcal{T}A(y_A(x), \phi) = \inf_{i \in I} \mathcal{T}A(y_A(x), \phi_i) = \inf_{i \in I} \phi_i(x),$$

so $\mathcal{T}A$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}A$ with respect to meets.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) First, we show that if $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$, then so is $\mathcal{T}f: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}B$. Since the inclusion $\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is a right adjoint, $\mathcal{T}A$ is a retract of $\mathcal{P}A$ in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, it is a \mathbb{P} -algebra by Proposition 12.11, then a \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra. Since \mathcal{T} , being a subfunctor of \mathcal{P} , preserves adjunctions, it follows that $\mathcal{T}f: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}B$ is a right adjoint, hence a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. Second, we show that for each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , the Yoneda embedding $y: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ is a morphism in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. This follows from that it is right adjoint to the functor $\text{colim}: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow A$. Therefore, the restriction of \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$.

Finally, we show that $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$ is a monad in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. It suffices to check that for each object A of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$, the component $m_A: \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ of the multiplication $m: \mathcal{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ at A is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. Since \mathbb{T} is a KZ-monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, for each real-enriched category X ,

$$m_X = \text{colim}: \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}X$$

is both a left and a right adjoint. In particular, for each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , the functor $m_A: \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. \square

A *lifting* of the monad $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$ along the forgetful functor

$$U: \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

is a monad $\tilde{\mathbb{T}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{m}, \tilde{y})$ in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{m}, \tilde{y})} & \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \\ \downarrow U & & \downarrow U \\ [0, 1]\text{-Cat} & \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{T}, m, y)} & [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \end{array}$$

$$U \circ \tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T} \circ U, \quad U \circ \tilde{m} = m \circ U, \quad U \circ \tilde{y} = y \circ U.$$

It is clear that such a lifting exists if and only if

- for each morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$, $\mathcal{T}f: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}B$ is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$;
- for each object A of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$, $y_A: A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ is a morphism of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$.

Therefore, such a lifting exists if and only if the restriction of \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. In this case the lifting is exactly the restriction of \mathbb{T} to the subcategory $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. This implies that the lifting of \mathbb{T} along the forgetful functor, when exists, is unique.

If $\tilde{\mathbb{T}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \tilde{m}, \tilde{y})$ is a lifting of $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, m, y)$ along $U: \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, the monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ defined by the composite adjunction

$$(\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg})^{\tilde{\mathbb{T}}} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \dashv \text{---} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{T}} \end{array} \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{U} \\ \dashv \text{---} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{P}^\dagger} \end{array} [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$$

is called the composite of \mathbb{P}^\dagger and \mathbb{T} , denoted by $\mathbb{T} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$, where $(\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg})^{\widetilde{\mathbb{T}}}$ denotes the Eilenberg-Moore category of the monad $\widetilde{\mathbb{T}}$.

It is known in category theory, see e.g. [30, II.3.8], that a lifting of the monad $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{y})$ along the forgetful functor $U: \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ determines, and is determined by, a unique distributive law of the monad $\mathbb{P}^\dagger = (\mathcal{P}^\dagger, \mathfrak{m}^\dagger, \mathfrak{y}^\dagger)$ over the monad $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{y})$. A *distributive law* of \mathbb{P}^\dagger over \mathbb{T} is a natural transformation $\delta: \mathcal{P}^\dagger \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T} \mathcal{P}^\dagger$ satisfying certain conditions, the details are omitted here. Since the lifting of \mathbb{T} along the forgetful functor, when exists, is unique, there is at most one distributive law of \mathbb{P}^\dagger over \mathbb{T} . So, it is safe for us to say simply “ \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathbb{T} ”.

From Proposition 14.13 the following conclusion follows immediately.

Proposition 14.14. *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathbb{T} .*
- (2) *The monad \mathbb{T} in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$ has a lifting to $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ along the forgetful functor.*
- (3) *For every \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , $\mathcal{T}A$ is a complete real-enriched category.*
- (4) *For every \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , the inclusion $\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is a right adjoint.*
- (5) *The restriction of \mathcal{T} is a class of weights on $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$.*

Proof of Theorem 14.12. (1) \Rightarrow (2) By Proposition 14.14, it suffices to show that for each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A , the inclusion functor $i_A: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is a right adjoint.

Since $\mathcal{P}A$ is completely distributive, it is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra by assumption. Thus, we have a string of adjunctions

$$\downarrow \dashv \text{colim} \dashv \mathfrak{y}_{\mathcal{P}A}: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A.$$

Since the Yoneda embedding $y_A: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ has a left adjoint $\text{colim}_A: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow A$ and any 2-functor preserves adjunctions, $\mathcal{T}\text{colim}_A: \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$ is left adjoint to $\mathcal{T}y_A: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{T}\text{colim}_A \circ \downarrow: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$$

is left adjoint to

$$\text{colim} \circ \mathcal{T}y_A: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A.$$

Since $y_A: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is fully faithful, by Proposition 5.10 and Example 6.5 we have $1_{\mathcal{P}A} = y_A^{-1} \circ (y_A)_\exists = \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}A} \circ \mathcal{P}y_A$. Since \mathcal{T} is a subfunctor of \mathcal{P} , the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{T}A & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{T}y_A} & \mathcal{T}\mathcal{P}A \\
 \downarrow i_A & & \downarrow i_{\mathcal{P}A} \\
 \mathcal{P}A & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}y_A} & \mathcal{P}\mathcal{P}A \\
 \searrow 1_{\mathcal{P}A} & & \downarrow \text{colim}_{\mathcal{P}A} \\
 & & \mathcal{P}A
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{colim}$$

is commutative. Therefore, $i_A: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$, being equal to $\text{colim} \circ \mathcal{T}y_A$, is a right adjoint of $\mathcal{T}\text{colim}_A \circ \downarrow: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow \mathcal{T}A$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose A is a completely distributive real-enriched category. Since \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathcal{T} , by Proposition 14.14 the inclusion $\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ has a left adjoint. The composite of the left adjoint of $\text{colim}_A: \mathcal{P}A \rightarrow A$ with the left adjoint of the inclusion $\mathcal{T}A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}A$ is then a left adjoint of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{T}A \rightarrow A$, so A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. \square

Proposition 14.15. *If the copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathbb{T} , then for each separated real-enriched category A , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *A is a complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra.*
- (2) *A is an algebra for \mathbb{T} when \mathbb{T} is viewed as a monad in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$.*
- (3) *A is an algebra for the composite monad $\mathbb{T} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$; that means, there is map $h: \mathcal{TP}^\dagger A \rightarrow A$ such that (A, h) is an algebra for the composite monad $\mathbb{T} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$.*

Proof. We check (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) first. Let A be a complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra. Then \mathcal{TA} is an object of $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ by Proposition 14.14. So, the string of adjunctions

$$\downarrow \dashv \text{colim} \dashv y: A \rightarrow \mathcal{TA}$$

ensures that $\text{colim}: \mathcal{TA} \rightarrow A$ is a morphism in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ and consequently, A is an algebra for \mathbb{T} when viewed as a monad in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. Conversely, suppose A is an algebra for \mathbb{T} when viewed as a monad in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. Then $y: A \rightarrow \mathcal{TA}$ has a left adjoint $\text{colim}: \mathcal{TA} \rightarrow A$ which is also a morphism in $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$. That means, colim has a left adjoint. Hence A is a continuous \mathbb{T} -algebra.

The equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) is a special case of a general result in category theory, see e.g. [30, II.3.8.4], which says that the Eilenberg-Moore category of the lifting $\tilde{\mathbb{T}}$ is isomorphic to that of the composite monad $\mathbb{T} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$. \square

Corollary 14.16. *Suppose the copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over \mathbb{T} . Then the category $\mathbb{T}\text{-ConLat}$ with complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebras as objects and right adjoint \mathbb{T} -homomorphisms as morphisms is monadic over $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. In particular, the category $[0, 1]\text{-CDL}$, of which the objects are real-enriched completely distributive lattices and the morphisms are functors that are at the time left adjoints and right adjoints, is the Eilenberg-Moore algebra category for the composite monad $\mathbb{P} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$ in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, hence monadic over $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.*

Question 14.17. Is the full subcategory of $\mathbb{T}\text{-Alg}$ composed of complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebras monoidal closed?

15. REAL-ENRICHED DOMAINS

For each real-enriched category X , let

$$\mathcal{J}X = \{\phi \in \mathcal{I}X \mid \phi \text{ has a colimit}\}.$$

Then, every forward Cauchy net of X has a Yoneda limit if and only if $\mathcal{J}X = \mathcal{I}X$.

The Yoneda embedding $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ factors through $\mathcal{J}X$, so we'll write $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$ for the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{J}X$. It is clear that $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$ has a left adjoint $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$ that sends each $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$ to its colimit.

Definition 15.1. (Waszkiewicz [78]) Suppose X is a real-enriched category. If $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$ has a left adjoint, then we say that X is continuous. In other words, X is continuous if there exists a string of adjunctions

$$\downarrow \dashv \text{colim} \dashv y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X.$$

A Yoneda complete and continuous real-enriched category is called a real-enriched domain.

A real-enriched category A is a real-enriched domain if and only if it is a continuous \mathbb{I} -algebra, where $\mathbb{I} = (\mathcal{I}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$ is the ideal monad in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$; that means, A is a separated real-enriched category such that there is a string of adjunctions:

$$\downarrow \dashv \text{colim} \dashv y: A \rightarrow \mathcal{I}A.$$

For each ordered set (X, \leq) , it is readily verified that $\omega(X, \leq)$ is a real-enriched domain if and only if (X, \leq) is a domain. But, the underlying ordered set of a real-enriched domain may fail to be a domain.

Example 15.2. (Yu and Zhang [82]) In this example we assume that the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal. Consider the real-enriched category X , where $X = [0, 1] \cup \{\infty\}$ and

$$X(x, y) = \begin{cases} x \rightarrow y & x, y \in [0, 1], \\ 1 & x = y = \infty, \\ 0 & x \in [0, 1], y = \infty, \\ y & x = \infty, y \in [0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Since forward Cauchy nets in X are forward Cauchy nets in $([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ plus constant nets with value ∞ , X is Yoneda complete. Since $\rightarrow: [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal, a routine calculation shows that

$$\mathbf{d}: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}X, \quad \mathbf{d}(x) = \begin{cases} X(-, \infty) & x = \infty, \\ X(-, 0) & x = 0, \\ \sup_{y < x} X(-, y) & x \in (0, 1] \end{cases}$$

is left adjoint to $\text{colim}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow X$, so X is a real-enriched domain. But, X_0 is not a domain.

Let X be a real-enriched category. The *way below distributor* of X refers to the distributor $\mathfrak{w}: X \dashrightarrow X$ given by

$$\mathfrak{w}(y, x) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{J}X} (X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi(y)).$$

It is clear that $\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \leq X(y, x)$.

Proposition 15.3. (Waszkiewicz [78]) *A real-enriched category X is continuous if and only if for all $x \in X$, the weight $\mathfrak{w}(-, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{J}X$ with x being a colimit. In this case, $\downarrow x = \mathfrak{w}(-, x)$.*

Proof. We prove the necessity first. Suppose X is continuous. We show that for each $x \in X$, $\mathfrak{w}(-, x) = \downarrow x$, hence $\mathfrak{w}(-, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{J}X$ and has x as colimit. Since $\text{colim } \downarrow x = x$, then

$$\mathfrak{w}(-, x) \leq X(x, \text{colim } \downarrow x) \rightarrow \downarrow x = \downarrow x.$$

On the other hand, since for all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$, we have

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \& \downarrow x = \mathcal{J}X(\downarrow x, \phi) \& \downarrow x \leq \phi,$$

then $\downarrow x \leq X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$, hence $\downarrow x \leq \mathfrak{w}(-, x)$.

For sufficiency we show that the assignment $x \mapsto \downarrow x := \mathfrak{w}(-, x)$ defines a left adjoint of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$. Let $x \in X$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$. By definition we have $\downarrow x \leq X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi$, hence

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \leq \mathcal{J}X(\downarrow x, \phi).$$

Since taking colimit is functorial $\mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$ and $\text{colim } \downarrow x = x$, then

$$\mathcal{J}X(\downarrow x, \phi) \leq X(\text{colim } \downarrow x, \text{colim } \phi) = X(x, \text{colim } \phi).$$

Therefore, \downarrow is a left adjoint of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$, as desired. \square

Proposition 15.4. (Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40]) *The way-below distributor \mathfrak{w} of a continuous real-enriched category interpolates in the sense that $\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w} = \mathfrak{w}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 15.3, $\mathfrak{w}(-, x)$ is the least element of $\mathcal{J}X$ having x as colimit. Since $\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \leq X(y, x)$ for all $y, x \in X$, it follows that $\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x) \leq \mathfrak{w}(-, x)$, so we only need to show that $\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}X$ and has x as colimit.

Step 1. $\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x) \in \mathcal{I}X$.

Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}X$. Since

$$\text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda) \& X(z, y) \& \mathfrak{w}(-, z) \leq \lambda,$$

it follows that

$$\text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda) \& X(z, y) \leq \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, z), \lambda),$$

so the assignment $y \mapsto \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda)$ defines a weight of X . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), \lambda \vee \mu) \\ &= \inf_{y \in X} \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \& \mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda \vee \mu) \\ &= \inf_{y \in X} \left(\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda \vee \mu) \right) \\ &= \inf_{y \in X} \left(\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow (\text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda) \vee \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \mu)) \right) \\ &= \inf_{y \in X} \left(\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \lambda) \right) \vee \inf_{y \in X} \left(\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), \mu) \right) \\ &= \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), \lambda) \vee \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, one verifies that for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}X$ and $r \in [0, 1]$,

$$\text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), r \& \lambda) = r \& \text{sub}_X(\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), \lambda).$$

This proves that $\mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x) \in \mathcal{I}X$.

Step 2. $\text{colim } \mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x) = x$.

For all $b \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned} X(x, b) &= \inf_{y \in X} (\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow X(y, b)) && (\text{colim } \mathfrak{w}(-, x) = x) \\ &= \inf_{y \in X} (\mathfrak{w}(y, x) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X(\mathfrak{w}(-, y), X(-, b))) && (\text{colim } \mathfrak{w}(-, y) = y) \\ &= \mathcal{P}X(\text{colim } \mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x), X(-, b)), \end{aligned}$$

hence $\text{colim } \mathfrak{w} \circ \mathfrak{w}(-, x) = x$. \square

The following definition is a direct extension of that for generalized metric spaces, see e.g. Bonsangue, van Breugel and Rutten [9], and Goubaul-Larrecq [20].

Definition 15.5. An element a of a real-enriched category X is compact if the functor

$$X(a, -): X \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$$

is Yoneda continuous, where $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$.

It follows from Proposition 8.2 that a Cauchy weight of a real-enriched category X is precisely an ideal of X that is a compact element of $\mathcal{P}X$.

Lemma 15.6. For each real-enriched category X and each element a of X , the following are equivalent:

- (1) a is compact.
- (2) $X(a, \text{colim } \phi) = \phi(a)$ for all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$.
- (3) $\mathfrak{w}(-, a) = X(-, a)$.

Proof. For all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$, by Example 6.1 the colimit of $X(a, -): X \longrightarrow \mathbf{V}$ weighted by ϕ is equal to the composite of $X(a, -)$ and ϕ ; that is, $\text{colim}_\phi X(a, -) = \phi \circ X(a, -) = \phi(a)$. This proves (1) \Leftrightarrow (2).

(2) \Rightarrow (3) For each $y \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{w}(y, a) &= \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{J}X} (X(a, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi(y)) \\ &= \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{J}X} (\phi(a) \rightarrow \phi(y)) \\ &= X(y, a).\end{aligned}$$

(3) \Rightarrow (2) Since taking colimit is functorial, then

$$\phi(a) = \mathcal{P}X(X(-, a), \phi) \leq X(a, \text{colim } \phi)$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$. On the other hand, since by definition

$$\mathfrak{w}(y, a) = \inf_{\phi \in \mathcal{J}X} (X(a, \text{colim } \phi) \rightarrow \phi(y)),$$

then $X(a, \text{colim } \phi) \leq \mathfrak{w}(y, a) \rightarrow \phi(y)$ for all $y \in X$ and all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$, hence

$$X(a, \text{colim } \phi) \leq \mathcal{P}X(\mathfrak{w}(-, a), \phi) = \mathcal{P}X(X(-, a), \phi) = \phi(a).$$

Therefore, $X(a, \text{colim } \phi) = \phi(a)$. \square

A real-enriched category X is *algebraic* if it is Yoneda complete and each of its elements is a Yoneda limit of a forward Cauchy net consisting of compact elements of X . Said differently, X is algebraic if it is Yoneda complete and for each $x \in X$, there is an ideal ϕ of the real-enriched category $K(X)$ composed of compact elements of X such that x is a colimit of the inclusion functor $i: K(X) \rightarrow X$ weighted by ϕ .

Example 15.7. This example shows the real-enriched category $\mathbb{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is algebraic if and only if so is its opposite \mathbb{V}^{op} , if and only if the continuous t-norm $\&$ is Archimedean. We distinguish three cases.

Case 1. $\&$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. Then all elements of \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}^{op} are compact, so both \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}^{op} are algebraic.

Case 2. $\&$ is isomorphic to the product t-norm. Then all elements of \mathbb{V} are compact, 0 is the only non-compact element of \mathbb{V}^{op} , both \mathbb{V} and \mathbb{V}^{op} are algebraic.

Case 3. $\&$ is not Archimedean. Let b be an idempotent element other than 0 and 1. For each $a \in [0, b]$ consider the ideal $\phi = \sup_{x < a} \mathbb{V}(-, x)$ of \mathbb{V} . Since $\text{colim } \phi = a$ and

$$\phi(a) = \sup_{x < a} (a \rightarrow x) \leq b < 1 = \mathbb{V}(a, \text{colim } \phi),$$

it follows that a is not compact. By help of this fact one readily verifies that \mathbb{V} is not algebraic. Likewise, one sees that each $a \in [0, b]$ is not compact in \mathbb{V}^{op} , so \mathbb{V}^{op} is not algebraic.

Proposition 15.8. *Every algebraic real-enriched category is a real-enriched domain.*

Proof. It suffices to check that the functor $\text{colim}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow X$ has a left adjoint. For each $a \in X$, take a forward Cauchy net $\{a_i\}_{i \in D}$ of compact elements of X with a as a Yoneda limit, let $\downarrow a$ be the Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{y(a_i)\}_{i \in D}$ in $\mathcal{I}X$ (existence is guaranteed by Proposition 9.17). Then, for every ideal ϕ of X ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}X(\downarrow a, \phi) &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \mathcal{I}X(y(a_j), \phi) && (\downarrow a \text{ is a Yoneda limit}) \\ &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} \phi(a_j) && (\text{Yoneda lemma}) \\ &= \inf_{i \in D} \sup_{j \geq i} X(a_j, \text{colim } \phi) && (a_j \text{ is compact}) \\ &= X(a, \text{colim } \phi), && (a \text{ is a Yoneda limit})\end{aligned}$$

hence \downarrow is a left adjoint of colim . \square

Proposition 15.9. *A real-enriched category is a real-enriched domain if and only if it is a retract of an algebraic real-enriched category in the category of \mathbb{L} -algebras.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 14.6 and the fact that for each real-enriched category X , the category $\mathcal{I}X$ of ideals of X is algebraic. \square

Proposition 15.10. *For a Smyth completable real-enriched category X , the functor $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$ is both left and right adjoint to $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$. In particular, X is continuous.*

Proof. First we show that every element of X is compact; that is, $X(a, \text{colim } \phi) = \phi(a)$ for all $a \in X$ and all $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$. Since X is Smyth completable, ϕ is Cauchy, hence representable because it has a colimit. This means $\phi = X(-, b)$ for some $b \in X$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} X(a, \text{colim } \phi) &= X(\text{colim } X(-, a), b) \\ &= \mathcal{P}X(X(-, a), X(-, b)) \\ &= \mathcal{P}X(X(-, a), \phi) \\ &= \phi(a). \end{aligned}$$

Next we show that $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$ is left adjoint to $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$. This is easy, since $\mathcal{J}X(y(a), \phi) = \phi(a) = X(a, \text{colim } \phi)$ for all $a \in X$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$. \square

Corollary 15.11. *Every Smyth complete real-enriched category is algebraic, hence a real-enriched domain.*

The equivalence between (1) and (3) in the next corollary is due to Ali-Akbari, Honarii, Pourmahdian and Rezaii [2].

Corollary 15.12. *For each separated real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Smyth complete.
- (2) The functor $y: X \rightarrow \mathcal{I}X$ is both left and right adjoint to the functor $\text{colim}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow X$.
- (3) Every forward Cauchy net of X has a Yoneda limit and every element of X is compact.

Theorem 9.25 shows that when the continuous t-norm $\&$ is Archimedean, Yoneda complete real-enriched categories can be characterized purely in terms of their set of formal balls. Theorem 15.15 below shows that in this case, under a mild assumption, there is a parallel result for continuous real-enriched categories.

The following notion is a direct extension of that of *standard quasi-metric space* in Goubault-Larrecq and Ng [21].

Definition 15.13. Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm. A real-enriched category X is standard provided that for each directed subset $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ of BX with $\sup_{i \in D} r_i > 0$, if $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a join, then so do the following subsets:

- (i) $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ for all $t > 0$;
- (ii) $\{(x_i, t \rightarrow r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ for $t = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$.

By Lemma 9.18 and Lemma 9.24, when $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm, every Yoneda complete real-enriched category is standard. The real-enriched category in Example 9.23 is not standard, otherwise, it would be Yoneda complete by Lemma 9.22.

Lemma 15.14. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t-norm. Let X be a standard real-enriched category and let $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ be a directed subset of BX with $\sup_{i \in D} r_i > 0$. If (x, r) is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then*

- (i) x is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ and $r = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$;
- (ii) $(x, 1)$ is a join of $\{(x_i, r \rightarrow r_i)\}_{i \in D}$;
- (iii) for each $t \in [0, 1]$, $(x, t \& r)$ is a join of $\{(x_i, t \& r_i)\}_{i \in D}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that x is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, the other conclusions will follow by Lemma 9.24. Let $t = \sup_{i \in D} r_i$. Since $\&$ is Archimedean, $\sup_{i \in D} (t \rightarrow r_i) = 1$. Since X is standard, the directed set $\{(x_i, t \rightarrow r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ has a join, say $(b, 1)$. By Lemma 9.22, b is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$, then (b, t) is a join of $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ by Lemma 9.24. Therefore, $r = t$ and x is isomorphic to b , so x is a Yoneda limit of $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$. \square

The following theorem is a combination and a slight improvement of related results in Goubault-Larrecq and Ng [21, Section 3] and Kostanek and Waszkiewicz [40, Section 9]. It implies that for standard quasi-metric spaces, continuity in the sense of Definition 15.1 coincides with that in the sense of Goubault-Larrecq and Ng [21, Definition 3.10].

Theorem 15.15. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t -norm and X is a standard real-enriched category. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is continuous.
- (2) The ordered set BX is continuous.

In this case, the way below distributor \mathfrak{w} of X and the way below relation \ll of BX determine each other via $(x, r) \ll (y, s) \iff r < s \& \mathfrak{w}(x, y)$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) First we present a fact that will be used in Step 1 below. Suppose X is a real-enriched category and $\{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX with $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$. Let $\phi_D = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$ and let $B\phi_D = \{(x, r) \mid \phi_D(x) > r\}$. By Proposition 9.13, $B\phi_D$ is a directed subset of BX . We assert that for each $(x, r) \in B\phi_D$, there exists $j \in D$ such that $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (x_j, r_j)$. To see this, suppose $(x, r) \in B\phi_D$. Since $\phi_D(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j)$, there is $i \in D$ such that $r < \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j)$. Since $\sup_{j \geq i} r_j = 1$, there is $j \geq i$ such that $r < r_j \& X(x, x_j)$, so $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (x_j, r_j)$.

Now we turn to the proof of the conclusion. Since X is continuous, the functor $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$ has a left adjoint $\downarrow: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$. For each $y \in X$, let

$$d(y) = \{(x, r) \in BX \mid r < \mathfrak{w}(x, y)\}.$$

Then $d(y)$ is a directed subset of BX with $(y, 1)$ as a join. In the following we prove in two steps that every element of BX is the join of the elements way below it, so BX is continuous.

Step 1. We show that $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$ for all $(x, r) \in d(y)$, hence $(y, 1)$ is the join of the elements way below it.

Let $(x, r) \in d(y)$. Suppose $D = \{(z_i, t_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX with a join, say (z, t) , larger than $(y, 1)$. It is clear that $t = 1$ and $X(y, z) = 1$. Since X is standard, $\sup_{i \in D} t_i = 1$ and z is a Yoneda limit of the forward Cauchy net $\{z_i\}_{i \in D}$. So, z is a colimit of the ideal ϕ_D generated by $\{z_i\}_{i \in D}$. Since \downarrow is left adjoint to colim we have

$$\mathcal{J}X(\downarrow z, \phi_D) = X(z, \text{colim } \phi_D) = X(z, z) = 1,$$

then $\downarrow z \leq \phi_D$ and $d(z) \subseteq B\phi_D$. Since $X(y, z) = 1$ and \downarrow is a functor, then $\downarrow y \leq \downarrow z$. Therefore, $d(y) \subseteq d(z) \subseteq B\phi_D$ and consequently, $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (z_j, t_j)$ for some $j \in D$. This proves that $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$.

Step 2. We show that $(x, r) \ll (y, s)$ whenever $r < s \& \mathfrak{w}(x, y)$, in particular $(x, s \& r) \ll (y, s)$ for all $(x, r) \in d(y)$, hence by Step 1, (y, s) is the join of the elements way below it.

Suppose $D = \{(z_i, t_i)\}_{i \in D}$ is a directed subset of BX with a join, say (z, t) , larger than (y, s) . We wish to show that $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (z_j, t_j)$ for some $j \in D$. Since X is standard, the monotone net $\{t_i\}_{i \in D}$ converges to t . Since $s \leq t \& X(y, z)$ and $r < s \& \mathfrak{w}(x, y)$, it follows that

$$r < t \& X(y, z) \& \mathfrak{w}(x, y) \leq t \& \mathfrak{w}(x, z).$$

Let $\phi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j)$. Since ϕ is an ideal of X with z as a colimit, it follows that $\mathfrak{w}(-, z) \leq \phi$, then

$$\begin{aligned} r &< t \& \mathfrak{w}(x, z) \\ &= t \& \sup_{w \in X} (\mathfrak{w}(w, z) \& \mathfrak{w}(x, w)) \\ &\leq t \& \sup_{w \in X} (\phi(w) \& \mathfrak{w}(x, w)) \\ &= t \& \sup_{w \in X} \left[\left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(w, x_j) \right) \& \mathfrak{w}(x, w) \right] \\ &\leq t \& \sup_{i \in D} \left(\sup_{w \in X} \inf_{j \geq i} X(w, x_j) \& \mathfrak{w}(x, w) \right) \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{i \in D} t_i \right) \& \left(\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} \mathfrak{w}(x, x_j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there is some $j \in D$ such that $r < t_j \& \mathfrak{w}(x, x_j) \leq t_j \& X(x, x_j)$, hence $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (z_j, t_j)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) First we present a fact that will be used in Step 3 below. Suppose X is a real-enriched category, $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$, and $(x, r) \in BX$. We assert that if $(x, r) \ll (\text{colim } \phi, 1)$, then $\phi(x) > r$. To see this, index the directed subset $\{(y, s) \mid \phi(y) > s\}$ of BX as $\{(y_i, s_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Then $\sup_{i \in D} s_i = 1$ and $\{y_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net with $\text{colim } \phi$ as a Yoneda limit. By Lemma 9.24 $(\text{colim } \phi, 1)$ is a join of $\{(y_i, s_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then $(x, r) \sqsubseteq (y_i, s_i)$ for some $i \in D$, hence

$$r \leq s_i \& X(x, y_i) < \phi(y_i) \& X(x, y_i) \leq \phi(x),$$

showing that $\phi(x) > r$.

Now we turn to the proof of the conclusion. For each $y \in X$, let

$$D = \{(x, r) \mid (x, r) \ll (y, 1)\}.$$

Then D is a directed set of BX with $(y, 1)$ as a join. Index D by itself, i.e. $D = \{(x_i, r_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Then $\sup_{i \in D} r_i = 1$ and $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ is a forward Cauchy net. Let

$$k(y) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j).$$

Then $k(y)$ is an ideal of X with y as a colimit. We show that the assignment $y \mapsto k(y)$ defines a left adjoint of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$, so X is continuous. We do this in three steps.

Step 1. $k(y) = \sup_{i \in D} r_i \& X(-, x_i)$. This implies that if $k(y)(x) > r$ then $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$.

For any $(x_i, r_i) \sqsubseteq (x_j, r_j)$ we have $r_i \leq X(x_i, x_j)$, then $r_i \& X(-, x_i) \leq X(-, x_j)$. Therefore,

$$r_i \& X(-, x_i) \leq \inf_{j \geq i} X(-, x_j),$$

hence

$$k(y) \geq \sup_{i \in D} r_i \& X(-, x_i).$$

To see the converse inequality, let $t < 1$. Since r_i tends to 1, there exists $i_0 \in D$ such that $r_j \geq t$ whenever $j \geq i_0$. Then

$$t \& k(y) \leq \sup_{i \geq i_0} \inf_{j \geq i} r_j \& X(-, x_j) \leq \sup_{i \in D} r_i \& X(-, x_i),$$

hence $k(y) \leq \sup_{i \in D} r_i \& X(-, x_i)$ by arbitrariness of t .

Step 2. If $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$, then $(x, t \& r) \ll (y, t)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

If $t \& r = 0$ there is nothing to prove, so in the following we assume that $t \& r > 0$. Index the directed set $\{(z, s) \mid (z, s) \ll (y, t)\}$ as $\{(z_i, s_i)\}_{i \in D}$. Since BX is continuous, (y, t) is a join of $\{(z_i, s_i)\}_{i \in D}$, then $(y, 1)$ is a join of the directed set $\{(z_i, t \rightarrow s_i)\}_{i \in D}$, so there exists $i \in D$ such that $(x, r) \leq (z_i, t \rightarrow s_i)$, hence $(x, t \& r) \leq (z_i, s_i) \ll (y, t)$.

Step 3. $k: X \rightarrow \mathcal{J}X$ is left adjoint to $\text{colim}: \mathcal{J}X \rightarrow X$.

For $y_1, y_2 \in X$, let $t = X(y_1, y_2)$. If $(x, r) \ll (y_1, 1)$, then $(x, t \& r) \ll (y_1, t)$ by Step 2. Since $(y_1, t) \sqsubseteq (y_2, 1)$, it follows that $(x, t \& r) \ll (y_2, 1)$, and then,

$$\begin{aligned} t \& k(y_1) &= \sup\{t \& r \& X(-, x) \mid (x, r) \ll (y_1, 1)\} \\ &\leq \sup\{r \& X(-, x) \mid (x, r) \ll (y_2, 1)\} \\ &\leq k(y_2), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that k is a functor. By Theorem 4.5 it remains to check that for all $y \in X$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{J}X$,

$$k(y) \leq \phi \iff y \sqsubseteq \text{colim } \phi.$$

The direction \implies is obvious since colim is functorial and $\text{colim } k(y) = y$. For the other direction it suffices to check that $k(\text{colim } \phi) \leq \phi$. This follows from that $\phi(x) > r$ whenever $(x, r) \ll (\text{colim } \phi, 1)$. \square

Corollary 15.16. (Goubault-Larrecq and Ng [21]) *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t -norm. Then a Yoneda complete real-enriched category X is a real-enriched domain if and only if BX is directed complete and continuous.*

The following corollary is a direct extension of the characterization of Smyth complete quasi-metric spaces in Romaguera and Valero [66].

Corollary 15.17. *Suppose $\&$ is a continuous Archimedean t -norm. Then for each separated and standard real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is Smyth complete.
- (2) BX is directed complete and continuous, and for all $x, y \in X$ and $r > 0$, $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$ if and only if $r < X(x, y)$.

Proof. (1) \implies (2) Since X is Smyth comple, it is a real-enriched domain with way below distributor given by $\mathfrak{w}(x, y) = X(x, y)$. Then, by Theorem 9.25 and Theorem 15.15, BX is directed complete and continuous, and $(x, r) \ll (y, 1)$ if and only if $r < X(x, y)$.

(2) \implies (1) By Theorem 9.25 and Theorem 15.15, X is a real-enriched domain with way below distributor given by $\mathfrak{w}(x, y) = X(x, y)$, then every element of X is compact and X is Smyth complete. \square

Consider the real-enriched category X in Example 9.26. Since every forward Cauchy net of X is eventually constant, it follows that X is Smyth complete. But, the ordered set of formal balls of X fails to be directed complete. This shows that in 15.16 and 15.17 the assumption that $\&$ is Archimedean is indispensable.

Real-enriched continuous lattices

A complete (hence cocomplete) real-enriched domain is called a *real-enriched continuous lattice*.

For a real-enriched category X , denote by $\text{Idl } X_0$ the set of ideals of the ordered set X_0 . For each ideal I of X_0 , the conical weight

$$\Lambda(I) := \sup_{x \in I} X(-, x)$$

is an ideal of X . If X is finitely complete and finitely cocomplete, then, with help of Proposition 7.5, one verifies that for each ideal ϕ of X ,

$$\chi(\phi) := \{x \in X \mid \phi(x) = 1\}$$

is an ideal of X_0 .

Lemma 15.18. *For each finitely complete and finitely cocomplete real-enriched category X , $\Lambda: \text{Idl } X_0 \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}X)_0$ is left adjoint to $\chi: (\mathcal{I}X)_0 \rightarrow \text{Idl } X_0$.*

Proof. Suppose I is an ideal of the ordered set X_0 and ϕ is an ideal of X . Then

$$I \subseteq \chi(\phi) \iff \forall x \in I, \phi(x) = 1 \iff \Lambda(I) \leq \phi,$$

hence $\Lambda \dashv \chi$. □

Proposition 15.19. *Let X be a separated and cocomplete real-enriched category. Then for each weight ϕ of X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) ϕ is an ideal of X .
- (2) $\phi = \Lambda(I)$ for some ideal I of the ordered set X_0 .

In this case, the colimit of ϕ is the join of $\chi(\phi)$ in the complete lattice X_0 .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) We show that the ideal $\chi(\phi)$ satisfies the requirement; that is, $\Lambda \circ \chi(\phi) = \phi$. Since Λ is left adjoint to χ , it follows that $\Lambda \circ \chi(\phi) \leq \phi$. For the converse inequality, pick a forward Cauchy net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ of X such that

$$\phi(x) = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j).$$

Let

$$I = \left\{ x \in X \mid x \leq \inf_{j \geq i} x_j \text{ for some } i \in D \right\},$$

where $\inf_{j \geq i} x_j$ denotes the meet in X_0 . Then I is an ideal of X_0 and

$$\phi = \sup_{x \in I} X(-, x),$$

so $I \subseteq \chi(\phi)$ and consequently, $\phi \leq \Lambda \circ \chi(\phi)$.

(2) \Rightarrow (1) View the ideal I of X_0 as a forward Cauchy net of X , then the conclusion follows.

Finally, we check the equality the colimit of ϕ is the joint of $\chi(\phi)$; that is, $\text{colim } \phi = \sup \chi(\phi)$, where $\sup \chi(\phi)$ denotes the join of $\chi(\phi)$ in X_0 . Since the ideal I given in (1) \Rightarrow (2) is contained in $\chi(\phi)$ and

$$\text{colim } \phi = \sup_{z \in X} \phi(z) \otimes z,$$

then $\text{colim } \phi \geq \sup \chi(\phi)$. The converse inequality follows from that $\text{colim } \phi = \sup I \leq \sup \chi(\phi)$. □

Corollary 15.20. *A functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between cocomplete real-enriched categories is Yoneda continuous if and only if $f: X_0 \rightarrow Y_0$ is Scott continuous.*

As another consequence of Proposition 15.19 we present a useful characterization of ideals of a separated and cocomplete real-enriched category.

Proposition 15.21. *Suppose X is a separated and cocomplete real-enriched category. Then, a weight ϕ of X is an ideal if and only if*

- (i) $\phi(x) > 0$ for some $x \in X$.
- (ii) $\phi(x \vee y) = \phi(x) \wedge \phi(y)$ for all $x, y \in X$, where $x \vee y$ denotes the join in X_0 .
- (iii) $\phi(r \otimes x) = 1$ whenever $r < \phi(x)$.

Proof. We prove the necessity first. Since ϕ is an ideal, it is inhabited, hence there is some x for which $\phi(x) > 0$. In the following we use Proposition 15.19 to check that ϕ satisfies both (ii) and (iii). Pick an ideal I of X_0 such that $\phi = \Lambda(I)$. We index the elements of I by itself; that means, we write an element of I as x_i , with $i \leq j$ if $x_i \sqsubseteq x_j$ in X_0 . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x \vee y) &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x \vee y, x_j) \\ &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \wedge X(y, x_j) \\ &= \sup_{i \in I} \left(\inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \wedge \inf_{j \geq i} X(y, x_j) \right) \\ &= \left(\sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x, x_j) \right) \wedge \left(\sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} X(y, x_j) \right) \\ &= \phi(x) \wedge \phi(y), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that ϕ satisfies (ii). For (iii), assume that $\phi(x) > r$. Then there exists $i_0 \in I$ such that $\inf_{j \geq i_0} X(x, x_j) \geq r$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(r \otimes x) &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} X(r \otimes x, x_j) \\ &= \sup_{i \in I} \inf_{j \geq i} (r \rightarrow X(x, x_j)) \\ &\geq r \rightarrow \inf_{j \geq i_0} X(x, x_j) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove the sufficiency. Let

$$I = \{x \in X \mid \phi(x) = 1\}.$$

By (i) and (iii) one sees that I is not empty. By (ii) one sees that I is directed. So I is an ideal of X_0 . It is clear that $\Lambda(I) \leq \phi$. To see that ϕ is an idea, it suffices to check that $\phi(x) \leq \Lambda(I)(x)$ for all $x \in X$. If $\phi(x) > r$, then $\phi(r \otimes x) = 1$ by (iii), hence $r \otimes x \in I$ and consequently, $\Lambda(I)(x) \geq X(x, r \otimes x) \geq r$. Then $\phi(x) \leq \Lambda(I)(x)$ by arbitrariness of r . \square

Corollary 15.22. *For each complete real-enriched category X , the set $\mathcal{I}X$ of ideals of X is closed in $[0, 1]^X$ (ordered pointwise) under meets and directed joins.*

Proof. Let $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in J}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{I}X$. The meet $\inf_{i \in J} \phi_i$ clearly satisfies (i) and (ii) in Proposition 15.21. It remains to check it also satisfies the condition (iii). If $r < \inf_{i \in J} \phi_i(x)$, then for each $i \in J$, $r < \phi_i(x)$, hence $\phi_i(r \otimes x) = 1$ and consequently, $\inf_{i \in J} \phi_i(r \otimes x) = 1$. Likewise, $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $[0, 1]^X$ under directed joins. \square

Theorem 15.23. (Lai and Zhang [48]) *For each separated and complete real-enriched category X , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) X is an enriched continuous lattice.
- (2) X_0 is a continuous lattice and for each $x \in X$ and each ideal ϕ of X ,

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) = \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y),$$

where \ll denotes the way below relation in X_0 .

- (3) X_0 is a continuous lattice and the map

$$d: X \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}X, \quad d(x) = \sup_{y \ll x} X(-, y)$$

is a functor, where \ll denotes the way below relation in X_0 .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Since $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $[0, 1]^X$ under meets and directed joins, then $(\mathcal{I}X)_0$ is a continuous lattice since so is $[0, 1]$. The adjunction $\downarrow \dashv \text{colim}: \mathcal{I}X \rightarrow X$ ensures that X_0 is a retract of $(\mathcal{I}X)_0$ in the category of depos, so X_0 is a continuous lattice. To see that

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) = \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y)$$

for all $x \in X$ and all $\phi \in \mathcal{I}X$, it suffices to show that the left adjoint $\downarrow: A \rightarrow \mathcal{I}A$ of $\text{colim}: \mathcal{I}A \rightarrow A$ is given by $\downarrow x = \sup_{y \ll x} y(y)$, because

$$\mathcal{I}X\left(\sup_{y \ll x} y(y), \phi\right) = \text{sub}_X\left(\sup_{y \ll x} y(y), \phi\right) = \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y).$$

Since x is a colimit of the ideal $\sup_{y \ll x} y(y)$, then $\downarrow x \leq \sup_{y \ll x} y(y)$. Since $\sup \chi(\downarrow x) = \text{colim } \downarrow x = x$ by Proposition 15.18, then every element way below x in X_0 belongs to $\chi(\downarrow x)$, so $\sup_{y \ll x} y(y) \leq \downarrow x$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) Obvious.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) By virtue of Theorem 4.5 we only need to show that $d: X_0 \rightarrow (\mathcal{I}X)_0$ is left adjoint to $\text{colim}: (\mathcal{I}X)_0 \rightarrow X_0$. This follows directly from Proposition 15.19, which guarantees that for each $x \in X$, $\sup_{y \ll x} X(-, y)$ is the smallest ideal of X (w.r.t. underlying order) that has x as a colimit. \square

Proposition 15.24. *Suppose X is a real-enriched continuous lattice. Then for all $x, y \in X$,*

$$\mathfrak{w}(y, x) = \sup_{z \ll x} X(y, z) = \sup_{z \ll x} \mathfrak{w}(y, z),$$

where \ll refers to the way below relation in the complete lattice X_0 .

Proof. The first equality follows from the argument of Theorem 15.23. The second equality follows from the first one and the interpolative property of the way below relation in X_0 . \square

Corollary 15.25. *Suppose X is a separated and complete real-enriched category. If X_0 is a continuous lattice and for all $p \in [0, 1]$, the map*

$$X_0 \rightarrow X_0, \quad x \mapsto p \circ x$$

is Scott continuous, then X is a real-enriched continuous lattice.

Proof. We show that for each $x \in X$ and each ideal ϕ of X ,

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) = \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y),$$

where \ll denotes the way below relation in X_0 .

On the one hand, since $\{y \in X \mid y \ll x\}$ is a directed set of X_0 with join x , the conical weight $\sup_{y \ll x} X(-, y)$ is an ideal of X with x as colimit, then

$$X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \geq \mathcal{I}X\left(\sup_{y \ll x} y(y), \phi\right) = \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y).$$

On the other hand, for all $p \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} p \leq X(x, \text{colim } \phi) &\implies x \leq p \circ \text{colim } \phi \\ &\implies x \leq \sup_{d \in \chi(\phi)} (p \circ d) \\ &\implies \forall y \ll x, y \leq p \circ d \text{ for some } d \in \chi(\phi) \\ &\implies \forall y \ll x, p \leq X(y, d) \text{ for some } d \in \chi(\phi), \\ &\implies \forall y \ll x, p \leq \sup_{d \in \chi(\phi)} X(y, d) \\ &\implies \forall y \ll x, p \leq \phi(y) \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies p \leq \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y).$$

Therefore, $X(x, \text{colim } \phi) \leq \inf_{y \ll x} \phi(y)$. \square

Example 15.26. For each continuous t-norm $\&$, $\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}} = ([0, 1], \alpha_R)$ is a real-enriched continuous lattice. We use Corollary 15.25 to verify the claim. First, since the underlying order of \mathbf{V}^{op} is the opposite of the usual order between real numbers, $(\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}})_0$ is a continuous lattice. Second, since the cotensor $p \multimap x$ of p with x in \mathbf{V}^{op} is given by $p \& x$, the map $p \multimap - : (\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}})_0 \rightarrow (\mathbf{V}^{\text{op}})_0$ is Scott continuous.

Theorem 15.27. (Lai and Zhang [48]) *The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Every real-enriched completely distributive lattice is a real-enriched domain.*
- (2) *The real-enriched category $\mathbf{V} = ([0, 1], \alpha_L)$ is a real-enriched domain.*
- (3) *The implication operator $\rightarrow : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal.*
- (4) *For each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra X , the inclusion $\mathcal{I}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ is a right adjoint.*
- (5) *The copresheaf monad $\mathbb{P}^\dagger = (\mathcal{P}^\dagger, \mathfrak{m}^\dagger, \mathfrak{y}^\dagger)$ distributes over the ideal monad $\mathbb{I} = (\mathcal{I}, \mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{y})$.*

Proof. (1) \implies (2) Obvious.

(2) \implies (3) By Theorem 15.23, it suffices to show that if

$$\mathbf{d} : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}\mathbf{V}, \quad \mathbf{d}(x)(t) = \begin{cases} t \rightarrow 0 & x = 0, \\ \sup_{y < x} (t \rightarrow y) & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

is a functor, then the implication operator $\rightarrow : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal.

Suppose on the contrary that $\rightarrow : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is not continuous at some point off the diagonal. Then there are idempotent elements $p, q > 0$ such that the restriction of $\&$ on $[p, q]$ is isomorphic to the Łukasiewicz t-norm. Pick $x \in (p, q)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{d}(x), \mathbf{d}(p)) &= \inf_{t \in [0, 1]} \left(\sup_{y < x} (t \rightarrow y) \rightarrow \sup_{z < p} (t \rightarrow z) \right) \\ &\leq \sup_{y < x} (x \rightarrow y) \rightarrow \sup_{z < p} (x \rightarrow z) \\ &= q \rightarrow p \\ &< x \rightarrow p, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\mathbf{d} : \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}\mathbf{V}$ is not a functor, a contradiction.

(3) \implies (4) It suffices to show that for each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra X , $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under meets and cotensors. That $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under meets is ensured by Lemma 15.22, so we only need to show that $\mathcal{I}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under cotensors.

For $p \in [0, 1]$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{I}X$, set

$$D = \{d \in X \mid p \leq \phi(d)\}.$$

Then D is a directed subset of X_0 . First we show that

$$\{p \multimap y \mid y \in \chi(\phi)\} \subseteq D.$$

Since $\phi = \sup_{z \in \chi(\phi)} X(-, z)$, then for all $y \in \chi(\phi)$,

$$\begin{aligned} p \rightarrow \phi(p \multimap y) &= p \rightarrow \sup_{z \in \chi(\phi)} X(p \multimap y, z) \\ &\geq p \rightarrow X(p \multimap y, y) \\ &= X(p \multimap y, p \multimap y) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $p \multimap y \in D$.

Next, let

$$\rho = \sup_{d \in D} X(-, d).$$

We wish to show that $p \rightarrow \phi = \rho$, from which the conclusion follows since ρ is an ideal of X and $p \rightarrow \phi$ is the cotensor of p with ϕ in $\mathcal{P}X$.

That $\rho \leq p \rightarrow \phi$ is clear. It remains to check that $p \rightarrow \phi(x) \leq \rho(x)$ for all $x \in X$. If $p \leq \phi(x)$, then $x \in D$ and

$$\rho(x) = \sup_{d \in D} X(x, d) \geq X(x, x) = 1 = p \rightarrow \phi(x).$$

If $p > \phi(x)$, then the implication operator \rightarrow is continuous at $(p, \phi(x))$, so,

$$\begin{aligned} p \rightarrow \phi(x) &= p \rightarrow \sup_{y \in \chi(\phi)} X(x, y) \\ &= \sup_{y \in \chi(\phi)} (p \rightarrow X(x, y)) \\ &= \sup_{y \in \chi(\phi)} X(x, p \multimap y) \\ &\leq \sup_{d \in D} X(x, d) && (p \multimap y \in D) \\ &= \rho(x). \end{aligned}$$

(4) \Rightarrow (5) Proposition 14.14.

(5) \Rightarrow (1) Theorem 14.12. □

Remark 15.28. (i) Continuity of the implication operator off the diagonal is related to the equivalence of the logic formulas

$$\exists x(p \rightarrow q(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad p \rightarrow \exists xq(x).$$

So, in many-valued logic whether complete distributivity implies continuity depends on the structure of the truth-values.

- (ii) Ideals of real-enriched categories may be thought of as analogue of ind-objects of categories (enriched over sets), however, in contrast to the fact that the category of ind-objects of a small category with finite colimits is complete and cocomplete (see e.g. Johnstone [34, Chapter VI, Section 1]), the real-enriched category $\mathcal{I}X$ of ideals of a complete real-enriched category X may fail to be complete. Actually, by Proposition 14.13 and the above theorem, in order that $\mathcal{I}X$ be complete for every complete real-enriched category X , it is necessary and sufficient that the implication operator of the continuous t-norm $\&$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal.

Let

[0, 1]-ConLat

be the category composed of real-enriched continuous lattices as objects, Yoneda continuous right adjoint functors as morphisms. This category is an analogue of the category of continuous lattices in the enriched context. When the implication operator of the t-norm $\&$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal, [0, 1]-ConLat is the Eilenberg-Moore category of the composite monad $\mathbb{I} \circ \mathbb{P}^\dagger$ of the copresheaf monad and the ideal monad, hence monadic over [0, 1]-Cat. Furthermore, in this case it is also monadic over the category of sets.

Theorem 15.29. *If the implication operator of $\&$ is continuous at every point off the diagonal, then the forgetful functor $U: [0, 1]\text{-ConLat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is monadic.*

We say that a functor $k: X \rightarrow X$ is a *kernel operator* if $k^2 = k$ and $k(x) \sqsubseteq x$ in X_0 for all $x \in X$. If $k: X \rightarrow X$ is a kernel operator, then $k: X \rightarrow k(X)$ is right adjoint to the inclusion $k(X) \rightarrow X$, so $k(X)$ is a retract of X in $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. In particular, if X is a real-enriched continuous lattice and $k: X \rightarrow X$ is a Yoneda continuous kernel operator, then $k: X \rightarrow k(X)$ is a Yoneda continuous right adjoint, hence $k(X)$ is a real-enriched continuous lattice by Corollary 14.7.

The verification of the following lemma is routine.

Lemma 15.30. *Suppose that X is a separated and complete real-enriched category. If R is an equivalence relation on X subject to the following conditions:*

- (i) R is closed w.r.t. directed joins in $X_0 \times X_0$,
- (ii) R is closed w.r.t. meets in $X_0 \times X_0$,
- (iii) If $(x, y) \in R$, then $(r \multimap x, r \multimap y) \in R$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$,

then the map $k: X \rightarrow X$ that sends each $x \in X$ to the meet of $\{y \mid (x, y) \in R\}$ in X_0 is a Yoneda continuous kernel operator.

Proof of Theorem 15.29. Since the forgetful functor $U: [0, 1]\text{-ConLat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is the composite of the forgetful functors $[0, 1]\text{-ConLat} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$ and $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, it is a right adjoint. So, it suffices to check that it creates split coequalizers.

Let $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$ be a parallel pair of morphisms in $[0, 1]\text{-ConLat}$ and let $h: Y \rightarrow Z$ be a split coequalizer of f, g in \mathbf{Set} . By definition there exist morphisms $Z \xrightarrow{i} Y \xrightarrow{j} X$ in \mathbf{Set} such that

$$h \circ f = h \circ g, f \circ j = \text{id}, h \circ i = \text{id}, g \circ j = i \circ h.$$

Let

$$R = \{(y_1, y_2) \in Y \times Y \mid h(y_1) = h(y_2)\}.$$

It is not hard to check that $(y_1, y_2) \in R$ if and only if there exists $(x_1, x_2) \in X \times X$ such that $g(x_1) = g(x_2)$, $y_1 = f(x_1)$ and $y_2 = f(x_2)$. With help of this fact, one readily verifies that R satisfies the conditions (i)-(iii) in Lemma 15.30, hence R determines a Yoneda continuous kernel operator $k: Y \rightarrow Y$. Since $k(Y)$ is a real-enriched continuous lattice with an underlying set equipotent to Z , Z can be made into a real-enriched continuous lattice so that $h: Y \rightarrow Z$ is a Yoneda continuous right adjoint. This proves that the forgetful functor $[0, 1]\text{-ConLat} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ creates split coequalizers. \square

It is shown in Pu and Zhang [63] by a similar argument that for every continuous t-norm, the category $[0, 1]\text{-CDL}$ is monadic over the category of sets, where, objects of $[0, 1]\text{-CDL}$ are real-enriched completely distributive lattices, morphisms of $[0, 1]\text{-CDL}$ are functors that preserve limits and colimits.

Let $F: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-ConLat}$ be the left adjoint of U . In the following we present a description of the monad determined by the adjunction $F \dashv U$.

We determine the composite functor $U \circ F$ first, which turns out to be the conical filter functor defined below.

Suppose X is a real-enriched category. Following Antoniuk and Waszkiewicz [5], by a *filter* of X we mean an ideal of its opposite X^{op} . In other words, a filter of X is a coweight ψ of X such that

$$\psi = \sup_{i \in D} \inf_{j \geq i} X(x_j, -)$$

for some net $\{x_i\}_{i \in D}$ that is *backward Cauchy* in the sense that

$$\sup_{i \in D} \inf_{k \geq j \geq i} X(x_k, x_j) = 1.$$

Definition 15.31. Suppose X is a set. A conical filter on X is defined to be a filter of the real-enriched category $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X)$.

Proposition 15.32. (Morsi [59]) *Suppose X is a set. Then, $\mathfrak{F}: [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a conical filter on X if and only if for all $\lambda, \mu \in [0, 1]^X$ and all $r \in [0, 1]$,*

- (CF1) $\text{sub}_X(\lambda, \mu) \leq \mathfrak{F}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}(\mu)$;
- (CF2) $\mathfrak{F}(1_X) = 1$;
- (CF3) $\mathfrak{F}(\lambda) \wedge \mathfrak{F}(\mu) = \mathfrak{F}(\lambda \wedge \mu)$;
- (CF4) $\mathfrak{F}(r \rightarrow \lambda) = 1$ whenever $\mathfrak{F}(\lambda) > r$.

Proof. Follows from Corollary 15.21 directly. \square

Proposition 15.33. *Suppose X is a set.*

- (i) *If each member of $\{\mathfrak{F}_i\}_{i \in J}$ is a conical filter on X , then so is the meet $\inf_{i \in J} \mathfrak{F}_i$.*
- (ii) *If $\{\mathfrak{F}_i\}_{i \in J}$ is a directed family of conical filters on X , then the join $\sup_{i \in J} \mathfrak{F}_i$ is a conical filter.*
- (iii) *If the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal, then for each $p \in [0, 1]$ and each conical filter \mathfrak{F} on X , $p \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ is a conical filter.*

Proof. (i) and (ii) are a special case of Corollary 15.22; (iii) is a special case of the implication (3) \Rightarrow (4) in Theorem 15.27. \square

For each set X let $\text{CFil}(X)$ denote the set of all conical filters on X . For each function $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and each conical filter \mathfrak{F} on X , the map

$$f(\mathfrak{F}): [0, 1]^Y \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \mu \mapsto \mathfrak{F}(\mu \circ f)$$

is readily verified to be a conical filter on Y . In this way we obtain a functor

$$\text{CFil}: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set},$$

called the *conical filter functor*.

When the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal, the forgetful functor

$$[0, 1]\text{-ConLat} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg}$$

has a left adjoint that maps each \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra A to $\mathcal{I}A$. Since the left adjoint of the forgetful functor $\mathbb{P}^\dagger\text{-Alg} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ maps each set X to the \mathbb{P}^\dagger -algebra $([0, 1]^X, \text{sub}_X^{\text{op}})$, we obtain the following:

Proposition 15.34. *Suppose the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal. Then the composite $U \circ F$ is isomorphic to the conical filter functor CFil .*

Now we determine the unit and the multiplication of the monad defined by the adjunction $F \dashv U$. For each set X and each $x \in X$, it is clear that

$$\mathbf{e}_X(x): [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \lambda \mapsto \lambda(x)$$

is a conical filter on X . The maps $\{\mathbf{e}_X\}_X$ constitute a natural transformation from the identity functor on \mathbf{Set} to CFil .

Lemma 15.35. *Suppose the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal. Then for each set X and each conical filter \wp on $\text{CFil}(X)$, the map*

$$\mathbf{n}_X(\wp): [0, 1]^X \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad \mathbf{n}_X(\wp)(\lambda) = \wp(\widehat{\lambda})$$

is a conical filter on X , where $\widehat{\lambda}: \text{CFil}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is given by $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}(\lambda)$.

Proof. Since \wp is a conical filter, there is a directed subset I of $[0, 1]^{\mathbf{CFil}(X)}$ (ordered pointwise) such that

$$\wp = \sup_{\xi \in I} \text{sub}_{\mathbf{CFil}(X)}(\xi, -).$$

Then for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]^X$ it holds that

$$\mathbf{n}_X(\wp)(\lambda) = \wp(\widehat{\lambda}) = \sup_{\xi \in I} \text{sub}_{\mathbf{CFil}(X)}(\xi, \widehat{\lambda}) = \sup_{\xi \in I} \inf_{\mathfrak{F} \in \mathbf{CFil}(X)} (\xi(\mathfrak{F}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{F})(\lambda),$$

which implies

$$\mathbf{n}_X(\wp) = \sup_{\xi \in I} \inf_{\mathfrak{F} \in \mathbf{CFil}(X)} (\xi(\mathfrak{F}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}).$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{n}_X(\wp)$ is a conical filter on X by Proposition 15.33. \square

The conical filter $\mathbf{n}_X(\wp)$ is called the *diagonal filter* or the *Kowalsky sum* of \wp . It is routine but a bit tedious to check that $\mathbf{n}: \mathbf{CFil}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{CFil}$ is a natural transformation, and that the triple $(\mathbf{CFil}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$ is the monad determined by the adjunction $F \dashv U$. We omit the verification here, instead, we display $(\mathbf{CFil}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$ as a submonad of the double fuzzy powerset monad $\mathbb{E} = (E, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$.

Consider the functor $\text{exp}: \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that maps each $f: X \rightarrow Y$ to

$$\text{exp}(f): [0, 1]^Y \rightarrow [0, 1]^X, \quad \mu \mapsto \mu \circ f.$$

It is readily verified that $\text{exp}: \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is right adjoint to its opposite $\text{exp}^{\text{op}}: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}^{\text{op}}$. The monad $\mathbb{E} = (E, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$ defined by $\text{exp}^{\text{op}} \dashv \text{exp}$ is called the *double fuzzy powerset monad* in the category of sets. Explicitly, for each set X and each function $f: X \rightarrow Y$,

- $E(X) = [0, 1]^{[0, 1]^X}$,
- $E(f): E(X) \rightarrow E(Y)$ is given by $E(f)(\mathfrak{A})(\mu) = \mathfrak{A}(\mu \circ f)$ for all $\mathfrak{A} \in E(X)$ and $\mu \in [0, 1]^Y$;
- the unit $\mathbf{e}_X: X \rightarrow E(X)$ is given by $\mathbf{e}_X(x)(\lambda) = \lambda(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]^X$;
- the multiplication $\mathbf{n}_X: E^2(X) \rightarrow E(X)$ is given by $\mathbf{n}_X(\mathcal{H})(\lambda) = \mathcal{H}(\widehat{\lambda})$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]^X$ and all $\mathcal{H}: [0, 1]^{E(X)} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, where $\widehat{\lambda}: E(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ sends $\mathfrak{A} \in E(X)$ to $\widehat{\lambda}(\mathfrak{A}) = \mathfrak{A}(\lambda)$.

The conical filter functor \mathbf{CFil} is clearly a subfunctor of $E: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ through which the unit \mathbf{e} of the monad \mathbb{E} factors. If in addition the implication operator is continuous at each point off the diagonal, then \mathbf{CFil} is closed with respect to the multiplication \mathbf{n} of the monad \mathbb{E} , hence

Proposition 15.36. *If the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal, then $(\mathbf{CFil}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$ is a submonad of the double fuzzy powerset monad $\mathbb{E} = (E, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$.*

Question 15.37. A conical filter \mathfrak{F} on a set X is said to be proper if $\mathfrak{F}(p_X) = p$ for all $p \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathbf{PFil}(X)$ denote the set of all proper conical filters on X . Then we obtain a functor $\mathbf{PFil}: \mathbf{Set} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$, which is a subfunctor of \mathbf{CFil} . It is not hard to check that if the implication operator $\rightarrow: [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is continuous at each point off the diagonal, then \mathbf{PFil} is a submonad of $(\mathbf{CFil}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{e})$. What are the Eilenberg-Moore algebras of the proper conical filter monad?

Question 15.38. Suppose \mathbb{T} is a submonad of the presheaf monad over which the copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes. By Corollary 14.16, the category $\mathbb{T}\text{-ConLat}$ with complete and continuous \mathbb{T} -algebras as objects and right adjoint \mathbb{T} -homomorphisms as morphisms is monadic over $[0, 1]\text{-Cat}$. Is $\mathbb{T}\text{-ConLat}$ monadic over the category of sets too?

Question 15.39. When does the copresheaf monad \mathbb{P}^\dagger distributes over the the flat weight monad or over the conically flat weight monad?

16. SATURATION

For each class of weights \mathcal{T} , no matter \mathcal{T} is saturated or not, we write

$$\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$$

for the category of separated \mathcal{T} -cocomplete real-enriched categories and \mathcal{T} -colimits preserving functors. If \mathcal{T} happens to be saturated, then $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$ is the category of Eilenberg-Moore algebras of the monad $\mathbb{T} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{y})$. In this section, we show that for each class of weights \mathcal{T} , there is a unique saturated class of weights $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ such that $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg}$, which implies, in particular, that $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$ is category of Eilenberg-Moore algebras of a unique submonad of the presheaf monad.

The main result of section, namely Theorem 16.1, is a special case of a result of Albert and Kelly [1] on saturation of class of weights in enriched category theory.

Theorem 16.1. *For each class of weights \mathcal{T} , there exists a unique saturated class of weights $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, called the saturation of \mathcal{T} , such that*

- (i) *a real-enriched category X is \mathcal{T} -cocomplete if and only if it is $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ -cocomplete;*
- (ii) *a functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between \mathcal{T} -cocomplete real-enriched categories preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits if and only if it preserves $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ -colimits.*

In particular, $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg}$.

To prove the theorem, we need to introduce two classes of weights: $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$.

For each real-enriched category X , define a subcategory

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}}X$$

of $\mathcal{P}X$ by putting a weight ϕ of X in $\hat{\mathcal{T}}X$ if, for any morphism $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ of $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$ and any functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$, the colimit of f weighted by ϕ always exists and is preserved by g , i.e. $g(\text{colim}_\phi f) = \text{colim}_\phi(g \circ f)$.

It is readily verified that

- (i) $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is a class of weights and contains the class \mathcal{T} ;
- (ii) $\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$;
- (iii) $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the largest class of weights for which $\hat{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg} = \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$.

Now we define the the class $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$. Suppose X is a real-enriched category, A is a subset of $\mathcal{P}X$, viewed as a subcategory. We say that A is *closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits* if, for each $\phi \in \mathcal{T}A$, the colimit of the inclusion functor $i: A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ weighted by ϕ belongs to A . It is readily seen that if $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}X$ is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits, then for each functor $g: K \rightarrow A$ and each $\phi \in \mathcal{T}K$, the colimit of $i \circ g$ weighted by ϕ belongs to A .

For each real-enriched category X , let

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}X$$

be the intersection of all subsets of $\mathcal{P}X$ that contain all representable weights of X and are closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits. Then $\overline{\mathcal{T}}X$ is the least such subset of $\mathcal{P}X$. Let

- $\mathbf{i}_X: \overline{\mathcal{T}}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ be the inclusion functor; and
- $\mathbf{t}_X: X \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{T}}X$ be the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\overline{\mathcal{T}}X$.

The composite $\mathbf{i}_X \circ \mathbf{t}_X$ is the Yoneda embedding $\mathbf{y}_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$.

Lemma 16.2. *For each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{T}X \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{T}}X$.*

Proof. Because for each weight ϕ of X , ϕ is the colimit of $\mathbf{i}_X \circ \mathbf{t}_X$ weighted by ϕ . \square

Lemma 16.3. *For each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and each $\phi \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}X$, $f_\exists(\phi) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}Y$.*

Proof. Let

$$Z = \{\phi \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}X \mid f_{\exists}(\phi) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}Y\}.$$

It is clear that Z contains all representable weights of X . If we can show that Z is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits, then $Z = \overline{\mathcal{T}}X$ and the conclusion follows.

Let $j: Z \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ be the inclusion functor. We show that for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}Z$, the colimit of j weighted by Φ belongs to Z .

Since $f_{\exists}: \mathcal{P}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ preserves colimits, then

$$f_{\exists}(\text{colim}_{\Phi} j) = \text{colim}_{\Phi}(f_{\exists} \circ j).$$

Since $f_{\exists} \circ j$ factors through $\overline{\mathcal{T}}Y$ by definition of Z , $\overline{\mathcal{T}}Y$ is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits, it follows that

$$\text{colim}_{\Phi}(f_{\exists} \circ j) \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}Y,$$

which implies that $\text{colim}_{\Phi} j \in Z$, as desired. \square

The above two lemmas imply that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ is a class of weights on $[0, 1]$ -**Cat**. The assignment $X \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{T}}X$ defines a functor

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg},$$

which is indeed left adjoint to the forgetful functor $U: \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$, as we see below. This is a special case of a general result of Kelly [36] in the theory of enriched categories.

Proposition 16.4. *The functor $\overline{\mathcal{T}}: [0, 1]\text{-Cat} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$ is left adjoint to the forgetful functor $U: \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} \rightarrow [0, 1]\text{-Cat}$.*

To prove Proposition 16.4 we need a lemma.

Lemma 16.5. *For each \mathcal{T} -cocomplete real-enriched category Y ,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{T}}Y \subseteq \{\phi \in \mathcal{P}Y \mid \phi \text{ has a colimit}\}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$W := \{\phi \in \mathcal{P}Y \mid \phi \text{ has a colimit}\}$$

is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits.

Let $j: W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}Y$ be the inclusion map. We wish to show that for each $\Phi \in \mathcal{T}W$, the colimit $\text{colim}_{\Phi} j$, as a weight of Y , has a colimit. First of all, by Corollary 7.11 we have

$$\text{colim}_{\Phi} j = \sup_{\phi \in W} \Phi(\phi) \& \phi.$$

Since every $\phi \in W$ has a colimit, assigning to each $\phi \in W$ its colimit defines a functor $h: W \rightarrow Y$. Since Y is \mathcal{T} -cocomplete, the colimit of $h: W \rightarrow Y$ weighted by Φ exists, say b . We claim that b is a colimit of the weight $\text{colim}_{\Phi} j$ of Y . For this we calculate: for all $y \in Y$,

$$\begin{aligned} Y(b, y) &= \mathcal{P}Y(\text{colim}_{\Phi} h, y(y)) \\ &= \mathcal{P}W(\Phi, h^{-1}(y(y))) \\ &= \inf_{\phi \in W} (\Phi(\phi) \rightarrow Y(h(\phi), y)) \\ &= \inf_{\phi \in W} \left[\Phi(\phi) \rightarrow \left(\inf_{z \in Y} (\phi(z) \rightarrow Y(z, y)) \right) \right] \\ &= \inf_{z \in Y} \left[\left(\sup_{\phi \in W} \Phi(\phi) \& \phi(z) \right) \rightarrow Y(z, y) \right] \\ &= \mathcal{P}Y(\text{colim}_{\Phi} j, y(y)), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that b is a colimit of the weight $\text{colim}_{\Phi} j$ of Y . \square

Proof of Proposition 16.4. It suffices to show that for each functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$ with Y in $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$, there is a unique \mathcal{T} -colimits preserving functor $\bar{f}: \bar{\mathcal{T}}X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f = \bar{f} \circ \mathfrak{t}_X$.

Since the real-enriched category W given in Lemma 16.5 is \mathcal{T} -cocomplete, it is readily verified that $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X$ is contained in

$$\{\phi \in \mathcal{P}X \mid f_{\exists}(\phi) \in W\}.$$

Let $h: W \rightarrow Y$ be the functor that sends each ϕ of W to its colimit. Then

$$\bar{f} := h \circ f_{\exists}: \bar{\mathcal{T}}X \rightarrow W \rightarrow Y$$

satisfies the requirement. This proves the existence. To see the uniqueness, suppose $g: \bar{\mathcal{T}}X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies the requirement. Then

$$\{\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}X \mid g(\phi) = \bar{f}(\phi)\}$$

contains all representable weights of X and is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits. Hence, $g = \bar{f}$ by definition of $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X$. \square

For each Y of $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$, the functor $\text{colim}: \bar{\mathcal{T}}Y \rightarrow Y$ sending each ϕ to its colimit is the component of the counit of the adjunction $\bar{\mathcal{T}} \dashv U$ in Proposition 16.4. Hence for each morphism $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ of $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$, the following square is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\mathcal{T}}Y & \xrightarrow{g_{\exists}} & \bar{\mathcal{T}}Z \\ \text{colim} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{colim} \\ Y & \xrightarrow{g} & Z \end{array}$$

This fact will be used in the proof of Theorem 16.1.

Proof of Theorem 16.1. For existence we show that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} := \hat{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfies the requirement. Since $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg}$, it remains to show that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is saturated.

Since $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X$ is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits in $\mathcal{P}X$, if we can prove that $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X = \hat{\mathcal{T}}X$ for each real-enriched category X , then $\hat{\mathcal{T}}X$ is closed under \mathcal{T} -colimits, hence under $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ -colimits, and consequently, $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is saturated.

First we prove that $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{T}}X$. That means, if $\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}X$ and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$, then for any functor $f: X \rightarrow Y$, the colimit of f weighted by ϕ exists and is preserved by g . Since $f_{\exists}(\phi) \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}Y$, the colimit of f weighted by ϕ exists. By commutativity of the above square we have $\text{colim}(g_{\exists} \circ f_{\exists}(\phi)) = g(\text{colim } f_{\exists}(\phi))$, hence the colimit of f weighted by ϕ is preserved by g .

Next we prove that $\hat{\mathcal{T}}X \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{T}}X$. Since $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg}$, each A of $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$ is $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ -cocomplete. Since $\bar{\mathcal{T}}X$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$, it is $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ -cocomplete. Since the inclusion $i_X: \bar{\mathcal{T}}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ preserves \mathcal{T} -colimits, it preserves $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ -colimits too. Then, for each $\phi \in \hat{\mathcal{T}}X$,

$$\text{colim}_{\phi} \mathfrak{t}_X = \text{colim}_{\phi}(i_X \circ \mathfrak{t}_X) = \text{colim}_{\phi} y_X = \phi,$$

hence $\phi \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}X$.

To see uniqueness, suppose \mathcal{S} is a saturated class of weights with $\mathcal{S}\text{-Alg} = \mathcal{T}\text{-Alg}$. Then we prove that $\mathcal{S} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ by showing that \mathcal{S} is a subclass of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ and contains the class $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$.

Since $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ is the largest class of weights for which $\mathcal{T}\text{-Alg} = \hat{\mathcal{T}}\text{-Alg}$, \mathcal{S} is a subclass of $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$. To see that \mathcal{S} contains the class $\bar{\mathcal{T}}$, first we show that \mathcal{S} contains the class \mathcal{T} ; that is, $\mathcal{T}X \subseteq \mathcal{S}X$ for each real-enriched category X . Since \mathcal{S} is saturated, then

- $\mathcal{S}X$ is \mathcal{S} -cocomplete, hence \mathcal{T} -cocomplete;
- the inclusion functor $j_X: \mathcal{S}X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ preserves \mathcal{S} -colimits, hence \mathcal{T} -colimits.

Let $s_X: X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}X$ be the Yoneda embedding with codomain restricted to $\mathcal{S}X$. Then for each $\phi \in \mathcal{T}X$,

$$\operatorname{colim}_\phi s_X = \operatorname{colim}_\phi (j_X \circ s_X) = \operatorname{colim}_\phi y_X = \phi,$$

hence $\phi \in \mathcal{S}X$ and $\mathcal{T}X \subseteq \mathcal{S}X$.

Now we show that \mathcal{S} contains $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$. Since \mathcal{S} is saturated and contains the class \mathcal{T} , it follows that for each real-enriched category X , $\mathcal{S}X$ is closed in $\mathcal{P}X$ under \mathcal{T} -colimits, then $\overline{\mathcal{T}}X \subseteq \mathcal{S}X$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M.H. Albert, G.M. Kelly, The closure of a class of colimits, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 51 (1998) 1-17.
- [2] M. Ali-Akbari, B. Honari, M. Pourmahdian, M.M. Rezaei, The space of formal balls and models of quasi-metric spaces, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 19 (2009) 337-355.
- [3] C. Alsina, M.J. Frank, B. Schweizer, *Associative Functions: Triangular Norms and Copulas*, World Scientific Press, Singapore, 2006.
- [4] P. America, J.J.M.M. Rutten, Solving reflexive domain equations in a category of complete metric spaces, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 39 (1989) 343-375.
- [5] S. Antoniuk, P. Waszkiewicz, A duality of generalized metric spaces, *Topology and its Applications* 158 (2011) 2371-2381.
- [6] R. Bělohávek, Concept lattices and order in fuzzy logic, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 128 (2004) 277-298.
- [7] J.Bénabou, Distributors at work, Lecture notes of a course given at TU Darmstadt, 2000.
- [8] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice Theory*, Third Edition, American Mathematical Society, 1973.
- [9] M.M. Bonsangue, F. van Breugel, J.J.M.M. Rutten, Generalized metric space: completion, topology, and powerdomains via the Yoneda embedding, *Theoretical Computer Science* 193 (1998) 1-51.
- [10] F. Borceux, *Handbook of Categorical Algebra, Vol. 1*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [11] F. Borceux, *Handbook of Categorical Algebra, Vol. 2*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [12] R. Cignoli, F. Esteva, L. Godo, A. Torrens, Basic Fuzzy Logic is the logic of continuous t-norms and their residua, *Soft Computing* 4 (2000) 106-112.
- [13] B.A. Davey, H.A. Priestley, *Introduction to Lattices and Order*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [14] A. Edalat, R. Heckmann, A computational model for metric spaces, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 193 (1998) 53-73.
- [15] S. Eilenberg, G.M. Kelly, Closed categories, in: *Proceedings of the Conference on Categorical Algebra (La Jolla 1965)*, Springer, 1966, pp. 421-562.
- [16] R.C. Flagg, Quantales and continuity spaces, *Algebra Universalis* 37 (1997) 257-276.
- [17] R.C. Flagg, R. Kopperman, Continuity spaces: Reconciling domains and metric spaces, *Theoretical Computer Science* 177 (1997) 111-138.
- [18] R.C. Flagg, P. Sünderhauf, K.R. Wagner, A logical approach to quantitative domain theory, *Topology Atlas Preprint No. 23*, 1996. <http://at.yorku.ca/e/a/p/p/23.htm>
- [19] G. Gierz, K.H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J.D. Lawson, M. Mislove, D.S. Scott, *Continuous Lattices and Domains*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [20] J. Goubault-Larrecq, *Non-Hausdorff Topology and Domain Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [21] J. Goubault-Larrecq, K.M. Ng, A few notes on formal balls, *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 13(4:18) (2017) 1-34.
- [22] G. Gutierrez, D. Hofmann, Approaching metric domains, *Applied Categorical Structures* 21 (2013) 617-650.
- [23] J. Gutiérrez García, U. Höhle, T. Kubiak, A theory of quantale-enriched dcpos and their topologization, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 444 (2022) 103-130.
- [24] P. Hájek, *Metamathematics of Fuzzy Logic*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.
- [25] H. Heymans, Sheaves on quantales as generalized metric spaces, PhD thesis, Universiteit Antwerpen, Belgium, 2010.
- [26] U. Höhle, *Many Valued Topology and Its Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001.
- [27] D. Hofmann, Topological theories and closed objects, *Advances in Mathematics* 215 (2007) 789-824.
- [28] D. Hofmann, Duality for distributive spaces, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 28 (2013) 66-122.

- [29] D. Hofmann, C. Reis, Probabilistic metric spaces as enriched categories, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 210 (2013) 1-21.
- [30] D. Hofmann, G.J. Seal, W. Tholen (eds.), *Monoidal Topology: A Categorical Approach to Order, Metric, and Topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [31] D. Hofmann, W. Tholen, Lawvere completion and separation via closure, *Applied Categorical Structures* 18 (2010) 259-287.
- [32] D. Hofmann, P. Waszkiewicz, Approximation in quantale-enriched categories, *Topology and its Applications* 158 (2011) 963-977.
- [33] D. Hofmann, P. Waszkiewicz, A duality of quantale-enriched categories, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 216 (2012) 1866-1878.
- [34] P.T. Johnstone, *Stone Spaces*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.
- [35] A. Joyal, M. Tierney, An Extension of the Galois Theory of Grothendieck, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, Vol. 51, No. 309. American Mathematical Society, 1984.
- [36] G.M. Kelly, *Basic Concepts of Enriched Category Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [37] G.M. Kelly, V. Schmitt, Notes on enriched categories with colimits of some class, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 14 (2005) 399-423.
- [38] E.P. Klement, R. Mesiar, E. Pap, *Triangular Norms*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- [39] A. Kock, Monads for which structures are adjoint to units, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 104 (1995) 41-59.
- [40] M. Kostanek, P. Waszkiewicz, The formal ball model for \mathcal{Q} -categories, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 21 (2011) 41-64.
- [41] H.P. Künzi, M.P. Schellekens, On the Yoneda completion of a quasi-metric space, *Theoretical Computer Science* 278 (2002) 159-194.
- [42] S. Lack, A 2-categories companion, in: *Towards Higher Categories*, Springer, 2010, pp. 105-191.
- [43] H. Lai, L. Shen, Fixed points of adjoint functors enriched in a quantaloid, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 321 (2017) 1-28.
- [44] H. Lai, L. Shen, Regularity vs. constructive complete (co)distributivity, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 33 (2018) 492-522.
- [45] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Complete and directed complete Ω -categories, *Theoretical Computer Science* 388 (2007) 1-25.
- [46] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Concept lattices of fuzzy contexts: formal concept analysis vs. rough set theory, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 50 (2009) 695-707.
- [47] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Closedness of the category of liminf complete fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 282 (2016) 86-98.
- [48] H. Lai, D. Zhang, Completely distributive enriched categories are not always continuous, *Theory and Applications of Categories* 35 (2020) 64-88.
- [49] H. Lai, D. Zhang, G. Zhang, A comparative study of ideals in fuzzy orders, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 382 (2020) 1-28.
- [50] H. Lai, D. Zhang, G. Zhang, The saturated prefilter monad, *Topology and its Applications* 301 (2021) 107525.
- [51] F.W. Lawvere, Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories, *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano* 43 (1973) 135-166.
- [52] W. Li, D. Zhang, Sober metric approach spaces, *Topology and its Applications* 233 (2018) 67-88.
- [53] R. Lowen, *Approach Spaces: the Missing Link in the Topology-Uniformity-Metric Triad*, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [54] R. Lowen, *Index Analysis, Approach Theory at Work*, Springer, 2015.
- [55] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 5, Springer, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [56] E.G. Manes, A class of fuzzy theories, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* 85 (1982) 409-451.
- [57] E.G. Manes, Monads of sets, in: *Handbook of Algebra, Volume 3*, Elsevier, 2003, pp. 67-153.
- [58] F. Marmolejo, R. Rosebrugh, R.J. Wood, Completely and totally distributive categories I, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 216 (2012) 1775-1790.
- [59] N.N. Morsi, Fuzzy T -locality spaces, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 69 (1995) 193-219.
- [60] N.N. Morsi, On two types of stable subconstructs of FTS, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 76 (1995) 191-203.
- [61] P.S. Mostert, A.L. Shields, On the structure of semigroups on a compact manifold with boundary, *Annals of Mathematics* 65 (1957) 117-143.
- [62] M.C. Pedicchio, W. Tholen, Multiplicative structures over sup-lattices, *Archivum Mathematicum* 25 (1989) 107-114.

- [63] Q. Pu, D. Zhang, Categories enriched over a quantaloid: Algebras, Theory and Applications of Categories 30 (2015) 751-774.
- [64] K.I. Rosenthal, *Quantales and Their Applications*, Longman, 1990.
- [65] K.I. Rosenthal, *The Theory of Quantaloids*, Longman, 1996.
- [66] S. Romaguera, O. Valero, Domain theoretic characterisations of quasi-metric completeness in terms of formal balls, Mathematical Structures in Computer Science 20 (2010) 453-472.
- [67] J.J.M.M. Rutten, Weighted colimits and formal balls in generalized metric spaces, Topology and its Applications 89 (1998) 179-202.
- [68] D.S. Scott, Continuous lattices, in: *Toposes, Algebraic Geometry and Logic*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 274, pp. 97-136. Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [69] M. B. Smyth, Quasi-uniformities: Reconciling domains with metric spaces, in: *Mathematical Foundations of Programming Language Semantics*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 298, pp. 236-253, Springer, Berlin, 1988.
- [70] M. B. Smyth, Completeness of quasi-uniform and syntopological spaces, Journal of London Mathematical Society 49 (1994) 385-400.
- [71] R.H. Street, Absolute colimits in enriched categories, Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques 24 (1983) 377-379.
- [72] I. Stubbe, Categorical structures enriched in a quantaloid: categories, distributors and functors, Theory and Applications of Categories 14 (2005) 1-45.
- [73] I. Stubbe, Categorical structures enriched in a quantaloid: tensored and cotensored categories, Theory and Applications of Categories 16 (2006) 283-306.
- [74] I. Stubbe, Towards “dynamic domains”: totally continuous cocomplete \mathcal{Q} -categories, Theoretical Computer Science 373 (2007) 142-160.
- [75] I. Stubbe, “Hausdorff distance” via conical cocompletion, Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques 51 (2010) 51-76.
- [76] S. Vickers, Localic completion of generalized metric spaces, Theory and Application of Categories 14 (2005) 328-356.
- [77] K.R. Wagner, Liminf convergence in Ω -categories, Theoretical Computer Science 184 (1997) 61-104.
- [78] P. Waszkiewicz, On domain theory over Girard quantales, Fundamenta Informaticae 92 (2009) 1-24.
- [79] K. Weihrauch, U. Schreiber, Embedding metric spaces into cpo’s, Theoretical Computer Science 16 (1981) 5-24.
- [80] R.J. Wood, Ordered sets via adjunction, in: *Categorical Foundations*, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 5-47.
- [81] X. Yang, D. Zhang, Formal balls of \mathcal{Q} -categories, Categories and General Algebraic Structures with Applications 18 (2023) 1-18.
- [82] J. Yu, D. Zhang, Continuous $[0, 1]$ -lattices and injective $[0, 1]$ -approach spaces, Fuzzy Sets and Systems 444 (2022) 49-78.
- [83] J. Yu, D. Zhang, A Hofmann-Mislove theorem for approach spaces, Theory and Applications of Categories 39 (2023) 21-50.
- [84] J. Yu, D. Zhang, Smyth complete real-enriched categories, arXiv:2311.18191, 2023.
- [85] L.A. Zadeh, Fuzzy sets, Information and Control 8 (1965) 338-353.
- [86] V. Zöberlein, Doctrines on 2-categories, Mathematische Zeitschrift 148 (1976) 267-279.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU, CHINA
Email address: dxzhang@scu.edu.cn