

Notes on Clark Barwick's operator categories

Haynes Miller

August, 2008

Definition. An *operator category* is an essentially small category Φ such that

- (1) Hom sets are finite.
- (2) There exists a terminal object, $*$.
- (3) Fibers exist: for any map $J \rightarrow I$ and any $i : * \rightarrow I$, the pullback $J_i \rightarrow J$ exists.

The *set of points* of an object I in Φ is $|I| = \Phi(*, I)$. This is a functor from Φ to finite sets.

An *operator morphism* from Ψ to Φ is a functor $u : \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ which preserves the terminal object and fibers, and is such that for every $I \in \Psi$ the natural map $|I| \rightarrow |u(I)|$ is surjective.

Lemma. If $u : \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ is an operator morphism then $|I| \rightarrow |u(I)|$ is bijective for every $I \in \text{ob } \Psi$.

Proof. Let $i, j : * \rightarrow I$ in Ψ and assume that $ui = uj : * = u(*) \rightarrow u(I)$. Let J be the fiber product of i and j . Since u preserves fibers, uJ is the fiber product of ui and uj . But these morphisms are equal, so $uJ = *$. Now $|J| \rightarrow |u(J)|$ is surjective, by assumption, so $|J| \neq \emptyset$. Let $k : * \rightarrow J$. Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} * & \longrightarrow & * \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow j \\ * & \xrightarrow{i} & I \end{array}$$

and this implies that $i = j$.

Examples. The category \mathbf{Fin} of finite sets is an operator category. The set of points functor for \mathbf{Fin} is the identity functor. The category \mathbf{Fin}' of nonempty finite sets and surjections is also an operator category.

The category $*/\mathbf{Fin}$ of pointed finite sets is an operator category, but less interesting: for any I , there's only one map $* \rightarrow I$, and the fiber of $f : J \rightarrow I$ over it is the pre-image of $* \in I$ as a pointed set.

The category \mathbf{Ord} of finite totally ordered sets is an operator category. The set of points is the underlying set. The category \mathbf{Ord}' of nonempty finite totally ordered sets and surjections is also an operator category.

For any operator category Φ , there is a natural operator map $\Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{Fin}$ given by the functor $|-|$. This morphism is initial in the category of morphisms from Φ to \mathbf{Fin} : for any $u : \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{Fin}$, the effect of u on $\Phi(*, -)$ induces a natural surjection

$$|I| = \Phi(*, I) \rightarrow \mathbf{Fin}(*, u(I)) = u(I).$$

This is the only natural transformation from $|-|$ to u : the image of $(x : * \rightarrow I) \in |I|$ under a natural transformation is $u(x) : * \rightarrow u(I)$.

One might call a map an “interval inclusion” if it is isomorphic to the “inclusion” of a fiber. Since any map from a terminal object is a monomorphism, and any pullback of a monomorphism is a monomorphism, the word “inclusion” is justified: it is a monomorphism. Note that in an operator category pullbacks along inclusions of intervals exist: in

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 K_i & \xrightarrow{g|_{K_i}} & J_i & \longrightarrow & * \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow i \\
 K & \xrightarrow{g} & J & \xrightarrow{f} & I
 \end{array}$$

the map $g|_{K_i}$ exists uniquely since the right hand square is a pullback, and the left hand square is a pullback because the outer rectangle is a pullback.

Note that given $f : J \rightarrow I$,

$$|J| = \coprod_{i \in |I|} |J_i|$$

Definition. Given an operator category Φ and a symmetric monoidal category $(\mathbf{C}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$, a Φ -monoid in \mathbf{C} consists of an object $M \in \text{ob } \mathbf{C}$ together with a morphism $\varphi_I : M^{\otimes |I|} \rightarrow M$ for every $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$, such that $\varphi_* : M \rightarrow M$ is the identity map and for every $f : J \rightarrow I$ in Φ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} M^{\otimes |J_i|} & \xrightarrow{=} & M^{\otimes |J|} \\
 \downarrow \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} \varphi_{J_i} & & \downarrow \varphi_J \\
 M^{\otimes |I|} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_I} & M
 \end{array}$$

commutes.

Perfection and the Leinster category

I think Barwick is interested in producing a version of the simplicial bar construction for such monoids, with the idea of getting at an A_∞ version. In order to construct the “ Φ -simplicial category,” he needs a little more structure on Φ .

Definition. Let Φ be an operator category. A *universal point* in Φ is a pair (T, o) , where $o : * \rightarrow T$ is a point of T , such that given any $i : * \rightarrow I$, there is a unique map $\chi_i : I \rightarrow T$ (the “characteristic map”) whose fiber over o is i .

For example \mathbf{Fin} admits a universal point, namely $\{0, 1\}$, with $o(*) = 1$. Similarly, a universal point for \mathbf{Ord} is given by $\{-, 0, +\}$, with $o(*) = 0$. But neither \mathbf{Fin}' nor \mathbf{Ord}' admit universal points.

The universal point is unique up to unique isomorphism. Suppose that $o : * \rightarrow T$ and $o' : * \rightarrow U$ are both universal points. Then $o \in |T|$ determines a map $T \rightarrow U$ pulling o back to o' , and $o' \in |U|$ determines a map $U \rightarrow T$ pulling o' back to o . The composite

$T \rightarrow T$ is the unique map pulling o back to itself—so is the identity on T . Similarly the composite $U \rightarrow U$ is the identity on U .

Definition. An operator category Φ is *perfect* if it admits a universal point and the functor $\text{Fib} : \Phi/T \rightarrow \Phi$, assigning to $I \rightarrow T$ the fiber I_o , has a right adjoint.

Barwick writes the source of the right adjoint as $T(-)$. The structure map $T(*) \downarrow T$ is an isomorphism, since a map from $J \downarrow T$ to $T(*) \downarrow T$ is equivalent to giving a map $J_o \rightarrow *$, which carries no information, and this implies that the structure map of the object over T which we are mapping into is an isomorphism. Thus for any I , the unique map $p_I : I \rightarrow *$ induces

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T(I) & \xrightarrow{T(p_I)} & T(*) \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \cong \\ & & T \end{array}$$

This shows that the canonical map $p_I : I \rightarrow *$ induces the structure map $T(I) \rightarrow T$. For this reason, only the source of the object in Φ/T needs a symbol.

It might be worthwhile writing out the adjunction in terms of the functor T . For any $f : J \rightarrow T(*)$ we have a factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J & \xrightarrow{\alpha_f} & T(\text{Fib}f) \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow T p_{\text{Fib}f} \\ & & T(*) \end{array}$$

which is natural, and for any I we have a map $\text{Fib}(T p_I) \rightarrow I$, which is a natural isomorphism; and the composites

$$T(I) \xrightarrow{\alpha_{T I}} T(\text{Fib}(T p_I)) \xrightarrow{T \beta_I} T(I)$$

and

$$\text{Fib}f \xrightarrow{\text{Fib} \alpha_f} \text{Fib}(T p_{\text{Fib}f}) \xrightarrow{\beta_{\text{Fib}f}} \text{Fib}f$$

are the identity maps. The left and right hand factors are thus inverse isomorphisms.

Fin is perfect. $T(I) = \{1\} \amalg I$ mapping to $T = \{0, 1\}$ by sending 1 to 1 and all of I to 0.

Ord is perfect. $T(I) = \{-\} \amalg I \amalg \{+\}$ mapping to $T = \{-, 0, +\}$ by sending $-$ to $-$, $+$ to $+$, and all of I to 0.

Lemma. The natural map $I \rightarrow \text{Fib}(T(I) \downarrow T)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. We must show that

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} I & \longrightarrow & \text{Fib}T(I) & \longrightarrow & T(I) \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ * & \longrightarrow & & \longrightarrow & T \end{array}$$

is a pullback. A compatible pair of maps from J into the corners of the diagram is the same as a map in Φ/T from $J \xrightarrow{o} T$ to $T(I) \rightarrow T$, which, by adjointness, is the same as a map $\text{Fib}(J \xrightarrow{o} T) \rightarrow I$. Now the fiber of the composite $J \xrightarrow{o} T$ is just J , so we have verified the pullback property.

The functor $T : \Phi \rightarrow \Phi$ has a canonical triple structure. The unit in the triple is the composite in the top line of the diagram above. To construct the multiplication, note first that since T is a right adjoint, it carries the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I & \longrightarrow & * \\ \downarrow \eta & & \downarrow \\ T(I) & \longrightarrow & T(*) \end{array}$$

to a pullback, which we embed in the diagram of pullbacks

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} I & \longrightarrow & * & \longrightarrow & * \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow o & & \downarrow o \\ T(I) & \longrightarrow & T(*) & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow T(o) & & \downarrow o \\ T^2(I) & \longrightarrow & T^2(*) & \longrightarrow & T(*) \end{array}$$

where the map $T^2(*) \rightarrow T(*)$ classifies the point $T(o) \circ o$ in $T^2(*)$. The multiplication $\mu_I : T^2(I) \rightarrow T(I)$ is the map over $T(*)$ which is adjoint to the identity map to I from the fiber of $T^2(I) \rightarrow T(*)$.

Definition. The *Leinster category* $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ of a perfect operator category Φ is the Kleisli category of the triple T .

Thus the objects of $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)$ are just the objects of Φ , while $\mathcal{L}(\Phi)(I, J) = \Phi(I, T(J))$. The identity map of I is $\eta_I : I \rightarrow T(I)$, and the composite of $f : I \rightarrow T(J)$ and $g : J \rightarrow T(K)$ is the composite

$$I \xrightarrow{f} T(J) \xrightarrow{T(g)} T^2(K) \xrightarrow{\mu_K} T(K)$$

The Leinster category will be the opposite of the Φ -analogue of the simplicial category.

For example, the Leinster category of \mathbf{Fin} has finite sets as objects, and maps from I to J given by maps from I to $T(J)$, that is, J with a point added. Adjoining a basepoint to I and sending it to the basepoint of J shows that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Fin})$ is the category of finite pointed sets.

Similarly, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{Ord})$ is the category of finite totally ordered sets with distinct maxima and minima which are preserved by morphisms. This is isomorphic to the opposite of the simplicial category, $\mathbf{\Delta}^{\text{op}}$.

I think that if Φ is a perfect operator category, there is a functor

$$\text{Mon}^{\Phi}(\mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(\mathcal{L}(\Phi), \mathbf{C})$$

whose essential image is described by a certain ‘‘Segal’’ condition.

Wreath product

An important construction is the ‘‘wreath product.’’ I suppose this is a special case of a Grothendieck construction. Let Φ and Ψ be two operator categories. The wreath product $\Phi \wr \Psi$ has objects $(I : |J| \rightarrow \text{ob } \Phi, J \in \text{ob } \Psi)$. A morphism $(I', J') \rightarrow (I, J)$ consists of a morphism $g \in \Psi(J', J)$ and for each $j \in |J'|$ a morphism $f_j \in \Phi(I'(j), I(g \circ j))$.

A terminal object in $\Phi \wr \Psi$ is given by $(*, *)$, where the second $*$ denotes a terminal object of Ψ and the first $*$ denotes the function $|*| \rightarrow \text{ob } \Phi$ sending $1 \in |*|$ to a terminal object in Φ . A point in (I, J) is thus a point j in J and a point i in $I(j)$;

$$|(I, J)| = \coprod_{j \in |J|} |I(j)|$$

Given $(f, g) : (I', J') \rightarrow (I, J)$, the fiber over a point $(i, j) \in |(I, J)|$ is given by $(j' \mapsto I'(j')_i, J'_j)$, where $I'(j')_i$ is the fiber of $g_{j'} : I'(j') \rightarrow I(j)$ over $i \in |I(j)|$, and $j' \in |J'_j|$, i.e. $j' : * \rightarrow J'$ such that $f \circ j' = j$.

The forgetful functor $\Phi \wr \Psi \rightarrow \Psi$ is an operator morphism: given (I, J) and a point $j \in |J|$, any choice of $i \in |I(j)|$ provides a point in (I, J) over j .

The functor $\Phi \rightarrow \Phi \wr \Psi$ sending I to $(I : * \rightarrow \text{ob } \Phi, *)$ is an operator morphism.

If (T_{Φ}, o) and (T_{Ψ}, o) are universal points in Φ and Ψ , then we can construct a universal point in the wreath product. It is given by (F, T_{Ψ}) , where $F : |T_{\Psi}| \rightarrow \text{ob } \Phi$ by sending o to T_{Φ} and the other points to o .

The category \mathbf{Ord}'_n defined inductively by $\mathbf{Ord}'_1 = \mathbf{Ord}'$, the category of nonempty finite ordered sets, and $\mathbf{Ord}'_n = \mathbf{Ord}'_{n-1} \wr \mathbf{Ord}'$ is isomorphic to Batanin’s category of ‘‘ n -ordinals.’’ He gives the following description of that category. An n -ordinal is a level-tree of uniform height n (so the levels are numbered 0 through n , level 0 is the root, and all branches grow up to level n) together with a total ordering of the leaves, with the property that if $a \leq b \leq c$ then b is at least as closely related to a and to c as a and c are to each other. This says that we have a planar tree with the leaves numbered consecutively. You could also describe this by giving a nested sequence of order-preserving relations, given by a composable sequence of order preserving surjections. Morphisms may not be order preserving (though Batanin defines a map to be order preserving if it is a morphism). To describe them, think of the object as a phylogenetic tree, expressing how closely related the various leaves are. Then a morphism never increases the distance between leaves, and if it reverses the order of a pair of leaves then it makes them more closely related.

and for every $f : J \rightarrow I$ and $g : K \rightarrow J$ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
P(I) \otimes P(f) \otimes P(g) & \xrightarrow{\theta_f \otimes 1} & P(J) \otimes P(g) \\
\downarrow 1 \otimes \mu_{f,g} & & \downarrow \theta_g \\
P(I) \otimes P(fg) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{fg}} & P(K)
\end{array}$$

commutes, where $\mu_{f,g}$ is the composite

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(J_i) \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \in |J|} P(K_j) \right) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} \left(P(J_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J_i|} P(K_j) \right) \\
& = \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} (P(J_i) \otimes P(f|_{K_i})) \xrightarrow{\bigotimes \theta_{f|_{K_i}}} \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(K_i)
\end{aligned}$$

A morphism of Φ operads, $\alpha : P \rightarrow P'$, is a collection of maps $\alpha_I : P(I) \rightarrow P'(I)$ for every $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$ which commute with the structure maps.

Example. The one-morphism category is an operator category. A $*$ -operad in \mathbf{C} is a \otimes -monoid in \mathbf{C} .

Example. Let \mathbf{Fin} be the operator category of finite sets. If $f : I \rightarrow I$ is a permutation then $P(f) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in I} P(*)$ is endowed with a canonical map from $\mathbf{1}$, and composition with the structure map $P(I) \otimes P(f) \rightarrow P(I)$ yields an automorphism of $P(I)$. Thus a \mathbf{Fin} operad determines a symmetric sequence, and the rest of the \mathbf{Fin} operad structure determines on P the structure of an operad in the traditional sense.

Example. Let \mathbf{Ord} be the category of finite ordered sets. Now the intervals are precisely intervals in the usual sense. An \mathbf{Ord} operad is a “non-symmetric” operad.

Sequences. A Φ operad doesn’t determine a functor from Φ to \mathbf{C} , but it does determine a contravariant functor $\text{Seq } \Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, where $\text{Seq } \Phi$ is subcategory of Φ consisting of morphisms all of whose fibers are points. Pulling back along such a morphism $f : J \rightarrow I$ induces a map $|I| \rightarrow |J|$ which is inverse to $|f|$: so the functor of points takes quasi-isomorphisms to bijections. The subcategory $\text{Seq } \Phi$ is the analogue of the category of sets and bijections in the traditional development of the theory of operads, so a functor from it to \mathbf{C} is a “ Φ sequence.”

Intervals pull back (to intervals). Using the fact that fiber inclusions are monomorphisms, it is easy to show that if $\phi : J \rightarrow I$ is a quasi-isomorphism and $F \rightarrow I$ is a fiber inclusion, then the map $\phi^{-1}F \rightarrow F$ is again a quasi-isomorphism.

Let $\phi : J \rightarrow I$ be a quasi-isomorphism and P a Φ operad. Let $f : K \rightarrow J$. For any $i \in |I|$, let $j \in |J|$ be the unique point such that $\phi j = i$. Then there is a canonical isomorphism of fibers $K_j \rightarrow K_i$. Write $g = \phi f$. Combined with the functoriality ϕ^* :

$P(I) \rightarrow P(J)$, we get a map along the top of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 P(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(K_i) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P(J) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} P(K_j) \\
 \searrow \theta_g & & \swarrow \theta_f \\
 & P(J) &
 \end{array}$$

which commutes by the associativity diagram of the operad.

This suggests that we try to define a monoidal structure on Φ sequences by

$$(P \circ Q)(K) = \operatorname{colim}_{\phi: K \rightarrow J} P(J) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} Q(K_j)$$

where the colimit is taken over the category $K/\operatorname{Seq} \Phi$.

Note that if $\Phi = \mathbf{Fin}$, we get

$$(P \circ Q)(0) = \coprod_{n \geq 0} P(n) \otimes_{\Sigma_n} Q(0)^{\otimes n}$$

In a \mathbf{Fin} operad, $P(0)$ is a P -algebra. If we assume that $Q(0) = o$, then the terms with ϕ not surjective don't contribute. If ϕ is surjective, then there are no automorphisms of it in $K/\operatorname{Seq} \Phi$, so

$$(P \circ Q)(K) = \coprod_{\sim} P(K/\sim) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in K/\sim} Q(j)$$

where the coproduct runs over equivalence relations on K .

Pulling back operads. Let $u : \Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ be an operator morphism, and P a Φ -operad in \mathbf{C} . The pullback of P along u is the Ψ -operad u^*P in \mathbf{C} with

$$(u^*P)(K) = P(u(K))$$

and structure maps given as follows. Let $f : J \rightarrow I$ in Ψ . For each $i \in |I|$, $(uf)^{-1}(ui) = u(f^{-1}(i))$ since u respects fibers, and u induces a bijection $|I| \rightarrow |u(I)|$ (by the Lemma). Thus the structure map

$$\theta_{uf} : P(uI) \otimes \bigotimes_{k \in |uI|} P((uf)^{-1}(k)) \rightarrow P(uJ)$$

precisely determines a map

$$\theta_f : (u^*P)(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} (u^*P)(f^{-1}(i)) \rightarrow (u^*P)(J)$$

Also, $\eta : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow P(*)$ is the same as a map $\eta : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow (u^*P)(*)$, since $u* = *$. These define the structure of a Ψ -operad.

For example, suppose $u : \Psi \rightarrow \mathbf{Fin}$ is given by $uI = |I|$. Then a \mathbf{Fin} -operad P —that is, an operad in the usual sense—gives rise to a Ψ -operad u^*P given by $u^*P(I) = P(|I|)$, and structure map given by

$$P(|I|) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(|f^{-1}(i)|) \rightarrow P(|J|),$$

using $|f^{-1}(i)| = |f|^{-1}(i)$.

Algebras over operads

Definition. Let P be a Φ -operad in \mathbf{C} . A P -algebra is an object A in \mathbf{C} together with a map

$$\varphi_I : P(I) \otimes A^{\otimes |I|} \rightarrow A$$

for each $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{1} \otimes A & & \\ \downarrow \eta \otimes 1 & \searrow = & \\ P(*) \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\varphi_*} & A \end{array}$$

commutes and for each $f : J \rightarrow I$ in Φ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(J_i) \otimes A^{\otimes |J_i|} & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \bigotimes \varphi_{J_i}} & P(I) \otimes A^{\otimes |I|} \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow \varphi_I \\ \left(P(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P(J_i) \right) \otimes A^{\otimes |J|} & & \\ \downarrow \theta_f \otimes 1 & & \downarrow \varphi_J \\ P(J) \otimes A^{\otimes |J|} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_J} & A \end{array}$$

commutes.

Definition. Let Φ be an operator category, \mathbf{C} a closed symmetric monoidal category, and P a Φ -operad in \mathbf{C} . The May-Thomason construction provides us with a category enriched over \mathbf{C} , with the same object set as Φ . Its object of morphisms from J to I is

$$\bigotimes_{f: J \rightarrow I} P(J_i)$$

and the composition is given by the structure map for the operad. This is perhaps better viewed as a “ Φ -graded” category.

Example. Suppose \mathbf{C} contains a zero object \emptyset . Define a Φ operad Z in \mathbf{C} by declaring that $Z(*) = \mathbf{1}$ and $Z(I) = \emptyset$ if $I \neq *$. An algebra for this operad is precisely a Φ -sequence. This is because of the

Lemma. $f : J \rightarrow I$ is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if $J_i = *$ for every $i \in |I|$.

Multicategories and modules over them

Definition. Let Φ be an operator category and \mathbf{C} a symmetric monoidal category. A Φ multicategory H enriched over \mathbf{C} consists in the data of:

- (0) A set S of “objects” of H ;
- (1) For each $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$, object $x \in S$, and map $y : |I| \rightarrow S$, an object $H_I(y, x) \in \mathbf{C}$;
- (2) For each $x \in S$, a map $\eta : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow H_*(x, x)$
- (3) For each morphism $f : J \rightarrow I$ in Φ , $w \in S$, $x : |I| \rightarrow S$, and $y : |J| \rightarrow S$, a map

$$\theta_f : H_I(x, w) \otimes H_f(y, x) \rightarrow H_J(y, w)$$

where

$$H_f(y, x) = \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} H_{J_i}(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i)$$

To give the axioms, note that if $p_J : J \rightarrow *$ then $H_{p_J}(y, x) = H_J(y, x)$ and

$$H_{1_J}(y, x) = \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} H_*(y_j, x_j)$$

Define $\mu_{f,g} : H_f(y, x) \otimes H_g(z, y) \rightarrow H_{fg}(z, x)$ as the composite

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\bigotimes_{i \in |I|} H_{J_i}(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i) \right) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j \in |J|} H_{K_j}(z|_{|K_j|}, y_j) \right) \cong \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} \left(H_{J_i}(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J_i|} H_{K_j}(z|_{|K_j|}, y_j) \right) \\ & = \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} (H_{J_i}(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i) \otimes H_{g_i}(z|_{|K_i|}, y|_{|J_i|})) \xrightarrow{\otimes \theta_{g_i}} \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} H_{K_i}(z|_{|K_i|}, x_i) \end{aligned}$$

where g_i is the unique map making

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_i & \xrightarrow{g_i} & J_i \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K & \xrightarrow{g} & J \end{array}$$

commutative. We require that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{1} \otimes H_K(z, y) & & H_f(y, x) \otimes \mathbf{1} \\ \eta_J \otimes \mathbf{1} \downarrow & \searrow = & \downarrow \mathbf{1} \otimes \eta_J \\ H_*(y, y) \otimes H_{p_K}(z, y) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{1,p}} & H_K(z, y) & & H_f(y, x) \otimes H_{1_J}(y, y) & \xrightarrow{\mu_{f,1}} & H_f(y, x) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_I(x, w) \otimes H_f(y, x) \otimes H_g(z, y) & \xrightarrow{\theta_f \otimes 1} & H_J(y, w) \otimes H_g(z, y) \\
\downarrow 1 \otimes \mu_{f,g} & & \downarrow \theta_g \\
H_I(x, w) \otimes H_{fg}(z, x) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{fg}} & H_K(z, w)
\end{array}$$

commute.

For example, if $S = \{*\}$, then we have a Φ -operad in \mathbf{C} . If $\Phi = *$, then we have a category enriched over \mathbf{C} with object set S .

Given any Φ multicategory in \mathbf{C} with object set S , and any $x \in S$, we have the “endomorphism operad” End_x with

$$\text{End}_x(I) = H_I(x_{|I|}, x)$$

where $x_{|I|}$ denotes the constant function from $|I|$ with value x .

Definition. Let H be a Φ multicategory enriched over \mathbf{C} . A *module* for H consists in

- (1) a function $M : S \rightarrow \text{ob } \mathbf{C}$, and
- (2) for each $J \in \text{ob } \Phi$ and each $y : |J| \rightarrow S$ and $x \in S$, a morphism

$$\varphi : H_J(y, x) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} M(y_j) \rightarrow M(x)$$

such that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{1} \otimes M(x) & & \\
\downarrow \eta \otimes 1 & \searrow = & \\
H_{1_x}(x, x) \otimes M(x) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & M(x)
\end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_I(x, w) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} \left(H_{J_i}(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J_i|} M(y_j) \right) & \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \otimes \varphi} & H_I(x, w) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} M(x_i) \\
\downarrow = & & \downarrow \varphi \\
H_I(x, w) \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i \in |I|} H(y|_{|J_i|}, x_i) \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} M(y_j) & & \\
\downarrow \theta \otimes 1 & & \downarrow \varphi \\
H_J(y, w) \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in |J|} M(y_j) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & M(w)
\end{array}$$

commute.

For example, if $S = \{*\}$ this is the notion of an algebra over the operad.

Definition. Suppose that \mathbf{C} has an initial object \emptyset such that $\emptyset \otimes X \cong \emptyset$ for any X . Fix a universal point $o : * \rightarrow T$ in an operator category Φ . A Φ -chirality in \mathbf{C} is a Φ multicategory H in \mathbf{C} with object set $|T|$ such that:

- (1) For any $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$, $H_I(x, o) = \emptyset$ unless $x = |\chi_i| : |I| \rightarrow |T|$ for some $i \in |I|$.
- (2) If $y \neq o$ in $|T|$ then for any $I \in \text{ob } \Phi$, $H_I(x, y) = \emptyset$ unless $x : |I| \rightarrow |T|$ is the constant function with value y .

This is actually what Barwick calls a “pure chirality.” In the general definition, the various different “generic” points of $|T|$ are allowed to interact with each other: (2) is replaced by the requirement that $o \notin \text{im } x$. I hope that pure chiralities will suffice.

First let’s study the objects $H_I(x, y)$.

By condition (2), when y is generic—i.e. $y \neq o$ —the only nontrivial $H_I(x, y)$ ’s are the objects making up the endomorphism operad P_y of y ,

$$P_y(I) = H_I(y|_{|I|}, y).$$

The other objects determined by a chirality are, for $J \in \text{ob } \Phi$ and $j \in |J|$,

$$M(J, j) = H_J(|\chi_j|, o).$$

All the other $H_J(x, o)$ ’s are trivial.

To analyze the endomorphism operad P_o we use:

Lemma. Let $J \in \text{ob } \Phi$ and $j \in |J|$. The only element of $|J|$ mapped to o by χ_j is j itself.

Proof. Let $f : J \rightarrow I$, and suppose that f pulls $i : * \rightarrow I$ back to $j : * \rightarrow J$. Since $|-|$ preserves pullbacks, the inverse image of $i \in |I|$ under $|f|$ is $\{j\} \subseteq |J|$. Apply this with $J = T$.

Thus if χ_j is a constant map then $|J| = \{j\}$. Conditions (1) and (2) thus combine to show that the objects $H_I(o_{|I|}, o)$ are trivial unless $I = *$. The endomorphism operad of o thus reduces to the monoid

$$H_*(o, o) = P_o(*) = M(*, \text{id}_*)$$

which we denote by A .

We analyze what data is given by the structure maps

$$\eta : \mathbf{1} \rightarrow H_*(x, x)$$

for $x \in |T|$ and

$$\theta_f : H_I(x, w) \otimes H_f(y, x) \rightarrow H_J(y, w)$$

for $f : J \rightarrow I$, $w \in |T|$, $x : |I| \rightarrow |T|$, and $y : |J| \rightarrow |T|$.

When $w = o$ and $I = *$, the map is trivial unless $x = o$ and the structure map gives us

$$H_*(o, o) \otimes H_J(\chi_j, o) \rightarrow H_J(\chi_j, o)$$

that is, an action by the monoid A on $M(J, j)$.

I'm finding it hard to interpret what the other structure morphisms give you. It seems to me that the following lemma should be useful.

Lemma. Let Φ be an operator category with a universal point $o : * \rightarrow T$, let $f : J \rightarrow I$ be a monomorphism (for example a fiber inclusion), and let $j \in |J|$. Then

$$\chi_{fj} \circ f = \chi_j : J \rightarrow T$$

Proof. Let $g : K \rightarrow J$ be such that $(\chi_{fj}f)g = op_K$. We want to show that $g = jp_K$. From the definition of χ_{fj} , $\chi_{fj}(fg) = op_K$ implies that $fg = (fj)p_K$, so what we want follows from associativity of composition and monomorphicity of f .

If I continue to take $w = o$, and expect to get something nontrivial in the source of θ_f , I had better take $x = |\chi_i|$ for some $i \in |I|$ and also $y = |\chi_j|$ for some $j \in |J|$, so the map is

$$\theta_f : M(I, i) \otimes H_f(|\chi_j|, |\chi_i|) \rightarrow M(J, j)$$

Now

$$H_f(|\chi_j|, |\chi_i|) = \bigotimes_{k \in |I|} H_{J_k}(|\chi_j|_{|J_k|}, \chi_i k)$$

We have to understand some things about the values of the characteristic functions of points. First, $\chi_i k = o$ if and only if $k = i$. So that tensor factor is a special case. The factor is nontrivial if and only if $|\chi_j|_{|J_i|} = |\chi_l|$ for some $l \in |J_i|$. If this occurs, then $\chi_j l = o$; but the only element carried to o by χ_j is j , so $l = j$. Conversely, by the lemma, if there is $l \in |J_i|$ such that $j = gl$ (where $g : J_i \rightarrow J$ is the interval inclusion) then $\chi_j \circ g = \chi_l$, and it follows that $|\chi_j|_{|J_i|} = |\chi_l|$.

The upshot is that the $k = i$ factor $H_{J_i}(|\chi_j|_{|J_i|}, o)$ is nontrivial only if $i = fj$. When this factor is trivial, it kills the entire object $H_f(|\chi_j|, |\chi_i|)$: so θ_f is interesting only when $i = fj$. In that case, the $k = i$ factor is $H_{J_{fj}}(|\chi_j|, o) = M(J_{fj}, j)$, so the structure morphism has the form

$$\theta_f : M(I, fj) \otimes M(J_{fj}, j) \otimes \bigotimes_k P_{\chi_{fj}k}(J_k) \rightarrow M(J, j)$$

as long as all points k of I other than fj have the property that $|\chi_j|$ is constant on J_k with value $\chi_{fj}k$. If this condition fails for any value of k , then the source is \emptyset and the structure map has no content.

So the question is: Let $f : J \rightarrow I$, $k \in |I|$, and $j \in |J|$. Is $|\chi_j|$ constant on J_k with value $\chi_{fj}k$? This is true if f is a monomorphism. If $k = fj$ then $J_k = *$, mapping to J by j , so it is true then too.

But it certainly isn't true in general. Suppose $I = *$ for example. Then $J_k = J$, and χ_j is certainly not constant (as long as J has more than one point). In this case $fj = k$, so one definitely needs to assume that $fj \neq k$ for the hypothesis to stand a chance.

Clark mentions that there are (pathological) perfect operator categories for which T contains intervals which don't contain o but do contain more than one point. Perhaps χ_j is always interval-preserving; if so, then Clark's hypothesis would imply that χ_j is constant on intervals not containing j .

If $w \neq o$, then for $H_I(x, w)$ to be nontrivial we must have $x = w_{|I|}$, and for $H_J(y, w)$ to be nontrivial we must have $y = w_{|J|}$. So now we want to understand

$$H_f(w_{|J|}, w_{|I|}) = \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} H_{J_i}(w_{|J_i|}, w) = \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P_w(J_i)$$

so the structure map is

$$P_w(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{i \in |I|} P_w(J_i) \rightarrow P_w(J)$$

which is just the operad structure on P_w .

Notes on points: Suppose $f : I \rightarrow *$ is a monomorphism. If $i \in |I|$, then the composite fi is the identity (since it's a self-map of the terminal object), and the composite if is too (since $f \circ if = fi \circ f = f = f \circ id_I$, and f is a monomorphism). Thus the proper subobjects of $*$ have no points. A pointless object doesn't have to be initial, in interesting cases. For example, in \mathbf{Ord}_2 we have the object (J, I) , where $I = \{1\}$ and $J(1) = \emptyset$.

In $\mathbf{Ord} \setminus \mathbf{Ord}$, we claim that the universal point is the central point in the object with base $\underline{3}$ and fibers $\underline{1}, \underline{3}, \underline{1}$. But suppose I want to classify 1 in the object with base $\underline{2}$ and both fibers $\underline{1}$. It seems to me that there are three maps which pull o back to 1: send 1 to o , and send 2 to either of the other points in the middle fiber or to the unique point in the right fiber.

The fallacy is that when 2 gets sent to the wrong point, the pullback is not the terminal object $\underline{1} \downarrow \underline{1}$ but rather $\underline{1} \downarrow \underline{2}$.

Given a Φ -operad P there will generally be many chiralities with $P_x = P$ for all x , but there is a preferred one. It has

$$M(J, j) = P(J)$$

for all $J \in \text{ob } \Phi$ and all $j \in |J|$. The structure map corresponding to $f : J \rightarrow I$, $j \in |J|$ is

$$\theta_f : P(I) \otimes \bigotimes_{k \in |I|} P(J_k) \rightarrow P(J)$$

as long as all $k \in |I|$ other than $k = fj$ have the property that $|\chi_j| = (\chi_{fjk})_{|J_k|}$. This is a piece of the operad structure of P (and if the condition holds for all k , it is precisely the operad structure map).