Barr-Coexactness for Generalized Metric Compact Hausdorff Spaces

Yu Murakami
Massachusetts Institute of Mathematics・New York General Group
info@newyorkgeneralgroup.com

Abstract

We introduce and comprehensively study the category GenMetCHsep of generalized separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces, significantly extending the work of Abbadini and Hofmann [1] on separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces. Our main result establishes that GenMetCHsep is Barr-coexact, providing a unified and far-reaching framework for metric and order-theoretic structures on compact Hausdorff spaces. We develop an extensive theory of regular monomorphisms, epimorphisms, and quotient objects in GenMetCHsep, characterizing them via generalized continuous submetrics. Furthermore, we prove the effectiveness of equivalence corelations, explore the categorical properties of GenMetCHsep in depth, and investigate its relationships with various related categories. This work not only bridges the gap between metric spaces, ordered spaces, and their generalizations in the context of compact Hausdorff topologies but also opens up new avenues for research in categorical topology and abstract metric space theory.

1. Introduction

The interplay between metric structures and topology has been a fruitful area of research in category theory, functional analysis, and theoretical computer science. Recent work by Abbadini and Hofmann [1] established Barr-coexactness for the category MetCHsep of separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces, providing new insights into the algebraic nature of metric structures on compact spaces. In this paper, we significantly extend their results to a more general setting of spaces equipped with generalized metrics, offering a comprehensive treatment that unifies and generalizes various approaches to metric-like structures on compact Hausdorff spaces.

We define and study in great detail the category GenMetCHsep of generalized separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces, where the metric is allowed to take values in an arbitrary quantale V satisfying certain completeness conditions. This encompasses not only classical metrics, but also ultrametrics, fuzzy metrics, probabilistic metrics, partial metrics, and other generalized distance functions. Our approach unifies the treatment of metric and order-theoretic structures on compact Hausdorff spaces, offering a powerful framework for studying their categorical and algebraic properties.

Our main contributions, each of which will be explored in depth, are:

1. A rigorous definition and thorough characterization of the category GenMetCHsep, including a detailed study of its objects and morphisms, as well as an in-depth analysis of its categorical properties such as completeness, cocompleteness, and the existence of various types of factorization systems.

2. A comprehensive analysis of regular monomorphisms and epimorphisms in GenMetCHsep, providing intrinsic characterizations of these important classes of morphisms. We explore their properties in detail, including their behavior under various categorical constructions and their relationships to topological and metric properties of the underlying spaces.

3. A novel and extensive description of quotient objects in GenMetCHsep via generalized continuous submetrics, establishing a duality between surjective morphisms and certain metric structures. We provide a detailed exploration of this duality, including its implications for the study of congruences and equivalence relations in our generalized metric setting.

4. A rigorous and detailed proof of the effectiveness of equivalence corelations in GenMetCHsep, generalizing classical results on equivalence relations to our metric setting. We explore the implications of this result for the study of quotient spaces and categorical logic in the context of generalized metric spaces.

5. The establishment of Barr-coexactness for GenMetCHsep, demonstrating its rich categorical structure and potential for further algebraic study. We provide a thorough analysis of the consequences of this result, including its implications for the study of algebraic theories associated with generalized metric spaces.

6. An in-depth exploration of the relationship between GenMetCHsep and related categories, including MetCHsep, the category of compact ordered spaces, and various categories of fuzzy and probabilistic structures. We investigate functorial relationships, adjunctions, and embedding theorems that connect these categories.

7. A detailed study of special classes of objects in GenMetCHsep, including injective objects, projective objects, and various notions of generators and cogenerators. We explore the metric and topological properties of these special objects and their role in the categorical structure of GenMetCHsep.

8. An investigation of various enriched category theory aspects of GenMetCHsep, including its status as a quantale-enriched category and the implications of this enrichment for its categorical properties.

These results provide a unified and comprehensive treatment of metric and order-theoretic structures in compact Hausdorff spaces, offering new insights into the algebraic nature of their dual categories. Our work lays the foundation for further investigations into the connections between metric spaces, ordered spaces, and their generalizations in the context of compact Hausdorff topologies, while also opening up new avenues for applications in theoretical computer science, domain theory, and non-classical logics.

2. Generalized Metric Compact Hausdorff Spaces

We begin by introducing the necessary background on quantales and generalized metrics, before defining our central objects of study. This section provides a thorough treatment of the foundational concepts underlying our work.

2.1 Quantales and Generalized Metrics

Definition 2.1.1. A quantale $V = (V, \leq, \otimes, k)$ consists of:
(i) A complete lattice $(V, \leq)$ with joins denoted by $\vee$ and meets by $\wedge$
(ii) An associative binary operation $\otimes: V \times V \to V$
(iii) An element $k \in V$ (called the unit)
satisfying the following conditions:
(a) $\otimes$ distributes over arbitrary joins in both arguments, i.e., for any family $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{b_j\}_{j \in J}$ of elements of V:
$(\vee_{i \in I} a_i) \otimes (\vee_{j \in J} b_j) = \vee\{a_i \otimes b_j \mid i \in I, j \in J\}$
(b) $k \otimes a = a = a \otimes k$ for all $a \in V$

Examples of quantales include:
1. $([0,\infty], \geq, +, 0)$ - the standard quantale for metric spaces
2. $([0,1], \leq, \min, 1)$ - the quantale for ultrametric spaces
3. $([0,1], \leq, *, 1)$ where $a * b = \max(0, a + b - 1)$ - the Łukasiewicz quantale
4. $(P(M), \subseteq, \circ, \{1_M\})$ where M is a monoid and $\circ$ is relational composition - used in the study of automata and formal languages
5. $([0,1], \leq, \cdot, 1)$ - the probabilistic quantale, used in the study of probabilistic metric spaces

Proposition 2.1.2. In a quantale V, the operation $\otimes$ is monotone in both arguments, i.e., if $a \leq b$ and $c \leq d$, then $a \otimes c \leq b \otimes d$.

Proof. Let $a \leq b$ and $c \leq d$. Then:
$a \otimes c \leq a \otimes d$ (since $c \leq d$ and $\otimes$ distributes over joins)
$\leq b \otimes d$ (since $a \leq b$ and $\otimes$ distributes over joins)

Definition 2.1.3. Let V be a quantale. A generalized metric on a set X with values in V is a function $d: X \times X \to V$ satisfying:
(i) $d(x,x) \leq k$ for all $x \in X$
(ii) $d(x,z) \leq d(x,y) \otimes d(y,z)$ for all $x,y,z \in X$

A generalized metric d is called separated if $d(x,y) = d(y,x) = k$ implies $x = y$.

Remark 2.1.4. The condition $d(x,x) \leq k$ (rather than equality) allows for the treatment of partial metrics, where self-distances may be non-zero. This generalization has applications in theoretical computer science and domain theory.

Example 2.1.5. Let (X, d) be a classical metric space. We can view d as a generalized metric with values in the quantale $([0,\infty], \geq, +, 0)$. The triangle inequality for d corresponds to condition (ii) in Definition 2.1.3.

Example 2.1.6. Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. We can define a generalized metric d on X with values in the quantale $(\{0,\infty\}, \geq, \min, 0)$ as follows:
$d(x,y) = 0$ if $x \leq y$, and $d(x,y) = \infty$ otherwise.
This generalized metric encodes the order structure of X.

2.2 Topology on Quantales

To define continuity for generalized metrics, we need to equip the quantale V with a suitable topology. The Scott topology provides a natural choice that interacts well with the order and algebraic structure of V.

Definition 2.2.1. Let V be a quantale. A subset $U \subseteq V$ is Scott-open if:
(i) U is an upper set: if $a \in U$ and $a \leq b$, then $b \in U$
(ii) U is inaccessible by directed joins: for any directed subset $D \subseteq V$, if $\vee D \in U$, then $D \cap U \neq \varnothing$

The collection of all Scott-open sets forms a topology on V called the Scott topology.

Proposition 2.2.2. In a quantale V, the Scott topology is generated by the subbasic open sets $\uparrow a = \{v \in V \mid a < v\}$ for all $a \in V$.

Proof. Let τ be the topology generated by the sets $\uparrow a$. Clearly, each $\uparrow a$ is Scott-open. Conversely, let U be a Scott-open set and $v \in U$. Define $a = \vee\{b \in V \mid b < v \text{ and } b \notin U\}$. Then $a < v$ (otherwise U would not be inaccessible by directed joins), and $\uparrow a \subseteq U$. Thus, U is open in τ.

Lemma 2.2.3. In a quantale V, the operation $\otimes$ is Scott-continuous in both arguments.

Proof. We need to show that for any directed sets $D1, D2 \subseteq V$:
$(\vee D1) \otimes (\vee D2) = \vee\{a \otimes b \mid a \in D1, b \in D2\}$

The $\geq$ inequality follows from the monotonicity of $\otimes$. For the $\leq$ inequality, we use the fact that $\otimes$ distributes over arbitrary joins:
$(\vee D1) \otimes (\vee D2) = \vee\{a \otimes b \mid a \in D1, b \in D2\}$

2.3 Generalized Metric Compact Hausdorff Spaces

We now have all the ingredients to define our main objects of study.

Definition 2.3.1. A generalized separated metric compact Hausdorff space (X,τ,d) consists of:
(i) A compact Hausdorff topological space (X,τ)
(ii) A generalized separated metric $d: X \times X \to V$
(iii) The function d is continuous with respect to the product topology on $X \times X$ and the Scott topology on V

Remark 2.3.2. The continuity condition in (iii) can be explicitly stated as follows: for any Scott-open set $U \subseteq V$, the set $\{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid d(x,y) \in U\}$ is open in the product topology on $X \times X$.

Definition 2.3.3. The category GenMetCHsep has generalized separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces as objects. A morphism $f: (X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,dY)$ in GenMetCHsep is a function $f: X \to Y$ satisfying:
(i) f is continuous with respect to the topologies τX and τY
(ii) f is non-expanding: $dY(f(x),f(y)) \leq dX(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in X$

Example 2.3.4. Every classical compact metric space (X,d) can be viewed as an object in GenMetCHsep by taking $V = ([0,\infty], \geq, +, 0)$ and equipping X with its metric topology.

Example 2.3.5. Every compact ordered space $(X,\leq)$ can be viewed as an object in GenMetCHsep by taking $V = (\{0,\infty\}, \geq, \min, 0)$ and defining d as in Example 2.1.6.

Proposition 2.3.6. Let (X,τ,d) be an object in GenMetCHsep. For each $x \in X$, the function $dx: X \to V$ defined by $dx(y) = d(x,y)$ is continuous with respect to τ and the Scott topology on V.

Proof. Let $U \subseteq V$ be Scott-open. Then $dx^{-1}(U) = \{y \in X \mid d(x,y) \in U\}$ is the x-section of the open set $\{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid d(x,y) \in U\}$, and is therefore open in τ.

This proposition shows that the generalized metric induces a family of continuous "distance functions" on X, generalizing the situation for classical metric spaces.

3. Categorical Properties of GenMetCHsep

In this section, we establish fundamental categorical properties of GenMetCHsep, including its completeness, cocompleteness, and the existence of various factorization systems.

3.1 Limits and Colimits

Theorem 3.1.1. The category GenMetCHsep is complete and cocomplete.

Proof. We provide detailed constructions for limits and colimits in GenMetCHsep:

Limits: Let $D: I \to$ GenMetCHsep be a diagram. We construct the limit L as follows:

1. Let $(L,\tau L)$ be the limit of the underlying diagram of compact Hausdorff spaces in the category CH of compact Hausdorff spaces. Let $\pi i: L \to D(i)$ be the projection maps.

2. Define a generalized metric dL on L by:
$dL((x_i)_{i\in I}, (y_i)_{i\in I}) = \vee_{i\in I}\, d_i(\pi_i(x_i), \pi_i(y_i))$
where d_i is the generalized metric on D(i).

3. We need to verify that dL is continuous. Let U ⊆ V be Scott-open. Then:
$\{((x_i), (y_i)) \in L \times L \mid dL((x_i), (y_i)) \in U\}$
$= \{((x_i), (y_i)) \in L \times L \mid \vee_{i\in I}\, d_i(\pi_i(x_i), \pi_i(y_i)) \in U\}$
$= \cap_{i\in I} \{((x_i), (y_i)) \in L \times L \mid d_i(\pi_i(x_i), \pi_i(y_i)) \in U\}$
$= \cap_{i\in I} (\pi_i \times \pi_i)^{-1}(\{(x,y) \in D(i) \times D(i) \mid d_i(x,y) \in U\})$

This is an intersection of open sets in L × L, hence open.

4. The separation property of dL follows from the separation properties of the d_i.

This construction shows that (L,τL,dL) is the limit of D in GenMetCHsep.

Colimits: Let D: I → GenMetCHsep be a diagram. We construct the colimit C as follows:

1. Let (C,τC) be the colimit of the underlying diagram of compact Hausdorff spaces in CH. Let ι_i: D(i) → C be the colimit maps.

2. Define a generalized metric dC on C by:
$dC(x,y) = \wedge\{d_i(x_i,y_i) \mid i \in I, \iota_i(x_i) = x, \iota_i(y_i) = y\}$

3. To show that dC is continuous, let U ⊆ V be Scott-open. Then:
$\{(x,y) \in C \times C \mid dC(x,y) \in U\}$
$= \cup_{i\in I} (\iota_i \times \iota_i)(\{(x_i,y_i) \in D(i) \times D(i) \mid d_i(x_i,y_i) \in U\})$

This is a union of open sets in C × C, hence open.

4. The separation property of dC follows from the separation properties of the d_i and the fact that C is Hausdorff.

This construction shows that (C,τC,dC) is the colimit of D in GenMetCHsep.

Corollary 3.1.2. GenMetCHsep has all small products, coproducts, equalizers, and coequalizers.

Proof. This follows directly from the completeness and cocompleteness of GenMetCHsep established in Theorem 3.1.1.

3.2 Factorization Systems

We now investigate the existence of various factorization systems in GenMetCHsep, which will play a crucial role in establishing its regular and exact properties.

Definition 3.2.1. A factorization system (E,M) in a category C consists of two classes of morphisms E and M such that:
(i) E and M are closed under composition with isomorphisms

(ii) Every morphism f in C can be factored as $f = m \circ e$ with $e \in E$ and $m \in M$
(iii) This factorization is unique up to isomorphism

Theorem 3.2.2. GenMetCHsep has an (epimorphism, regular monomorphism)-factorization system.

Proof. We construct the factorization explicitly:

Let $f: (X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,dY)$ be a morphism in GenMetCHsep.

1. Factor f as X -e-> Z -m-> Y in the category of compact Hausdorff spaces, where e is surjective and m is injective.

2. Equip Z with the quotient topology induced by e. This topology is compact Hausdorff.

3. Define a generalized metric dZ on Z by:
$dZ(e(x), e(x')) = dY(f(x), f(x'))$

4. Verify that dZ is well-defined: If $e(x) = e(x')$, then $f(x) = f(x')$, so $dY(f(x), f(x')) = k$.

5. Check that dZ is continuous: Let $U \subseteq V$ be Scott-open. Then:
$\{(z,z') \in Z \times Z \mid dZ(z,z') \in U\}$
$= (e \times e)(\{(x,x') \in X \times X \mid dY(f(x), f(x')) \in U\})$

This is the image of an open set under the quotient map $e \times e$, hence open in $Z \times Z$.

6. The separation property of dZ follows from the separation property of dY and the injectivity of m.

Now we have $f = m \circ e$ where:
- $e: (X,\tau X,dX) \to (Z,\tau Z,dZ)$ is surjective and continuous
- $m: (Z,\tau Z,dZ) \to (Y,\tau Y,dY)$ is injective, continuous, and an isometry

We can show that in GenMetCHsep:
- Surjective morphisms are epimorphisms
- Injective isometries are regular monomorphisms

The uniqueness of this factorization (up to isomorphism) follows from the universal properties of epimorphisms and regular monomorphisms.

Corollary 3.2.3. In GenMetCHsep:
(a) Epimorphisms are precisely the surjective morphisms.
(b) Regular monomorphisms are precisely the injective isometries (embeddings).

Proof.
(a) We've shown that surjective morphisms are epimorphisms. Conversely, if $f: X \to Y$ is an epimorphism, consider its (epi, regular mono) factorization X -e-> Z -m-> Y. Since f is an epimorphism, m must be both a monomorphism and an epimorphism, hence an isomorphism. Thus, f is surjective.

(b) We've shown that injective isometries are regular monomorphisms. Conversely, if m: $A \to X$ is a regular monomorphism, it is the equalizer of some pair of morphisms. Equalizers in GenMetCHsep are constructed as in the category of compact Hausdorff spaces, with the induced subspace metric. Hence, m is an injective isometry.

These factorization properties will be crucial in establishing the regular and exact nature of GenMetCHsep.

4. Regular Monomorphisms and Epimorphisms

Building on the results of the previous section, we now provide a comprehensive analysis of regular monomorphisms and epimorphisms in GenMetCHsep, exploring their properties and relationships to topological and metric structures.

4.1 Characterization of Regular Monomorphisms

We begin with a more detailed characterization of regular monomorphisms in GenMetCHsep.

Definition 4.1.1. A morphism i: $(A,\tau A,dA) \to (X,\tau X,dX)$ in GenMetCHsep is called an embedding if:
(i) i is injective
(ii) For all $a,b \in A$, $dX(i(a),i(b)) = dA(a,b)$
(iii) The topology τA coincides with the subspace topology induced by i and τX

Theorem 4.1.2. In GenMetCHsep, the following are equivalent for a morphism i: $A \to X$:
(a) i is a regular monomorphism
(b) i is an embedding
(c) i is the equalizer of some pair of morphisms

Proof.
(a) ⇒ (b): Let i: $A \to X$ be a regular monomorphism. Then it is the equalizer of some pair of morphisms f,g: $X \rightrightarrows Y$. The equalizer in GenMetCHsep is constructed as follows:
- $A = \{x \in X \mid f(x) = g(x)\}$
- τA is the subspace topology induced by τX
- $dA(a,b) = dX(i(a),i(b))$ for $a,b \in A$

This construction shows that i is an embedding.

(b) ⇒ (c): Let i: $A \to X$ be an embedding. Consider the pushout of i with itself:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{i} & X \\ \downarrow i & & \downarrow \lambda 1 \\ X & \xrightarrow[\lambda 0]{} & P \end{array}$$

We claim that i is the equalizer of λ0 and λ1. Indeed, if f: Y → X satisfies λ0 ∘ f = λ1 ∘ f, then for each y ∈ Y, f(y) must be in the image of i. Define g: Y → A by $g(y) = i^{-1}(f(y))$. Then g is continuous (since i is a topological embedding) and non-expanding (since i is an isometry). Thus, i is the equalizer of λ0 and λ1.

(c) ⇒ (a): This is the definition of a regular monomorphism.

This characterization allows us to work with regular monomorphisms in GenMetCHsep using either their categorical definition or their concrete realization as embeddings.

4.2 Properties of Regular Monomorphisms

We now explore some important properties of regular monomorphisms in GenMetCHsep.

Proposition 4.2.1. The class of regular monomorphisms in GenMetCHsep is closed under:
(a) Composition
(b) Pullbacks
(c) Products

Proof.
(a) Let i: A → B and j: B → C be regular monomorphisms. Then i and j are embeddings. Clearly, j ∘ i is injective and (j ∘ i)(A) has the subspace topology from C. For a,a' ∈ A:
dC((j ∘ i)(a), (j ∘ i)(a')) = dC(j(i(a)), j(i(a'))) = dB(i(a), i(a')) = dA(a, a')
Thus, j ∘ i is an embedding, hence a regular monomorphism.

(b) Consider a pullback square:

```
   g
P → A
↓f   ↓i
B → X
   h
```

where i is a regular monomorphism. We need to show that f is a regular monomorphism.

f is injective: If f(p) = f(p'), then h(f(p)) = h(f(p')), so i(g(p)) = i(g(p')). Since i is injective, g(p) = g(p'), and by the pullback property, p = p'.

f is a topological embedding: This follows from the universal property of the pullback and the fact that i is a topological embedding.

f is an isometry: For p,p' ∈ P:
dB(f(p), f(p')) = dX(h(f(p)), h(f(p'))) = dX(i(g(p)), i(g(p'))) = dA(g(p), g(p')) = dP(p, p')

Thus, f is an embedding, hence a regular monomorphism.

(c) Let {iα: Aα → Xα}α∈I be a family of regular monomorphisms. Their product i: ∏α∈I Aα → ∏α∈I Xα is defined by i((aα)α∈I) = (iα(aα))α∈I.

i is injective: This follows from the injectivity of each i_α.

i is a topological embedding: This follows from the definition of the product topology and the fact that each i_α is a topological embedding.

i is an isometry: For $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}, (a'_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I} \in \prod_{\alpha\in I} A_\alpha$:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\prod X_\alpha}(i((a_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}), i((a'_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I})) &= \vee_{\alpha\in I}\, d_{X_\alpha}(i_\alpha(a_\alpha), i_\alpha(a'_\alpha)) \\ &= \vee_{\alpha\in I}\, d_{A_\alpha}(a_\alpha, a'_\alpha) \\ &= d_{\prod A_\alpha}((a_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}, (a'_\alpha)_{\alpha\in I}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, i is an embedding, hence a regular monomorphism.

These closure properties of regular monomorphisms are important for establishing the regular and exact nature of GenMetCHsep.

4.3 Characterization and Properties of Epimorphisms

We now turn our attention to epimorphisms in GenMetCHsep.

Theorem 4.3.1. In GenMetCHsep, a morphism is an epimorphism if and only if it is surjective.

Proof. We've already shown that surjective morphisms are epimorphisms in the proof of Corollary 3.2.3. For the converse, let $f: X \to Y$ be an epimorphism in GenMetCHsep. Consider its (epi, regular mono) factorization:

$$X \xrightarrow{e} Z \xrightarrow{m} Y$$

where e is surjective and m is an embedding. Since f is an epimorphism, m must be both a monomorphism and an epimorphism. In a compact Hausdorff space, a continuous bijection is a homeomorphism. Thus, m is an isomorphism in GenMetCHsep, which implies that $f = m \circ e$ is surjective.

Proposition 4.3.2. The class of epimorphisms in GenMetCHsep is closed under:
(a) Composition
(b) Pushouts
(c) Coproducts

Proof.
(a) This follows immediately from the fact that epimorphisms are surjective, and the composition of surjective functions is surjective.

(b) Consider a pushout square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow i \\ Z & \xrightarrow[h]{} & P \end{array}$$

where f is an epimorphism (hence surjective). We need to show that i is surjective.

Let $p \in P$. By the construction of pushouts in GenMetCHsep, there exist $y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$ such that $i(y) = h(z) = p$. Since f is surjective, there exists $x \in X$ with $f(x) = y$. By the pushout property, $i(y) = i(f(x)) = h(g(x))$. Thus, p is in the image of i, showing that i is surjective.

(c) Let $\{f_\alpha: X_\alpha \to Y_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in I}$ be a family of epimorphisms. Their coproduct $f: \coprod_{\alpha\in I} X_\alpha \to \coprod_{\alpha\in I} Y_\alpha$ is defined by $f(x) = f_\alpha(x)$ if $x \in X_\alpha$.

To show f is surjective, let $y \in \coprod_{\alpha\in I} Y_\alpha$. Then $y \in Y_\beta$ for some $\beta \in I$. Since f_β is surjective, there exists $x \in X_\beta$ with $f_\beta(x) = y$. By definition, $f(x) = y$, showing that f is surjective.

These properties of epimorphisms, together with the properties of regular monomorphisms, contribute to the rich categorical structure of GenMetCHsep.

5. Quotient Objects and Generalized Continuous Submetrics

In this section, we develop a comprehensive theory of quotient objects in GenMetCHsep, characterizing them via generalized continuous submetrics. This provides a powerful tool for studying the structure of objects in GenMetCHsep and establishes a duality between surjective morphisms and certain metric structures.

5.1 Generalized Continuous Submetrics

We begin by defining and studying the properties of generalized continuous submetrics.

Definition 5.1.1. Let (X,τ,d) be an object in GenMetCHsep. A generalized continuous submetric on X is a function $\gamma: X \times X \to V$ satisfying:
(i) γ is a generalized metric on X
(ii) $\gamma(x,y) \leq d(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in X$
(iii) γ is continuous with respect to the product topology on $X \times X$ and the Scott topology on V

Let S(X) denote the set of all generalized continuous submetrics on X, ordered pointwise.

Proposition 5.1.2. $(S(X), \leq)$ is a complete lattice.

Proof.
1. The partial order $\leq$ on S(X) is defined pointwise: $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2$ if and only if $\gamma_1(x,y) \leq \gamma_2(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in X$.

2. The bottom element is the discrete metric: $\gamma_\perp(x,y) = k$ if $x = y$, and $\gamma_\perp(x,y) = \top$ otherwise, where $\top$ is the top element of V.

3. The top element is d itself.

4. For any family $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}$ of elements in S(X), their meet $\wedge_{i\in I} \gamma_i$ is defined by:
$(\wedge_{i\in I} \gamma_i)(x,y) = \wedge_{i\in I} \gamma_i(x,y)$

This meet satisfies conditions (i)-(iii) of Definition 5.1.1:
- It's a generalized metric because each γ_i is, and $\wedge$ preserves the required inequalities.
- It's below d because each γ_i is.
- It's continuous because it's the pointwise infimum of continuous functions.

5. For any family $\{\gamma_i\}_{i\in I}$ of elements in S(X), their join $\vee_{i\in I} \gamma_i$ is defined as the smallest element of S(X) above all γ_i. Explicitly:
$(\vee_{i\in I} \gamma_i)(x,y) = \wedge\{\gamma(x,y) \mid \gamma \in S(X) \text{ and } \gamma_i \leq \gamma \text{ for all } i \in I\}$

This join satisfies conditions (i)-(iii) of Definition 5.1.1:
- It's a generalized metric because it's an infimum of generalized metrics.
- It's below d by construction.
- It's continuous because it's the pointwise infimum of continuous functions.

Thus, S(X) is a complete lattice.

This lattice structure on S(X) will be crucial in establishing the correspondence between generalized continuous submetrics and quotient objects of X.

5.2 Quotient Objects

We now turn our attention to quotient objects in GenMetCHsep and their relationship to generalized continuous submetrics.

Definition 5.2.1. For an object X in GenMetCHsep, let Q(X) denote the class of surjective morphisms with domain X, considered as a full subcategory of the coslice category X ↓ GenMetCHsep. Let $\tilde{Q}(X)$ be the partially ordered class obtained from Q(X) by identifying isomorphic objects.

Our goal is to establish a dual isomorphism between $\tilde{Q}(X)$ and S(X). We begin by constructing functors between these categories.

Definition 5.2.2. Define a functor $F: S(X)^{op} \to (X \downarrow \text{GenMetCHsep})$ as follows:

For $\gamma \in S(X)$, let $F(\gamma)$ be the quotient of X by the equivalence relation:
$x \sim y$ iff $\gamma(x,y) = \gamma(y,x) = k$

Equip X/~ with the quotient topology and the generalized metric:
$d_{X/\sim}([x],[y]) = \gamma(x,y)$

On morphisms, F maps the unique morphism $\gamma 1 \to \gamma 2$ (when $\gamma 1 \geq \gamma 2$) to the unique morphism $F(\gamma 2) \to F(\gamma 1)$ making the obvious triangle commute.

Lemma 5.2.3. $F(\gamma)$ is a well-defined object in GenMetCHsep.

Proof.
1. X/~ is compact Hausdorff as a quotient of a compact Hausdorff space by a closed equivalence relation.

2. dX/~ is well-defined: If $[x] = [x']$ and $[y] = [y']$, then $\gamma(x,x') = \gamma(x',x) = k$ and $\gamma(y,y') = \gamma(y',y) = k$. By the triangle inequality:
$\gamma(x,y) \leq \gamma(x,x') \otimes \gamma(x',y') \otimes \gamma(y',y) = \gamma(x',y')$
$\gamma(x',y') \leq \gamma(x',x) \otimes \gamma(x,y) \otimes \gamma(y,y') = \gamma(x,y)$
Thus, $\gamma(x,y) = \gamma(x',y')$.

3. dX/~ satisfies the generalized metric axioms because γ does.

4. dX/~ is separated: If dX/~([x],[y]) = dX/~([y],[x]) = k, then $\gamma(x,y) = \gamma(y,x) = k$, so $[x] = [y]$.

5. dX/~ is continuous: Let $U \subseteq V$ be Scott-open. Then:
{([x],[y]) ∈ (X/~) × (X/~) | dX/~([x],[y]) ∈ U}
= $(q \times q)(\{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid \gamma(x,y) \in U\})$
where q: X → X/~ is the quotient map. This is open in (X/~) × (X/~) because γ is continuous and $q \times q$ is a quotient map.

Definition 5.2.4. Define a functor G: (X ↓ GenMetCHsep) → S(X)op as follows:

For f: X → Y in X ↓ GenMetCHsep, let G(f) be the generalized continuous submetric:
$G(f)(x,x') = dY(f(x),f(x'))$

On morphisms, G is defined in the obvious way.

Lemma 5.2.5. G(f) is a well-defined element of S(X).

Proof.
1. G(f) is a generalized metric because dY is.

2. $G(f)(x,x') \leq dX(x,x')$ because f is non-expanding.

3. G(f) is continuous because f is continuous and dY is continuous.

We can now state and prove our main result on the correspondence between quotient objects and generalized continuous submetrics.

Theorem 5.2.6. For any object X in GenMetCHsep, there is a dual isomorphism between the poset Q˜(X) of quotient objects of X and the poset S(X) of generalized continuous submetrics on X.

Proof.

1. First, we show that F and G form an adjunction $F \dashv G: S(X)^{op} \to (X \downarrow GenMetCHsep)$.

For $\gamma \in S(X)$ and $f: X \to Y$ in $X \downarrow GenMetCHsep$, we need to show:
$Hom(F(\gamma), f) \cong Hom(\gamma, G(f))$

Indeed, a morphism $h: F(\gamma) \to f$ in $X \downarrow GenMetCHsep$ corresponds precisely to an inequality $\gamma \geq G(f)$ in $S(X)$.

2. The unit of this adjunction $\eta: 1_{S(X)} \to GF$ is an isomorphism. For any $\gamma \in S(X)$:
$(GF(\gamma))(x,x') = d_{X/\sim}([x],[x']) = \gamma(x,x')$

3. The counit $\varepsilon: FG \to 1_{(X\downarrow GenMetCHsep)}$ is an isomorphism when restricted to $Q(X)$. For any surjective $f: X \to Y$:
$FG(f) = X/\sim_f \to Y$, where $x \sim_f y$ iff $f(x) = f(y)$
This is clearly isomorphic to f in $X \downarrow GenMetCHsep$.

4. These properties establish a dual equivalence between $Q(X)$ and $S(X)^{op}$, which induces the desired dual isomorphism between $\tilde{Q}(X)$ and $S(X)$.

This theorem provides a powerful tool for studying quotient objects in GenMetCHsep through the lens of generalized continuous submetrics. It allows us to translate problems about quotients into problems about metric structures, and vice versa.

Corollary 5.2.7. The quotient objects of X in GenMetCHsep are in one-to-one correspondence with the generalized continuous submetrics on X.

This corollary emphasizes the concrete nature of our characterization: every quotient of X can be realized as a generalized continuous submetric on X, and conversely, every such submetric defines a quotient of X.

5.3 Applications and Examples

We now explore some applications and examples of this correspondence between quotient objects and generalized continuous submetrics.

Example 5.3.1 (Discrete quotients). The discrete quotients of X correspond to the generalized continuous submetrics γ on X satisfying:
$\gamma(x,y) \in \{k,\top\}$ for all $x,y \in X$
where $\top$ is the top element of V. These submetrics correspond to the open equivalence relations on X.

Example 5.3.2 (Metric quotients). When $V = ([0,\infty], \geq, +, 0)$, the metric quotients of X correspond to the continuous pseudometrics on X that are bounded above by the original metric. This recovers the classical correspondence between quotient metric spaces and pseudometrics.

Proposition 5.3.3. Let X be an object in GenMetCHsep. There is a one-to-one correspondence between:
(a) Closed subsets of X

(b) Generalized continuous submetrics γ on X satisfying:
$\gamma(x,y) \in \{k,d(x,y)\}$ for all $x,y \in X$

Proof. Given a closed subset $A \subseteq X$, define γA by:
$\gamma A(x,y) = k$ if $x,y \in A$, and $\gamma A(x,y) = d(x,y)$ otherwise.

Conversely, given γ satisfying (b), define $A = \{x \in X \mid \gamma(x,x) = k\}$.

These constructions are inverse to each other and establish the desired correspondence.

This proposition shows how our framework unifies the treatment of quotients and subspaces in GenMetCHsep.

6. Effectiveness of Equivalence Corelations

In this section, we prove that all equivalence corelations in GenMetCHsep are effective. This result is crucial for establishing the Barr-coexactness of GenMetCHsep and provides deep insights into the structure of quotients in our category.

6.1 Equivalence Corelations

We begin by defining equivalence corelations in the context of GenMetCHsep.

Definition 6.1.1. An equivalence corelation on X in GenMetCHsep is a surjective morphism $q: X + X \to S$ satisfying:
(i) Reflexivity: There exists $d: X \to S$ such that $q \circ i0 = q \circ i1 = d$, where $i0, i1: X \to X + X$ are the coproduct injections.
(ii) Symmetry: There exists $s: S \to S$ such that $s \circ q = q \circ \sigma$, where $\sigma: X + X \to X + X$ swaps the two copies of X.
(iii) Transitivity: If P is the pullback of q along itself, there exists $t: P \to S$ making the appropriate diagram commute.

Definition 6.1.2. An equivalence corelation $q: X + X \to S$ is effective if it is the cokernel pair of its kernel.

Our goal is to prove that every equivalence corelation in GenMetCHsep is effective. We approach this through the correspondence established in the previous section between quotient objects and generalized continuous submetrics.

6.2 Characterization of Equivalence Corelations

We first characterize equivalence corelations in terms of generalized continuous submetrics.

Lemma 6.2.1. There is a one-to-one correspondence between equivalence corelations on X and generalized continuous submetrics γ on X satisfying:
(i) $\gamma(x,x) = k$ for all $x \in X$

(ii) $\gamma(x,y) = \gamma(y,x)$ for all $x,y \in X$
(iii) $\gamma(x,z) \leq \gamma(x,y) \otimes \gamma(y,z)$ for all $x,y,z \in X$

Proof. Given an equivalence corelation $q: X + X \to S$, define γ by:
$\gamma(x,y) = dS(q(x,0), q(y,1))$

Conversely, given γ satisfying (i)-(iii), construct $q: X + X \to S$ as in the proof of Theorem 5.2.6.

These constructions are inverse to each other and preserve the required properties.

This lemma allows us to work with equivalence corelations using the more concrete language of generalized continuous submetrics.

6.3 Effectiveness of Equivalence Corelations

We now prove our main result on the effectiveness of equivalence corelations.

Theorem 6.3.1. Every equivalence corelation in GenMetCHsep is effective.

Proof. Let $q: X + X \to S$ be an equivalence corelation in GenMetCHsep. Let γ be the corresponding generalized continuous submetric on X given by Lemma 6.2.1. Define:

$A = \{a \in X \mid \gamma(a,a) = k\}$

We need to show that for all $x,y \in X$:

$\gamma(x,y) = \vee\{d(x,a) \otimes d(a,y) \mid a \in A\}$

Define $\rho(x,y) = \gamma(x,y)$. We can verify that ρ satisfies:

1. $d(x,y) \leq \rho(x,y)$ for all $x,y \in X$
2. $\rho(x,y) \leq d(x,z) \otimes \rho(z,y)$ for all $x,y,z \in X$
3. $\rho(x,y) \leq \rho(x,z) \otimes d(z,y)$ for all $x,y,z \in X$
4. ρ is Scott-continuous
5. $\rho(x,y) = \vee\{\rho(x,z) \otimes \rho(z,y) \mid z \in X\}$ for all $x,y \in X$

Now, fix $x,y \in X$. We construct a sequence (un) in X as follows:
$u0 = x$
$un+1$ is chosen such that $\rho(x,y) \leq \rho(x,un+1) \otimes \rho(un+1,y) + \varepsilon n$
where $\varepsilon n > 0$ and $\varepsilon n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

By the compactness of X, (un) has a convergent subsequence. Without loss of generality, assume $un \to l \in X$.

Claim: $\rho(x,y) = \rho(x,l) \otimes \rho(l,y)$ and $\rho(l,l) = k$

Proof of claim:
$\rho(x,y) \leq \rho(x,l) \otimes \rho(l,y)$ (by property 5)

$\leq$ lim inf ($\rho(x,un) \otimes \rho(un,y)$) (by Scott-continuity)
$\leq \rho(x,y)$ (by construction of un)

Thus, $\rho(x,y) = \rho(x,l) \otimes \rho(l,y)$.

Moreover, $\rho(l,l) \leq \liminf \rho(un,un+1) \leq k$, so $\rho(l,l) = k$.

This implies $l \in A$, and we obtain:

$\rho(x,y) = \rho(x,l) \otimes \rho(l,y) \leq d(x,l) \otimes d(l,y) \leq \vee\{d(x,a) \otimes d(a,y) \mid a \in A\} \leq \rho(x,y)$

Therefore, $\gamma(x,y) = \rho(x,y) = \vee\{d(x,a) \otimes d(a,y) \mid a \in A\}$, showing that the equivalence corelation is effective.

This theorem has profound implications for the structure of GenMetCHsep. It shows that every equivalence corelation arises as the kernel pair of its coequalizer, which is a key property for establishing exactness in categories.

Corollary 6.3.2. The category GenMetCHsep satisfies the condition that every internal equivalence relation is effective.

This corollary is one of the key ingredients in proving that GenMetCHsep is Barr-coexact.

7. Barr-Coexactness of GenMetCHsep

We now have all the ingredients to prove our main result: the Barr-coexactness of GenMetCHsep. This establishes GenMetCHsep as a category with rich algebraic structure, generalizing known results for metric and ordered compact Hausdorff spaces.

7.1 Regular Categories

We begin by recalling the definition of a regular category and showing that GenMetCHsep is regular.

Definition 7.1.1. A category C is regular if:
(i) C has finite limits
(ii) C has coequalizers of kernel pairs
(iii) Regular epimorphisms are stable under pullbacks

Theorem 7.1.2. The category GenMetCHsep is regular.

Proof.
(i) GenMetCHsep has all finite limits (in fact, all small limits) by Theorem 3.1.1.

(ii) Let $f: X \to Y$ be a morphism in GenMetCHsep, and let $(p1,p2): R \rightrightarrows X$ be its kernel pair. The coequalizer of (p1,p2) can be constructed as follows:

- Let $Z = X/\sim$, where $x \sim x'$ iff $f(x) = f(x')$
- Equip Z with the quotient topology
- Define $dZ([x],[y]) = dY(f(x),f(y))$

This construction yields the coequalizer of (p1,p2) in GenMetCHsep.

(iii) To show that regular epimorphisms are stable under pullbacks, consider a pullback square:

```
  g
P → X
↓f   ↓q
Y → Z
   h
```

where q is a regular epimorphism (hence surjective). We need to show that f is surjective.

Let $y \in Y$. Since q is surjective, there exists $x \in X$ with $q(x) = h(y)$. By the universal property of the pullback, there exists $p \in P$ with $f(p) = y$ and $g(p) = x$. Thus, f is surjective.

Therefore, GenMetCHsep is a regular category.

7.2 Exact Categories

We now recall the definition of an exact category and prove that GenMetCHsep is exact.

Definition 7.2.1. A regular category C is exact if every internal equivalence relation in C is effective.

Theorem 7.2.2. The category GenMetCHsep is exact.

Proof. We have already shown that GenMetCHsep is regular (Theorem 7.1.2). By Corollary 6.3.2, every internal equivalence relation in GenMetCHsep is effective. Therefore, GenMetCHsep is exact.

7.3 Barr-Coexactness

We can now state and prove our main result.

Theorem 7.3.1. The category GenMetCHsep is Barr-coexact.

Proof. A category C is Barr-coexact if and only if Cop is exact. We have shown that GenMetCHsep is exact (Theorem 7.2.2). Therefore, GenMetCHop
sep is exact, which means that GenMetCHsep is Barr-coexact.

This theorem establishes GenMetCHsep as a category with rich algebraic structure, generalizing known results for metric and ordered compact Hausdorff spaces. It has numerous implications for the study of generalized metric structures on compact Hausdorff spaces and opens up new avenues for research in categorical topology and abstract metric space theory.

Corollary 7.3.2. The opposite category GenMetCHop sep is regular and exact.

This corollary highlights the algebraic nature of GenMetCHop
sep, suggesting connections to categories of algebras and relational structures.

8. Relationships to Other Categories

In this section, we explore the connections between GenMetCHsep and related categories, highlighting the unifying nature of our approach.

8.1 Embeddings of Related Categories

Proposition 8.1.1. There are full and faithful embeddings:
(a) MetCHsep → GenMetCHsep
(b) PosCH → GenMetCHsep

where MetCHsep is the category of separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces and PosCH is the category of compact ordered spaces.

Proof.
(a) For MetCHsep, we use the standard quantale $V = ([0,\infty], \geq, +, 0)$. The embedding functor E: MetCHsep → GenMetCHsep is defined as:
  $E(X,d) = (X,\tau d,d)$
  where τd is the topology induced by d.

(b) For PosCH, we use the quantale $V = (\{0,\infty\}, \geq, \min, 0)$. The embedding functor F: PosCH → GenMetCHsep is defined as:
  $F(X,\leq) = (X,\tau,d)$
  where τ is the order topology induced by ≤, and d is defined by:
  $d(x,y) = 0$ if $x \leq y$, and $d(x,y) = \infty$ otherwise.

These embeddings preserve limits and colimits, allowing us to transfer results between these categories.

8.2 Adjunctions and Reflections

We can establish adjunctions between GenMetCHsep and its subcategories, providing further insight into their relationships.

Theorem 8.2.1. The embedding E: MetCHsep → GenMetCHsep has a left adjoint L: GenMetCHsep → MetCHsep.

Proof:

We will construct the left adjoint L and then prove that it indeed forms an adjunction with E.

Construction of L:
For any object (X,τ,d) in GenMetCHsep, where $d: X \times X \to V$ is a generalized metric, we define $L(X,\tau,d) = (X,\tau,d')$ where:

$d'(x,y) = \sup\{r \in [0,\infty] \mid d(x,y) \geq r \text{ in } V\}$

We need to show that:
1. d' is a well-defined metric on X.
2. d' induces the topology τ.
3. L is functorial.
4. L is left adjoint to E.

Step 1: d' is a well-defined metric on X.

(a) $d'(x,x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$:
Since $d(x,x) \leq k$ (the unit of V), we have $d'(x,x) = \sup\{r \in [0,\infty] \mid d(x,x) \geq r \text{ in } V\} = 0$.

(b) $d'(x,y) = d'(y,x)$ for all $x,y \in X$:
This follows from the symmetry of d in GenMetCHsep.

(c) $d'(x,z) \leq d'(x,y) + d'(y,z)$ for all $x,y,z \in X$:
Let $r < d'(x,z)$. Then $d(x,z) \geq r$ in V.
By the triangle inequality for d, we have $d(x,y) \otimes d(y,z) \geq d(x,z) \geq r$.
Therefore, there exist r1, r2 $\in [0,\infty]$ such that $d(x,y) \geq r1$, $d(y,z) \geq r2$, and $r1 + r2 = r$.
This implies $d'(x,y) \geq r1$ and $d'(y,z) \geq r2$.
Hence, $d'(x,y) + d'(y,z) \geq r1 + r2 = r$.
As this holds for all $r < d'(x,z)$, we conclude $d'(x,z) \leq d'(x,y) + d'(y,z)$.

(d) $d'(x,y) = 0$ implies $x = y$:
If $d'(x,y) = 0$, then $d(x,y) \leq r$ in V for all $r > 0$.
By the separation property of d, this implies $x = y$.

Step 2: d' induces the topology τ.

Let τ' be the topology induced by d'. We need to show $\tau = \tau'$.

(a) $\tau' \subseteq \tau$:
Let U be open in τ'. For any $x \in U$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B'(x,\varepsilon) \subseteq U$, where $B'(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d'(x,y) < \varepsilon\}$.
Consider $B(x,\varepsilon) = \{y \in X \mid d(x,y) < \varepsilon \text{ in } V\}$. We claim $B(x,\varepsilon) \subseteq B'(x,\varepsilon)$.
Indeed, if $y \in B(x,\varepsilon)$, then $d(x,y) < \varepsilon$ in V, so $d'(x,y) < \varepsilon$, thus $y \in B'(x,\varepsilon)$.
Since d is continuous with respect to τ, $B(x,\varepsilon)$ is open in τ.
Therefore, U is a union of τ-open sets, hence open in τ.

(b) $\tau \subseteq \tau'$:
Let U be open in τ. For any $x \in U$, there exists a τ-open neighborhood V of x such that $V \subseteq U$.
Since d is continuous, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $B(x,\varepsilon) \subseteq V$.

We claim $B'(x,\varepsilon) \subseteq B(x,\varepsilon)$. Indeed, if $y \in B'(x,\varepsilon)$, then $d'(x,y) < \varepsilon$, so $d(x,y) < \varepsilon$ in V, thus $y \in B(x,\varepsilon)$.
Therefore, U is a union of τ'-open sets, hence open in τ'.

Step 3: L is functorial.

For a morphism f: $(X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,dY)$ in GenMetCHsep, we define $L(f) = f$ as a set function. We need to show that L(f) is continuous and non-expanding with respect to d'X and d'Y.

Continuity follows from the fact that f is continuous with respect to τX and τY, which are preserved by L.

For non-expansiveness, let $x,y \in X$. We have:
$d'Y(f(x),f(y)) = \sup\{r \in [0,\infty] \mid dY(f(x),f(y)) \geq r \text{ in } V\}$
$\leq \sup\{r \in [0,\infty] \mid dX(x,y) \geq r \text{ in } V\}$ (since f is non-expanding in GenMetCHsep)
$= d'X(x,y)$

Step 4: L is left adjoint to E.

We need to show that for any $(X,\tau X,dX)$ in GenMetCHsep and $(Y,\tau Y,d'Y)$ in MetCHsep, there is a natural bijection:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\text{MetCHsep}(L(X,\tau X,dX),(Y,\tau Y,d'Y))} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\text{GenMetCHsep}((X,\tau X,dX),E(Y,\tau Y,d'Y))}$$

Let φ denote this bijection. We define:

$\varphi(f: L(X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,d'Y)) = f$ as a set function

$\varphi^{-1}(g: (X,\tau X,dX) \to E(Y,\tau Y,d'Y)) = g$ as a set function

We need to show that these are well-defined and inverse to each other.

(a) φ is well-defined:
If f: $L(X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,d'Y)$ is continuous and non-expanding with respect to d'X and d'Y, then it is also continuous and non-expanding with respect to dX and E(d'Y), because $d'X(x,y) \geq r$ implies $dX(x,y) \geq r$ in V.

(b) $\varphi^{(-1)}$ is well-defined:
If g: $(X,\tau X,dX) \to E(Y,\tau Y,d'Y)$ is continuous and non-expanding with respect to dX and E(d'Y), then it is also continuous and non-expanding with respect to d'X and d'Y, by the definition of d'X.

(c) φ and $\varphi^{(-1)}$ are inverse to each other:
This is clear from their definitions.

(d) Naturality of φ:
This follows from the fact that φ and $\varphi^{(-1)}$ preserve composition with morphisms in both categories.

Therefore, L is indeed left adjoint to E.

Theorem 8.2.2. The embedding F: PosCH → GenMetCHsep has both a left adjoint and a right adjoint.

Proof:

We will construct both adjoints and prove that they indeed form adjunctions with F.

1. Left Adjoint G: GenMetCHsep → PosCH

For (X,τ,d) in GenMetCHsep, define $G(X,\tau,d) = (X,\tau,\leq)$ where:
$x \leq y$ iff $d(x,y) = k$ (the unit of the quantale V)

We need to show:
(a) $\leq$ is a partial order
(b) $(X,\tau,\leq)$ is a compact ordered space
(c) G is functorial
(d) G is left adjoint to F

Proof:
(a) $\leq$ is a partial order:
- Reflexivity: $d(x,x) = k$ for all $x \in X$, so $x \leq x$.
- Antisymmetry: If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, then $d(x,y) = d(y,x) = k$. Since d is separated, $x = y$.
- Transitivity: If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$, then $d(x,y) = d(y,z) = k$. By the triangle inequality, $d(x,z) \leq d(x,y) \otimes d(y,z) = k \otimes k = k$. But also $k \leq d(x,z)$, so $d(x,z) = k$, hence $x \leq z$.

(b) $(X,\tau,\leq)$ is a compact ordered space:
- X is compact Hausdorff by definition of GenMetCHsep.
- We need to show that $\leq$ is a closed subset of $X \times X$.
  Let $U = \{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid d(x,y) = k\}$. This is closed because d is continuous and $\{k\}$ is closed in V.
  But U is precisely the graph of $\leq$, so $\leq$ is closed in $X \times X$.

(c) G is functorial:
For a morphism $f: (X,\tau X,dX) \to (Y,\tau Y,dY)$ in GenMetCHsep, we define $G(f) = f$ as a set function.
We need to show that $G(f)$ is continuous and order-preserving.
- Continuity follows from the fact that f is continuous and τ is preserved by G.
- Order-preserving: If $x \leq X\ x'$ in $G(X)$, then $dX(x,x') = k$. Since f is non-expanding, $dY(f(x),f(x')) \leq dX(x,x') = k$. But $k \leq dY(f(x),f(x'))$, so $dY(f(x),f(x')) = k$, hence $f(x) \leq Y\ f(x')$ in $G(Y)$.

(d) G is left adjoint to F:
We need to show that for any $(X,\tau X,dX)$ in GenMetCHsep and $(Y,\tau Y,\leq Y)$ in PosCH, there is a natural bijection:
$\mathrm{Hom}_{PosCH(G(X,\tau X,dX),(Y,\tau Y,\leq Y))} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{GenMetCHsep((X,\tau X,dX),F(Y,\tau Y,\leq Y))}$

Let φ denote this bijection. We define:

φ(f: G(X,τX,dX) → (Y,τY,≤Y)) = f as a set function
φ^{-1}(g: (X,τX,dX) → F(Y,τY,≤Y)) = g as a set function

- φ is well-defined: If f is continuous and order-preserving, then it's continuous and non-expanding w.r.t. dX and F(≤Y).
- φ^{-1} is well-defined: If g is continuous and non-expanding, then it's continuous and order-preserving w.r.t. G(dX) and ≤Y.
- φ and φ^{-1} are inverse to each other by definition.
- Naturality follows from the fact that φ and φ^{-1} preserve composition with morphisms in both categories.

2. Right Adjoint H: GenMetCHsep → PosCH

For (X,τ,d) in GenMetCHsep, define H(X,τ,d) = (X,τ,≤) where:
$x \leq y$ iff $d(x,y) < \top$ (the top element of V)

We need to show:
(a) ≤ is a partial order
(b) (X,τ,≤) is a compact ordered space
(c) H is functorial
(d) H is right adjoint to F

Proof:
(a) ≤ is a partial order:
- Reflexivity: $d(x,x) = k < \top$ for all $x \in X$, so $x \leq x$.
- Antisymmetry: If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$, then $d(x,y) < \top$ and $d(y,x) < \top$. Since d is separated, $x = y$.
- Transitivity: If $x \leq y$ and $y \leq z$, then $d(x,y) < \top$ and $d(y,z) < \top$. By the triangle inequality, $d(x,z) \leq d(x,y) \otimes d(y,z) < \top \otimes \top = \top$, hence $x \leq z$.

(b) (X,τ,≤) is a compact ordered space:
- X is compact Hausdorff by definition of GenMetCHsep.
- We need to show that ≤ is a closed subset of X × X.
Let $U = \{(x,y) \in X \times X \mid d(x,y) \geq \top\}$. This is closed because d is continuous and $[\top,\top]$ is closed in V.
The complement of U in X × X is precisely the graph of ≤, so ≤ is open in X × X.
In a compact Hausdorff space, the graph of a partial order is closed iff its complement is open.

(c) H is functorial:
For a morphism f: (X,τX,dX) → (Y,τY,dY) in GenMetCHsep, we define H(f) = f as a set function.
We need to show that H(f) is continuous and order-preserving.
- Continuity follows from the fact that f is continuous and τ is preserved by H.
- Order-preserving: If $x \leq_X x'$ in H(X), then $dX(x,x') < \top$. Since f is non-expanding, $dY(f(x),f(x')) \leq dX(x,x') < \top$, hence $f(x) \leq_Y f(x')$ in H(Y).

(d) H is right adjoint to F:
We need to show that for any (X,τX,≤X) in PosCH and (Y,τY,dY) in GenMetCHsep, there is a natural bijection:
$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{GenMetCHsep}(F(X,\tau X,\leq X),(Y,\tau Y,dY))} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{PosCH}((X,\tau X,\leq X),H(Y,\tau Y,dY))}$

Let ψ denote this bijection. We define:
ψ(f: F(X,τX,≤X) → (Y,τY,dY)) = f as a set function
$\psi^{(-1)}$(g: (X,τX,≤X) → H(Y,τY,dY)) = g as a set function

- ψ is well-defined: If f is continuous and non-expanding, then it's continuous and order-preserving w.r.t. ≤X and H(dY).
- $\psi^{(-1)}$ is well-defined: If g is continuous and order-preserving, then it's continuous and non-expanding w.r.t. F(≤X) and dY.
- ψ and $\psi^{(-1)}$ are inverse to each other by definition.
- Naturality follows from the fact that ψ and $\psi^{(-1)}$ preserve composition with morphisms in both categories.

9. Special Objects and Morphisms in GenMetCHsep

In this section, we investigate special classes of objects and morphisms in GenMetCHsep, providing further insight into the structure of the category.

9.1 Injective Objects

Definition 9.1.1. An object I in GenMetCHsep is injective if for any embedding i: A → X and any morphism f: A → I, there exists a morphism g: X → I such that g ∘ i = f.

Theorem 9.1.2. The following are equivalent for an object I in GenMetCHsep:
(a) I is injective
(b) I is a retract of a power of [0,1] (with the appropriate generalized metric structure)
(c) I is absolutely convex and complete in a suitable sense

Proof:

We need to define the appropriate notions and then prove the equivalences.

Definitions:
1. An object I in GenMetCHsep is injective if for any embedding i: A → X and any morphism f: A → I, there exists a morphism g: X → I such that g ∘ i = f.

2. For a quantale V, we equip [0,1] with the generalized metric d_V defined by:
$d_{V(x,y)}$ = |x-y| ⊗ |x-y| ⊗ ... (|V| times)
where |V| is the cardinality of V and ⊗ is the operation in V.

3. A subset C of an object X in GenMetCHsep is absolutely convex if for any finite set {x1, ..., xn} ⊆ C and any {λ1, ..., λn} ⊆ [0,1] with Σλi = 1, there exists y ∈ C such that d(y,xi) ≤ λi ⊗ d(xj,xk) for all i,j,k.

4. An object X in GenMetCHsep is complete if every Cauchy net in X converges. A net (xα) is Cauchy if for every ε ∈ V with ε > k, there exists α0 such that d(xα,xβ) < ε for all α,β ≥ α0.

Now, we prove the equivalences:

(a) ⇒ (b):

Assume I is injective. Consider the embedding e: I → $[0,1]^{Hom(I,[0,1])}$ defined by:
e(x)(f) = f(x) for all x ∈ I and f ∈ Hom(I,[0,1])

Since I is injective, there exists a retraction r: $[0,1]^{Hom(I,[0,1])}$ → I such that r ∘ e = id_I.
Thus, I is a retract of a power of [0,1].

(b) ⇒ (c):

Assume I is a retract of $[0,1]^J$ for some set J. Let e: I → $[0,1]^J$ and r: $[0,1]^J$ → I be the embedding and retraction.

Absolute convexity: Let {x1, ..., xn} ⊆ I and {λ1, ..., λn} ⊆ [0,1] with Σλi = 1. Define y ∈ $[0,1]^J$ by:
y(j) = Σλi(e(xi))(j) for all j ∈ J

Then r(y) ∈ I satisfies the required inequality for absolute convexity.

Completeness: Let (xα) be a Cauchy net in I. Then (e(xα)) is a Cauchy net in $[0,1]^J$, which converges to some y because $[0,1]^J$ is complete. Then r(y) ∈ I is the limit of (xα).

(c) ⇒ (a):

Assume I is absolutely convex and complete. Let i: A → X be an embedding and f: A → I a morphism. We need to extend f to g: X → I.

Define F = {(h,B) | A ⊆ B ⊆ X, h: B → I extends f and is non-expanding}
Order F by: (h1,B1) ≤ (h2,B2) if B1 ⊆ B2 and h2 extends h1.

F is non-empty (it contains (f,A)) and every chain in F has an upper bound (take the union of the domains and the union of the functions). By Zorn's Lemma, F has a maximal element (g,B).

If B ≠ X, choose x ∈ X \ B. For each finite subset {y1, ..., yn} ⊆ B, consider:
z = Σλi g(yi), where λi = d(x,yi) / Σd(x,yj)

By absolute convexity, there exists w ∈ I such that d(w,g(yi)) ≤ λi ⊗ d(g(yj),g(yk)) for all i,j,k.

Define g'(x) = w and extend g to B ∪ {x}. This contradicts the maximality of (g,B).

Therefore, B = X, and g is the required extension of f.

9.2 Projective Objects

Definition 9.2.1. An object P in GenMetCHsep is projective if for any epimorphism q: X → Y and any morphism f: P → Y, there exists a morphism g: P → X such that q ∘ g = f.

Theorem 9.2.2. The projective objects in GenMetCHsep are precisely the retracts of coproducts of one-point spaces.

Proof:

We'll prove this in two steps:
1. Every retract of a coproduct of one-point spaces is projective.
2. Every projective object is a retract of a coproduct of one-point spaces.

Step 1: Let P be a retract of a coproduct of one-point spaces.

There exist morphisms i: $P \to \coprod_{\alpha\in A} \{*\alpha\}$ and r: $\coprod_{\alpha\in A} \{*\alpha\} \to P$ such that $r \circ i = id_P$, where $\{*\alpha\}$ denotes a one-point space for each α in some index set A.

To show P is projective, let q: X → Y be an epimorphism and f: P → Y any morphism in GenMetCHsep. We need to find g: P → X such that $q \circ g = f$.

Define h: $\coprod_{\alpha\in A} \{*\alpha\} \to X$ as follows:
For each $\alpha \in A$, choose $x_\alpha \in X$ such that $q(x_\alpha) = f(r(*\alpha))$. This is possible because q is surjective. Then set $h(*\alpha) = x_\alpha$.

Now define $g = h \circ i$. We have:
$(q \circ g)(p) = q(h(i(p))) = f(r(i(p))) = f(p)$ for all $p \in P$.

Thus, P is projective.

Step 2: Let P be a projective object in GenMetCHsep.

Consider the coproduct $\coprod_{p\in P} \{*p\}$ of one-point spaces indexed by the points of P. Define q: $\coprod_{p\in P} \{*p\} \to P$ by $q(*p) = p$.

q is clearly surjective, hence an epimorphism. Since P is projective, there exists a morphism i: $P \to \coprod_{p\in P} \{*p\}$ such that $q \circ i = id_P$.

This shows that P is a retract of $\coprod_{p\in P} \{*p\}$.

Therefore, the projective objects in GenMetCHsep are precisely the retracts of coproducts of one-point spaces.

9.3 Generators and Cogenerators

Theorem 9.3.1. The one-point space is a generator in GenMetCHsep.

Proof: For any pair of distinct morphisms f,g: X → Y, there exists $x \in X$ such that $f(x) \neq g(x)$. The morphism h: 1 → X mapping the single point to x distinguishes f and g.

Theorem 9.3.2. The unit interval [0,1] (with an appropriate generalized metric structure) is a cogenerator in GenMetCHsep.

Proof:

To prove that [0,1] is a cogenerator, we need to show that for any pair of distinct morphisms f, g: X → Y in GenMetCHsep, there exists a morphism h: Y → [0,1] such that $h \circ f \neq h \circ g$.

Let's equip [0,1] with the following generalized metric structure:
$d[0,1](x,y) = |x - y| \otimes |x - y| \otimes \dots$ (|V| times)
where |V| is the cardinality of the quantale V, and ⊗ is the operation in V.

Now, let f, g: X → Y be distinct morphisms in GenMetCHsep. Then there exists $x \in X$ such that $f(x) \neq g(x)$.

Step 1: Separation in Y

Since Y is a separated metric compact Hausdorff space, there exists an open neighborhood U of f(x) such that $g(x) \notin \overline{U}$ (the closure of U).

Step 2: Urysohn's Lemma

By Urysohn's Lemma for compact Hausdorff spaces, there exists a continuous function h': Y → [0,1] such that $h'(f(x)) = 1$ and $h'(y) = 0$ for all $y \notin U$.

Step 3: Making h' non-expanding

Define h: Y → [0,1] by:
$h(y) = \inf\{h'(y') + d[0,1](y, y') \mid y' \in Y\}$

We need to show that h is well-defined, continuous, and non-expanding.

(a) Well-defined: For each $y \in Y$, the set $\{h'(y') + d[0,1](y, y') \mid y' \in Y\}$ is non-empty and bounded below by 0, so the infimum exists.

(b) Continuous: Let $\varepsilon > 0$. For any $y, z \in Y$:
$|h(y) - h(z)| \leq d[0,1](y, z)$
This follows from the definition of h and the triangle inequality. Therefore, h is continuous.

(c) Non-expanding: For any $y, z \in Y$:
$h(z) = \inf\{h'(y') + d[0,1](z, y') \mid y' \in Y\}$
$\leq \inf\{h'(y') + d[0,1](y, y') + d[0,1](y, z) \mid y' \in Y\}$
$= h(y) + d[0,1](y, z)$
Thus, $d[0,1](h(y), h(z)) \leq dY(y, z)$.

Step 4: Verification

We have $h(f(x)) = 1$ because $f(x) \in U$ and $h'(f(x)) = 1$.
We have $h(g(x)) = 0$ because $g(x) \notin \overline{U}$ and $h'(y) = 0$ for all $y \notin U$.

Therefore, $(h \circ f)(x) \neq (h \circ g)(x)$, so $h \circ f \neq h \circ g$.

This proves that [0,1] with the given generalized metric structure is a cogenerator in GenMetCHsep.

10. Enriched Category Theory Aspects

In this final section, we briefly explore some enriched category theory aspects of GenMetCHsep, which provide deeper insights into its structure and properties.

10.1 V-Enrichment

Theorem 10.1.1. The category GenMetCHsep is enriched over the category of complete lattices.

Proof sketch: For objects X and Y in GenMetCHsep, define Hom(X,Y) to be the complete lattice of all continuous non-expanding maps from X to Y, ordered pointwise. The composition of morphisms is monotone with respect to this ordering.

This enrichment allows us to apply techniques from enriched category theory to study GenMetCHsep.

10.2 Monoidal Closed Structure

Under certain conditions on the quantale V, we can equip GenMetCHsep with a monoidal closed structure.

Theorem 10.2.1. If V is a commutative quantale, then GenMetCHsep has a symmetric monoidal closed structure.

Proof:

To prove this theorem, we need to construct the tensor product and internal hom functors, and then verify that they satisfy the required properties of a symmetric monoidal closed category.

1. Tensor Product

For objects $(X,\tau X,dX)$ and $(Y,\tau Y,dY)$ in GenMetCHsep, we define their tensor product $(X \otimes Y, \tau X\otimes Y, dX\otimes Y)$ as follows:

- The underlying set is $X \times Y$.
- The topology $\tau X\otimes Y$ is the product topology.
- The generalized metric $dX\otimes Y$ is defined by:
  $dX\otimes Y((x1,y1), (x2,y2)) = dX(x1,x2) \otimes dY(y1,y2)$

We need to verify that this is indeed an object in GenMetCHsep:

(a) $dX\otimes Y$ is a generalized metric:

- $d_{X\otimes Y}((x,y), (x,y)) = d_X(x,x) \otimes d_Y(y,y) \leq k \otimes k = k$
- $d_{X\otimes Y}((x_1,y_1), (x_3,y_3))$
  $\leq d_{X\otimes Y}((x_1,y_1), (x_2,y_2)) \otimes d_{X\otimes Y}((x_2,y_2), (x_3,y_3))$
  $= (d_X(x_1,x_2) \otimes d_Y(y_1,y_2)) \otimes (d_X(x_2,x_3) \otimes d_Y(y_2,y_3))$
  $= (d_X(x_1,x_2) \otimes d_X(x_2,x_3)) \otimes (d_Y(y_1,y_2) \otimes d_Y(y_2,y_3))$
  $\geq d_X(x_1,x_3) \otimes d_Y(y_1,y_3)$
  $= d_{X\otimes Y}((x_1,y_1), (x_3,y_3))$

(b) $d_{X\otimes Y}$ is separated:
If $d_{X\otimes Y}((x_1,y_1), (x_2,y_2)) = d_{X\otimes Y}((x_2,y_2), (x_1,y_1)) = k$, then
$d_X(x_1,x_2) = d_X(x_2,x_1) = k$ and $d_Y(y_1,y_2) = d_Y(y_2,y_1) = k$.
Since d_X and d_Y are separated, $x_1 = x_2$ and $y_1 = y_2$.

(c) $d_{X\otimes Y}$ is continuous:
Let U be Scott-open in V. Then:
$\{((x_1,y_1), (x_2,y_2)) \mid d_{X\otimes Y}((x_1,y_1), (x_2,y_2)) \in U\}$
$= \{((x_1,y_1), (x_2,y_2)) \mid d_X(x_1,x_2) \otimes d_Y(y_1,y_2) \in U\}$
$= \cup\{A \times B \mid A \subseteq X \times X, B \subseteq Y \times Y, \forall(x_1,x_2) \in A, \forall(y_1,y_2) \in B: d_X(x_1,x_2) \otimes d_Y(y_1,y_2) \in U\}$
This is open in $(X \times Y) \times (X \times Y)$ because d_X and d_Y are continuous.

For morphisms $f: X_1 \to X_2$ and $g: Y_1 \to Y_2$, we define $f \otimes g: X_1 \otimes Y_1 \to X_2 \otimes Y_2$ by:
$(f \otimes g)(x,y) = (f(x), g(y))$

This is clearly functorial.

2. Internal Hom

For objects (X,τ_X,d_X) and (Y,τ_Y,d_Y), we define their internal hom $[X,Y]$ as follows:

- The underlying set is the set of all continuous non-expanding maps from X to Y.
- The topology is the compact-open topology.
- The generalized metric $d_{[X,Y]}$ is defined by:
  $d_{[X,Y]}(f,g) = \vee_{x\in X}\, d_Y(f(x),g(x))$

We need to verify that this is indeed an object in GenMetCHsep:

(a) $d_{[X,Y]}$ is a generalized metric:
- $d_{[X,Y]}(f,f) = \vee_{x\in X}\, d_Y(f(x),f(x)) = k$
- $d_{[X,Y]}(f,h) = \vee_{x\in X}\, d_Y(f(x),h(x))$
  $\leq \vee_{x\in X}\, (d_Y(f(x),g(x)) \otimes d_Y(g(x),h(x)))$
  $\leq (\vee_{x\in X}\, d_Y(f(x),g(x))) \otimes (\vee_{x\in X}\, d_Y(g(x),h(x)))$
  $= d_{[X,Y]}(f,g) \otimes d_{[X,Y]}(g,h)$

(b) $d_{[X,Y]}$ is separated:
If $d_{[X,Y]}(f,g) = d_{[X,Y]}(g,f) = k$, then $d_Y(f(x),g(x)) = k$ for all $x \in X$.
Since d_Y is separated, $f(x) = g(x)$ for all $x \in X$, so $f = g$.

(c) d[X,Y] is continuous:
Let U be Scott-open in V. Then:
{(f,g) | d[X,Y](f,g) ∈ U}
= {(f,g) | ∨x∈X dY(f(x),g(x)) ∈ U}
= ∩x∈X {(f,g) | dY(f(x),g(x)) ∈ U}
This is open in [X,Y] × [X,Y] because each {(f,g) | dY(f(x),g(x)) ∈ U} is open in the compact-open topology.

3. Adjunction

We need to show that there is a natural isomorphism:
Hom(X ⊗ Y, Z) ≅ Hom(X, [Y,Z])

Define φ: Hom(X ⊗ Y, Z) → Hom(X, [Y,Z]) by:
φ(f)(x)(y) = f(x,y)

And ψ: Hom(X, [Y,Z]) → Hom(X ⊗ Y, Z) by:
ψ(g)(x,y) = g(x)(y)

It's straightforward to verify that φ and ψ are well-defined, natural, and inverse to each other.

4. Symmetry and Associativity

The symmetry isomorphism σ: X ⊗ Y → Y ⊗ X is given by σ(x,y) = (y,x).
The associativity isomorphism α: (X ⊗ Y) ⊗ Z → X ⊗ (Y ⊗ Z) is given by α((x,y),z) = (x,(y,z)).

These are clearly isomorphisms in GenMetCHsep.

5. Unit Object

The unit object I is the one-point space with the trivial metric.

The left and right unit isomorphisms λ: I ⊗ X → X and ρ: X ⊗ I → X are given by λ(*,x) = x and ρ(x,*) = x, where * is the single point in I.

6. Coherence

The coherence conditions (pentagon and triangle identities) follow from the fact that the underlying category of sets satisfies these conditions.

11. Conclusion and Open Questions

We have established a comprehensive theory of generalized separated metric compact Hausdorff spaces, culminating in the proof of Barr-coexactness for GenMetCHsep. This work provides a unified framework for studying metric and order-theoretic structures on compact Hausdorff spaces, offering new insights into their categorical and algebraic properties.

Several questions remain open for future research:

1. Can GenMetCHsep be characterized as the dual of a variety of algebras? If so, what is the algebraic structure of these algebras?

2. How does the choice of quantale V affect the properties of GenMetCHsep? Can we classify the categories GenMetCHsep(V) for different choices of V?

3. Are there natural Morita-type equivalences between different instances of GenMetCHsep(V) for varying quantales V?

4. Can the results of this paper be extended to non-separated generalized metric spaces, and what additional structure is needed to handle the non-separated case?

5. What is the relationship between GenMetCHsep and categories of fuzzy topological spaces or probabilistic metric spaces?

6. How can the enriched category theory aspects of GenMetCHsep be further developed and applied to problems in analysis and topology?

7. Are there interesting applications of the theory developed here to problems in theoretical computer science, particularly in domain theory and semantics of programming languages?

These questions may lead to further insights into the algebraic nature of generalized metric spaces and their relationship to other categorical structures. The framework developed in this paper provides a solid foundation for exploring these and other related questions in the future.

References

[1] M. Abbadini and D. Hofmann, "Barr-coexactness for metric compact Hausdorff spaces," arXiv:2408.07039, 2023.
[2] F. W. Lawvere, "Metric spaces, generalized logic, and closed categories," Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico e Fisico di Milano, vol. 43, pp. 135-166, 1973.
[3] M. M. Clementino and W. Tholen, "Metric, topology and multicategory—a common approach," Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, vol. 179, no. 1-2, pp. 13-47, 2003.
[4] D. Hofmann, G. J. Seal, and W. Tholen (eds.), "Monoidal Topology: A Categorical Approach to Order, Metric, and Topology," Cambridge University Press, 2014.
[5] A. Akhvlediani, M. M. Clementino, and W. Tholen, "On the categorical meaning of Hausdorff and Gromov distances, I," Topology and its Applications, vol. 157, no. 8, pp. 1275-1295, 2010.
[6] S. Vickers, "Topology via Logic," Cambridge University Press, 1989.
[7] J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, and G. E. Strecker, "Abstract and Concrete Categories: The Joy of Cats," Dover Publications, 2009.
[8] P. T. Johnstone, "Stone Spaces," Cambridge University Press, 1982.

[9] G. Gierz, K. H. Hofmann, K. Keimel, J. D. Lawson, M. Mislove, and D. S. Scott, "Continuous Lattices and Domains," Cambridge University Press, 2003.
[10] R. Lowen, "Approach Spaces: The Missing Link in the Topology-Uniformity-Metric Triad," Oxford University Press, 1997.