# CATEGORICAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN GRAPH THEORY

#### **RICHARD T. BUMBY**

Department of Mathematics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

and

#### DANA MAY LATCH

Department of Mathematics North Carolina State University Raleigh, North Carolina 27650

(Received January 9, 1984)

ABSTRACT. This paper presents some graph-theoretic questions from the viewpoint of the portion of category theory which has become common knowledge. In parcicular, the reader is encouraged to consider whether there is only one natural category of graphs and how theories of directed graphs and undirected graphs are related.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Category of graphs, algebraic structure. 1980 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODES. 05C99, 18B99, 18C99.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The use of category theory in graph theory is no longer novel (P. Hell [1]), and methods of category theory have been made generally available to the "Working Mathematician". The main category theoretic topics that we need and the section number of MacLane [2] in which they may be found are: adjoint functors (Chap. IV); representable functors (Sect. III.2); Kan extensions (Chap. IX); functor categories (Sect. II.4); monads (Chap. VI); and cartesian closed categories (Sect. IV.6). Nevertheless, one can find examples in the literature of errors, imprecision, or laborious constructions of special cases. As a result of reviewing some of this work for Mathematical Reviews, we set ourselves the task of presenting a sound description of some of the material which seemed most susceptible to these flaws.

In particular, we wish to answer the question in the title of the paper of Harary and Read [3] with a firm "No!", and elaborate on defects noted in the reviews of Farzan and Waller [4] and Ribenboim [5] (see also Ribenboim [6]). The concepts of "involutorial graph" and "hom-graph" are defined by Ribenboim without citing any earlier work. This makes it difficult to assess their pedigree. We shall present evidence that, as originally presented, these definitions were wrong since they did not account for the category theoretical properties which have been recognized as essential parts of the algebraic structure and cartesian closedness. The difficulty with a study of a "category of graphs" is that graph theory was born as a branch of combinatorics which leans towards defining graphs in terms of adjacency properties of a set of vertices, which restrict the available objects and ignores the relations between them, while category theory emphasizes the structure preserving mappings (morphisms) and gives its best results where one is able to construct objects "freely determined by some properties".

Our first observation is that directed graphs are easier to describe than undirected graphs. In Section 2, we construct categories which give satisfactory descriptions of <u>a</u> category of directed graphs and which have simple categorical descriptions (as functor categories). The construction of a category of undirected graphs is discussed in Section 3.

Second, vertices and edges have traditionally been considered to be different things, but Ribenboim treated vertices as being degenerate edges. In Section 2, we study the relationship between the categories of directed graphs which model these two definitions. In Section 4, we observe that the "Cartesian" structure has more intuitively satisfying properties when the vertices are considered as degenerate edges.

Section 3 is devoted to recapturing an undirected graph from one of its canonically generated directed graphs. This process uses the theory of monads which stems from the definition of "algebraic structure" in the context of category theory. 2. TWO POSSIBLE DEFINITIONS OF "DIRECTED GRAPH"

In order to describe a directed graph G, one first specifies a set V of <u>vertices</u> and a set E of <u>edges</u>. Each edge is considered as starting at a vertex, called its <u>origin</u> and going to another vertex, called its <u>terminal</u>. Actually, these assignments define functions o (for origin) and t (for terminal) from E to V. This definition allows oriented graphs to have <u>multiple edges</u>  $(e_1, e_2 \in E$  with  $e_1 \neq e_2$ ,  $o(e_1) = o(e_2)$  and  $t(e_1) = t(e_2)$  and <u>loops</u> (e  $\in E$  with o(e) = t(e)). Often, such graphs are excluded in combinatorial graph theory problems.

This definition is equivalent to defining a directed graph as a functor from the category  $\underline{A}^{op}$  (see Figure 1) to the category Ens, of sets.



Figure 1. The category  $\underline{A}$ 

Clearly, G[0] corresponds to V and G[1] to E. Then, without loss of generality, the functions  $G(\delta^1):G[1] \rightarrow G[0]$  and  $G(\delta^0):G[1] \rightarrow G[0]$  are the maps <u>origin</u> and <u>terminal</u>, respectively.

If graphs are functors, then the appropriate definition of "graph morphism" should be a natural transformation between these functors. Such a natural transformation

$$f:G_1 \xrightarrow{\bullet} G_2:A^{op} \rightarrow Ens$$

is given by a map of vertices  $f[0]:G_1[0] + G_2[0]$  and a map of edges  $f[1]:G_1[1] + G_2[1]$  which "commute with" <u>origin</u> and <u>terminal</u>. Thus a category of directed graphs can be modeled by the functor category  $[A^{op}, Ens]$ .

By contrast, considering vertices to be "degenerate edges" leads one to view the category of graphs as the functor category  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  (see Figure 2).



Figure 2. The Category B

If  $H:\underline{B}^{op} \rightarrow Ens$ , then H[0] represents the <u>vertices</u> of H and H[1], the <u>edges</u> of H. The functions  $H(\delta^1):H[1] \rightarrow H[0]$  and  $H(\delta^0):H[1] \rightarrow H[0]$  are again said to be <u>origin</u> and <u>terminal</u>, respectively. In addition, the identities  $\sigma^0 \delta^1 = Id_{[0]}, i = 0, 1$  in <u>B</u> insure that the function  $H(\sigma^0):H[0] \rightarrow H[1]$  is an embedding of the set of vertices into the set of edges of H, mapping each vertex to a loop based at that vertex. Thus, each vertex can be thought of as a "degenerate edge".

Since  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  and  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  are both examples of functor categories, we are able to use general properties of functor categories to describe the fundamental category-theoretic constructions within each category, and to relate these two candidates for a category of directed graphs. The first principle which we use is that limits and colimits (including the terminal object as a special case of a limit and the initial object as a special case of a colimit) are computed "pointwise".

For example, the null set  $\emptyset$  is an initial object in Ens since there is a unique (null) map of  $\emptyset$  into every set. An initial object in  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  or  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  is a graph with no vertices, no edges, and all structural maps null. The null graph is thus essential to a categorical approach.

Similarly, since a terminal object of Ens is any one pointed set, the terminal object of  $[\underline{A}^{op}, \text{Ens}]$  must have one vertex and one edge which is a loop. In  $[\underline{B}^{op}, \text{Ens}]$ , the unique edge of the terminal object T is degenerate. Thus T has the property of representing the vertex set of a graph, i.e., H[0] and the hom-set  $[\underline{B}^{op}, \text{Ens}](T, H)$  are isomorphic as sets, for each graph H. In fact,  $\_[0]:[\underline{B}^{op}, \text{Ens}] \neq \text{Ens}$  and  $[\underline{B}^{op}, \text{Ens}](T, \_):[\underline{B}^{op}, \text{Ens}] \neq \text{Ens}$  are functors which are naturally equivalent.

Since a product in a category is a limit, products in  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  and  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ are also computed "pointwise". The product  $P = G \times G'$  of  $\underline{A}$ -graphs G and G' has vertices  $P[0] = G[0] \times G'[0]$  and edges  $P[1] = G[1] \times G'[1]$ . The origin and terminal maps from P[1] to P[0] are constructed canonically from these maps in G and G'

EXAMPLE. Suppose G and G' each have one edge connecting two distinct vertices (e from a to b and e' from a' to b', respectively). Then  $P[0] = \{(a,a'), (a,b'), (b,a'), (b,b')\}; P[1] = \{(e,e')\}; P(\delta^1)(e,e') = (a,a');$  and  $P(\delta^0)(e,e') = (b,b')$  (see Figure 3).



Figure 3. The <u>A</u>-graph  $G \times G'$ 

EXAMPLE. The product Q of <u>B</u>-graphs H and H' has  $Q[0] = H[0] \times H'[0]$  and  $Q[1] = H[1] \times H'[1]$  with  $Q(\delta^0)$ ,  $Q(\delta^1)$  and  $Q(\sigma^0)$  constructed from the corresponding maps in H and H'. In particular, if H and H' each have two vertices and one nondegenerate edge, then the product graph Q has four vertices and nine edges, four of which are degenerate (see Figure 4).



Figure 4. The <u>B</u>-graph  $H \times H'$ 

Since the same construction can product very different results in  $[\underline{\underline{A}}^{op}, Ens]$  and  $[\underline{\underline{B}}^{op}, Ens]$ , it is desirable to be able to relate these two categories so that constructions in one would be naturally "induced" in the other.

The inclusion  $u: \underline{A} \xrightarrow{\longleftarrow} \underline{B}$  of  $\underline{A}$  as a subcategory of  $\underline{B}$  induces a (forgetful) functor

$$U:[\underline{B}^{OP},Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{OP},Ens]$$

For a <u>B</u>-graph H, the <u>A</u>-graph U(H) is just the restriction of H to the subcategory <u>A</u><sup>op</sup> of <u>B</u><sup>op</sup>. In the <u>A</u>-graph U(H), the degenerate edges  $H(\sigma^0)v$ , for various vertices  $v \in H[0]$ , are no longer distinguished. The restriction of natural transformations gives no difficulty, and it is easy to verify that  $U:[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens] + [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  is actually a functor.

Because  $U:[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  is defined by composition with the inclusion  $u^{op}: \underline{A}^{op} \rightarrow \underline{B}^{op}$ , it induces more structure: U has both left and right adjoints which are the Kan extensions L and R. These are described below.

For each <u>A</u>-graph G, L(G), the "<u>B</u>-graph freely generated by G", is obtained by adding to G[1] a new degenerate edge  $\clubsuit$ , one for each vertex  $v \in G[0]$ , and setting L(G)( $\sigma^0$ )(v) =  $\hat{v}$ . If f:G  $\neq$  G' is an <u>A</u>-morphism (i.e., a natural transformation from the functor G to the functor G'), then L(f):L(G)  $\neq$  L(G') is defined to agree with f when "restricted to G" and to satisfy

$$(L(f)[1])(\hat{v}) = (f[0])(v).$$

To see that  $L:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  is the left adjoint of  $U:[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ , one shows that there is a <u>natural</u> one-to-one correspondence

$$\psi(G,H):[\underline{B}^{op},Ens](L(G),H) \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{op},Ens](G,U(H))$$

for each A-graph G and each B-graph H.

This adjoint relationship may also be described in terms of the unit natural transformation

$$n:1d \rightarrow UL:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$$

or the counit natural transformation

$$\varepsilon: LU \rightarrow 1d: [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$$

of the adjoint pair <L,U>. We now construct both natural transformations. The construction, given above, for the <u>B</u>-graph L(G) may be restricted to  $\underline{A}^{op}$  to give the <u>A</u>-graph UL(G). This construction yields G as a specific subgraph of UL(G); the collection of these inclusions  $\Pi_{G}: G \rightarrow UL(G)$  is natural in G. In fact, this collection is the unit natural transformation of the adjunction <L,U>. Similarly, the counit  $\varepsilon:LU \rightarrow Id$  is given by describing the <u>B</u>-graph morphism  $\varepsilon_{H}:LU(H) \rightarrow H$  for each <u>B</u>-graph H. The graph LU(H) differs from H by the addition of new degenerate edges for each vertex, the old ones having lost their distinction in U(H). The <u>B</u>-graph epimorphism  $\varepsilon_{H}$  is the identity on  $H \subseteq LU(H)$  and maps each new degenerate  $\hat{v}$  added by L to the original degenerate edge  $H(\sigma^{0})(v)$  in H[1]. Next, the adjoint relationship <L,U> may be verified by demonstrating that the following composites are identity natural transformations:

$$U \xrightarrow{\eta U} ULU \xrightarrow{U\varepsilon} U$$

$$U \xrightarrow{L\eta} LUL \xrightarrow{\varepsilon L} L$$

Lastly, note that neither  $\epsilon_{\rm H}^{}$  nor  $\,n_{\rm G}^{}$  can be an isomorphism unless H or G, respectively, is a null graph.

The right adjoint

$$R:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$$

is given as follows: for each <u>A</u>-graph G, R(G) is the <u>B</u>-graph whose vertex set R(G)[0] is the collection of all <u>loops</u> of G (i.e. edges  $l \in G[1]$  with  $G(\delta^1)(l) = G(\delta^0)(l)$ ). The set of edges R(G)[1] is the collection of all triples  $<li_0, e, l_1 >$  of edges of G with  $l_0, l_1$  loops and e an edge having origin the vertex of  $l_0$  and terminal the vertex of  $l_1$ , i.e.  $G(\delta^1)(l_0) = G(\delta^0)(l_0) = G(\delta^1)(e)$ and  $G(\delta^1)(l_1) = G(\delta^0)(l_1) = G(\delta^0)(e)$ . The origin and terminal of  $<l_0, e, l_1 > are$   $l_0, l_1$ , respectively; i.e.  $(R(G))(\delta^1) < l_0, e, l_1 > = l_0$  and  $(R(G))(\delta^0) < l_0, e, l_1 > = l_1$ . Lastly, the distinguished R(G)-loop at the R(G)-vertex l is <l, l, l>; i.e.  $(R(G))(\sigma^0)(l) = <l, l, l>$ . The unit natural transformation  $\eta: ld \rightarrow RU: [\underline{B}^{OP}, Ens] + [\underline{B}^{OP}, Ens]$  consists of the <u>B</u>-morphisms  $\eta_H: H + RU(H)$ . Particularly,  $\eta_H$  carries a vertex v of the <u>B</u>-graph H to the vertex of RU(H) which is the degenerate loop  $H(\sigma^0)(v)$ , i.e.  $\eta_H(v) = H(\sigma^0)(v)$ ; and  $\eta_H$  maps an edge e of H with origin v and terminal w to the edge  $<H(\sigma^0)v_e, H(\sigma^0)w>$ , i.e.  $\eta_H(e) = <H(\sigma^0\delta^1)e, e, H(\sigma^0\delta^0)e>$ . Clearly,  $\eta_H: H + RU(H)$  is the <u>B</u>-monomorphism which identifies H with the <u>full</u> subgraph of RU(H) generated by vertices  $\{H(\sigma^0)v|v \in H[0]\}$ . The counit  $\varepsilon: UR \cdot Id: [\underline{A}^{op}, \varepsilonns] + [\underline{A}^{op}, \varepsilonns]$  is analogously defined to be a family of A-graph morphisms  $\varepsilon_G: UR(G) \neq G$ . The vertices of UR(G) are the loops of G. The A-morphism  $\varepsilon_G$  maps such a loop to its vertex  $G(\delta^0)(\ell) = G(\delta^1)(\ell)$  and carries an edge  $\langle \ell_0, e, \ell_1 \rangle$  to the edge e; i.e.  $\varepsilon_G[0](\ell) = G(\delta^0)(\ell)$  and  $\varepsilon_G[1] \langle \ell_0, e, \ell_1 \rangle = e$ . Thus  $\varepsilon_G$  "compresses" UR(G) onto the full A-subgraph of G generated by those vertices having loops.

Note that  $\varepsilon_{G}$  is an A-graph isomorphism if and only if at each vertex of G, there is precisely one loop. Similarly,  $n_{H}$  is a B-graph isomorphism exactly when each loop of H is a degenerate loop  $H(\sigma^{0})v$ . Therefore U and R induce an isomorphism between the full subcategories A of A-graphs with exactly one loop per vertex and B of B-graphs with only degenerate loops.

These ideas above illustrate the first part of the following theorem whose second part we use later.

THEOREM 2.1 (Lambek and Rattray). Let  $S:X \xrightarrow{} Y:T$  be a pair of adjoint functors with unit  $n:ld \xrightarrow{} TS:X + X$  and counit  $\varepsilon:ST \xrightarrow{} ld:Y + Y$ . Then T and S induce an equivalence between  $Fix(TS,n) = \{X \in obX | n_X: X \xrightarrow{} TS(X)\}$  and  $Fix(ST,\varepsilon) = \{Y \in obY | \varepsilon_Y:ST() \xrightarrow{\cong} Y\}$ . Moreover, the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) the triple (TS, $\eta$ ,T $\varepsilon$ S) on X is idempotent;
- (ii) nT is a natural isomorphism;
- (iii) the cotriple (ST, $\varepsilon$ ,SnT) on <u>V</u> is idempotent;
- (iv)  $\epsilon S$  is a natural isomorphism;
- (v) TS:X + X factors through the subcategory Fix(TS,n);
- (vi)  $ST: Y \rightarrow Y$  factors through the subcategory  $Fix(ST, \epsilon)$ .

If these conditions hold, Fix(TS,n) is a reflective subcategory of <u>X</u> with reflector the factorization (v) and  $Fix(ST,\epsilon)$  is a coreflective subcategory of Y with coreflector the factorization (vi).

PROOF. See Lambek and Rattray [8], Theorem 1.1.

In the example just discussed,  $S:X + \underline{V}$  is  $U:[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens] + [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  and  $T: \underline{V} + X$  is the right adjoint  $R:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] + [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ . The condition for  $Fix(RU,n) \subseteq [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  to be reflective and  $Fix(UR,\varepsilon) \subseteq [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  to be coreflective fail. Consider  $n_{RG}: RG + RU(RG)$  where G is a graph with one vertex v and two loops  $\ell_0, \ell_1$  at v. Then RG has two vertices  $\{\ell_0, \ell_1\}$ , each with two loops

$$\{\langle \ell_0, \ell_i, \ell_0 \rangle, \langle \ell_1, \ell_i, \ell_1 \rangle\}, \quad i = 0, 1.$$
(2.1)

However, RU(RG) has four vertices, the four loops (2.1). Thus  $\eta_{RG}$  fails to be an isomorphism and condition (ii) above does not hold. In fact, Fix(RU, $\eta$ ) is not coreflective since the inclusion does not preserve colimits.

Suppose we compose the adjunction  $S:X \xrightarrow{V} Y:T$  with an adjoint pair  $M:Y \xrightarrow{Z} Z:N$  then Theorem 2.1 applies to the composite adjunction  $MS:X \xrightarrow{Z} Z:NT$ . In particular, if  $\underline{Z}$  is a reflective subcategory of  $\underline{Y}$  with idempotent cotriple (MSTN, $\varepsilon$ ,MSnTN), then there is a reflective subcategory  $\underline{X}_1$  of  $\underline{X}$ , guaranteed by Theorem 2.1 which is equivalent to a coreflective subcategory  $\underline{Z}_1$  of  $\underline{Z}$ .

As an illustration, let  $\Gamma_1$  be the full reflective subcategory of [ $\underline{A}^{op}$ , Ens] generated by all <u>A</u>-graphs which have at most one loop at each vertex. The left

adjoint (usually called the reflector)  $M: [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] + \Gamma_1$  of the inclusion  $N:\Gamma_1 \leftrightarrow [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  maps each <u>A</u>-graph G to the quotient <u>A</u>-graph G<sub>1</sub> with the same vertices as G, the same edges between distinct vertices, but having only one loop at each vertex at which G has loops and having no new loops. Applying  $\text{UR:} [\underline{A}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ens}] \rightarrow [\underline{A}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ens}]$  to a graph  $\text{NG}_1$  with  $\text{G}_1 \in \Gamma_1$ , yields the full subgraph  $UR(G_1)$  of  $NG_1$  generated by the vertices of  $NG_1$  at which there is a loop. Note that  $UR(G_1)$  is already in the subcategory  $\Gamma_1$ ; hence the function  $M: [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow \Gamma_1$ , has no further effect and  $MURN(G_1) = URN(G_1)^{end} NG_1$ . Iterating this construction yields the same graph, up to isomorphism. Thus condition (vi) of Theorem 2.1 holds, and all the other equivalent properties (i)-(v) and the conclusions of Theorem 2.1 follow. Particularly, the <u>coreflective</u> subcategory [ of  $\Gamma_1$  consisting of <u>A</u>-graphs with exactly one loop per vertex is equivalent to the <u>reflective</u> subcategory  $\Delta$  of <u>B</u>-graphs with only degenerate loops. Note that  $\Gamma = Fix(UR, \epsilon)$  and  $\Delta = Fix(RU, \eta)$  for the original adjunction U: [ $\underline{B}^{op}$ , Ens]  $\underset{[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]}{\overset{$ subcategory of X without the existence of a factorization of TS:X  $\rightarrow$  X through  $Fix(TS,\eta)$  (i.e. condition (v) of Theorem 2.1 fails even though part of the conclusion is still true).

A second important subcategory  $\Gamma_2$  of  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  is the full reflective subcategory generated by the <u>simple A</u>-graphs G with at most one edge from any particular vertex to another. The reflector  $M:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] + \Gamma_2$ , the left adjoint of the full inclusion  $N:\Gamma_2^{\longrightarrow}[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ , maps each <u>A</u>-graph G to the quotient <u>A</u>-graph G<sub>2</sub> having the same vertices as G, but with edges e and e' identified whenever  $G(\delta^1)e = G(\delta^1)e'$  and  $G(\delta^0)e = G(\delta^0)e'$ . Again, the cotriple on  $\Gamma_2$  is easily seen to be idempotent. Using an argument similar to the one for  $\Gamma_1$ , it follows that there exists a reflective subcategory  $\Delta_2$  of  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  which is equivalent to a coreflective subcategory  $\hat{\Gamma}_2$  of  $\Gamma_2$ .

Theorem 2.1 thus establishes equivalences between subcategories of  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ and  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  which introduce the combinatorially useful concepts of "absence of (unnecessary) loops" or "characterization of edges by their origin and terminal vertices". The "combinatorially interesting graphs" are extracted in a natural way from either of the functor categories  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  or  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ . Thus either of the two possible general definitions of "directed graph" leads to the same theory. Along the way, though, we have found that the interplay of these generalizations leads to deeper properties than one might have expected.

3. UNDIRECTED GRAPHS

In combinatorial problems, a graph is simple considered to be one-dimensional complex. Each graph U has a set V(U) of <u>vertices</u>, a set E(U) of <u>edges</u>, and an <u>incidence relation</u>  $I(U) \subseteq V(U) \times E(U)$  with each edge incident to at most two vertices. Clearly, a directed <u>A</u>-graph G can be given this structure, denoted by P(G): the vertices are G[0]; the edges are G[1]; and the incidence relation is the collection of pairs

$$\{(G(\delta^{0})e, e), (G(\delta^{1})e, e) | e \in G[1]\} \subseteq G[0] \times G[1]$$

A morphism  $f:U_1 \rightarrow U_2$  of undirected graphs is given by a pair of functions,

 $V(f):V(U_1) \rightarrow V(U_2)$  and  $E(f):E(U_1) \rightarrow E(U_2)$ ,

such that incidence is preserved; i.e.

$$(V(f) \times E(f)I(U_1) \subseteq I(U_2).$$

Any  $\underline{\underline{A}}$ -graph morphism  $f: G_1 \rightarrow G_2$  "induces" such a pair

 $P(f):P(G_1) \rightarrow P(G_2)$ 

of functions between undirected graphs since f commutes with origin and terminal. Hence, this construction induces a functor

$$P:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow T$$

from the category of A-graphs to the category  ${\mathbb T}$  of undirected graphs.

The category  $\mathbb{T}$  is not easy to describe, since it depends on using, within category theory, the notation of a set with at most two elements (to describe the incidence relation I(U)). This difficulty illustrates a difference between the combinatorial and categorical viewpoints in graph theory. The categorical approach searches for general concepts which may be simply described and proceeds from there to particular or special examples; while the combinatorial approach assumes that such things as multiple edges or loops will be complicated. The "purity" of the categorical approach aside, it appears necessary to make some arbitrary choices in order to obtain a category to model T. However, we are able to avoid this difficulty by using external relationships (which we expect to exist) between  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  and  $\mathbb{T}$  to help "internally" construct T.

The functor  $P:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow T$  forgets orientation; hence it is reasonable to investigate the possibility that P has a right adjoint

$$0:T \rightarrow [A^{op}, Ens]$$

Thus we search for objects OU in  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  such that they agree with our "intuition" about the category T and such that there is a natural equivalence

$$\psi(\mathbf{G},\mathbf{U}):\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{PG},\mathbf{U}) \xrightarrow{\cong} [\underline{\mathbf{A}}^{\mathrm{OP}},\mathsf{Ens}](\mathbf{G},\mathbf{OU}). \tag{3.1}$$

Every <u>A</u>-graph G is determined by the sets G[0] and G[1] of vertices and edges, respectively, and by the functions  $G(\delta^1)$  and  $G(\delta^0)$  of origin and terminal. Since  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  is a functor category, the Yoneda Lemma guarantees that these sets and functions can be naturally described in terms of <u>representable functors</u>; in particular,

$$G[i] = [\underline{A}^{OP}, Ens] (\underline{A}(\_, [i]), G), \quad i = 0, 1$$

$$G[\delta^{i}] = [\underline{A}^{OP}, Ens] (\underline{A}(\_, \delta^{i}), G), \quad i = 0, 1.$$
(3.2)

The object (actually functor)

and

$$V \equiv \underline{A}(\_, [0]) : \underline{A}^{OP} \neq Ens$$

which represents vertices has one vertex since  $\underline{\underline{A}}([0],[0])$  consists only of the identity, and no edges since  $\underline{\underline{A}}([1],[0])$  is empty. The object

$$E \equiv A(\_, [1]): \underline{A}^{op} \neq Ens$$

which represents edges similarly has two vertices and one edge joining them. The morphisms (natural transformations)

$$B \equiv \underline{A}(\_,\delta^{\perp}): \underline{A}(\_,[0]) \xrightarrow{\bullet} \underline{A}(\_,[1])$$

8

and

$$T \equiv \underline{A}(\_,\delta^{\circ}):\underline{A}(\_,[0]) \xrightarrow{\bullet} \underline{A}(\_,[1])$$

^

from V to E select the origin and terminal vertices, respectively, of the unique edge in E. The subcategory  $\underline{\underline{A}}$  of  $[\underline{\underline{A}}^{op}, Ens]$  consisting of objects V and E with morphisms B and T is isomorphic to  $\underline{\underline{A}}$ .

For each graph U in T, we can determine the structure of OU by using both (3.1) and (3.2). The set of vertices of OU is  $[\underline{\underline{A}}^{op}, Ens](V, OU)$  which is naturally isomorphic to T(PV,U):

$$(OU)[0] \cong [\underline{A}^{OP}, Ens] (\underline{A}(\_, [0]).OU)$$
$$= [\underline{A}^{OP}, Ens] (V, OU)$$
$$\cong T(PV, U).$$

Since graph V has one vertex and no edges, and  $P:[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \rightarrow T$  is a forgetful functor, PV is the graph in T with one vertex and no edges. A T-morphism PV  $\rightarrow$  U is given by selecting a vertex of U to be the image of the unique vertex of PV. Thus (OU)[0] is identified with the set of vertices of U.

Similarly, the edge set of OU is given by the set T(PE,U). The <u>A</u>-morphism  $T:V \rightarrow E$  induces a map  $T(PT,U):T(PE,U) \rightarrow T(PV,U)$ . The undirected graph PE has one edge and two vertices; thus T(PT,U) restricts a morphism with domain PE to one of these vertices. If vertex v of U is incident to edge e, then there is a T-morphism

f :PE + U

such that the unique edge of PE is mapped to e and such that the vertex of PE designated by PT:PV  $\rightarrow$  PE is mapped to v.

We <u>expect</u> that this description above would determine the morphism  $f_e$ uniquely. First, if e is a proper edge, then e has precisely one other vertex incident with it; and  $f_e: PE \rightarrow U$  should have this vertex as the image of the second vertex of PE. Second, if e is a loop, then there is only one vertex v incident with e; and both vertices of PE must be mapped to v. Note that these assignments establish a natural equivalence between

$$(0U)[1] \cong T(PE,U)$$
 and  $I(U) \subseteq V(U) \times E(U)$ .

In addition, the terminal map

$$(0U)(\delta^{U}):(0U)[1] + (0U)[0]$$

is given by the natural projection of I(U) on V(U).

To complete the description of the directed graph OU, it is necessary to give the origin map

$$(0U)(\delta^{\perp}):(0U)[1] \rightarrow (0U)[0].$$

The argument given above to justify the identification of T(PE,U) with I(U) is a construction of  $(OU)(\delta^1)$ ; i.e.

$$(0U)(\delta^{1})(v,e) = \begin{cases} v'; \text{ if } (v',e) \in I(U), v' \neq v \\ v; \text{ otherwise } . \end{cases}$$

This construction uses the difficult to <u>naturally</u> describe notion "is incident with either one or two vertices". The existence of the adjoint relationship <P,0>

demands that the construction of the origin be <u>natural</u>. Hence we will exploit the simple functor category  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  of  $\underline{A}$ -graphs, use the assumed existence of an adjoint pair <P,0>, and apply the general theory of <u>monads</u> to construct a category <u>of algebras</u>  $\Gamma$  which will be a functor category model [ $\underline{X}^{op}$ , Ens] for T.

As a first step, we give a description of the <u>monad</u> (or <u>triple</u>)  $M = \langle T, n, \mu \rangle$ In [ $\underline{A}^{op}$ , Ens] which results from the <u>assumed</u> existence of the adjunction  $\langle P, 0 \rangle$ . For each  $\underline{A}$ -graph G, TG  $\equiv$  OP(G) is described using the above discussion. Hence, IG[0] = G[0] and TG[1] is given as the pushout

$$\ell(G) \xrightarrow{G[1]}_{z_0} TG[1]$$
(3.3)

where  $l(G) = \{e \in G[1] | G(\delta^0)(e) = G(\delta^1)(e)\}$ , the <u>set of loops</u> of G. The universal properties of the pushout in Ens are used to give a description of origin  $TG(\delta^1)$  and terminal  $TG(\delta^0)$  to reflect the above construction of

$$T \equiv OP: [\underline{\underline{A}}^{OP}, Ens] \rightarrow [\underline{\underline{A}}^{OP}, Ens].$$

Thus  $TG(\hat{S}^0):TG[1] \rightarrow TG[0]$  is the composition of the identification  $\hat{T}_{C}[0]:G[0] \xrightarrow{\cong} TG[0]$  with the function  $\omega$  in



while  $TG(\delta^1):TG[1] \rightarrow TG[0]$  is defined similarly by interchanging  $G(\delta^0)$  and  $G(\delta^1)$  in (3.4).

The unit of the adjunction  $\langle P, 0 \rangle$ ,

n:ld 
$$\rightarrow$$
 T: [ $\underline{\underline{A}}^{op}$ , Ens]  $\rightarrow$  [ $\underline{\underline{\underline{A}}}^{op}$ , Ens],

is given by

$$n_{G}[0] \equiv 1d:G[0] \rightarrow TG[0], \text{ and } n_{G}[1] \equiv z_{0}:G[1] \rightarrow TG[1]$$

of diagram (3.3), for each A-graph G. Clearly, from the definition of  $TG(\delta^0)$ and  $TG(\delta^1)$ ,  $\eta_G$  is an A-graph morphism <u>natural</u> in G.

The multiplication

$$\mu: \mathbb{T}^2 \xrightarrow{\bullet} \mathbb{T}: [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens] \xrightarrow{\bullet} [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$$

of the monad M is constructed from the counit  $\varepsilon: PO \rightarrow Id:T \rightarrow T$  of the adjoint pair <P,0>. For each graph U,  $\varepsilon_U: PO(U) \rightarrow U$  is the identifying map on vertices,  $V(\varepsilon_U) \equiv Id:V(PO(U)) \rightarrow V(U)$ . The set E(PO(U)) of edges of PO(U) is, from the above discussion, just the incidence relation  $I(U) \subseteq V(U) \times E(U)$ . A sketch of the construction of the equivalence

$$\psi(G,U):T(PG,U) \xrightarrow{\cong} [A^{op},Ens](G,OU)$$

leads to the function  $E(\varepsilon_U):E(PO(U)) + E(U)$  being the projection I(U) + E(U). The incidence relation I(PO(U)) in PO(U) can be given as a pushout with a map to I(K):



where  $t_U$  is a "twist" map which chooses the <u>other</u> element of I(U) over the same edge in E(U). In the context of the monad M, the above constructions lead to the pushout description (3.6) for the multiplication  $\eta_c: T^2G \rightarrow TG:$ 



where  $t:TG[1] \rightarrow TG[1]$  is defined by



Note that t:TG[1]  $\rightarrow$  TG[1] together with ld:G[0]  $\rightarrow$  G[0]  $\cong$  TG[0] on vertices does not define an A-graph morphism, but  $\mu_G = \langle 1d, \mu_G[1] \rangle$ :T<sup>2</sup>G  $\rightarrow$  TG is in [A<sup>op</sup>,Ens].

The axioms for a monad (see MacLane [2], VI.1) are now easily verified; in particular, the constructions are clearly "natural in G",  $G \in [A^{op}, Ens]$ .

An <u>algebra</u> for the <u>monad</u>  $M = \langle T, \eta, \mu \rangle$  is defined as an object X of the underlying category, which is  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  in this case, together with a morphism h:TX  $\rightarrow$  X such that diagrams (3.8) commute:



Since  $n_X[0] = 1d:X[0] \rightarrow (TX[0] \equiv X[0])$  and  $n_X[1]:X[1] \rightarrow TX[1]$  is the map  $z_0$  of (3.3), we construct  $h:TX \rightarrow X$  with  $hn_X = 1d_X$  from the pushout (3.9):



The requirement that h:TX + X be an A-graph morphism forces the map b:X[1] + X[1] to reverse orientation (i.e.,  $X(\delta^1)b = X(\delta^{1-1}):X[1] + X[0]$ , i = 0,1). Furthermore, the restriction  $b/\ell(X)$  must be the "identity" inclusion  $\ell(X) + X[1]$ . The commuting of the first diagram of (3.8) reduces, in this case, to the statement that

 $b:X[1] \rightarrow X[1]$  has

 $b^2 \equiv 1d:X[1] \rightarrow X[1];$ 

i.e., b is an involution.

Thus the concept of graph with involution arises naturally from the concept of unoriented graph; in fact, it provides an algebraic realization of this concept. The category  $T_1$  of M-algebras always has a pair of adjoint functors which induce the monad M in the base category.

In addition, the Kleisli construction uses the monad M to describe a category  $T_2$  which is essentially the category of free algebras. The objects of  $T_2$  are the same as those of  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ , but there are additional morphisms in  $T_2$ . Any pair of functions  $f = \langle f_0, f_1 \rangle$ ,  $f_0:G[0] \neq G'[0]:f_1G[1] \neq G'[1]$  which preserve incidence (rather than origin and terminal) is a morphism of  $T_2$ .

In general, the category of all algebras (in our case,  $T_1$ ) is a terminal object in the category Adj(M) of adjoint pairs which induce the monad M, and the Kleisli construction (in our case  $T_2$ ) is initial in Adj(M). The unique  $\psi:T_2 + T_1$ functor of MacLane [2] (VI.5, Theorem 3) is both full and faithful. Furthermore, every algebra in  $T_1$  is isomorphic to a free algebra in  $\psi(T_2)$ ; hence, the two categories are equivalent. Thus,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are, essentially, equally good models of T, and they are canonically chosen from all categories inducing the monad M.

The category  $T_2$  is perhaps closer to our original idea of unoriented graphs T; but the category  $T_1$  has other advantages. Observe that <u>A</u>-graphs with involution can be naturally extended to a <u>C</u>-graph (object in [<u>C</u><sup>op</sup>, Ens]) with <u>C</u> pictured in Fig. 5.

 $[0] \underbrace{\delta^{1}}_{\delta^{0}} [1] \underbrace{\tau}_{\tau}$  $\tau \delta^{1} = \delta^{0}; \ \tau \delta^{0} = \delta^{1}; \ \tau^{2} = 1d$ Figure 5. The category <u>C</u>

The category of algebras  $T_1$  defined by the monad M is the full subcategory of  $[\underline{C}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ens}]$  of  $\underline{C}$ -graphs U satisfying  $\{e|U(\tau)e = e\} = \{e|U(\delta^0)e = U(\delta^1)e\}$ ; i.e., the set of edges fixed by  $U(\tau)$  is precisely the set of all loops of U. It is easy to show that  $T_1$  is a reflective subcategory of  $[\underline{C}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ens}]$ . Construct the reflector, the left adjoint to the inclusion of  $T_1$  into  $[\underline{C}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ens}]$ , by passing from a given  $\underline{C}$ -graph U to a new  $\underline{C}$ -graph  $U_1$ , a <u>quotient</u> of U, having the same vertices as U, having the same edges between distinct vertices of U, but having  $U(\tau)e$  identified with e for each loop  $e \in \ell(U)$ .

Note that equivalence of categories is weaker than isomorphism. In particular, the comparison  $\psi:T_2 \rightarrow T_1$  is not an isomorphism of categories, i.e., the object map  $|\psi|:|T_2| \rightarrow |T_1|$  is not one-to-one and onto. However, the notion of equivalence appears to be more appropriate than isomorphism for modeling a theory. Hence, there is only one "useful" model up to equivalence, but two different approaches to that model.

We may also form a corresponding theory for  $\underline{\underline{B}}$ -graphs starting from an orientation-forgetful functor

$$P':[\underline{B}^{OP},Ens] + T'.$$

The category of algebras  $T'_1$  for a monad M' in  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ , with similar properties to the monad M in  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ , may be described by introducing an "involution". These algebras approximate the "involutional graphs" of Ribenboim [5]. Of course, if a graph admits more than one involution, each involution defines a different algebra. (The original definition required only the <u>existence</u> of an involution in the hope of defining a <u>subcategory</u> of  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ ; but the involution was incorporated into the algebraic structure in Ribenboim [6].) Curiously, the definition in Ribenboim [5,6] also requires that

### an edge fixed by involution be degenerate. (3.10)

The requirement (3.10) is incorporated naturally into the program developing the monad M' by having  $H(\sigma^0):H[0] \rightarrow H[1]$  play the role of the inclusion  $\ell(G) \rightarrow G[1]$  of (3.3) in the definition of T'H[1]. With this change, T'H( $\sigma^0$ ) is the common composition H[0] + T'H[1] in the analog of (3.3); and  $T'H(\delta^1):T'H[1] + T'H[0]$ , i = 0,1, is given as in (3.4). Again,  $n'_H[1]:H[1] + T'H[1]$ is the analog of  $z_0$  of (3.3), and  $\mu'_H[1]:T'T'H[1] + T'H[1]$  is constructed as in (3.6) and (3.7). (Note that the mapping  $\mu_H$ , in general, is not as isomorphism (cf. Ribenboim [5], p. 159).)

The category  $T'_1$  of all algebras for the monad M' in  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  is the category  $[\underline{D}^{op}, Ens]$ , where  $\underline{D}$  is depicted in Figure 6.



The corresponding Kleisli construction yields a category  $T'_2$  which is not equivalent to  $T'_1$ ; rather the free algebras in  $T'_2$  are characterized by (3.10). Thus the original definition of involutorial graph was designed to select a subcategory of  $T'_1$  equivalent to  $T'_2$ . It is also curious that (3.10) defines a subcategory of  $T'_1 \equiv [\underline{D}^{op}, Ens]$  which is both reflective and coreflective.

Also, consider the Kan extensions of the functors induced by the inclusions  $\underline{B} \xrightarrow{\leftarrow} \underline{D}$  and  $\underline{A} \xrightarrow{\leftarrow} \underline{C}$ . In particular, the forgetful functor  $U:[\underline{D}^{op}, Ens] + [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$  and its left adjoint (i.e., left-Kan extension) induce the monad M. 4. CATEGORIES OF GRAPHS ARE CARTESIAN CLOSED

A benefit of viewing a category of graphs as a functor category is that any functor category  $[\underline{X}^{op}, Ens]$ , for small  $\underline{X}$  is cartesian closed (see Freyd [9], p. 8). The proof of this result is constructive; i.e. an algorithm is provided for computing the "internal-Hom" functors. If Y, Z are objects in  $[\underline{X}^{op}, Ens]$ , then Hom(Y,Z) is also an object in  $[\underline{X}^{op}, Ens]$ , whose evaluation at object p of  $\underline{X}$  is defined by:

$$Hom(Y,Z)(p) \equiv [\underline{X}^{op}, Ens](\underline{X}(\_, p) \times Y, Z).$$
(4.1)

Thus, for our examples, we give the representable functors

$$\underline{X}(\_,[i]):\underline{X}^{op} \rightarrow Ens$$

for i = 0, 1 and X = A, B, C or D. Figure 7 depicts the directed graphs given by these representable functors.



Figure 7. Representable functors

As an example of the use of formula (4.1), we construct Hom(Y,Z) in  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$ . The set of vertices is given by

$$Hom(Y,Z)[0] \equiv [\underline{A}^{op}, Ens](A(\_,[0]) \times Y,Z).$$

But  $\underline{A}(\_,[0])$  is a graph with one vertex and no edges. Since products are computed "coordinatewise",  $\underline{A}(\_,[0]) \times Y$  has vertices Y[0] and <u>no edges</u>. Thus

 $Hom(Y,Z)[0] \cong Ens(Y[0],Z[0]).$ 

The graph  $\underline{A}(\_,[1])$  has one edge joining two vertices. Thus  $\underline{A}(\_,[1]) \times Y$  has the same number of edges as Y, but twice as many vertices. The structural maps satisfy

$$\delta^{i}(\langle 1d\rangle, e) = (\langle \delta^{i}\rangle, \delta^{i}e)$$

Thus Hom(Y,Z)[1] is identified with the set of all triples of functions <r:Y[1] + Z[1], s:Y[0] + Z[0], t:Y[0] + Z[0]> for which diagrams (4.2) commute

$$\begin{array}{c} Y[1] \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} Z[1] & Y[1] \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} Z[1] \\ \downarrow Y(\delta^{1}) & Z(\delta^{1}) & \downarrow Y(\delta^{0}) & Z[\delta^{0}] \\ Y[0] \xrightarrow{\mathbf{s}} Z[0] & Y[0] \xrightarrow{\mathbf{t}} Z[0] \end{array}$$
(4.2)

The origin,  $Hom(Y,Z)(\delta^1)$ , is given by

<r,s,t>++>s

the terminal,  $Hom(Y,Z)(\delta^0)$ , by

EXAMPLE. If Y is discrete, i.e.  $Y[1] = \emptyset$ , then Hom(Y,Z) has all functions Y[0] + Z[0] as vertices and has a unique edge joining each pair of vertices.

In general, the set of edges joining points s,t  $\in$  Hom(Y,Z)[0] is given by the set of functions r:Y[1]  $\rightarrow$  Z[1] satisfying (4.2). Although this construction satisfies the adjoint property (4.1), it seems to have little relation to graph homorphisms.

Next, consider  $[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens]$ . From Figure 7, it is clear that  $\underline{B}(\_, [0])$  has one vertex and one edge; so that

14

Thus, Hom(Y,Z)[0] is the set of <u>B</u>-graph morphisms:

Hom(Y,Z)[0] = 
$$[\underline{B}^{op}, Ens](\underline{B}(\_, [0]) \times Y, Z)$$
  
 $\cong [\underline{B}^{op}, Ens](Y, Z).$ 

Each "edge" of Hom(Y,Z)[1] is represented by a triple  $\langle r:Y[1] \rightarrow Z[1]; s:Y \rightarrow Z; t:Y \rightarrow Z \rangle$ , where s and t are <u>B</u>-graph morphisms for which (4.3) is commutative:

$$Y[0] \xrightarrow{Y(\delta^{1})} Y[1] \xrightarrow{Z(\delta^{0})} Y[0]$$

$$\downarrow s[0] \qquad \downarrow r \qquad \downarrow t[0]$$

$$Z[0] \xrightarrow{Z(\delta^{1})} Z[1] \xrightarrow{Z(\delta^{0})} Z[0].$$
(4.3)

As before,

gives the origin of Hom(Y,Z) and

defines the terminal.

If s and t are given, then the set of edges of Hom(Y,Z) with origin s and terminal t is indexed by those functions r:Y[1] + Z[1] satisfying (4.3). The definition of Hom graph in Ribenboim [5], p. 165, was in this spirit. However, for no apparent reason, only the restriction of r to  $Y(\sigma^0)Y[0]$  entered into that definition. In Ribenboim [6], p. 110, a totally different definition was given. Again, it was an explicit construction, and again there was no claim of naturality. The idea was that the edges should be indexed by the functions  $r:Y[1] \rightarrow Z[1]$  of our definition. The difficulty is that (4.3) determines only s[0] and t[0], so that the vertices could only be the equivalence classes of "graph homomorphisms restricting to the same functions on vertices". By contrast, our construction is no more cumbersome than these two attempts, but the underly general principle is quite simple and guarantees the Hom will have the proper adjoint relation to cartesian product.

Our internal Hom-functor has the usual properties of Hom in Ens in particular, there is a composition

$$o:Hom(Y,Z) \times Hom(W,Y) \rightarrow Hom(W,Z). \tag{4.4}$$

The realizations of vertices in Hom(Y,Z)[0] as graph homomorphisms and of Hom(Y,Z)[1] as triples  $\langle r, s, t \rangle$  are compatible with the composition (4.4).

The composition (4.4) induces a natural monoid structure on Hom(W,W). If the invertible elements of Hom(W,W) are selected, the resulting subgraph is a group called Aut(W).

The various reflective subcategories constructed in Section 2 and Section 3 in the discussion of categories of graphs sould be cartesian closed. In fact, the following proposition gives an easy computation of Hom in many cases. PROPOSITION. Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a cartesian closed category and  $I:\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$  is a full reflective inclusion with  $R:\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma'$  the reflector (i.e., <R,I> adjoint pair). Then R preserves products iff for all  $A \in \Gamma$  and  $B \in \Gamma'$ , Hom(A,B) is in  $\Gamma'$ .

PROOF. See Freyd [9; p. 13].

REMARK. The reflective subcategory  $A_1$  of  $[\underline{A}^{op}, Ens]$  constructed in Section 2 does not satisfy this property; however  $A_2$  does.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. We give special thanks to F. E. J. Linton for his advice during the writing of this paper. Thanks are also due to M. L. Gardner, P. Hell and S. MacLane for their encouragement and useful conversations.

#### REFERENCES

- HELL, P. An Introduction to the Category of Graphs (in <u>Topics in Graph Theory</u>, New York, 1977) Ann. New York Acad. Sci. 328 (1979), 120-136.
- MACLANE, S. <u>Categories for the Working Mathematician</u>, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- 3. HARARY, F. and READ, R.C. Is the Null Graph a Pointless Concept?, <u>Graph</u> <u>Theory</u> <u>and</u> <u>Combinatorics</u>, Springer-Verlag, 1973, 37-44.
- FARZAN, M. and WALLER, D.A. Kronecker Products and Local Joins of Graphs, <u>Canad</u>. J. <u>Math. 29</u> (1977), 255-269, MR 55#2625.
- RIBENBOIM, P. Graphs with Algebraic Structures, Report to the Algebra Group, <u>Queens Papers in Pure and Applied Math. 36</u>, Queens University (1973), 155-184.
- RIBENBOIM, P. Algebraic Structures on Graphs, <u>Algebra Universalis</u> <u>16</u> (1983), 105-123.
- MACDONALD, J. and STONE, A. Topoi Over Graphs, <u>Cahiers Topologie Geom</u>. <u>Differentiable</u> <u>25</u> (1984), 51-62.
- LAMBEK, J. and RATTRAY, B.A. Localization and Duality in Additive Categories, <u>Houston J. Math. 1</u> (1975), 87-100.
- 9. FREYD, P. Aspects of Topoi, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 7 (1972), 1-76.

16

# Special Issue on Space Dynamics

# **Call for Papers**

Space dynamics is a very general title that can accommodate a long list of activities. This kind of research started with the study of the motion of the stars and the planets back to the origin of astronomy, and nowadays it has a large list of topics. It is possible to make a division in two main categories: astronomy and astrodynamics. By astronomy, we can relate topics that deal with the motion of the planets, natural satellites, comets, and so forth. Many important topics of research nowadays are related to those subjects. By astrodynamics, we mean topics related to spaceflight dynamics.

It means topics where a satellite, a rocket, or any kind of man-made object is travelling in space governed by the gravitational forces of celestial bodies and/or forces generated by propulsion systems that are available in those objects. Many topics are related to orbit determination, propagation, and orbital maneuvers related to those spacecrafts. Several other topics that are related to this subject are numerical methods, nonlinear dynamics, chaos, and control.

The main objective of this Special Issue is to publish topics that are under study in one of those lines. The idea is to get the most recent researches and published them in a very short time, so we can give a step in order to help scientists and engineers that work in this field to be aware of actual research. All the published papers have to be peer reviewed, but in a fast and accurate way so that the topics are not outdated by the large speed that the information flows nowadays.

Before submission authors should carefully read over the journal's Author Guidelines, which are located at http://www .hindawi.com/journals/mpe/guidelines.html. Prospective authors should submit an electronic copy of their complete manuscript through the journal Manuscript Tracking System at http://mts.hindawi.com/ according to the following timetable:

Manuscript Due	July 1, 2009
First Round of Reviews	October 1, 2009
Publication Date	January 1, 2010

# **Lead Guest Editor**

**Antonio F. Bertachini A. Prado**, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais (INPE), São José dos Campos, 12227-010 São Paulo, Brazil; prado@dem.inpe.br

# **Guest Editors**

**Maria Cecilia Zanardi,** São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; cecilia@feg.unesp.br

**Tadashi Yokoyama,** Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Rio Claro, 13506-900 São Paulo, Brazil; tadashi@rc.unesp.br

**Silvia Maria Giuliatti Winter,** São Paulo State University (UNESP), Guaratinguetá, 12516-410 São Paulo, Brazil; silvia@feg.unesp.br