

# Principal bundles as Frobenius adjunctions with application to geometric morphisms

BY CHRISTOPHER TOWNSEND

8 Gordon Villas, Aylesbury Road, Tring, Hertfordshire, HP23 4DJ.

e-mail: info@christophertownsend.org

(Received 15 July 2014; revised 29 June 2015)

## Abstract

Using a suitable notion of principal  $G$ -bundle, defined relative to an arbitrary cartesian category, it is shown that principal bundles can be characterised as adjunctions that stably satisfy Frobenius reciprocity. The result extends from internal groups to internal groupoids. Since geometric morphisms can be described as certain adjunctions that are stably Frobenius, as an application it is proved that all geometric morphisms, from a localic topos to a bounded topos, can be characterised as principal bundles.

---

## 1. Introduction

The main aim of this paper is to show that in any cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$ , principal  $G$ -bundles over an object  $X$  for an internal group  $G$  are the same thing as adjunctions  $\mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  that stably satisfy Frobenius reciprocity, provided the adjunction of connected components,  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^* : [G, \mathcal{C}] \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}$ , exists and itself stably satisfies Frobenius reciprocity.  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  is the category of objects of  $\mathcal{C}$  equipped with a  $G$  action; i.e. the category of  $G$ -objects with  $G$ -homomorphisms between them.

Geometric morphisms can be characterised as adjunctions between categories of locales that satisfy Frobenius reciprocity, [T10b]. So as an application to the case  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Loc}$ , it follows that geometric morphisms  $Sh(X) \longrightarrow B(G)$ , from the category of sheaves over a locale  $X$  to the topos of  $G$ -sets, for any localic group  $G$ , are the same thing as localic principal  $\hat{G}$ -bundles, where  $\hat{G}$  is the étale completion of  $G$ . This is a key relationship as it can be used to establish, for discrete  $G$  at least, the more well-known result that there is a classifying space for principal  $G$ -bundles; see [I96] for a description of how topos theoretic results about principal bundles relate back to more well-known topological results.

Our main result easily generalises from internal groups to internal groupoids. It follows that any geometric morphism from a localic topos to a topos bounded over some base topos **Set** can be represented as a principal bundle.

In the next section we recall some basic facts about the category  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  of  $G$ -objects and  $G$ -homomorphisms for a group  $G$  internal to a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$  and define a notion of principal  $G$ -bundle over an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

In the third section we prove our main result which shows how the notion of principal  $G$ -bundle can be related to stably Frobenius adjunctions. The proofs and techniques are simple as they only involve cartesian categories and various adjunctions. Our strategy is to first

37 demonstrate the main result for the case of principal bundles over the terminal object 1 (i.e.  
 38  $X = 1$ ) and then show how the case of general  $X$  can be obtained by applying the proof for  
 39  $X = 1$  to the cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}/X$ .

40 The fourth section describes in summary how the main result generalises to groupoids.

41 The fifth section describes how the main result can be applied to the case  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Loc}$ , the  
 42 category of locales, to give a description of geometric morphisms  $Sh(X) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  for  
 43 certain classes of localic groupoids  $\mathbb{G}$ .

44 The results apply equally to open localic groupoids and to proper localic groupoids. In  
 45 fact, an axiomatic treatment of locale theory [T10a] reveals that the theory of ‘open’ principal  
 46 bundles can be viewed as order dual to the theory of ‘proper’ principal bundles. The  
 47 results here show that both theories of principal bundles have representations as Frobenius  
 48 adjunctions. What is not clear is whether the theory of ‘proper’ principal bundles has any-  
 49 thing like the depth of the more familiar theory of ‘open’ principal bundles.

## 50 2. Principal $G$ -bundles in a cartesian category

51 We start with some basic definitions and results relative to a cartesian category,  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  
 52  $(G, m)$  is an internal group then  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  is the category of  $G$ -objects, whose objects are  
 53 pairs  $(A, *_A)$  where  $A$  is an object of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $*_A : G \times A \longrightarrow A$  is a  $G$ -action; that is,  
 54 satisfies the usual unit and associative diagrams. For example,  $(G, m)$  itself is a  $G$ -object;  
 55 further for any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $(X, \pi_2)$  is an object of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ ; it is  $X$  with the *trivial* action.  
 56 The morphisms  $f : (A, *_A) \longrightarrow (B, *_B)$  of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  are morphisms  $f : A \longrightarrow B$  that  
 57 commute with the actions, i.e.  $f *_A = *_B(Id_G \times f)$ . Sending any  $X$  to  $(X, \pi_2)$  defines a  
 58 functor  $G^*$  from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ . Its left adjoint, when it exists, is written  $\Sigma_G^1$  and must send  
 59  $(A, *_A)$  to the coequalizer of  $\pi_2, *_A : G \times A \rightrightarrows A$ . If  $\Sigma_G$  exists then  $\Sigma_G(G, m) = 1$   
 60 because  $! : G \longrightarrow 1$  is a coequalizer of  $\pi_2, m : G \times G \rightrightarrows G$  (it is split by the identity  
 61  $e : 1 \longrightarrow G$  of  $G$ ).

62 The category  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  is cartesian; products and equalisers are created in  $\mathcal{C}$ .  $(G, m)$  is a  
 63 rather special object of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ ; for any other object  $(A, *_A)$ ,  $(A, *_A) \times (G, m) \cong (A, \pi_2) \times$   
 64  $(G, m)$ . To see this send an ‘element’  $(a, g)$  of  $(A, \pi_2) \times (G, m)$  to  $(g *_A a, g)$  and an ‘ele-  
 65 ment’  $(a, g)$  of  $(A, *_A) \times (G, m)$  to  $(g^{-1} *_A a, g)$ ; it is easy to verify that this establishes an  
 66 isomorphism in  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ . Although this argument, and arguments below, deploy ‘elements’ it  
 67 is important to understand that this is just shorthand for defining and arguing about morph-  
 68 isms in a category.

69 If  $X$  is an object of  $\mathcal{C}$  then the *slice category*, written  $\mathcal{C}/X$ , is the category whose objects  
 70 are morphisms  $f : Y \longrightarrow X$  and whose morphisms are commuting triangles. We will tend  
 71 to use the notation  $Y_f$  when considering the morphism  $f : Y \longrightarrow X$  as an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Any  
 72 morphism  $f : Y \longrightarrow X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  gives rise to an adjunction  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^* : \mathcal{C}/Y \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}/X$  between  
 73 slice categories where the right adjoint is given by pullback (and  $\Sigma_f(Z_g) = Z_{fg}$  for a  
 74 morphism  $g : Z \longrightarrow Y$ ).  $\mathcal{C}/X$  is a cartesian category; limits are created in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Coequalizers  
 75 in  $\mathcal{C}/X$ , when they exist, are created in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $G = (G, m, e)$  is an internal group of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  
 76  $X$  is an object of  $\mathcal{C}$  then  $G \times X$  is an internal group of  $\mathcal{C}/X$ ; its multiplication is given by  
 77  $(G \times G) \times X \xrightarrow{m \times Id_X} G \times X$  and its unit is  $X \xrightarrow{(e^1, Id_X)} G \times X$ .

<sup>1</sup> The notation  $\Pi_0 \dashv \Delta$  is more usual than our  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$ ; however, we choose to label this adjunction  
 with  $G$ , as we will be switching between different  $G$ s.

78 A morphism  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is an *effective descent morphism* if the pullback functor  
 79  $f^* : \mathcal{C}/Y \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}/X$  is monadic. Since  $f^*$  always has a left adjoint, by Beck's monadicity  
 80 theorem,  $f$  is an effective descent morphism if and only if  $f^*$  reflects isomorphisms and  $\mathcal{C}/Y$   
 81 has and  $f^*$  preserves coequalisers for any pair of  $f^*$ -split arrows. For any internal group  $G$   
 82 in a cartesian category the morphism  $! : (G, m) \longrightarrow 1$  of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  is an effective descent  
 83 morphism. This can be observed because of the well-known fact that  $[G, \mathcal{C}]/(G, m) \simeq \mathcal{C}$   
 84 (to see this send a morphism to its kernel in one direction and send an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the  
 85 projection  $(X, \pi_2) \times (G, m) \longrightarrow (G, m)$  in the other). Under this equivalence the pullback  
 86 functor  $(G, m)^* : [G, \mathcal{C}] \longrightarrow [G, \mathcal{C}]/(G, m)$  is just the forgetful functor from  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  to  $\mathcal{C}$   
 87 that forgets the group action; its left adjoint sends  $X$  to  $(G, m) \times (X, \pi_2)$  and this adjunction  
 88 induces a monad on  $\mathcal{C}$ ; it is easy to see that  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  is by definition the category of algebras  
 89 of this induced monad.

90 An adjunction  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{D} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}$  between cartesian categories satisfies *Frobenius recipro-*  
 91 *city* provided the morphism  $L(R(X) \times W) \xrightarrow{(L\pi_1, L\pi_2)} LRX \times LW \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_X \times Id_{LW}} X \times LW$  is an  
 92 isomorphism for all objects  $W$  and  $X$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  respectively where  $\varepsilon$  is the counit of the  
 93 adjunction. For any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  there is an adjunction  $L_X \dashv R_X : \mathcal{D}/RX \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}/X$  given  
 94 by  $L_X(W_g) = \text{'the adjoint transpose of } g\text{'}$  and  $R_X(Y_f) = R(f)$ . The original adjunction  
 95  $L \dashv R$  is said to be *stably Frobenius* provided  $L_X \dashv R_X$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity  
 96 for every object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ . It is easy to verify that for any morphism  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  of a  
 97 cartesian category the pullback adjunction  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^* : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}/Y$  is stably Frobenius.  
 98 For another example, if  $\mathcal{C}$  has coequalisers that are stable under product (pullback) then  
 99  $G^* : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow [G, \mathcal{C}]$  has a left adjoint,  $\Sigma_G$ , and the adjunction  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  satisfies Frobenius  
 100 reciprocity (is stably Frobenius). Notice that both the property of satisfying Frobenius reci-  
 101 reciprocity and of being stably Frobenius are stable under composition of adjunctions. Given  
 102 two adjunctions  $\mathcal{D} \xrightleftharpoons[R]{L} \mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{D}' \xrightleftharpoons[R']{L'} \mathcal{C}$  then any third adjunction  $F \dashv U : \mathcal{D} \rightleftarrows \mathcal{D}'$  is  
 103 said to be *over*  $\mathcal{C}$  provided  $L'F = L$ ; of course, in such circumstances  $UR' \cong R$  by unique-  
 104 ness of adjoints. The collection all adjunctions between  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  can be considered  
 105 as a category with morphisms natural transformations between the left adjoints.

106 Our first lemma shows that in certain situations adjunctions that satisfy Frobenius reci-  
 107 procity and are over a base category  $\mathcal{C}$  give rise to effective descent morphisms:

108 **LEMMA 2.1.** *Let  $G$  be an internal group in a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $G^* : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow$*   
 109  *$[G, \mathcal{C}]$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_G$  and the resulting adjunction satisfies Frobenius reciprocity.*  
 110 *Let  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  be an adjunction over  $\mathcal{C}$  (i.e.  $\Sigma_G L = Id_{\mathcal{C}}$ ) which also sat-*  
 111 *isfies Frobenius reciprocity. Write  $(P, *)$  for the  $G$ -object  $L1$  and assume further that*  
 112  *$P \cong R(G, m)$ . Then  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent morphism.*

113 We will see in the next section that, in fact, the condition  $P \cong R(G, m)$  always holds.

114 *Proof.* Firstly  $\Sigma_G L1 = 1$  by assumption that  $L \dashv R$  is over  $\mathcal{C}$ . So for any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  
 115  $\Sigma_G(L1 \times G^*X) \cong \Sigma_G L1 \times X \cong X$ ; i.e.

$$G \times P \times X \xrightarrow[\pi_{23}]{** \times Id_X} P \times X \xrightarrow{\pi_2} X$$

116 is a coequaliser diagram in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Since this is a coequaliser for every  $X$  it is easy to see that  
 117  $P^* : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}/P$  reflects isomorphisms. So to complete the proof all we need to show is  
 118 that if  $X \xrightarrow[f]{g} Y$  is pair of morphisms of  $\mathcal{C}$  with the property that there is a split coequaliser

119 diagram

$$P \times X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Id \times f} \\ \xleftarrow[Id \times g]{} \\ \xleftarrow[s]{} \end{array} P \times Y \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow[q]{} \\ \xrightarrow[i]{} \end{array} Q (*)$$

120 in  $\mathcal{C}/P$  then there is a coequaliser  $Y \xrightarrow{n} N$  of  $f$  and  $g$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  with the property that  $P \times$   
 121  $Y \xrightarrow{Id_P \times n} P \times N$  is isomorphic to  $P \times Y \xrightarrow{q} Q$ .

122 Since  $P \cong R(G, m)$  by applying  $L$  to  $(*)$  and the Frobenius reciprocity assumption we  
 123 obtain a split coequaliser diagram:

$$(G, m) \times LX \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Id \times Lf} \\ \xleftarrow[Id \times Lg]{} \\ \xleftarrow[s']{} \end{array} (G, m) \times LY \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow[q \circ \cong]{} \\ \xrightarrow[i']{} \end{array} LQ.$$

124 Since  $(G, m) \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent morphism, there is a coequaliser diagram

$$LX \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{Lf} \\ \xrightarrow[Lg]{} \end{array} LY \xrightarrow{t} (T, *_T)$$

125 in  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  with the property that  $(G, m) \times LY \xrightarrow{Id \times t} (G, m) \times (T, *_T)$  is isomorphic to  
 126  $(G, m) \times LY \xrightarrow{Lq \circ \cong} LQ$ . Because  $\Sigma_G L = Id_{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\Sigma_G$  is a left adjoint, it follows that  
 127  $Y \xrightarrow{\Sigma_G(t)} \Sigma_G(T, *_T)$  is a coequalizer in  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $f, g$ . Notice that  $(T, *_T) \cong L\Sigma_G(T, *_T)$  be-  
 128 cause  $L$ , as a left adjoint, preserves coequalisers. Finally, for any object  $W$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ , morphisms  
 129  $Q \longrightarrow W$  correspond to morphisms  $P \times Y \longrightarrow W$  that compose equally with  $Id \times f$   
 130 and  $Id \times g$  and these in turn correspond (under  $L \dashv R$ , using  $W \cong RG^*W$ ) to morphisms  
 131  $(G, m) \times LY \longrightarrow G^*W$  that compose equally with  $Id \times Lf$  and  $Id \times Lg$ . These then  
 132 correspond to morphisms  $(G, m) \times (T, *_T) \longrightarrow G^*W$  since  $LQ \cong (G, m) \times (T, *_T)$ .  
 133 Then, by adjoint transpose under  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$ , these correspond to morphisms  $\Sigma_G((G, m) \times$   
 134  $(T, *_T)) \longrightarrow W$ . But

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_G((G, m) \times (T, *_T)) &\cong \Sigma_G((G, m) \times L\Sigma_G(T, *_T)) \\ &\cong \Sigma_G((G, m) \times (P, *) \times G^*\Sigma_G(T, *_T)) \\ &\cong \Sigma_G((G, m) \times (P, \pi_2) \times G^*\Sigma_G(T, *_T)) \\ &\cong \Sigma_G((G, m) \times G^*(P \times \Sigma_G(T, *_T))) \\ &\cong \Sigma_G(G, m) \times P \times \Sigma_G(T, *_T) \\ &\cong P \times \Sigma_G(T, *_T) \end{aligned}$$

135 and so  $Q \cong P \times \Sigma_G(T, *_T)$  as required.

136 We now define principal bundle relative to an arbitrary cartesian category. The definition at  
 137 this level of generality appears to be originally in [K89].

138 *Definition 2.1.* If  $G$  is an internal group in a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$  then a *principal  $G$ -*  
 139 *bundle* is a  $G$ -object  $(P, *)$  such that:

- 140 (i)  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent morphism; and  
 141 (ii) the morphism  $(*, \pi_2) : G \times P \longrightarrow P \times P$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is an isomorphism.

142 The inverse of  $(*, \pi_2)$ , if it exists, must be a map of the form  $(\psi, \pi_2)$  for a morphism  $\psi : P \times P \longrightarrow G$ . For any ‘elements’  $b$  and  $b'$  of  $B$ ,  $\psi(b, b')$  is the unique ‘element’ of  $G$  such that  $\psi(b, b') * b' = b$ .  $\psi$  has a number of well-known properties that will be exploited below; for example,  $\psi(g * p, p') = g\psi(p, p')$  and  $\psi(p, g * p') = \psi(p, p')g^{-1}$ .

146 The category of principal  $G$ -bundles is the full subcategory of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$  consisting of objects that are principal  $G$ -bundles.

148 *Definition 2.2.* If  $G$  is an internal group in a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $X$  is an object of  $\mathcal{C}$  then a *principal  $G$ -bundle over  $X$*  is a  $G$ -object  $(P, *)$ , together with a morphism  $f : P \longrightarrow X$  such that:

- 151 (i)  $f* = f\pi_2$ ; i.e.  $f(g * p) = f(p)$  for any ‘elements’  $g, p$  of  $G, P$  respectively;  
 152 (ii)  $f : P \longrightarrow X$  is an effective descent morphism; and  
 153 (iii) the morphism  $(*, \pi_2) : G \times P \longrightarrow P \times_X P$  of  $\mathcal{C}/X$  is an isomorphism.

154 Principal bundles are also known as torsors. In our general context of cartesian categories there is no real extra generality when talking about principal bundles over  $X$  in comparison to principal bundles:

157 **LEMMA 2.2.** *If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cartesian category,  $G$  an internal group and  $X$  an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then (i)  $[G \times X, \mathcal{C}/X] \cong [G, \mathcal{C}]/(X, \pi_2)$  and (ii) the category of principal  $G$ -bundles over  $X$  is isomorphic to the category of  $G \times X$  principal bundles relative to  $\mathcal{C}/X$ .*

160 *Proof.* (i) can be checked from the definitions and (ii) follows from (i).

161 We will use this lemma to ease the proof of our main theorem, which is the purpose of the next section.

### 163 3. A categorical relationship between principal bundles and Frobenius reciprocity

164 We can now state and prove our main result for the case  $X = 1$ ; this will be used in the proof for general  $X$  to follow.

166 **PROPOSITION 3.1.** *Say  $\mathcal{C}$  is a cartesian category and  $G$  is an internal group with the property that the functor  $G^* : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow [G, \mathcal{C}]$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_G$  such that  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity. Then there is an equivalence between the category of principal  $G$ -bundles and the category of adjunctions  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  that satisfy Frobenius reciprocity.*

171 *Further any such adjunction is also stably Frobenius.*

172 Although the connection to principal bundles is not made explicit, one can combine [BLV11, theorems 2.15 and 5.7] to establish this Proposition.

174 *Proof.* Say  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C} \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity and has  $\Sigma_G L = Id_{\mathcal{C}}$ . Let  $L1 = (P, *)$ . Then  $LR(G, m) \cong (P, *) \times (G, m)$ , which we have observed already is isomorphic to  $G^*P \times (G, m)$ . By assumption that  $\Sigma_G L = Id_{\mathcal{C}}$  we have that for any object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $X \cong RG^*X$  and so further  $LR(G, m) \cong L(1 \times RG^*R(G, m)) \cong (P, *) \times G^*R(G, m)$ . But  $\Sigma_G(G, m) \cong 1$  and  $\Sigma_G(P, *) = 1$ , the latter because  $\Sigma_G L1 = 1$ . It follows that  $R(G, m) \cong P$  because  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity, and this exhibits an

180 isomorphism  $G \times P \cong P \times P$ . By Lemma 2.1,  $!^P : P \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent  
181 morphism; therefore  $(P, *)$  is a principal bundle.

182 In the other direction, say we are given a principal bundle  $(P, *)$ . We will use  $\psi : P \times$   
183  $P \longrightarrow G$  for the map that exists because  $G \times P \cong P \times P$ . Define  $L : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow [G, \mathcal{C}]$  by  
184  $LX = (P, *) \times (X, \pi_2)$ . Define  $R : [G, \mathcal{C}] \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$  by sending  $(A, *_A)$  to the coequaliser of  
185  $P \times A$  defined by the arrows

$$G \times P \times A \xrightarrow[(Id_P \times *_A)(Id_P \times i \times Id_A)(\tau \times Id_A)]{*\times Id_A} P \times A$$

186 where  $\tau : G \times P \longrightarrow P \times G$  is the twist isomorphism and  $i : G \longrightarrow G$  is the inverse of  $G$ .  
187 In other words  $R(A, *_A)$  is defined to be the tensor  $P \otimes_G A$  where  $(g * p) \otimes a = p \otimes (g^{-1} *_A a)$   
188 for any ‘elements’  $a, p$  and  $g$  of  $A, P$  and  $G$  respectively. This coequaliser exists because  
189 an easy diagram chase shows that it is isomorphic to  $\Sigma_G((P, *) \times (A, *_A))$ . There is an  
190 ‘evaluation’ map  $ev : P \times (P \otimes_G A) \longrightarrow A$  defined by  $(b', b \otimes a) \mapsto \psi(b', b) *_A a$ . This  
191 is well defined because the coequaliser that defines  $P \otimes_G A$  is stable under products; this is  
192 because  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity. Using properties of  $\psi$  it can be checked  
193 that  $ev : (P, *) \times (P \otimes_G A, \pi_2) \longrightarrow (A, *_A)$ ; i.e. the evaluation map is a  $G$ -homomorphism.  
194 We now check that  $L$  is left adjoint to  $R$ . Say we are given an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  and an object  
195  $(A, *_A)$  of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ , then send any map  $f : X \longrightarrow P \otimes_G A$  to the  $G$ -homomorphism

$$P \times X \xrightarrow{Id_P \times f} P \times (P \otimes_G A) \xrightarrow{ev} A.$$

196 On the other hand given any  $G$ -homomorphism  $g : (P, *) \times (X, \pi_2) \longrightarrow (A, *_A)$  notice  
197 that the map

$$P \times X \xrightarrow{(\pi_1, g)} P \times A \xrightarrow{\otimes} P \otimes_G A$$

198 composes equally with  $* \times Id_X : G \times P \times X \longrightarrow P \times X$  and  $\pi_2 \times Id_X : G \times P \times X \longrightarrow P \times$   
199  $X$  and so factors through  $\pi_2 : P \times X \longrightarrow X$  (because  $\Sigma_G((P, *) \times (X, \pi_2)) \cong \Sigma_G(P, *) \times$   
200  $X \cong 1 \times X$ ). This defines a map  $X \longrightarrow P \otimes_G A$ . To check that this establishes a natural  
201 bijection between  $\mathcal{C}(X, P \otimes_G A)$  and  $[G, \mathcal{C}]((P, *) \times (X, \pi_2), (A, *_A))$  is a routine applica-  
202 tion of the properties of  $\psi : P \times P \longrightarrow G$ . Therefore  $L \dashv R$ . Observe that the counit of  
203 the adjunction is given by the evaluation map  $ev : (P, *) \times (P \otimes_G A, \pi_2) \longrightarrow (A, *_A)$ .

204 We must show that  $L \dashv R$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity; i.e., that the map  $(P, *) \times (X \times$   
205  $P \otimes_G A, \pi_2) \longrightarrow (P, *) \times (X, \pi_2) \times (A, *_A)$  given by  $(p, x, p' \otimes a) \mapsto (p, x, \psi(p, p') *_A a)$   
206 has an inverse. It is easy to check using the properties of  $\psi$  that the assignment  $(p, x, a) \mapsto$   
207  $(p, x, p \otimes a)$  defines a  $G$ -homomorphism and is the required inverse.

208 Also observe that  $\Sigma_G(P, *) = 1$  because  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$  is a regular epimorphism. There-  
209 fore  $\Sigma_G LX = \Sigma_G((P, *) \times (X, \pi_2)) \cong X$  and so  $L \dashv R$  is over  $\mathcal{C}$  as required.

210 It is clear that we have now established a categorical equivalence between principal  $G$ -  
211 bundles and adjunctions. This is because any  $L \dashv R$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  that satisfies Frobenius reciprocity  
212 is uniquely determined by  $L \dashv 1$  and, in the other direction, the principal bundle associated  
213 with the adjunction  $(P, *) \times (-, \pi_2) \dashv P \otimes_G (-)$  is  $(P, *)$ .

214 Finally we prove that, in fact, the adjunction  $L \dashv R$  is stably Frobenius. Let  $(B, *_B)$  be an  
215 object of  $[G, \mathcal{C}]$ . We must check, for any  $G$ -homomorphism  $n : (A, *_A) \longrightarrow (B, *_B)$   
216 and any  $f : X \longrightarrow P \otimes_G B$  that the canonical map  $(P, *) \times (X \times_{P \otimes_G B} P \otimes_G$   
217  $A, \pi_2) \longrightarrow ((P, *) \times (X, \pi_2)) \times_{(B, *_B)} (A, *_A)$  is an isomorphism. Given that we have  
already established an isomorphism  $(P, *) \times (X \times P \otimes_G A, \pi_2) \cong (P, *) \times (X, \pi_2) \times (A, *_A)$

218 this is just a question of verifying that the subobject of  $(P, *) \times (X \times P \otimes_G A, \pi_2)$  deter-  
 219 mined by  $\{(p, x, p' \otimes a) \mid p^x \otimes b^x = p' \otimes n(a)\}$  corresponds under this isomorphism to the  
 220 subobject  $\{(p, x, a) \mid \psi(p, p^x) *_B b^x = n(a)\}$  of  $(P, *) \times (X, \pi_2) \times (A, *_A)$  (where we are  
 221 using  $p^x \otimes b^x$  for  $f(x)$ ). It must also be verified that the isomorphism is over  $(B, *_B)$ . Both  
 222 easily follow again from the properties of  $\psi$ .

223 In the proof above we did not use the fact that  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent  
 224 morphism in the construction of a Frobenius adjunction from the principal bundle  $(P, *)$ ;  
 225 we only exploited the fact that it is a regular epimorphism. It follows that as a side result we  
 226 immediately have the following lemma:

227 **LEMMA 3.2.** *Say  $G$  is an internal group in a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $(P, *)$  a  $G$ -object such  
 228 that the morphism  $(*, \pi_2) : G \times P \longrightarrow P \times P$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is an isomorphism and  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$   
 229 a regular epimorphism. Then,  $! : P \longrightarrow 1$  is an effective descent morphism and  $(P, *)$   
 230 is a principal  $G$ -bundle (provided  $G$  is such that  $G^*$  has a left adjoint and the resulting  
 231 adjunction satisfies Frobenius reciprocity).*

232 Our main result is now an easy application of the case  $X = 1$ :

233 **THEOREM 3.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cartesian category and  $G$  an internal group with the property  
 234 that the functor  $G^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [G, \mathcal{C}]$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_G$  such that  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  is stably  
 235 Frobenius, and let  $X$  be an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then there is an equivalence between the category  
 236 of principal  $G$ -bundles over  $X$  and the category of adjunctions  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  that  
 237 are stably Frobenius and are over  $\mathcal{C}$  (i.e.  $\Sigma_G L = \Sigma_X$ ).*

238 *Proof.* By the proposition all that is required is a proof that the category of adjunc-  
 239 tions  $L' \dashv R' : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G \times X, \mathcal{C}/X]$  over  $\mathcal{C}/X$  that satisfy Frobenius reciprocity is  
 240 equivalent to the category of adjunctions  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  that are stably  
 241 Frobenius. To see that this is sufficient to complete the proof recall from above that  
 242  $[G, \mathcal{C}]/(X, \pi_2) \cong [G \times X, \mathcal{C}/X]$  and so the assumption that  $\Sigma_G \dashv G^*$  is stably Frobenius  
 243 implies that  $(G \times X)^* : \mathcal{C}/X \rightarrow [G \times X, \mathcal{C}/X]$  has a left adjoint and the resulting adjunction  
 244 satisfies Frobenius reciprocity, allowing the proposition to be applied. Now any adjunction  
 245  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  factors as

$$\mathcal{C}/X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{\Delta_X}} \\ \xleftarrow{\Delta_X^*} \end{array} \mathcal{C}/X \times X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L_{(X, \pi_2)}} \\ \xleftarrow{R_{(X, \pi_2)}} \end{array} [G, \mathcal{C}]/(X, \pi_2) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{(X, \pi_2)}} \\ \xleftarrow{(X, \pi_2)^*} \end{array} [G, \mathcal{C}]$$

246 and so gives rise to an adjunction  $L_{(X, \pi_2)} \Sigma_{\Delta_X} \dashv \Delta_X^* R_{(X, \pi_2)}$  which can be seen to be over  $\mathcal{C}/X$ ;  
 247 this adjunction satisfies Frobenius reciprocity because  $L \dashv R$  is stably Frobenius (and the  
 248 property of satisfying Frobenius reciprocity is preserved by composition of adjunctions).  
 249 In the other direction say we are given  $L' \dashv R' : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G \times X, \mathcal{C}/X]$  over  $\mathcal{C}/X$  that  
 250 satisfies Frobenius reciprocity. Then by the proposition  $L' \dashv R'$  is stably Frobenius and so  
 251 the composite adjunction

$$\mathcal{C}/X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{L'} \\ \xleftarrow{R'} \end{array} [G, \mathcal{C}]/(X, \pi_2) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma_{(X, \pi_2)}} \\ \xleftarrow{(X, \pi_2)^*} \end{array} [G, \mathcal{C}]$$

252 is stably Frobenius. It can be readily checked that this composite adjunction is over  $\mathcal{C}$  and  
 253 that the two constructions establishes an equivalence between two categories of adjunctions.

254 **COROLLARY 3.4.** *For an adjunction  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  the following are  
 255 equivalent:*

- 256 (1)  $L \dashv R$  is stably Frobenius;  
 257 (2)  $L_{G^*X} \dashv R_{G^*X}$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity; and  
 258 (3)  $L_{G^*Z} \dashv R_{G^*Z}$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity for every object  $Z$  of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

259 We do not use these characterisations below; they are included here because they can be  
 260 applied to show that geometric morphisms between bounded toposes over a base topos **Set**  
 261 can be characterised as **Loc**-indexed adjunctions (in the sense of indexed category theory,  
 262 e.g. [J02, B1]). It is hoped to make this the subject of a separate paper.

263 *Proof.* Clearly (1) implies (3) implies (2) because (3) and (2) are weaker conditions than  
 264 (1). (2) implies (1) because if  $L_{G^*X} \dashv R_{G^*X}$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity then so does the  
 265 adjunction  $\mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows \mathcal{C}/X \times X \rightleftarrows [G, \mathcal{C}]/G^*X$ . This latter adjunction, as we have remarked  
 266 in the proof of the theorem, is over  $\mathcal{C}/X$  and so we may apply the ‘Further’ part of the  
 267 Proposition 3.1 to conclude that it is stably Frobenius.

268 In the case  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$ , the generic principal  $G$ -bundle,  $(G, m)$ , corresponds to the étale point  
 269 of the topos of  $G$ -sets; the right adjoint constructed in the Theorem is then the usual forgetful  
 270 functor (forget the  $G$ -action).

#### 271 4. Extending to groupoids

272 The above definitions and results can easily be generalised from groups to groupoids. If  
 273  $\mathbb{G} = (G_1 \times_{G_0} G_1 \xrightarrow{m} G_1 \xrightarrow[d_1]{d_0} G_0)$  is an internal groupoid in a cartesian category  $\mathcal{C}$  then  
 274  $((G_1)_{d_0}, m)$  is itself a ‘special’ object of  $[\mathbb{G}, \mathcal{C}]$  in the sense that  $((G_1)_{d_0}, m) \times (A_g, *_A) \cong$   
 275  $((G_1)_{d_0}, m) \times \mathbb{G}^*A$  where  $\mathbb{G}^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [\mathbb{G}, \mathcal{C}]$  is the functor that send an object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the  
 276  $\mathbb{G}$ -object  $(\pi_1 : G_0 \times X \longrightarrow G_0, d_1 \times Id_X)$ . The data for a principal  $\mathbb{G}$ -bundle additionally  
 277 includes a map  $g : P \longrightarrow G_0$  that is invariant under the action. The proofs above go  
 278 through essentially unchanged, so we content ourselves with stating the following theorem:

279 **THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cartesian category and  $\mathbb{G}$  an internal groupoid with the prop-*  
 280 *erty that the functor  $\mathbb{G}^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [\mathbb{G}, \mathcal{C}]$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}$  such that  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}} \dashv \mathbb{G}^*$  is stably*  
 281 *Frobenius and let  $X$  be an object of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then there is an equivalence between the category*  
 282 *of principal  $\mathbb{G}$ -bundles over  $X$  and the category of adjunctions  $L \dashv R : \mathcal{C}/X \rightleftarrows [\mathbb{G}, \mathcal{C}]$  that*  
 283 *are stably Frobenius and are over  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

284 If  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Set}$  then this Theorem captures an instance of Diaconescu’s theorem, because prin-  
 285 cipal  $\mathbb{G}$ -bundles are the same thing as  $\mathbb{G}$ -torsors in this case. However, the applications that  
 286 we focus on here are to geometric morphisms.

#### 287 5. Application to geometric morphisms

288 We now apply our results to the case  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Loc}$ , the category of locales and so  $\mathbb{G}$  is a  
 289 groupoid internal to **Loc**; i.e. a localic groupoid. See, for example, [J02, part C] for relevant  
 290 background material. Our aim is to explain how to apply the results above to show that  
 291 geometric morphisms  $f : Sh(X) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  are the same thing as principal  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ -bundles over  
 292  $X$ , where  $Sh(X)$  is the topos of sheaves for a locale  $X$  and  $B\mathbb{G}$  is the topos of  $\mathbb{G}$ -equivariant  
 293 sheaves; that is, the full subcategory of  $[\mathbb{G}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  consisting of  $\mathbb{G}$ -objects,  $(A_g, *_A)$  such that  
 294  $g : A \longrightarrow G_0$  is a local homeomorphism.  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  is the étale completion of  $\mathbb{G}$ ; see, e.g. [J02,  
 295 C5.3-16] for a description of étale completion. We will show that we cannot hope to apply the  
 296 result for arbitrary localic groupoids  $\mathbb{G} = (G_1 \xrightarrow[d_1]{d_0} G_0)$ , but we can for the two important



297 special cases of (i) an open and (ii) a proper localic groupoid; that is,  $d_0$  (equivalently  $d_1$ )  
 298 is (i) open and (ii) proper. To apply Theorem 4.1 we need to make two connections. Firstly  
 299 we need to recall that geometric morphisms  $f : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  between any two elementary  
 300 toposes  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  can be represented as stably Frobenius adjunctions  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^*$  between the  
 301 corresponding categories of locales (that is, between  $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\mathbf{Loc}_{\mathcal{E}}$ ). Secondly we need to  
 302 recall what conditions are required to ensure that the equivalence  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  holds  
 303 (it is well known that  $\mathbf{Loc}_{Sh(X)} \simeq \mathbf{Loc}/X$ ; e.g. [J02, theorem C1.6.3]). The following two  
 304 propositions address how to make these two connections in turn.

305 **PROPOSITION 5.1.** *For any two elementary toposes  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  there is a categorical equi-*  
 306 *valence between the category of geometric morphisms from  $\mathcal{F}$  to  $\mathcal{E}$  and the category of*  
 307 *adjunctions  $L \dashv R : \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathcal{F}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Loc}_{\mathcal{E}}$  that are stably Frobenius and have  $R$  preserving the*  
 308 *Sierpiński locale.*

309 *Proof.* This is essentially the main result of [T10b]. If  $f : \mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}}$  is a geometric morph-  
 310 ism between elementary toposes then there is a ‘pullback’ adjunction  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^*$  between the  
 311 category of locales in  $\mathcal{F}$  and the category of locales in  $\mathcal{E}$ , with the right adjoint being given  
 312 by pullback in the category of elementary toposes. [T10b] shows how [J02, C2.4.11] can  
 313 be used to easily show that the adjunction  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^*$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity for any  
 314 geometric morphism  $f$  and, moreover, shows that any such adjunction,  $L \dashv R$ , arises in this  
 315 way from a uniquely determined geometric morphism, provided  $R$  preserves the Sierpiński  
 316 locale and its internal distributive lattice structure. But for any locale  $X$  over  $\mathcal{E}$  there is a  
 317 geometric morphism  $f_X : Sh_{\mathcal{F}}(f^*X) \longrightarrow Sh_{\mathcal{E}}(X)$  obtained by pulling back along the loc-  
 318 alic geometric morphism  $Sh(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ . [T10b, lemma 3.2] confirms the easily observed  
 319 fact that the pullback adjunction  $\Sigma_{f_X} \dashv (f_X)^*$  is  $(\Sigma_f)_X \dashv (f^*)_X$  (under  $\mathbf{Loc}_{Sh(X)} \simeq \mathbf{Loc}/X$ )  
 320 and so  $\Sigma_f \dashv f^*$  is stably Frobenius since  $(\Sigma_f)_X \dashv (f^*)_X$  satisfies Frobenius reciprocity for  
 321 each  $X$ .

322 For all localic groupoids  $\mathbb{G}$ , the functor  $\mathbb{G}^* : \mathbf{Loc} \rightarrow [\mathbb{G}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  has a left adjoint since  $\mathbf{Loc}$   
 323 has coequalisers. But the resulting adjunction does not necessarily satisfy Frobenius reci-  
 324 procity. To see this, consider a regular epimorphism  $f : X \longrightarrow Y$  in the category of locales  
 325 that is not stable under products (so, there exists a locale  $Q$  such that  $X \times Q \xrightarrow{Id_Q \times f} Y \times Q$   
 326 is not a regular epimorphism - see [P97, p39, preamble to lemma 4.4], for a specific ex-  
 327 ample of such  $f$  and  $Q$ ). Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be the groupoid determined by the kernel pair of  $f$ . Then  
 328  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}(1) = Y$  and  $\mathbb{G}^*Q$  is  $(X \times Q, (X \times_Y X) \times Q \xrightarrow{\pi_2 \times Id_Q} X \times Q)$ , and so  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}\mathbb{G}^*X$  is the  
 329 coequaliser of the product of the kernel pair of  $f$  and  $Q$ . By assumption this coequaliser  
 330 is not  $Y \times Q$  and so we cannot have  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}(1 \times \mathbb{G}^*(Q)) \cong \Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}(1) \times Q$  and  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}} \dashv \mathbb{G}^*$  does  
 331 not satisfy Frobenius reciprocity. So, ensuring that  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}} \dashv \mathbb{G}^*$  is stably Frobenius must re-  
 332 quire some further assumptions of  $\mathbb{G}$ . The following proposition describes two cases of such  
 333 further assumptions:

334 **PROPOSITION 5.2.** *If  $\mathbb{G}$  is an open or proper localic groupoid then:*

- 335 (i)  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  over  $\mathbf{Loc}$ ; and  
 336 (ii) the adjunction  $\Sigma_{\hat{\mathbb{G}}} \dashv \hat{\mathbb{G}}^* : [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}] \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Loc}$  is stably Frobenius.

337 *Proof.* (i) [J02, theorem C5.1.5] shows that locales descend along geometric morphisms  
 338  $f : \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , whenever  $f$  is an open surjection or a proper surjection. For any localic  
 339 groupoid  $\mathbb{G}$  there is a surjective geometric morphism  $d : Sh(G_0) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  (whose in-  
 340 verse image is the forgetful functor), and it is easy to see that the definition of ‘locales

341 descend along  $d'$  (see [J02, the preamble to lemma 5.1.2]) is equivalent to the assertion that  
 342  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  because  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$  is by definition the localic groupoid determined by pulling  
 343 back  $d$  against itself [J02, C5.3.16].

344 [J02, lemma C5.3.6] shows that for an open (or proper) localic groupoid  $\mathbb{G}$  the geometric  
 345 morphism  $d$  is an open (or proper) surjection and so  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  as required.

346 The forgetful functor  $[\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}] \longrightarrow \mathbf{Loc}/G_0$  corresponds to  $d^* : \mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Loc}/G_0$   
 347 under this equivalence and since the forgetful functor is monadic, it reflects isomorphisms.  
 348 Using  $\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}$  for the geometric morphism  $B\mathbb{G} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ , observe that  $d^*\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}^* \cong G_0^*$  and so the  
 349 equivalence  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  can be seen to be over  $\mathbf{Loc}$  since  $G_0$  is the locale of objects  
 350 of  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ .

351 (ii) is clear from (i) because  $\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}$  induces a stably Frobenius adjunction  $\Sigma_{\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}} \dashv \gamma_{\mathbb{G}}^* :$   
 352  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Loc}$  by the last Proposition and we have observed that  $\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}^*$  maps to  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}^*$  under  
 353  $\mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}} \simeq [\hat{\mathbb{G}}, \mathbf{Loc}]$

354 Alternatively, (ii) can be proved directly. If  $\mathbb{G}$  is open (or proper) then so is its étale  
 355 completion [J02, C5.3.16]. But asserting that the adjunction  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}} \dashv \mathbb{G}^*$  is stably Frobenius  
 356 can be seen to be equivalent to asserting that the coequaliser determined by  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}(A_g, *_A)$  is  
 357 pullback stable. This is well known to be the case if the groupoid is open or proper because  
 358 the coequaliser determined by  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{G}}(A_g, *_A)$  must be open (e.g. [J02, proposition C5.1.4])  
 359 and open (and proper) coequalisers are pullback stable.

360 *Remark 5.3.* It is worth noting that the direct proof of (ii) can be done axiomatically  
 361 (using an axiomatic system similar to [T10a]). This shows that statements and results about  
 362 open maps are formally dual to statements and results about proper maps. It also follows  
 363 that we could apply our main result to  $[\mathbb{G}, \mathbf{Loc}]$ , without going to the étale completion; but  
 364 the cost is that  $[\mathbb{G}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  will not necessarily be a category of locales for some topos. As  
 365 future work it may be worth examining whether axiomatic approaches to locale theory are  
 366 stable under the formation of the category of  $\mathbb{G}$ -objects, where  $\mathbb{G}$  is not necessarily étale  
 367 complete. This could provide a category of ‘spaces’ more granular than the category of  
 368 bounded toposes and still capable of classifying principal bundles.

369 We now state and prove our main application.

370 **THEOREM 5.4.** *Let  $\mathbb{G}$  be a localic groupoid and  $X$  a locale.*

371 (i) *If  $\mathbb{G}$  is open, there is an equivalence between the category of geometric morphisms*  
 372  *$Sh(X) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  and the category of principal  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ -bundles over  $X$ . The principal*  
 373 *bundle maps  $f : P \longrightarrow X$  that arise in this way are always open surjections.*

374 (ii) *If  $\mathbb{G}$  is proper, there is an equivalence between the category of geometric morphisms*  
 375  *$Sh(X) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  and the category of principal  $\hat{\mathbb{G}}$ -bundles over  $X$ . The principal*  
 376 *bundle maps  $f : P \longrightarrow X$  that arise in this way are always proper surjections.*

377 Any Grothendieck topos is equivalent to  $B\mathbb{G}$  for some open localic groupoid [J02, C5.2.11],  
 378 so (i) provides a principal bundle description of the points (with localic domains at least) of  
 379 arbitrary Grothendieck toposes. In fact one can always choose an étale complete open localic  
 380 groupoid to represent a Grothendieck topos [J02, C5.3.16], and so for any Grothendieck  
 381 topos  $\mathcal{E}$  there is a localic groupoid  $\mathbb{G}$  such that geometric morphisms  $Sh(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  (over  
 382  $\mathbf{Set}$ ) are the same things as principal  $\mathbb{G}$ -bundles over  $X$ . (i) is originally observed in [B90]  
 383 using different methods. (i) restricted to étale groupoids; that is, groupoids such that  $d_0$   
 384 (equivalently  $d_1$ ) is a local homeomorphism, is covered in [I96] and [I91].

385 *Proof.* (i) and (ii) together: the proof is essentially a question of applying our main  
 386 theorem (Theorem 4.1), given the last two propositions. Notice for any adjunction  
 387  $\mathbf{Loc}/X \rightleftarrows \mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}}$  that is over  $\mathbf{Loc}$ , the right adjoint must preserve the Sierpiński locale be-  
 388 cause both  $\gamma_{\mathbb{G}}^* : \mathbf{Loc} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Loc}_{B\mathbb{G}}$  and  $X^* : \mathbf{Loc} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Loc}/X$  preserve the Sierpiński  
 389 locale.

390 For any principal bundle  $(f : P \longrightarrow X, * : G_1 \times_{G_0} P \longrightarrow P)$  determined by either  
 391 the equivalence of (i) or (ii), it should be clear that the morphism  $f$  is an open (or proper)  
 392 surjection. This is because it is determined by pullback of the open (proper) surjection  $d : Sh(G_0) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  and open (proper) surjections are pullback stable.  
 393

## 394 6. Further work

395 There are two areas where more detailed further work should easily yield specific  
 396 results:

397 (1) Results of Moerdijk [I90] show how geometric morphisms can be described as certain  
 398 locales with actions, and so are similar to our results. In that paper the actions are of a  
 399 localic category, rather than a localic groupoid and so it is not immediately clear how to  
 400 relate Moerdijk's results back to ours. However the key construction of [I90] also uses a  
 401 tensor, similarly to our results, so there appears to be a close relationship.

402 (2) In this paper we have only looked at geometric morphisms  $Sh(X) \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$  over  
 403  $\mathbf{Set}$ , rather than general geometric morphisms  $\mathcal{F} \longrightarrow B\mathbb{G}$ . For  $\mathcal{F}$  bounded over  $\mathbf{Set}$  we can  
 404 always find an open groupoid  $\mathbb{H}$  so that such general geometric morphisms can be represen-  
 405 ted as stably Frobenius adjunctions between  $[\mathbb{H}, \mathbf{Loc}]$  and  $[\mathbb{G}, \mathbf{Loc}]$ . It is expected that in a  
 406 category whose objects are stably Frobenius adjunctions over some base cartesian category  
 407  $\mathcal{C}$  (and whose morphisms are stably Frobenius adjunctions over  $\mathcal{C}$ ), any object of the form  
 408  $[\mathbb{H}, \mathcal{C}]$  is a suitable coequalizer (perhaps of the simplicial diagram determined by  $\mathbb{H}$ ). In this  
 409 way it should be straightforward to extend the results from  $Sh(X)$  to an arbitrary bounded  
 410 topos  $\mathcal{F}$ , so providing a description of general geometric morphisms as a locale over two  
 411 bases ( $H_0$  and  $G_0$ ) with two (interacting) groupoid actions such that one of the actions is  
 412 principal.

## 413 REFERENCES

- 414 [B90] M. BUNGE. An application of descent to a classification theorem for toposes. *Math. Proc. Camb.*  
 415 *Phil. Soc.* **107** (1990), pp 59–79.  
 416 [BLV11] A. BRUGUIERES, S. LACK and A. VIRELIZIER. Hopf monads on monoidal categories. *Adv.*  
 417 *Math.* **227** Issue 2, 1 (2011), pp. 745–800.  
 418 [J02] P. T. JOHNSTONE. *Sketches of an elephant: a topos theory compendium*. Vols 1, 2, Oxford Logic  
 419 Guides **43, 44** (Oxford Science Publications, 2002).  
 420 [JT84] A. JOYAL and M. TIERNEY. An extension of the Galois theory of Grothendieck. *Mem. Amer.*  
 421 *Math. Soc.* **309** (1984).  
 422 [K89] A. KOCK. Fibre bundles in general categories. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra.* **56**, 3 (1989), 233–245.  
 423 [I90] I. MOERDIJK. The classifying topos of a continuous groupoid. II. *Cah. Topol. Géom. Differ.*  
 424 *Catég.* **31**, No. 2 (1990), 137–168.  
 425 [I91] I. MOERDIJK. Classifying toposes and foliations. *Ann. Inst. fourier (Grenoble).* **41**, no. 1 (1991),  
 426 p. 189–209.  
 427 [I96] I. MOERDIJK. *Classifying Spaces and Classifying Topoi.* **1616** (Springer Verlag, 1995).  
 428 [P97] T. PLEWE. Localic triquotient maps are effective descent maps. *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.*  
 429 **122**, No. 01 (Cambridge University Press, 1997), 17–43.

- 430 [T06] C. F. TOWNSEND. On the parallel between the suplattice and preframe approaches to locale  
431 theory. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic.* **137**, 1-3 (2006), 391–412
- 432 [T10a] C. F. TOWNSEND. An axiomatic account of weak triquotient assignments in locale theory. *J.*  
433 *Pure Appl. Algebra.* **6**, 214 (2010), 729–739.
- 434 [T10b] C. F. TOWNSEND. A representation theorem for geometric morphisms. *Appl. Categ. Structures.*  
435 **18** (2010), 573–583.