

Double Categories of Relations

Michael Lambert

July 19, 2021

Abstract

A double category of relations is essentially a cartesian equipment with strong, discrete and functorial tabulators and for which certain local products satisfy a Frobenius Law. A double category of relations is equivalent to a double category whose proarrows are relations on some ordinary category admitting a proper and stable factorization system. This characterization is based closely on the recent characterization of double categories of spans due to Aleiferi. The overall development can be viewed as a double-categorical version of that of the notion of a “tabular allegory” or that of a “functionally complete bicategory of relations.”

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Relations as Cartesian Equipments	3
2.1	Factorization Systems	3
2.2	Structure of Relations	4
2.3	Tabulators are Strong and Monic	5
2.4	Modularity vs Reciprocity	8
3	Preliminary Characterization	9
3.1	The Case of Spans	10
3.2	Equivalent Conditions for Oplax/Lax Adjunction	10
3.3	Conditions for Adjoint Equivalences	13
4	Cartesian Equipments as Double Categories of Relations	15
4.1	Covers and Inclusions	15
4.2	A Factorization System	15
4.3	The Characterization Theorem	18
5	Prospectus	19
5.1	Spurious Generality?	19
5.2	Applications	20
5.2.1	Corelations	20
5.2.2	Monoidal Fibrations	20
5.2.3	Logic of Relations	20

1 Introduction

A relation in a category \mathcal{C} with binary products is a monomorphism $S \rightarrow A \times B$ in \mathcal{C} . This abstracts the usual definition in the case where \mathcal{C} is the category of sets. In the latter case relations $S \rightarrow A \times B$ and $T \rightarrow B \times C$ compose by taking $T \circ S \rightarrow A \times C$ to be the set of those (a, c) for which there is a $b \in B$ with aSb and bTc . This is abstracted in the case that \mathcal{C} is a regular category by taking a pullback $S \times_B T$ and then the image $T \circ S$ of the resulting span $S \times_B C \rightarrow A \times C$. However, composition is not strictly associative unless one imposes a suitable equivalence relation. In the former case, the structure ends up being that of a bicategory $\mathfrak{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$. In the latter case, one has an honest category $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$.

A **bicategory of relations** [CW87] is a cartesian bicategory in which every object is discrete. Every functionally complete bicategory of relations is biequivalent to one of the form $\mathfrak{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$. “Functionally complete” means that

every arrow has a so-called “tabulation.” An **allegory** [FS90] is a locally-ordered 2-category equipped with an anti-involution $(-)^{\circ}$ satisfying a modularity law $fg \wedge h \leq (f \wedge hg^{\circ})g$ written in compositional order. Each “tabular” allegory is equivalent to an ordinary category $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$. In this sense, functionally complete bicategories of relations and tabular allegories are characterizations of a “calculus of relations.” Another approach to formalizing a calculus of relations is that of the double category $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$ for a regular category \mathcal{C} . Its objects and arrows are sets and functions, while its proarrows and cells are relations and suitable functions between them. This paper has its origin in the question of which double categories occur as $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$ for some regular category \mathcal{C} . That is, the question is, what conditions are necessary and sufficient for a double category to be of the form $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$?

Any answer should follow to some extent the development for allegories and bicategories of relations. First off, bicategories of relations are *cartesian* double categories. Thus, a starting point for the double-categorical question is the recent definition of a “cartesian double category” and the accompanying characterization of double categories of the form $\mathbf{Span}(\mathcal{C})$ for some finitely-complete category \mathcal{C} as in [Ale18]. A double category \mathbb{D} is equivalent to one $\mathbf{Span}(\mathcal{C})$ if, and only if, \mathbb{D} is a unit-pure cartesian equipment with strong tabulators and certain Eilenberg-Moore objects. “Unit-pure” is a sort of discreteness requirement whereas the latter two conditions are completeness requirements on top of that of being cartesian. That \mathbb{D} is an equipment seems a minimal requirement on double categories reproducing much of the conventional calculus of Kan extensions arising in the case of profunctors and enabling various constructions in formal category theory (Cf. [Roa15] and [Roa19]).

Following [Ale18], the goal is to characterize $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$ as a certain cartesian equipment satisfying further completeness conditions. What distinguishes the present approach from that of [Ale18] is the emphasis on tabulators. In the reference, Eilenberg-Moore objects are taken as basic and their existence is shown to imply that of tabulators. However, the full characterizations of allegories and bicategories of relations really depend on the tabulations. In the case of allegories, a tabulator of an arrow R is a pair of arrows f and g such that $gf^{\circ} = R$ and $f^{\circ}f \wedge g^{\circ}g = 1$. The first condition says that the tabulator is “strong” and the second that “tabulators are monic.” The latter condition is what distinguishes relations from ordinary spans. Now, in an arbitrary double category tabulators would be given by a right adjoint $\top: \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ to the external identity functor $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ [GP04]. In the case of profunctors, this definition specializes to the category of elements construction. Owing to the importance of category of elements constructions, tabulators are thus taken as basic.

Thus, the present characterization gives further conditions on tabulators in a cartesian equipment ensuring that it is of the form $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C})$. In fact it is convenient to work in a slightly more general setting of a category \mathcal{C} admitting a stable and proper factorization system $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$. In this setting the double-categorical calculus of relations exists allowing the formation of the cartesian equipment $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$. We develop a Frobenius law in §2.4 which is used in the proof of Theorem 4.11 showing that \mathbb{D}_0 admits a suitably rich factorization system for forming $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$. It turns out that at this level of generality $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is unit-pure, its tabulators are strong and suitably functorial, local products satisfy Frobenius, and inclusions satisfy an important exactness condition. Our main result, namely, Theorem 4.14 below is that these conditions are sufficient:

Theorem 1.1. *A double category \mathbb{D} is equivalent to one $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ for some proper and stable factorization system on a finitely-complete category \mathcal{C} if, and only if, \mathbb{D} is*

1. *a unit-pure cartesian equipment;*
2. *with strong, discrete and functorial tabulators;*
3. *for which local products satisfy Frobenius.*

Details on double categories can be found in [GP99] and [GP04]. Throughout we shall always mean a pseudo-double category, that is, a pseudo-category object in \mathbf{Cat} viewed as a 2-category. Our conventions and notations are summarized in a previous paper [Lam21]. An **oplax/lax adjunction** between double categories is a conjoint pair of arrows in the strict double category of lax and oplax functors [GP04]. An oplax/lax adjunction is **strong** if both functors are pseudo. In §2 is given a review of factorization systems and the construction of $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$. It is shown to be a cartesian equipment whose local products satisfy the Frobenius Law. The theorem above is proved in two parts. §3 is dedicated to proving the first part, namely, that under suitable conditions on \mathbb{D} , the identity functor on \mathbb{D}_0 extends to an oplax/lax adjunction $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}$. It is shown that under certain further conditions this is in fact a strong adjoint equivalence. In §4 it is seen that related conditions on \mathbb{D} imply that \mathbb{D}_0 admits a suitable factorization system for forming a double category of relations $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$. The main theorem above is then basically a corollary to the two parts of the development.

2 Relations as Cartesian Equipments

A calculus of relations is supported by any category \mathcal{C} equipped with a suitable factorization system. This leads to the formation of a double category $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ whose salient structures are analyzed in this section.

2.1 Factorization Systems

Recall some standard facts that will be needed throughout. See [Bor94] for more.

Definition 2.1. A morphism e has the **left lifting property** with respect to m if for every square as below there is a diagonal filler

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & B \\ e \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow m \\ C & \longrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

making two commutative triangles. Also say that m has the **right lifting property** with respect to e . A class of arrows \mathcal{E} is **orthogonal** to a class of arrows \mathcal{M} if any e has the left lifting property with respect to any morphism in \mathcal{M} and any morphism of \mathcal{M} has the right lifting property with respect to all the morphisms of \mathcal{E} and moreover all of these diagonal lifts are unique. Say in this case that \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} are orthogonal.

Definition 2.2. An **orthogonal factorization system** on a category \mathcal{C} is a pair $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ consisting of two sets of arrows \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} of \mathcal{C} such that

1. every morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ has a factorization $f = me$ where $e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$;
2. \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} are orthogonal.

Denote \mathcal{E} -arrows using ‘ \twoheadrightarrow ’ and \mathcal{M} -arrows by ‘ \rightarrow ’. Regular epimorphisms \mathcal{E} and monomorphisms \mathcal{M} comprise the two classes of an orthogonal factorization system on any regular category.

Proposition 2.3. A pair $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ of subsets of arrows of \mathcal{C} is an orthogonal factorization system if, and only if,

1. the factorization $f = me$ exists and is unique up to unique isomorphism;
2. \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} each contain all isomorphisms and are closed under composition.

Proof. Necessity is straightforward: that \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} are orthogonal induces the required isomorphism. Additionally isomorphisms have required lifting properties with respect to the two subsets \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} simply by virtue of being invertible. For the converse, the conditions imply that \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} are orthogonal: factor the top and bottom arrows in the square setting up the condition. That the two classes are closed under composition and that factorizations are unique induces a unique iso completing the lifting requirement. \square

Lemma 2.4. For any orthogonal factorization system $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ on a category \mathcal{C} ,

1. factorizations are functorial in the sense that given two factorizations making a commutative rectangle, the dashed arrow making two commutative squares exists and is unique:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \end{array}$$

2. \mathcal{M} is closed under pullback and contains any diagonals;
3. dually, \mathcal{E} is closed under pushout and contains all codiagonals.

Proof. (1) Orthogonality implies the existence and uniqueness of the dashed arrow. (2) If the left square is pullback, its universal property gives the dashed arrow:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \\ e \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \cdot & \twoheadrightarrow & \cdot \end{array}$$

Since e is any arrow of \mathcal{E} , this proves the lifting property. (3) Similar to (2) but suitably dualized. \square

Definition 2.5. A **stable factorization system** on \mathcal{C} is an orthogonal factorization system on \mathcal{C} for which \mathcal{E} is pullback-stable. An orthogonal factorization system is **proper** if every arrow in \mathcal{E} is an epimorphism and every arrow in \mathcal{M} is a monomorphism.

2.2 Structure of Relations

Let \mathcal{C} denote a cartesian category with a stable factorization system $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$. Thus, \mathcal{M} is closed under pullback, contains all the diagonals and thus all graphs and cographs.

Definition 2.6. An \mathcal{F} -relation is an \mathcal{M} -monic arrow $R \rightarrow A \times B$.

Let $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_0 = \mathcal{C}$ and take $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_1$ to denote the category whose objects are spans $A \xleftarrow{l} S \xrightarrow{r} B$ such that l and r are jointly in \mathcal{M} . The arrows are morphisms of spans. This will define the structure of a double category, and in fact, a cartesian equipment satisfying other axioms. Its objects and arrows are those of \mathcal{C} . Its proarrows are \mathcal{F} -relations and its cells θ as at left are morphisms $\theta: R \rightarrow S$ making

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{R} & B \\ f \downarrow & \theta & \downarrow g \\ C & \xrightarrow{S} & D \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} R & \longrightarrow & A \times B \\ \theta \downarrow & & \downarrow f \times g \\ S & \longrightarrow & C \times D \end{array}$$

as on the right commute. Take $y: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ to denote the functor sending an object X to the span consisting of identity arrows on X and taking a morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xleftarrow{1} & X & \xrightarrow{1} & X \\ f \downarrow & & f \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Y & \xleftarrow{1} & Y & \xrightarrow{1} & Y \end{array}$$

This is well-defined because the diagonal morphisms are supposed to be in \mathcal{M} . In this sense, the diagonals are chosen images. Notice moreover that $y: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is fully faithful by construction. The source and target functors $\text{src}, \text{tgt}: \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F}) \rightrightarrows \mathcal{C}$ are given by taking a cell θ as above to f and to g , respectively. That is, f is the source of θ while g is the target. These are clearly functors. What will be external composition is given by pullback in \mathcal{C} and taking \mathcal{F} -images. That is, given two \mathcal{F} -relations $R \rightarrow A \times B$ and $S \rightarrow B \times C$ take the pullback $R \times_B S$ in \mathcal{C} and define the composite $R \odot S$ to be the span coming from the \mathcal{F} -image

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R \times_B S & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A \times C \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & R \odot S & \end{array}$$

This assignment extends to a functor

$$\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_1 \times_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_1 \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_1$$

giving the external composition. The arrow assignment

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R \times_B S & \xrightarrow{\quad} & A \times C & & \\ \downarrow & \searrow & \nearrow & & \\ & R \odot S & & & \\ \downarrow & \vdots & \downarrow & & \\ T \times_B U & \xrightarrow{\quad} & X \times Z & & \\ & \searrow & \nearrow & & \\ & T \odot U & & & \end{array}$$

exists and is functorial by the fact that images coming with the orthogonal factorization system are functorial. Note that this does not require stability. It is immediate that \otimes so defined satisfies the expected properties with respect to sources and targets.

Lemma 2.7. $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is a double category.

Proof. Components of associativity natural isos are induced using the fact that \mathcal{E} is pullback stable; that is, the dashed iso below exists since each side of the figure is an image factorization of the same morphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (R \times_B S) \times_C T & \xrightarrow{\cong} & R \times_B (S \times_C T) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 R \odot S \times_C T & & R \times_B S \odot T \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 (R \odot S) \odot T & \overset{\exists!}{\underset{\cong}{\dashrightarrow}} & R \odot (S \odot T) \\
 & \searrow & \swarrow \\
 & A \times D &
 \end{array}$$

Naturality follows by uniqueness in the orthogonality condition; associativity, because images are unique up to unique iso. The proarrows giving the external units are the diagonals $\Delta: A \rightarrow A \times A$. These are inclusions since \mathcal{M} is closed under finite limits and diagonals. Note that $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is flat since inclusions are monic, hence left-cancelable. \square

Definition 2.8. A double category \mathbb{D} has **tabulators** if $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ has a right adjoint $\top: \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ in **Dbl**. In this case, the **tabulator** of a proarrow $m: A \rightarrow B$ is the object $\top m$ together with the counit cell $\top m \Rightarrow m$. Denote the external source and target by l and r , respectively.

Lemma 2.9. $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ has tabulators. The unit of the adjunction $y \dashv \top$ is iso. Equivalently y is fully-faithful.

Proof. Define $\top: \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})_0$ by sending $R \rightarrow A \times B$ to R with the evident assignment on arrows. In other words, \top takes the apex of spans and morphisms between them. The component of the counit at $R \rightarrow A \times B$ is the cell given by the morphism of \mathcal{F} -relations

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 R & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & R \times R \\
 \downarrow 1 & & \downarrow d \times c \\
 R & \xrightarrow{(d,c)} & A \times B
 \end{array}$$

On the other hand, the unit is up to iso the identity map on a given object A . That is, y takes the diagonal $A \rightarrow A \times A$ and then \top takes the apex A , meaning that $1 \cong \top y$ canonically. By a general result on adjoint functors (IV.3.1 in [Mac98]) this is equivalent to the statement that y is fully faithful. \square

Definition 2.10 (Cf. §4.3.7 [Ale18]). A double category \mathbb{D} is **unit-pure** if $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ is full.

Example 2.11. **Set**, **Span**(\mathcal{C}) and $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ are all unit-pure whereas **Prof** is not.

Since $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ is always faithful, unit-pure means that y is fully faithful. If \mathbb{D} has tabulators, this is equivalent to the statement that the unit of the adjunction $y \dashv \top$ is invertible.

2.3 Tabulators are Strong and Monic

Relations not only form a double category, but have all companions and conjoints, making $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ into an equipment. Not only that, but $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is cartesian. This allows us to formulate a version of “tabulators are monic” using local products.

Definition 2.12 (Cf. [GP04]). An arrow $f: A \rightarrow B$ and proarrow $f_! : A \twoheadrightarrow B$ in a double category \mathbb{D} are **companions** with unit and counit

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_A} & A \\ \downarrow 1 & \eta & \downarrow f \\ A & \xrightarrow{f_!} & B \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f_!} & B \\ \downarrow f & \epsilon & \downarrow 1 \\ B & \xrightarrow{y_B} & B \end{array}$$

if $\eta \otimes \epsilon = 1$ and $\epsilon\eta = y_f$ both hold. Dually, an arrow $f: A \rightarrow B$ and proarrow $f^* : B \twoheadrightarrow A$ are **conjoint** with unit and counit

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{f^*} & A \\ \downarrow 1 & \epsilon & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{y_B} & B \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_A} & A \\ \downarrow f & \eta & \downarrow 1 \\ B & \xrightarrow{f^*} & A \end{array}$$

if $\epsilon \otimes \eta = 1$ and $\epsilon\eta = y_f$ hold. In the former case $(f, f_!)$ is said to form a companion pair; in the latter case (f, f^*) is a conjoint pair. $f_!$ is a companion of f and f^* is a conjoint of f .

Definition 2.13 (Cf. §4 of [Shu08]). A double category \mathbb{D} is an **equipment** if every arrow $f: A \rightarrow B$ has both a proarrow companion and a proarrow conjoint.

Example 2.14. \mathbf{Set} , \mathbf{Prof} , \mathbf{Rel} are all equipments. So is $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$. Companions in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ are given by graphs; conjoints by opgraphs.

Definition 2.15. A cell θ as below is **cartesian** if given any other cell δ

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{m} & B \\ \downarrow f & \theta & \downarrow g \\ C & \xrightarrow{n} & D \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \\ \downarrow h & \delta & \downarrow k \\ C & \xrightarrow{n} & D \end{array}$$

together with arrows u and v such that $f = hu$ and $g = kv$, there is a unique cell γ with source h and target k such that $\theta\gamma = \delta$ holds. A **restriction** of a niche as at left below is a cartesian cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & & B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ C & \xrightarrow{n} & D \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A & \twoheadrightarrow & B \\ \downarrow f & \rho & \downarrow g \\ C & \xrightarrow{n} & D \end{array}$$

as on the right.

Remark 2.16. A cell is cartesian if, and only if, it is a cartesian arrow for the functor $\langle \text{src}, \text{tgt} \rangle : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_0$. Thus, dually, an opcartesian cell is an opcartesian arrow for the same functor. An **extension** of a “coniche” as on the left below is an opcartesian cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{m} & B \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow g \\ C & & D \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{m} & B \\ \downarrow f & \xi & \downarrow g \\ C & \twoheadrightarrow & D \end{array}$$

as on the right.

Lemma 2.17. A double category \mathbb{D} is an equipment if and only if $\langle \text{src}, \text{tgt} \rangle : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_0$ is a bifibration. An equipment thus has all restrictions and extensions.

Proof. A detailed proof is given in [Shu08]. The restriction of a niche as above is the composite $f_! \otimes n \otimes g^*$. Dually, the extension of the coniche is the composite $f^* \otimes m \otimes g_!$. \square

Restrictions and extensions of external identity arrows will be denoted as $f_! \otimes g^*$ and $f^* \otimes g_!$, respectively, without the “ y ” to reduce notational clutter. We shall assume that for any equipment $\langle \text{src}, \text{tgt} \rangle : \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0 \times \mathbb{D}_0$ is a cloven fibration.

Example 2.18. Extensions in $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ are computed by \mathcal{F} -images; restrictions are given by pullback.

Let \mathbf{DbI} denote the 2-category of double categories, double functors and (vertical) transformations.

Definition 2.19 (Cf. §4.2 of [Ale18]). A double category \mathbb{D} is **cartesian** if the double functors $\Delta: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ have right adjoints in \mathbf{DbI} .

Lemma 2.20 (See Prop. 4.2.2 of [Ale18]). *If \mathbb{D} is a cartesian equipment, then every category $\mathbb{D}(A, B)$ has products. In this sense \mathbb{D} has “local products.”*

Proof. Given two proarrows $m: A \rightrightarrows B$ and $n: A \rightrightarrows B$, the product in $\mathbb{D}(A, B)$ is given by taking the restriction

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \overset{m \wedge n}{\dashrightarrow} & B \\ \Delta \downarrow & \rho & \downarrow \Delta \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{m \times n} & B \times B \end{array}$$

along the diagonals. □

Lemma 2.21. $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is cartesian and thus has local products.

Proof. The underlying category is \mathcal{C} , which has a terminal object and products by assumption. The product of relations $R: A \rightrightarrows B$ and $S: C \rightrightarrows D$ is the product

$$R \times S \rightarrow A \times B \times C \times D \cong A \times C \times B \times D$$

which is again a relation since \mathcal{M} is closed under products. This defines the required right adjoint to the diagonal double functor. The required adjoint for the double functor $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ uses the fact that \mathcal{C} has a terminal object. The terminal relation is the evident morphism $1 \rightarrow 1 \times 1$, which is an iso, hence in \mathcal{M} . □

Remark 2.22. Since restrictions are calculated by pullback, any local product in $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ arises as in the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R \wedge S & \longrightarrow & A \times B \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ R \times S & \longrightarrow & A \times A \times B \times B \end{array}$$

This is needed in the next technical result required for the development of the Frobenius law.

Lemma 2.23. *External composition with conjoinants distributes over local products in the sense that*

$$f^* \otimes (R \wedge S) \cong (f^* \otimes R) \wedge (f^* \otimes S)$$

holds canonically whenever the compositions and products make sense.

Proof. On the one hand, $f^* \otimes (R \wedge S)$ is given by the image of the top arrow of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R \wedge S & \longrightarrow & A \times B & \xrightarrow{f \times 1} & C \times B \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \times \Delta \\ R \times S & \longrightarrow & A \times A \times B \times B & \xrightarrow{f \times f \times 1 \times 1} & C \times C \times B \times B \end{array}$$

On the other hand, $(f^* \otimes R) \wedge (f^* \otimes S)$ is given by a pullback; however by construction of $R \wedge S$, there is a dashed arrow as below, giving the same diagram as that above.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R \wedge S & \dashrightarrow & (f^* \otimes R) \wedge (f^* \otimes S) & \longrightarrow & C \times B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \Delta \times \Delta \\ R \times S & \longrightarrow & (f^* \otimes R) \times (f^* \otimes S) & \longrightarrow & C \times C \times B \times B \end{array}$$

Thus, the left square is a pullback, implying that the dashed arrow is in \mathcal{E} . Thus, $(f^* \otimes R) \wedge (f^* \otimes S)$ is the same image factorization. That is, there is a unique isomorphism as in the statement. □

That tabulators are “monic” now takes the following form.

Proposition 2.24. *The legs of the tabulator of a proarrow $R \rightarrow A \times B$ in $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ are jointly an inclusion and the iso*

$$l^* \otimes l_! \wedge r^* \otimes r_! \cong y$$

holds canonically.

Proof. The first statement is trivial owing to the fact that a proarrow is just an \mathcal{M} -arrow $R \rightarrow A \times B$. For the second statement, the restriction gives the kernel of the relation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{\langle l, r \rangle_! \otimes \langle l, r \rangle^*} & R \\ \langle l, r \rangle \downarrow & \rho & \downarrow \langle l, r \rangle \\ A \times B & \xrightarrow{y} & A \times B \end{array}$$

But the composite

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{l^* \otimes l_! \wedge r^* \otimes r_!} & R \\ \Delta \downarrow & \rho & \downarrow \Delta \\ R \times R & \xrightarrow{l^* \otimes l_! \times r^* \otimes r_!} & R \times R \\ l \times r \downarrow & \rho & \downarrow l \times r \\ A \times B & \xrightarrow{y \times y} & A \times B \end{array}$$

computes the same restriction. So, if one is y , then the other is too and conversely. \square

Tabulators are additionally “strong” in the following sense.

Definition 2.25. The tabulator $\langle l, r \rangle: \top m \rightarrow A \times B$ of a proarrow $m: A \rightarrow B$ is **strong** if m is the canonical extension $m \cong l^* \otimes r_!$.

Proposition 2.26. *Tabulators in $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ are strong.*

Proof. Extensions are given by taking \mathcal{F} -factorizations. \square

2.4 Modularity vs Reciprocity

A morphism in an allegory is supposed to behave as a relation. Accordingly, we think of the proarrows of a given equipment \mathbb{D} as relations. Moreover those proarrows $p: A \rightarrow B$ for which $p = p_!$ for some ordinary arrow $p: A \rightarrow B$, we have $p_! \dashv p^*$ and thus could define such a proarrow to be a **map** in \mathbb{D} . This allows us to formulate a modularity law on the same pattern, namely, as $g \otimes f \wedge h \leq g \otimes (f \wedge g^*h)$, written in diagrammatic order. Local products \wedge can be given by supposing that \mathbb{D} is cartesian and locally ordered.

However, modularity is not quite right for our treatment. Rather what is needed is the Frobenius law used in the development of bicategories of relations. This is a structure law between a monoid $\nabla: X \wedge X \rightarrow X$ and comonoid $\Delta: X \rightarrow X \wedge X$ with $\Delta \dashv \nabla$, namely, that

$$\Delta \nabla \cong (1 \wedge \nabla)(\Delta \wedge 1)$$

holds (ignoring associativity). Maps in a bicategory of relations are again those morphisms of the bicategory with a right adjoint. For each object B of a cartesian bicategory \mathbb{B} there is an induced hyperdoctrine (see [Law70]) valued in meet-semilattices

$$\mathbb{B}(i, B): \mathbf{Map}(\mathbb{B})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{SLat}$$

where i is the inclusion of maps into \mathbb{B} (Cf. [nLa20] for details). The restatement of Frobenius in this context is the law

$$r \wedge qf^\circ = (rf \wedge q)f^\circ.$$

This is a more conventional version of Frobenius. In type theory, this is a statement that existential quantification and conjunction partially commute (Cf. §1.9 of [Jac99]). Reinterpreting this law with internal right adjoints

given by double-categorical conjoints $()^\circ = ()^*$, there is the present version of **Frobenius Law for Cartesian Equipments**:

$$r \wedge f^* \otimes q \cong f^* \otimes (f_! \otimes r \wedge q) \quad (2.1)$$

written in diagrammatic order. The claim is that $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ satisfies this version of Frobenius. This takes the form

$$R \wedge f^* \otimes S \cong f^* \otimes (f_! \otimes R \wedge S) \quad (2.2)$$

for a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ and two relations $R: B \rightrightarrows X$ and $S: A \rightrightarrows X$. The technical ingredient in the next result is that if f is in \mathcal{E} , then the projection $\text{prj}: A \times_B R \rightarrow R$ is also in \mathcal{E} by pullback-stability. This means that the unique map $\text{prj}: f_! \otimes R \rightarrow R$ induced by image factorizations is also in \mathcal{E} . Therefore, again by pullback-stability, the induced product map $\text{prj} \times 1: f_! \otimes R \rightarrow R \times S$ is also in \mathcal{E} .

Proposition 2.27. *Local products in $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ satisfy the Frobenius law.*

Proof. Start with the assumption that f as above is in \mathcal{E} . On the one hand, $R \wedge f^* \otimes S$ is formed from a pullback of the product of diagonals; and taking a further pullback, say, P , it lives as an image factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} P & \longrightarrow & R \wedge f^* \otimes S & \longrightarrow & B \times X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \times \Delta \\ R \times S & \longrightarrow & R \times f^* \otimes S & \longrightarrow & B \times B \times X \times X \end{array}$$

On the other hand, after forming $f_! \otimes R$ as an image, $f^* \otimes (f_! \otimes R \wedge S)$ is the image of the top row in the pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} f_! \otimes R \wedge S & \longrightarrow & A \times X & \xrightarrow{f \times 1} & B \times X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \times \Delta \\ f_! \otimes R \times S & \longrightarrow & A \times A \times X \times X & \longrightarrow & B \times B \times X \times X \end{array}$$

However, $R \wedge f^* \otimes S$ presents this image. For the entire pullback diagram forming $f_! \otimes R \wedge S$ immediately above factors through the diagram giving P . That is, the cover $\text{prj} \times 1: f_! \otimes R \times S \rightarrow R \times S$ along with the projection to $B \times X$ induces the dashed arrow

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} f_! \otimes R \wedge S & \dashrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & R \wedge f^* \otimes S & \longrightarrow & B \times X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta \times \Delta \\ f_! \otimes R \times S & \longrightarrow & R \times S & \longrightarrow & R \times f^* \otimes S & \longrightarrow & B \times B \times X \times X \end{array}$$

using the universal property of the pullback P . This makes the whole figure equal to the pullback diagram forming $f_! \otimes R \wedge S$. This implies the the leftmost square is a pullback, hence that the dashed arrow is a cover. Therefore, the top row is an image factorization and by uniqueness is must be canonically isomorphic to $R \wedge f^* \otimes S$ via a unique isomorphism. Lemma 2.23 completes the proof using the fact that arbitrary f factors as a cover followed by an inclusion:

$$\begin{aligned} f^* \otimes ((f_! \otimes R) \wedge S) &\cong (m^* \otimes e^*) \otimes ((e_! \otimes m_!) \otimes R) \wedge S && \text{(factor } f) \\ &\cong m^* \otimes (e^* \otimes (e_! \otimes (m_! \otimes R)) \wedge S) && \text{(associativity)} \\ &\cong m^* \otimes ((m_! \otimes R) \wedge (e^* \otimes S)) && \text{(Frobenius for } e) \\ &\cong (m^* \otimes m_! \otimes R) \wedge (m^* \otimes e^* \otimes S) && \text{(Lemma 2.23)} \\ &\cong R \wedge (m^* \otimes e^* \otimes S) && \text{(} m \text{ is an inclusion)} \\ &\cong R \wedge f^* \otimes S \end{aligned}$$

as required. \square

3 Preliminary Characterization

This section is devoted to the first part of the main result. That is, the last subsection provides conditions under which a double category \mathbb{D} is equivalent to $\mathbb{R}\text{el}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$ where $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ is a proper and stable factorization system on \mathbb{D}_0 . The starting point for this development is the now well-established treatment of the case of spans in a cartesian category. Review this development first.

3.1 The Case of Spans

The characterization of spans in [Ale18] starts from a result of [Nie12]. Namely, a double category admits a normalized oplax/lax adjunction if and only if it is an equipment with tabulators.

Theorem 3.1 (Theorem 5.5/5.6 of [Nie12]). *Let \mathbb{D} denote a double category with pullbacks. The following are equivalent:*

1. *There is an oplax/lax adjunction $F: \mathbf{Span}(\mathbb{D}_0) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}_0: G$ where F is normal and identity on \mathbb{D}_0 .*
2. *\mathbb{D} has all companions, conjoiners and tabulators.*

Proof. If \mathbb{D} possesses tabulators and is an equipment, this allows construction of the oplax and lax functors. G is defined on proarrows by taking a tabulator; F is defined on proarrows by taking an extension of a coniche given by a span. □

The main result of [Ale18] concerning spans gives equivalent conditions under which such a normalized oplax/lax adjunction is a strong equivalence of double categories. These extra conditions are just that \mathbb{D} is cartesian and possess certain internal Eilenberg-Moore objects.

Definition 3.2 (See §5.3 of [Ale18]). A **copoint** of an endoproarrow $m: A \twoheadrightarrow A$ in a double category \mathbb{D} is a globular cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{m} & A \\ \parallel & \downarrow & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{u_A} & A. \end{array}$$

Let $\mathbf{Copt}(\mathbb{D})$ denote the category of pairs (m, γ) where γ is a copoint of the endoproarrow m . The morphisms $(m, \gamma) \rightarrow (n, \epsilon)$ are cells $\theta: m \Rightarrow n$ of \mathbb{D} such that $\epsilon\theta = \gamma$ holds. A double category \mathbb{D} **admits Eilenberg-Moore objects for copointed endomorphisms** if the inclusion $\mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Copt}(\mathbb{D})$ has a right adjoint.

The characterization is then the following.

Theorem 3.3 (Theorem 5.3.2 of [Ale18]). *For a double category \mathbb{D} the following are equivalent:*

1. *\mathbb{D} is equivalent to $\mathbf{Span}(\mathcal{C})$ for some finitely-complete category \mathcal{C} .*
2. *\mathbb{D} is a unit-pure cartesian equipment admitting Eilenberg-Moore objects for copointed endoproarrows.*
3. *\mathbb{D}_0 has pullbacks satisfying the strong Beck-Chevalley condition and the canonical functor*

$$\mathbf{Span}(\mathbb{D}_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$$

is an equivalence of double categories.

Proof. This is stated and proved completely in §5.3 of the reference. □

3.2 Equivalent Conditions for Oplax/Lax Adjunction

Before treating the conditions for a genuine equivalence, first give equivalent conditions for an oplax/lax adjunction. Theorem 3.8 below is the relation version of Niefield's Theorem 3.1 quoted above. The following subsection will show how such an adjunction can restrict to an equivalence. First consider some necessary conditions.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose that $F: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}: G$ is a normalized oplax/lax adjunction that is the identity on \mathbb{D}_0 . It follows that \mathbb{D}*

1. *is an equipment;*
2. *has discrete tabulators;*
3. *the unit $1 \Rightarrow \top y$ is an iso;*

4. and for each $e \in \mathcal{E}$, the cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y^A} & A \\ e \downarrow & \lrcorner y_e & \downarrow e \\ E & \xrightarrow{y^E} & E \end{array}$$

is an extension in \mathbb{D} .

Proof. Take $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbb{D}_0 . The graph and opgraph give the companion and conjoint in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$. The images under F given the corresponding companion and conjoint in \mathbb{D} making it an equipment. Since oplax functors preserve extensions and every cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & A \\ e \downarrow & \lrcorner e & \downarrow e \\ E & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & E \end{array}$$

is one in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$, the corresponding image under F is an extension, making y_e an extension in \mathbb{D} since it is isomorphic to Fe by normalization. Existence of tabulators results from the fact that the composite

$$\mathbb{D}_1 \xrightarrow{G_1} \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})_1 \xrightarrow{apex} \mathbb{D}_0$$

is a right adjoint for $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$. By normalization of G , its unit is an isomorphism. \square

Lemma 3.5. *If \mathbb{D} has companions and conjoints and y_e for each $e \in \mathcal{E}$ is an extension, then the identity functor $1: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to an opnormal oplax functor $F: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$.*

Proof. For an \mathcal{F} -relation $R \rightarrow A \times B$, take the image FR in \mathbb{D} to be the proarrow $A \rightarrow B$ arising in the canonical extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{y} & R \\ d \downarrow & \lrcorner \xi_R & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{d^* R c_!} & B \end{array}$$

That the cell is opcartesian gives the arrow assignment, yielding a functor $F_1: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ by uniqueness properties. Comparison cells for composition are given using the extension property of the composite cell ξy_e . That is, they arise as in the lower-left corner of the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R \times_B S & \xrightarrow{R \times_B S} & R \times_B S \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ R \times_B S & \xrightarrow{R \times_B S} & R \times_B S \xrightarrow{R \times_B S} & R \times_B S \\ \downarrow p & \lrcorner y_p & \swarrow p & \searrow q & \downarrow q \\ R & \xrightarrow{R} & R & \xrightarrow{S} & S \\ \downarrow d & \lrcorner \xi_R & \downarrow c & \downarrow d & \lrcorner \xi_S & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{d^* R c_!} & B & \xrightarrow{d^* S c_!} & C \end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc} R \times_B S & \xrightarrow{R \times_B S} & R \times_B S \\ e \downarrow & \lrcorner y_e & \downarrow e \\ R \odot S & \xrightarrow{R \odot S} & R \odot S \\ \downarrow d & \lrcorner \xi & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{d^* (R \odot S) c_!} & C \\ \parallel & \exists! \phi_{R,S} & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{d^* R c_!} & B \xrightarrow{d^* S c_!} & C \end{array}$$

In general these are not invertible. The coherence laws for an oplax functor follow by the fact that all the cells are defined using the uniqueness clause of the lifting property of opcartesian cells. \square

Lemma 3.6. *If \mathbb{D} has tabulators and they are inclusions, then $1: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to a normal lax functor $G: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Write $\top: \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ for the right adjoint to $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$. For a proarrow $p: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathbb{D} , define the image Gp in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$ to be the inclusion $\top p \rightarrow A \times B$ given by the tabulator of p . By the universal property of tabulators

this induces a functorial arrow assignment yielding the required functor $G_1: \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbf{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$. Externally this is lax-functorial. For composable proarrows $p: A \rightrightarrows B$ and $q: B \rightrightarrows C$, the morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \top p \odot \top q & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\ \downarrow \gamma_{p,q} & & \downarrow \\ \top(p \otimes q) & \longrightarrow & A \times C \end{array}$$

gives the required laxity cell $\gamma: \top p \odot \top q \Rightarrow \top(p \otimes q)$. This arrow exists by orthogonality of the factorization system on \mathbb{D}_0 . The naturality and associativity conditions for a lax functor follow by the uniqueness of image factorizations, the fact that tabulators are jointly inclusions, and the fact that \mathcal{E} is pullback-stable. Unit comparison cells are induced again from the universal property of tabulators; given an object

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & A \times A \\ \downarrow \gamma_A & & \downarrow 1 \times 1 \\ \top y_A & \longrightarrow & A \times A \end{array}$$

defines the required cell $\gamma_A: y_A \Rightarrow \top y_A$. Note that G is normalized if, and only if, $y: \mathbb{D}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ is fully faithful. \square

Proposition 3.7. *If \mathbb{D} is an equipment with tabulators in which for each regular epimorphism e the cell y_e is an extension, the functors $F_1: \mathbb{R}\mathbf{el}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})_1 \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}_1: G_1$ of the previous lemmas form an adjunction $F_1 \dashv G_1$.*

Proof. Develop the unit $\eta: 1 \Rightarrow G_1 F_1$. Starting with a \mathcal{F} -relation $R \rightarrow A \times B$, take the canonical extension and then its tabulator. By the universal property of the tabulator, there is a unique morphism $R \rightarrow \top(d^* \otimes_R c_!)$ fitting into

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \longrightarrow & A \times B \\ \eta_R \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \top(d^* \otimes_R c_!) & \longrightarrow & A \times B \end{array}$$

making a morphism of relations. Take this to be η_R . These are natural in R by the uniqueness aspect of the universal property of tabulators. On the other hand, components of the counit $\epsilon: F_1 G_1 \Rightarrow 1$ are given in the following way. For a given proarrow $p: A \rightrightarrows B$, the proarrow $F_1 G_1 p$ is the extension of the image of the tabulator $\top p$. The counit component ϵ_p arises as in the the left bottom corner of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \top p \xrightarrow{y} \top p & & \top p \xrightarrow{y} \top p \\ \downarrow l \quad \xi_{\top p} \quad \downarrow r & = & \downarrow l \quad \tau_p \quad \downarrow r \\ A \xrightarrow{d^* \otimes_{\top p} c_!} B & & A \xrightarrow{p} B \\ \parallel \quad \exists! \quad \parallel & & \\ A \xrightarrow{p} B & & A \xrightarrow{p} B \end{array}$$

since the extension $\xi_{\top p}$ is opcartesian. Again this is natural in p by functoriality of tabulators and uniqueness clauses of universal properties. Triangle identities follow by construction. For example, given a relation $R \rightarrow A \times B$, verify that $F_1 \eta_R \epsilon_{F_1 R} = 1$ holds. There are equalities of cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{y} & R \\ d \downarrow & \xi_R & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ \parallel & F_1 \eta_R & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ \parallel & \epsilon & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ & d^* \otimes_R c_! & \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{y} & R \\ \eta_R \downarrow & y \eta_R & \downarrow \eta_R \\ \top(d^* \otimes c_!) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \top(d^* \otimes c_!) \\ d \downarrow & \xi_{\top(d^* \otimes c_!)} & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ \parallel & \epsilon & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ & d^* \otimes_R c_! & \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc} R & \xrightarrow{y} & R \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \\ & d^* \otimes_R c_! & \end{array} \end{array}$$

by construction. The leftmost holds by the definition of $F_1\eta_R = d_1\eta_{Rc^*}$; the right holds by construction of $\epsilon_{d_1Rc^*}$. Now, the composite in the lower left is $F_1\eta_{R\epsilon_{F_1R}}$. It must be an identity since ξ_R occurring on both sides is an extension. Verifying the other triangle identity is a similar kind of argument but is more straightforward. \square

Theorem 3.8. *For a double category \mathbb{D} with a stable and proper factorization system $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ on \mathbb{D}_0 , the identity functor $\mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to an oplax/lax adjunction $F: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}: G$ if, and only if,*

1. \mathbb{D} is a unit-pure equipment;
2. has discrete tabulators;
3. y_e is an extension for each cover e .

Proof. There remains only to verify the remaining conditions of an oplax/lax adjunction. These are those of (d) in §3.2 of [GP04]. Given composable relations $R \rightarrow A \times B$ and $S \rightarrow B \times C$, the components of η need to be coherent with external composition and laxity cells. But the morphisms of relations on each side of

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 R \odot S & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\
 \eta_{R \odot S} \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 \top(d^* \otimes_{R \odot S} c_1) & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\
 \top \phi \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 \top(d^* \otimes_{R \odot S} c_1) & \longrightarrow & A \times C
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 R \odot S & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\
 \eta_R \odot \eta_S \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 \top(d^* R c_1) \odot \top(d^* S c_1) & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\
 \gamma \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 \top(d^* \otimes_{R \odot S} c_1) & \longrightarrow & A \times C
 \end{array}$$

are the same by the uniqueness of image factorizations. Similarly, that components of ϵ are coherent with external composition follows by the construction of ϕ and the uniqueness property of cells induced by opcartesian cells. \square

3.3 Conditions for Adjoint Equivalences

The constructions from the previous subsection lead to results characterizing the existence of certain adjoint equivalences. Throughout suppose that \mathbb{D} is a double category with a proper and stable factorization system \mathcal{F} on \mathbb{D}_0 . The first result stems directly from Theorem 3.8. Two added conditions, namely that tabulators are strong and that every relation is a tabulator, make the adjunction into an adjoint equivalence.

Theorem 3.9. *The identity functor $1: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to a normalized oplax/lax adjoint equivalence*

$$F: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}: G$$

if, and only if,

1. \mathbb{D} is a unit-pure equipment;
2. each y_e is an extension cell for any cover e ;
3. \mathbb{D} has strong and discrete tabulators;
4. every \mathcal{F} -relation $R \rightarrow A \times B$ is a tabulator of its canonical extension.

Proof. The first two conditions are equivalent to the existence of the oplax/lax adjunction. The rest of the proof follows from the construction of the unit and the counit of the adjunction. Consider first the unit. By construction, the maps η_R and the $\tilde{\xi}_R: R \rightarrow \top d_1 R c^*$ arising in its definition are monic. Hence the unit $\eta_R = \tilde{\xi}_R e$ is an isomorphism if, and only if, η_R is an epimorphism, which true if and only if $\tilde{\xi}_R$ is an epimorphism. But that means that η_R is an isomorphism if, and only if $\tilde{\xi}_R: R \rightarrow \top d_1 R c^*$ is an iso, that is, if, and only if, R is isomorphic to the tabulator of its canonical extension. On the other hand, concerning the counit, if a proarrow p is an extension of its tabulator, then the component of the counit completes a triangle between two extensions and must be iso. Conversely, if the counit component is an iso, then τ_p is up to globular iso an opcartesian cell, hence an extension itself. \square

By a “strong” adjoint equivalence of double categories, we mean an oplax/lax adjoint equivalence where both functors are pseudo. In the case of the present development, this amounts to a Beck-Chevalley condition and the requirement that tabulators are in a particular sense “functorial.” In logic, Beck-Chevalley is the condition, roughly speaking, that substitution commutes with quantification (cf. §1.8 of [Jac99]). Categorically, this is to ask that certain adjoints commute. Double categorically this is expressed by the following.

Definition 3.10 (Cf. §13 of [Shu08] and §5.2 of [Ale18]). An equipment \mathbb{D} satisfies the **Beck-Chevalley condition** if for any pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \cdot & \xrightarrow{q} & \cdot \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow g \\ \cdot & \xrightarrow{f} & \cdot \end{array}$$

the associated composite cell

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \cdot & \xrightarrow{p^*} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{y} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{q_!} & \cdot \\ \downarrow 1 & \Downarrow & \downarrow p & & \downarrow q & \Downarrow & \downarrow 1 \\ \cdot & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \cdot \\ \downarrow 1 & \Downarrow & \downarrow f & & \downarrow g & \Downarrow & \downarrow 1 \\ \cdot & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{y} & \cdot & \xrightarrow{g_!} & \cdot \end{array}$$

is invertible.

Proposition 3.11. *If \mathbb{D} is an equipment with strong tabulators, then \mathbb{D}_0 has pullbacks that satisfy Beck-Chevalley.*

Proof. That \mathbb{D}_0 has pullbacks is proved under similar conditions in the next subsection. Proposition 5.2.3 of [Ale18] proves the entire result in detail. \square

A functorial choice of \mathbb{I} -limits in §4.3 of [GP99] refers to the existence of a lax functor $\mathbb{D}^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ equipped with a further transformation satisfying some conditions. “Functorial” will mean something different here. As in the proof of Lemma 3.6 composable proarrows induce a morphism between tabulators

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \top p \odot \top q & \longrightarrow & A \times C \\ \downarrow \gamma_{p,q} & & \downarrow \\ \top(p \otimes q) & \longrightarrow & A \times C \end{array}$$

making a commutative square. If tabulators are discrete and \mathcal{F} is a proper, stable factorization system, then γ is an iso if, and only if, it is a cover.

Definition 3.12. Tabulators are **externally functorial** if for each pair of composable proarrows p and q as above, the induced morphism $\top p \otimes \top q \rightarrow \top(p \otimes q)$ is invertible.

Theorem 3.13. *The identity functor $1: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to an adjoint equivalence of pseudo-functors*

$$F: \mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F}) \rightleftarrows \mathbb{D}: G$$

if, and only if,

1. \mathbb{D} is a unit-pure equipment;
2. y_e is an extension cell for each cover e ;
3. \mathbb{D} has strong, discrete and externally functorial tabulators;
4. every \mathcal{F} -relation $R \rightarrow A \times B$ is a tabulator of its canonical extension.

Proof. That the conditions are necessary is for the most part proved by Theorem 3.9. The remaining observation is just that tabulators in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$ are functorial. So, given the equivalence, tabulators in \mathbb{D} must be functorial too. For sufficiency, it suffices by Theorem 3.9 to prove that the induced functors F and G are pseudo. On the one hand, the existence of strong tabulators implies Beck-Chevalley. The composite cell on the left-hand side of the equation in the proof of Lemma 3.5 contains the Beck-Chevalley cell and is thus opcartesian, making the comparison cell $\phi_{R,S}$ induced there invertible. On the other hand, the assumption that tabulators are functorial implies that each laxity comparison cell is in fact iso. That is, both F and G are pseudo, making a strong adjoint equivalence. \square

4 Cartesian Equipments as Double Categories of Relations

Now, for the second part of the characterization, turn to the question of when \mathbb{D}_0 admits a proper and stable factorization system. Additionally, it needs to be seen how any such conditions relate to those developed in the previous section. Start with identifying the morphisms of the left and right classes.

4.1 Covers and Inclusions

The condition that y_e is an extension for all regular epimorphisms in \mathbb{D}_0 is the central fact that appears to make the proof of the main oplax/lax adjunction of the previous section possible. In $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{el}(\mathcal{C})$ for regular \mathcal{C} , it is certainly the case that all such arrows produce extensions y_e . For the extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_A} & A \\ e \downarrow & \xi & \downarrow e \\ E & \xrightarrow{e^* \otimes e_!} & E \end{array}$$

results in a globular cell $\gamma: e^* \otimes e_! \Rightarrow y_E$ such that $\gamma\xi = y_e$. However, extensions in $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{el}(\mathcal{C})$ are computed by images. That is, e is a regular epimorphism if, and only if,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & A \times A \\ e \downarrow & & \downarrow e \times e \\ E & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & E \times E \end{array}$$

computes the extension of y_A . In other words, e is a regular epimorphism if, and only if, the unique globular cell γ above is an iso $e^* \otimes e_! \cong y_E$.

Definition 4.1 (Cf. §4.2 in [Sch15]). The **kernel** of a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is the restriction ρ of the unit on B along f . Dually, the **cokernel** of f is the extension cell ξ

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f_! \otimes f^*} & A \\ f \downarrow & \rho & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{y_B} & B \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y_A} & A \\ f \downarrow & \xi & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{f^* \otimes f_!} & B \end{array}$$

A morphism $e: A \rightarrow E$ in an equipment is a **cover** if the canonical globular cell is an iso $e^* \otimes e_! \cong y_E$. Dually, a morphism $m: E \rightarrow B$ is an **inclusion** if the canonical globular cell is an iso $m_! \otimes m^* \cong y_E$.

So, to put the definitions in a pithy or sloganish way, a morphism is a cover if it has a trivial cokernel; it is an inclusion if it has a trivial kernel. Notice that these definitions recall those of simple and entire maps in an allegory (§2.13 of [FS90]). Subsequent developments require a kind of exactness condition on inclusions.

Definition 4.2. An inclusion is **regular** if it is the tabulator of its cokernel.

Example 4.3. Every inclusion in $\mathbb{R}\mathbf{el}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is regular.

4.2 A Factorization System

Assume that \mathbb{D} is a cartesian equipment with tabulators. A technical result:

Lemma 4.4. *If $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ is fully faithful, then*

1. *every cover is an epimorphism and every inclusion is a monomorphism.*
2. *if each tabulator is jointly an inclusion, then every diagonal is an inclusion.*

Proof. (1) Assume that $f: A \rightarrow B$ is an inclusion and take arrows $u, v: X \rightrightarrows A$ such that $fu = fv$. Using the fact that f is an inclusion and that $yfu = yfv$, it follows that $y_u = y_v$ holds. From this $u = v$ since y is faithful.

(2) Fully faithful means that every object is its own tabulator with identity morphisms as the legs of the tabulator. But if tabulators are jointly inclusions, then the diagonal on any object is an inclusion. \square

As a result if covers and inclusions form the two classes of a (weak) factorization system on \mathbb{D}_0 , it will automatically be proper. In fact these will be the two classes of a stable factorization system. First, however, it needs to be seen that local products behave the right way. Assume throughout that $y: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ is fully faithful and that tabulators are jointly inclusions.

Lemma 4.5. *Local products of covariant representables are idempotent. Equivalently, each diagonal cell*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{p_!} & B \\ \Delta_A \downarrow & \Delta_{p_!} & \downarrow \Delta_B \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{p_! \times p_!} & B \times B \end{array}$$

is cartesian. Dually, local products of contravariant representables p^ are idempotent.*

Proof. There are canonical isos

$$p_! \otimes \Delta_! \cong \Delta_! \otimes (p \times p)_! \cong \Delta_! \otimes (p_! \times p_!)$$

The leftmost iso is from the fact that two sides compute the same restriction, namely, that of the ordinary morphism $\Delta_B p = (p \times p)\Delta_A$. The rightmost is from the fact that the product functor $\times: \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ is pseudo, hence preserves restrictions. As a result, the isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{p_!} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & B \\ \parallel & \lrcorner & \parallel & \cong & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{p_!} & B & \xrightarrow{\Delta_!} & B \times B \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} B \\ \parallel & \cong & \parallel & \lrcorner & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{\Delta_!} & A \times A & \xrightarrow{p_! \times p_!} & B \times B \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} B \end{array}$$

establishes the result by the construction of local products. The topmost iso is the fact that Δ_B is an inclusion by Lemma 4.4. The dual case is analogous. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Each leg of the tabulator of the cokernel of any morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is an inclusion.*

Proof. By the universal property of the tabulator there is a factorization of the cokernel of f

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y} & B \\ e \downarrow & \exists! & \downarrow e \\ \top(f^* \otimes f_!) & \xrightarrow{y} & \top(f^* \otimes f_!) \\ l \downarrow & \tau & \downarrow r \\ B & \xrightarrow{f^* \otimes f_!} & B \end{array} & = & \begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{y} & B \\ f \downarrow & \xi & \downarrow f \\ B & \xrightarrow{f^* \otimes f_!} & B \end{array} \end{array}$$

Since y_B is the tabulator of y_B , it follows that $l = r$. Then compute that

$$y \cong \langle l, l \rangle_! \otimes \langle l, l \rangle^* \cong l_! \otimes l^* \wedge l_! \otimes l^* \cong l_! \wedge l_! \otimes l^* \wedge l^* \cong l_! \otimes l^*$$

using the fact that local products are idempotent as in Lemma 4.5, proving that l is an inclusion. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Any morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ has a canonical factorization $f = me$ where m is an inclusion and e is a cover.*

Proof. What remains to see is that e is a cover. However, $e_! \cong f_! \otimes l^*$ holds and dually $e^* \cong l_! \otimes f^*$ holds since in each case either side computes the same restriction. Now, note that the composite

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \top(f^* \otimes f_!) & \xrightarrow{l_!} & B & \xrightarrow{f^*} & A & \xrightarrow{f_!} & B & \xrightarrow{l^*} & \top(f^* \otimes f_!) \\ \downarrow l & \xi & \parallel & \xi & \downarrow f & \xi & \parallel & \xi & \downarrow l \\ B & \xrightarrow{y} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & B & \xrightarrow{y} & B \end{array}$$

is a restriction cell, meaning that

$$l_! \otimes f^* \otimes f_! \otimes l^* \cong l_! \otimes l^* \cong y$$

canonically. That is, $e^* \otimes e_! \cong y$ holds, as required. \square

Now, assume that every inclusion in \mathbb{D} is regular.

Theorem 4.8. *With \mathcal{E} as the covers and \mathcal{M} as the inclusions, $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ is an orthogonal factorization system on \mathbb{D}_0 .*

Proof. The factorization of a given morphism was produced above. Write the tabulator as E . The classes \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{M} clearly are closed under composition and contain all isos. Thus, it remains only to see that the factorization above is unique up to unique iso. For take a factorization $f = mp$ with p a cover and m an inclusion. By the universal property of the tabulator, there is a unique u such that both triangles commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & & \\ \downarrow p & \searrow e & \\ M & \xrightarrow{u} & E \\ \downarrow m & \swarrow l & \\ B & & \end{array}$$

This means that u is both an inclusion and a cover. But in fact u is an isomorphism. For since m is the tabulator of its cokernel, and since l and m have the same cokernel, they are, up to iso, the same tabulator. Therefore, u has an inverse, as required. \square

Lemma 4.9. \mathbb{D}_0 has all pullbacks.

Proof. Take a corner diagram $h: A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B: e$. Take the tabulator of the restriction as in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \top(h_! \otimes e^*) & \xrightarrow{y} & \top(h_! \otimes e^*) \\ \downarrow d & \tau & \downarrow c \\ A & \xrightarrow{h_! \otimes e^*} & B \\ \downarrow h & \xi & \downarrow e \\ C & \xrightarrow{y} & C \end{array}$$

The arrows d and c now complete the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{c} & B \\ \downarrow d & & \downarrow e \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & C \end{array}$$

The square commutes because C is the tabulator of yc . The universal property for the pullback follows by the universal property of the tabulator. \square

Now, assume that \mathbb{D} satisfies Beck-Chevalley. A technical result:

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{c} & B \\ d \downarrow & & \downarrow e \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & C \end{array}$$

is a pullback square with e a cover. The maps d and c satisfy

$$y_A \cong y_A \wedge d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_!$$

canonically.

Proof. On the one hand, since $h_! \otimes h^*$ is a restriction, there is a canonical cell $y \Rightarrow h_! \otimes h^*$. Thus, from the computation

$$\begin{aligned} h_! \otimes h^* &\cong h_! \otimes e^* \otimes e_! \otimes h^* && (e \text{ is a cover}) \\ &\cong d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_! && (\text{Beck-Chevalley}) \end{aligned}$$

there is a canonical cell $y \Rightarrow d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_!$. On the other hand, the codomain of this cell is an extension:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} P & \xrightarrow{y} & P & \xrightarrow{y} & P & & \\ d \downarrow & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow d & & \\ A & \xrightarrow{d^*} & P & \xrightarrow{c_!} & B & \xrightarrow{c^*} & P & \xrightarrow{d_!} & A \end{array}$$

Thus, there is a canonical cell $d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_! \Rightarrow y$ and the composite

$$d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_! \Rightarrow y \Rightarrow d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_!$$

must be the identity cell by uniqueness. The other composite must be the identity cell since \mathbb{D} is unit-pure. \square

Theorem 4.11. $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M})$ *is a proper, stable factorization system on \mathbb{D}_0 .*

Proof. Indeed covers are stable under pullback. Let $e: B \rightarrow C$ denote a cover. The pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P & \xrightarrow{c} & B \\ d \downarrow & & \downarrow e \\ A & \xrightarrow{h} & C \end{array}$$

is formed using the tabulator of the restriction $h_! \otimes e^*$ as above. Now, to see that d is a cover, calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} y &\cong y \wedge d^* \otimes c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_! && (\text{Lemma above}) \\ &\cong d^* \otimes (d_! \wedge c_! \otimes c^* \otimes d_!) && (\text{Frobenius}) \\ &\cong d^* \otimes d_! \wedge d_! && (c_! \otimes d^* \otimes d_! \cong d_!) \\ &\cong d^* \otimes d_! && (\wedge \text{ idempotent}) \end{aligned}$$

This uses the fact that $c_! \otimes d^* \otimes d_!$ and $d_!$ compute the same extension. \square

4.3 The Characterization Theorem

Now, we have the main result of the paper. First a lemma making the connection between regular inclusions and the assumption that every relation is a tabulator.

Lemma 4.12. *Assume that \mathbb{D}_0 has the factorization system \mathcal{F} of the previous subsection. If every \mathcal{F} -relation in \mathbb{D} is the tabulator of its cokernel, then inclusions in \mathbb{D} are regular.*

Proof. If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is an inclusion, so is $\langle f, f \rangle: A \rightarrow B \times B$. The assumption on relations then implies that A is, up to iso, the tabulator of the proarrow

$$\langle f, f \rangle^* \otimes \langle f, f \rangle! \cong f^* \otimes f! \otimes f^* \otimes f! \cong f^* \otimes f!$$

proving the result. The first iso is a result of the fact that the two sides compute the same restriction; the second uses the fact that f is an inclusion. \square

Now, a first pass on the main result:

Theorem 4.13. *If \mathbb{D} is a unit-pure, cartesian equipment such that*

1. *tabulators exist and are strong, discrete and functorial,*
2. *every relation is a tabulator, and finally*
3. *local products satisfy Frobenius*

then the identity functor $1: \mathbb{D}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_0$ extends to an adjoint equivalence

$$\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{D}$$

where \mathcal{F} is the orthogonal factorization system given by inclusions and covers.

Proof. The lemma above shows that under the conditions, the required factorization system \mathcal{F} on \mathbb{D}_0 exists by Theorem 4.11. The identity functor extends to the required equivalence by Theorem 3.13 since covers are defined in such a way that each y_e is an extension cell. \square

As a direct consequence of the previous theorem and the results of the previous subsection, we arrive at the culminating characterization:

Theorem 4.14. *A double category \mathbb{D} is equivalent to one $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ for some proper and stable factorization system on a finitely-complete category \mathcal{C} if, and only if, \mathbb{D} is*

1. *a unit-pure cartesian equipment;*
2. *with strong, discrete and functorial tabulators;*
3. *in which every relation is the tabulator of its cokernel;*
4. *and for which local products satisfy Frobenius.*

Proof. The conditions are all necessary by the results describing $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ in §§2.2-2.4. On the other hand, given the conditions, a previous result Theorem 4.11 shows that \mathbb{D}_0 admits a stable and proper factorization system \mathcal{F} so that $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathbb{D}_0; \mathcal{F})$ makes sense. That the identity functor on \mathbb{D}_0 extends to an equivalence is Theorem 4.13. \square

5 Prospectus

Let us end with some comments on future and ongoing work.

5.1 Spurious Generality?

Throughout the development has been centered around a proper and stable factorization system \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{C} in the general case and on \mathbb{D}_0 in the case that we are working directly with a given double category. In [Kel91], however, it is shown that although this generality does support a calculus of relations, the generality is in a sense “illusory.” That is, the 2-category $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$ is actually always equivalent to $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{D})$ for a regular category \mathcal{D} . This is the category of so-called “maps” in $\mathbf{Rel}(\mathcal{C}; \mathcal{F})$. Maps are those arrows of the 2-category that internally have a right adjoint. In the case of allegories something similar is true. That is, any tabular allegory \mathcal{A} is equivalent to relations in its (regular) category of maps (Cf. §2.148 of [FS90]). Here maps are those morphisms of \mathcal{A} that are both entire and simple.

It remains to be seen if there is a corresponding definition of “map” for double categories of relations and whether the category of such maps is an ordinary regular category. If this is so, it would likely give another setting for a calculus of relations and the presentation of a given double category of relations as a bona fide double category of objects, arrows, relations and cells in an ordinary regular category.

5.2 Applications

There are many potential applications, mostly within category theory, but possibly in other areas.

5.2.1 Corelations

Any characterization of relations would afford a dual characterization of corelations, a topic of some recent interest. For example in [FZ18], corelations are shown to be a certain pushout, leading to characterizations of equivalence relations, partial equivalence relations, linear subspaces and others. Corelations have also been shown to be the prop for certain Frobenius monoids [CF16]. The present development is potentially a starting point for double-categorical versions of these results.

5.2.2 Monoidal Fibrations

In §14 of [Shu08], it is shown that under certain conditions, every monoidal bifibration gives rise to an equipment with some extra structure. However, it appears that the definition of a cartesian equipment, as presented in [Ale18], is needed for a sort of inverse construction taking a cartesian equipment to a monoidal bifibration. Under such a hypothetical correspondence, it is of interest to see which monoidal bifibrations correspond to double categories of relations. Our conjecture is that these will be closely related to regular fibrations and subobject fibrations as in §4.2 and §4.4 of [Jac99]. If this is the case it would be a starting point for extending fibrational semantics of type theories to interpretations in double categories with extra structure.

5.2.3 Logic of Relations

Relational theories take their models in sets and relations [BPS17]. Recent interest in bicategories of relations appears to be stage-setting for interpretations of regular logic [FS19]. A characterization of double categories of relations may provide a means to tell which double categories support a sound interpretation of relational theories or regular logic and provide a forum for a comparison of ordinary Lawvere theories and relational theories.

References

- [Ale18] Evangelia Aleiferi. Cartesian Double Categories with an Emphasis on Characterizing Spans. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1809.06940, September 2018.
- [Bor94] F. Borceux. *Handbook of Categorical Algebra 1: Basic Category Theory*, volume 50 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.
- [BPS17] Filippo Bonchi, Dusko Pavlovic, and Pawel Sobocinski. Functorial Semantics for Relational Theories. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1711.08699, November 2017.
- [CF16] Brandon Coya and Brendan Fong. Corelations are the prop for extraspecial commutative Frobenius monoids. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1601.02307, January 2016.
- [CW87] A. Carboni and R.F.C. Walters. Cartesian bicategories I. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 49:11–32, 1987.
- [FS90] Peter J. Freyd and Andre Scedrov. *Categories, Allegories*. North Holland, 1990.
- [FS19] Brendan Fong and David I Spivak. Regular and relational categories: Revisiting ‘Cartesian bicategories I’. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1909.00069, August 2019.
- [FZ18] Brendan Fong and Fabio Zanasi. Universal constructions for (co)relations: Categories, monoidal categories, and props. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 14:1–25, 2018.
- [GP99] Marco Grandis and Robert Paré. Limits in double categories. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géom. Diff.*, 40:162–220, 1999.
- [GP04] Marco Grandis and Robert Paré. Adjoints for double categories. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géom. Diff. Catégoriques*, 45:193–240, 2004.

- [Jac99] B. Jacobs. *Categorical Logic and Type Theory*, volume 141 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. Elsevier, 1999.
- [Kel91] G.M. Kelly. A note on relations relative to a factorization system. In G. Rosolini A. Carboni, M. C. Pedicchio, editor, *Category Theory: Proceedings of the International Conference held in Como, Italy, July 22-28, 1990*, volume 1488 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 249–61. Springer, 1991.
- [Lam21] Michael Lambert. Discrete double fibrations. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 37(22):671–708, 2021.
- [Law70] William F. Lawvere. Equality in hyperdoctrines and comprehension schema as an adjoint functor. *Proceedings of the AMS Symposium on Pure Mathematics*, XVII:1–14, 1970.
- [Mac98] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 1998.
- [Nie12] Susan Niefield. Span, cospan, and other double categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 26(26):729–742, 2012.
- [nLa20] nLab. Frobenius reciprocity. <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Frobenius+reciprocity>, 2020. Accessed: 2021-04-01.
- [Roa15] Seerp Roald Koudenburg. A double-dimensional approach to formal category theory. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1511.04070, November 2015.
- [Roa19] Seerp Roald Koudenburg. Augmented virtual double categories. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1910.11189, October 2019.
- [Sch15] Patrick Schultz. Regular and exact (virtual) double categories. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1505.00712, May 2015.
- [Shu08] Michael Shulman. Framed bicategories and monoidal fibrations. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 20:650–738, 2008.