

# Exploring dualities beyond sound doctrines

Bruno Lindan  
University of Manchester

CT2025, Masaryk University, 15 July, 2025

# Gabriel-Ulmer duality

---

The 2-functor

$$\mathbf{Lex} \longrightarrow \mathbf{LFP}^{\mathrm{op}}$$

given by sending

$$\mathcal{C} \longmapsto \mathbf{Lex}[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]$$

yields an equivalence of 2-categories.

- **Lex** = 2-category of finitely complete small categories, and
- **LFP** = 2-category of locally finitely presentable categories.

## Key Property (of finite limits)

---

Given  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{Lex}$ ,  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  lex,  $\mathrm{Lan}_{\mathcal{Y}} F$  is also lex:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Y}} & [\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Set}] \\ & \searrow F & \downarrow \mathrm{Lan}_{\mathcal{Y}} F \\ & & \mathbf{Set} \end{array}$$

We say (“the doctrine of”) finite limits is **sound**.

## Key Property (of finite limits)

---

Given  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{Lex}$ ,  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  lex,  $\mathrm{Lan}_{\mathcal{Y}} F$  is also lex:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Y}} & [\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Set}] \\ & \searrow F & \downarrow \mathrm{Lan}_{\mathcal{Y}} F \\ & & \mathbf{Set} \end{array}$$

We say (“the doctrine of”) finite limits is **sound**. (Important consequence:  $G \in [\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]$  is lex iff it is a *filtered colimit* of representables).

# Gabriel-Ulmer for sound doctrines

---

If  $\Phi$  is a different “limit doctrine”<sup>1</sup> enjoying *Key Property*, then

$$\Phi\text{-cat} \xrightarrow{C \mapsto \Phi[C, \mathbf{Set}]} \mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}^{\text{op}}$$

is an equivalence of 2-categories<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Class of small shapes

<sup>2</sup>J. Adámek, F. Borceux, S. Lack, J. Rosický, *A classification of accessible categories*, 2002;  
C. Centazzo, E. Vitale, *A duality relative to a limit doctrine*, 2002

# Gabriel-Ulmer for sound doctrines

---

If  $\Phi$  is a different “limit doctrine”<sup>1</sup> enjoying *Key Property*, then

$$\Phi\text{-cat} \xrightarrow{C \mapsto \Phi[C, \mathbf{Set}]} \mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}^{\text{op}}$$

is an equivalence of 2-categories<sup>2</sup>.

- $\Phi\text{-cat}$ : 2-category of small  $\Phi$ -complete (+ Cauchy complete) categories, ...
- $\mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}$ : 2-category of locally  $\Phi$ -presentable categories: that is, locally small, cocomplete, and generated by  $\Phi$ -presentable objects under  $\Phi$ -filtered colimits (a shape  $\mathcal{D}$  being  $\Phi$ -filtered if  $\mathcal{D}$ -colimits commute with  $\Phi$ -limits in  $\mathbf{Set}$ ).

For instance:  $\Phi =$  finite limits, countable limits, finite products, no limits at all, ...

---

<sup>1</sup>Class of small shapes

<sup>2</sup>J. Adámek, F. Borceux, S. Lack, J. Rosický, *A classification of accessible categories*, 2002;  
C. Centazzo, E. Vitale, *A duality relative to a limit doctrine*, 2002

# Gabriel-Ulmer for sound doctrines

---

If  $\Phi$  is a different “limit doctrine”<sup>1</sup> enjoying *Key Property*, then

$$\Phi\text{-cat} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{C} \mapsto \Phi[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}]} \mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}^{\text{op}}$$

is an equivalence of 2-categories<sup>2</sup>.

- **$\Phi\text{-cat}$** : 2-category of small  $\Phi$ -complete (+ Cauchy complete) categories, ...
- **$\mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}$** : 2-category of locally  $\Phi$ -presentable categories: that is, locally small, cocomplete, and generated by  $\Phi$ -presentable objects under  $\Phi$ -filtered colimits (a shape  $\mathcal{D}$  being  $\Phi$ -filtered if  $\mathcal{D}$ -colimits commute with  $\Phi$ -limits in **Set**).

For instance:  $\Phi =$  finite limits, countable limits, finite products, no limits at all, ...

**Do we need  $\Phi$  sound for such a theorem?**

---

<sup>1</sup>Class of small shapes

<sup>2</sup>J. Adámek, F. Borceux, S. Lack, J. Rosický, *A classification of accessible categories*, 2002;  
C. Centazzo, E. Vitale, *A duality relative to a limit doctrine*, 2002

## Theorem

Letting  $\mathbf{L}\Psi\text{-Cat}$  be the 2-category of locally small, complete,  $\Phi$ -filtered-cocomplete categories, there is a (relative) adjunction  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}] \dashv_J \mathbf{L}\Psi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{L}\Psi\text{-Cat}^{op} & \\ \Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}] \nearrow & \downarrow \mathbf{L}\Psi[-, \mathbf{Set}] & \\ \Phi\text{-cat} & \xrightarrow{J} & \Phi\text{-CAT} \end{array}$$



## Theorem

Letting  $\mathbf{L}\Psi\text{-Cat}$  be the 2-category of locally small, complete,  $\Phi$ -filtered-cocomplete categories, there is a (relative) adjunction  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}] \dashv_J \mathbf{L}\Psi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbf{L}\Psi\text{-Cat}^{op} & \\
 \Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}] \nearrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{L}\Psi[-, \mathbf{Set}] \\
 \Phi\text{-cat} & \xrightarrow{J} & \Phi\text{-CAT}
 \end{array}$$

## Theorem

If  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]: \Phi\text{-cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}^{op}$  is an equivalence, then  $\Phi$  is sound.

Some limit doctrines are not sound (e.g. pullbacks, countable products, ...), but we still want to be able to recover

$$\mathcal{C} \in \Phi\text{-cat}$$

from

$$\Phi[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}] \in ?$$

Some limit doctrines are not sound (e.g. pullbacks, countable products, ...), but we still want to be able to recover

$$\mathcal{C} \in \Phi\text{-cat}$$

from

$$\Phi[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}] \in ?$$

Towards an understanding of the general situation, we investigate whether  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  *reflects equivalences*.

## Theorem

*(Under technical assumption on  $\Phi$ )  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  reflects equivalences  $\iff \Phi\text{-cat}$  has the property that for 1-cells, fully faithful + lax epimorphism  $\implies$  equivalence.*

## Theorem

(Under technical assumption on  $\Phi$ )  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  reflects equivalences  $\iff \Phi\text{-cat}$  has the property that for 1-cells, fully faithful + lax epimorphism  $\implies$  equivalence.

## Brief comment on proof.

( $\implies$ ) Assumption on  $\Phi$  gives us a larger, sound doctrine  $\Sigma \supset \Phi$  with  $\mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P} \simeq \mathbf{L}\Sigma\mathbf{P}$ . Can show property holds of  $\Sigma$  exploiting fact that  $\Sigma\text{-cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{cat}$  sends arrows to right adjoint arrows, via *Key Property*.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Sigma[\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{Set}] & \xrightarrow{f^*} & \Sigma[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}] \\ \vdots \downarrow & & \vdots \downarrow \\ \Sigma[\mathcal{D}, \mathbf{Set}] & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{f^*} \\ \top \\ \xleftarrow{\text{Lan}_f} \end{array} & \Sigma[\mathcal{C}, \mathbf{Set}] \end{array}$$

(Then show that property passes to  $\Phi \subset \Sigma$ ).



Moreover<sup>3</sup>,

### Lemma

*A 1-cell  $f$  in  $\Phi\text{-cat}$  is a lax epimorphism  $\iff$  it is  $\Phi$ -absolutely codense.*

Together:

### Theorem

*$\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  reflects equivalences  $\iff$  a functor is  $\Phi$ -absolutely codense only if it is essentially surjective.*

(“All  $\Phi$ -complete categories are  $\Phi$ -absolutely complete”).

---

<sup>3</sup>Lifting to  $\Phi\text{-cat}$  the characterisation of lax epis in  $\mathbf{cat}$  due to: J. Adámek, R. El Bashir, M. Sobral, J. Velebil, *On functors which are lax epimorphisms*, 2001

Moreover<sup>3</sup>,

### Lemma

*A 1-cell  $f$  in  $\Phi\text{-cat}$  is a lax epimorphism  $\iff$  it is  $\Phi$ -absolutely codense.*

Together:

### Theorem

*$\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  reflects equivalences  $\iff$  a functor is  $\Phi$ -absolutely codense only if it is essentially surjective.*

(“All  $\Phi$ -complete categories are  $\Phi$ -absolutely complete”). In summary:

- To get a Gabriel-Ulmer-style duality  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]: \Phi\text{-cat} \rightarrow \mathbf{L}\Phi\mathbf{P}^{\text{op}}$ , we need that  $\Phi$  is sound.
- ...but, so long as there are no interesting  $\Phi$ -absolute limits, we can at least say that  $\Phi[-, \mathbf{Set}]$  reflects equivalences.

---

<sup>3</sup>Lifting to  $\Phi\text{-cat}$  the characterisation of lax epis in  $\mathbf{cat}$  due to: J. Adámek, R. El Bashir, M. Sobral, J. Velebil, *On functors which are lax epimorphisms*, 2001