NOTES ON SIMPLICIAL HOMOTOPY THEORY

NICOLA GAMBINO AND SIMON HENRY

Abstract. Some notes on simplicial homotopy theory

1. Introduction

Date: May 14, 2018.

2. Constructive simplicial homotopy theory

- Basics on **SSet** and notation.
- We use $\Delta[n]$, $\partial\Delta[n]$ and $\Lambda^k[n]$ and following Joyal.
- Recall the existence of a weak model structure on **SSet**:
  - Fibrations = Kan fibrations
  - Cofibrations = Levelwise complemented monomorphisms such that degeracies are decidable on the complement of the image.
  - Cofibrant objects are simplicial sets in which degeneracies are decidable.
- It would be good to have an explicit definition of the cofibrant replacement functor.
- Recall the pushout product property.

Proposition 2.1. *Cofibrations are closed under pullbacks.*

Proof. To be added. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *For $0 \leq k \leq n$, the horn inclusion $i \colon \Lambda^k[n] \to \Delta[n]$ is a retract of the pushout product*

$$i \mathbin{\hat{\times}} \delta^k \colon \big(\Lambda^k[n] \times \Delta[1]\big) \cup (\Delta[n] \times k) \to \Delta[n] \times \Delta[1]\,.$$

Proposition 2.3. *A map is a Kan fibration if and only if it has the right lifting property with respect to the pushout products $i \mathbin{\hat{\times}} \delta^k$.*

3. **Dependent products**

- We wish to establish a restricted form of the Frobenius condition.
- We follow Gambino-Sattler, but without making use of the assumption that every object is cofibrant.

4. The universe

Recall that we work in a constructive set theory with two universes u_1 and u_2 and that we refer to elements of u_1 as small sets. We then define a simplicial set X to be *small*

Definition 4.1.

(i) We say that a simplicial set X is *small* if X_n is a small set for every $[n] \in \Delta$.

(ii) We say that a map $f\colon Y \to X$ in **SSet** is *small* if for every $x\colon \Delta[n] \to X$ the simplicial set Y_x fitting in the pullback square

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y_x \arrow[r] \arrow[d] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\lrcorner", very near start] & Y \arrow[d, "f"] \\ \Delta[n] \arrow[r, "x"'] & X \end{tikzcd}$$

is small.

By the results in [29] for arbitrary presheaf categories, small maps in **SSet** admit a weak classifier, i.e. a small map $\rho\colon \overline{\mathsf{V}} \to \mathsf{V}$ such that for every small map $f\colon Y \to X$ there exists a pullback diagram of the form

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\lrcorner", very near start] & \overline{\mathsf{V}} \arrow[d, "\rho"] \\ X \arrow[r] & \mathsf{V} \end{tikzcd}$$

Letting $X = \Delta[n]$ in this diagram suggests to define V_n as the set of all small maps with codomain $\Delta[n]$. In this way, however, one does not obtain a presheaf since the transition functions will satisfy the functorial laws only up to isomorphism rather than equality. To remedy this, the n-simplices of V are defined instead to be the functors $F\colon (\Delta/[n])^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$ such that the corresponding map of simplicial sets $\mathsf{El}(F) \to \Delta[n]$ is small. MORE TO BE ADDED.

Following [15, 39], we consider the pullback

$$\begin{tikzcd} \overline{\mathsf{U}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\lrcorner", very near start] & \overline{\mathsf{V}} \arrow[d, "\rho"] \\ \mathsf{U} \arrow[r] & \mathsf{V} \end{tikzcd}$$

where $\mathsf{U} \subseteq \mathsf{V}$ is defined by letting

$$\mathsf{U}_n = \{ F \in \mathsf{V}_n \mid \mathsf{El}(F) \to \Delta[n] \text{ is a small Kan fibration } \}$$

Proposition 4.2.

(i) $\pi\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}} \to \mathsf{U}$ *is a small Kan fibration.*

(ii) $\pi\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}} \to \mathsf{U}$ *classifies small Kan fibrations, i.e. for every small Kan fibration* $f\colon Y \to X$ *there exists a pullback diagram of the form*

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\lrcorner", very near start] & \overline{\mathsf{U}} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ X \arrow[r] & \mathsf{U} \end{tikzcd}$$

(iii) The simplicial set $\overline{\mathsf{U}}$ *is cofibrant.*

Proof. We prove the three claims separately.

(i) Should follow by locality.
(ii) Should be immediate.
(iii) See handwritten notes. Key step is the constructive version of the Eilenberg-Zilber lemma.

□

However, the simplicial set U does not appear to be cofibrant and hence it does not seem possible to show that $\pi\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}} \to \mathsf{U}$ is a weak classifier for small Kan fibrations with cofibrant codomain. In order to remedy this, we consider the cofibrant replacement U_c of U, which comes equipped with a trivial fibration $p\colon \mathsf{U}_c \to \mathsf{U}$, and the pullback

$$\begin{tikzcd} \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_c"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, very near start, "\lrcorner"] & \overline{\mathsf{U}} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ \mathsf{U}_c \arrow[r, "p"'] & \mathsf{U} \end{tikzcd}$$

We can now prove that $\pi_c\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \to \mathsf{U}_c$ has the desired properties.

Proposition 4.3.

(i) $\pi_c\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \to \mathsf{U}_c$ *is a small Kan fibration with fibrant codomain.*
(ii) The map $\pi_c\colon \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \to \mathsf{U}_c$ *classifies small Kan fibrations with cofibrant domain, i.e. for every small Kan fibration* $f\colon Y \to X$ *with* X *cofibrant there exists a pullback diagram of the form*

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \arrow[d, "\pi_c"] \\ X \arrow[r] & \mathsf{U}_c \end{tikzcd}$$

(iii) The simplicial set $\overline{\mathsf{U}}_c$ *is cofibrant.*

Proof. Part (i) follows from part (i) of Proposition 4.2. For part (ii), let $f\colon Y \to X$ be a small Kan fibration with X cofibrant. Since f is a small Kan fibration, we know from Proposition 4.2 that there is a pullback diagram of the form

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, very near start, "\lrcorner"] & \overline{\mathsf{U}} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ X \arrow[r] & \mathsf{U} \end{tikzcd}$$

Since X is cofibrant, we have the lifting diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathsf{U}_c \arrow[d, "p"] \\ X \arrow[r] \arrow[ur, dotted] & \mathsf{U} \end{tikzcd}$$

which shows that the map $X \to \mathsf{U}$ factors via U_c. We then obtain the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"'] & \overline{\mathsf{U}}_c \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi_c"] \arrow[dr, phantom, very near start, "\lrcorner"] & \overline{\mathsf{U}} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\ X \arrow[r] & \mathsf{U}_c \arrow[r, "p"'] & \mathsf{U} \end{tikzcd}$$

Here, the right-hand side square and the rectangle are pullbacks and therefore the left-hand side square is also a pullback, as required. Part (iii) follows from the fact that both U_c and $\overline{\mathsf{U}}$ are cofibrant, the latter being part (iii) of Proposition 4.2. $\square$

Note that we have not shown yet that U_c fibrant. This will be done in Section 6, as a consequence of the equivalence extension property for fibrations, which we establish in Section 5.

5. **The equivalence extension property**

- Here we follow Kapulkin and Lumsdaine.

6. Fibrancy and univalence of the universe

- Fibrancy should follow directly from equivalence extension property, without using 'composition vs filling' but rather retract property for horns (see notes).
- Once we have established fibrancy of U_c, then one can prove univalence by showing that $t\colon \mathsf{Weq}(U_c) \to U_c$ is a trivial fibration.
- Question: do we need to know that $\mathsf{Weq}(U_c)$ is a cofibrant object to get univalence?

7. Semantics

- This should be essentially straightforward, following Kapulkin and Lumsdaine, but we may need to modify the notion of a Π-structure to accommodate the cofibrant replacements that we take for Π.

References

[1] S. Awodey. Notes on cubical models of type theory. Draft manuscript, March 2015.

[2] S. Awodey and M. A. Warren. Homotopy theoretic models of identity types. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 146:45–55, 2009.

[3] M. Batanin, D.-C. Cisinski, and M. Weber. Multitensor lifting and strictly unital higher category theory. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 28:804–856, 2013.

[4] J. Bénabou and J. Roubaud. Monades et descente. *C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris*, 270, Serie A:96–98, 1970.

[5] B. van den Berg and R. Garner. Types are weak ω-groupoids. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 102(3):370–394, 2010.

[6] B. van den Berg and R. Garner. Topological and simplicial models of identity types. *Transactions of the ACM on Computational Logic*, 13(1):3–44, 2012.

[7] B. Berger and I. Moerdijk. On an extension of the notion of Reedy category. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 269(3-4):977–1004, 2011.

[8] J. Bergner and C. Rezk. Reedy categories and the Θ-construction. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 274(1):499–514, 2013.

[9] M. Bezem, T. Coquand, and S. Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. In Ralph Matthes and Aleksy Schubert, editors, *19th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2013)*, volume 26, pages 107–128. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2014.

[10] M. Bezem, T. Coquand, and E. Parmann. Non-constructivity in Kan simplicial sets. In Thorsten Altenkirch, editor, *13th International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications (TLCA 2015)*, volume 38, pages 92–106. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.

[11] J. Bourke and R. Garner. Algebraic weak factorisation systems I: accessible AWFS. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 220:108–147, 2016.

[12] J. Bourke and R. Garner. Algebraic weak factorisation systems II: categories of weak maps. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 220:148–174, 2016.

[13] A. K. Bousfield. Constructions of factorisation systems in categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 9:207–220, 1977.

[14] D.-C. Cisinski. Les préfaisceaux comme modèles des types d'homotopie. *Astérisque*, 308:xxiv+392, 2006.

[15] D.-C. Cisinski. Univalent universes for elegant models of homotopy types. arXiv:1406.0058, 2014.

[16] M. M. Clementino, E. Giuli, and W. Tholen. Topology in a category: compactness. *Portugaliae Mathematica*, 53(4):397–433, 1996.

[17] C. Cohen, T. Coquand, S. Huber, and A. Mörtberg. Cubical type theory: a constructive interpretation of the univalence axiom. arXiv:1611.02108. To be published in the post-proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs, TYPES 2015, 2016.

[18] J. Emmenegger. A category-theoretic version of the identity type weak factorization system. arXiv:1412.0153, 2014.

[19] P. Gabriel and M. Zisman. *Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory*, volume 35 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer, 1967.

[20] N. Gambino and R. Garner. The identity type weak factorisation system. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 409:94–109, 2008.

[21] N. Gambino and J. Kock. Polynomial functors and polynomial monads. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 154(1):153–192, 2013.

[22] R. Garner. A homotopy-theoretic universal property of Leinster's operad for weak ω-categories. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 147:615–628, 2009.

[23] R. Garner. Understanding the small object argument. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 17(3):247–285, 2009.

[24] R. Garner. Homomorphisms of higher categories. *Advances in Mathematics*, 224(6):2269–2311, 2010.

[25] R. Garner and S. Lack. On the axioms for adhesive and quasiadhesive categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 27(3):27–46, 2012.

[26] P. Goerss and J. F. Jardine. *Simplicial homotopy theory*. Birkäuser, 1999.

[27] M. Grandis and W. Tholen. Natural weak factorisation systems. *Archivum Mathematicum*, 42:397–408, 2006.

[28] P. Hirschhorn. *Model categories and their localizations*. American Mathematical Society, 2003.

[29] M. Hofmann and T. Streicher. Lifting grothendieck universes. Available from the second-named author's web page, 1997.

[30] M. Hovey. *Model categories*. American Mathematical Society, 1999.

[31] S. Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. Licentiate of philosophy thesis, University of Gothenburg, 2015.

[32] J. M. E. Hyland. First steps in synthetic domain theory. In M.-C. Pedicchio A. Carboni and G. Rosolini, editors, *Category Theory*, volume 1488 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 280–301. Springer, 1991.

[33] P. T. Johnstone. *Sketches of an elephant: a Topos theory compendium*. Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2002.

[34] A. Joyal. The theory of quasi-categories and its applications. Quaderns 45, Centre de Recerca Matemàtica, 2008.

[35] A. Joyal and M. Tierney. An introduction to simplicial homotopy theory. Available from `http://hopf.math.purdue.edu/Joyal-Tierney/JT-chap-01.pdf`, 1999.

[36] A. Joyal and M. Tierney. Quasi-categories vs Segal spaces. In *Categories in algebra, geometry and mathematical physics*, volume 431 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 277–326. American Mathematical Society, 2007.

[37] A. Joyal and M. Tierney. Notes on simplicial homotopy theory. Lecture notes, available at `http://mat.uab.cat/~kock/crm/hocat/advanced-course/Quadern47.pdf`, 2008.

[38] K. Kamps and T. Porter. *Abstract homotopy and simple homotopy theory*. World Scientific Publishing Co., 1997.

[39] C. Kapulkin and P. LeFanu Lumsdaine. The simplicial model of Univalent Foundations (after Voevodsky). arXiv:1211.2851v4, 2016.

[40] G. M. Kelly and R. Street. Review of the elements of 2-categories. In *Category Seminar*, volume 420 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1974.

[41] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*. Springer, second edition, 1998.

[42] F. W. Lawvere. Adjointness in foundations. *Dialectica*, 23:281–296, 1969.

[43] F. W. Lawvere. Equality in hyperdoctrines and comprehension schema as an adjoint functor. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society Symposium on Pure Mathematics XVII*, pages 1–14, 1970.

[44] J. Lurie. *Higher topos theory*. Number 170 in Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, 2009.

[45] I. Moerdijk and J. Nuiten. Minimal fibrations of dendroidal sets. arXiv:1509.01073, 2015.

[46] B. Nordström, K. Petersson, and J. Smith. Martin-löf type theory. In S. Abramsky, D. M. Gabbay, and T. S. E. Maibaum, editors, *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, Oxford Logic Guides, chapter V, pages 1–37. Oxford University Press, 2001.

[47] I. Orton and A. M. Pitts. Axioms for modelling cubical type theory in a topos. In *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2016)*, volume 62 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 24:1–24:19, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.

[48] A. M. Pitts. Nominal presentation of cubical sets models of type theory. In H. Herbelin, P. Letouzey, and M. Sozeau, editors, *20th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2014)*. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.

[49] D. G. Quillen. *Homotopical algebra*, volume 43 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1967.

[50] E. Riehl. Monoidal algebraic model structures. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 217:1069–1104, 2013.

[51] E. Riehl and D. Verity. The theory and practice of Reedy categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 29(9):256–301, 2014.

[52] E. Rielh. Algebraic model structures. *New York Journal of Mathematics*, 17:173–231, 2011.

[53] E. Rielh. *Categorical homotopy theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

[54] J. Rosický and W. Tholen. Factorization, fibration and torsion. *Journal of Homotopy and Related Structures*, 2(295–314), 2007.

[55] G. Rosolini. *Continuity and effectiveness in topoi*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1986.

[56] M. Shulman. Univalence for inverse diagrams and homotopy canonicity. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25:1203–1277, 2015.

[57] M. Shulman. The univalence axiom for elegant Reedy presheaves. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, To appear.

[58] A. Swan. An algebraic weak factorisation system on 01-substitution sets: a constructive proof. arXiv:1409.1829, 2014.

[59] V. Voevodsky. Univalent foundations project. `http://www.math.ias.edu/vladimir/files/univalent_foundations_project.pdf`, 2010.

[60] V. Voevodsky. The equivalence axiom and univalent models of type theory. (talk at cmu on february 4, 2010). arXiv:1402.5556v2, 2014.

[61] M. A. Warren. *Homotopy theoretic aspects of constructive type theory*. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon University, 2008.