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Abstract

We define a natural 2-categorical structure on the base category of a large class of Grothendieck fibrations. Given any model category $C$, we construct a fibration whose fibers are the homotopy categories of the slice categories $C/A$, and we show that in the case $C = \text{Top}$, our construction applied to this fibration recovers the usual 2-category of spaces.
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I Introduction

The goal of this paper is to exhibit a naturally occurring 2-categorical structure on the base category of any Grothendieck fibration satisfying certain assumptions. In the motivating case of interest, the base category in question is the category of topological spaces, and our construction recovers the usual 2-category of topological spaces, continuous maps, and (homotopy classes of) homotopies.

The notion of Grothendieck fibration (as well as the essentially equivalent notion of pseudo-functor) was first introduced [Gro95, SGA71] in order to formulate the notion of descent (and later [Gir71], stack). Later, Lawvere introduced fibrations into categorical logic with his theory of hyperdoctrines [Law06]. It is the latter, logical use of hyperdoctrines which are most relevant to the present work. Specifically, in an accompanying paper [Hel19], we introduce “homotopical” semantics for first-order logic, and the 2-categorical structure introduced here is used to prove a “homotopy-invariance” theorem for these semantics.

We recall that a Grothendieck fibration (see Part II) is a functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ satisfying certain conditions which allows us to define, for each morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, a functor $f^* : \mathcal{C}^B \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^A$ between the corresponding “fibers” of $\mathcal{C}$. We will be considering certain fibrations which (following [Mak95]) we call $\&=\&$-fibrations. Among the conditions for $\mathcal{C}$ to be a $\&=\&$-fibration are that the category $\mathcal{B}$ have finite products and that, for each $B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}$, the fiber $\mathcal{C}^B \times B$ has an “equality object” $\text{Eq}_{\mathcal{B} \times B}$, satisfying a certain universal property (the name “equality object” comes from the logical view of fibrations, in which the objects of the fiber $\mathcal{C}^B$ are viewed as predicates on the set $B$).

The 2-categorical structure in a $\&=\&$-fibration arises as follows. Given two morphisms $f, g : A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we define a $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy to be a morphism $\tau_A : (f, g)^* \text{Eq}_{\mathcal{B} \times B}$ in $\mathcal{C}^A$, where $(f, g)$ is the induced morphism $A \rightarrow B \times B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, and $\tau_A$ is the terminal object of $\mathcal{C}^A$. The 2-cells of the 2-categorical structure on $\mathcal{B}$ are given by the $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies. After this, the definitions of the remaining elements of the 2-categorical structure more or less suggest themselves.

The most natural source of Grothendieck fibrations are the “codomain” or “family” fibrations $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, in which $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is the category of morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ is the functor sending each morphism to its codomain. This is a fibration whenever $\mathcal{C}$ has pullbacks, and is in fact a $\&=\&$-fibration. In these cases, the “equality objects” $\text{Eq}_{\mathcal{B}}$ are just the diagonal morphisms $\Delta : B \rightarrow B \times B$, and the resulting 2-categorical structure is trivial (i.e., the only 2-cells are identities).

The cases of interest are slight variations on the codomain fibrations. Here, we start with the category $\mathcal{C}$ of topological spaces (or Kan complexes, or more generally the category of fibrant objects of any right-proper Quillen model category), form the codomain fibration $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$, and then take the homotopy category of each fiber of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$. The result, $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ is still a $\&=\&$-fibration; but now, the equality objects $\text{Eq}_{\mathcal{B}}$ are the “path-space fibrations” $B^I \rightarrow B \times B$, and the $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$-homotopies are the (homotopy classes of) homotopies, in the usual sense.

Let us say something about which aspects of our results are already known and which are (as far as we know) new. The notion of equality in a fibration was introduced in [Law70]. The basic ingredients which go into the definition of our 2-category are well-known – for example, the definition of the “vertical” composition simply amounts to the proof that this notion of equality is transitive. However, the fact that these ingredients can be used to define a 2-category has not, to our knowledge, been observed, though we should mention that [Jac99, p. 214] effectively constructs the “homotopy category” of our 2-category in the case of fibrations whose fibers are pre-orders (whence it follows that the Hom-categories of the associated 2-category are also pre-orders.).

The idea that equality is related to homotopy is central to Homotopy Type Theory (see [AW09, KLL12,
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War08), which was the direct inspiration for this work (and for Hel19). In particular, War08 observes that what we call $\mathcal{F}(C)$ (see Definition 15.1) is a $\wedge$-fibration, and that the path objects in it satisfy a “weak” version of the universal property of equality objects, though our “fibration of homotopy categories” $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ (see §15), in which the path objects have the stronger universal property, is not considered (see the introduction to Part IV for more on this).

At the time of first writing, the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ was, to our knowledge, new, but we since learned from Chaitanya Subramaniam that it has also been constructed by P. Cagne in Cag18, where it is also shown to be equivalent to the fibration described in §15.8 (see also the footnote in the introduction to §15).

The paper is organized as follows:

**Part II:** We recall the basic definitions and collect some facts regarding Grothendieck fibrations, and in particular $\wedge$-fibrations and $\wedge=$-fibrations.

**Part III:** We introduce the notion of homotopies in fibrations, and use it to construct a 2-categorical structure on the base of a $\wedge=$-fibration. We prove some additional properties about this 2-categorical structure, namely its compatibility with the finite products on the base, and with the pseudo-functor associated to the fibration.

**Part IV:** We give examples of $\wedge=$-fibrations. In particular, we associate to any right-proper model category $C$ a fibration whose fibers are the homotopy categories of the slice categories of $C$.

**Part V:** We relate the 2-categorical structure on the category of topological spaces arising from Parts III and IV to the standard 2-category of spaces.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank M. Makkai for reading and giving helpful comments on an early version of this paper, we thank Arpon Raksit for many helpful discussions, and for the remark mentioned in §11 concerning universal properties, and we thank Dylan Cant for pointing out that in Part V, we could use the Hurewicz model structure, rather than the mixed model structure, on the category of topological spaces.

II Preliminaries on fibrations

Part II introduces Grothendieck fibrations (which we will just call fibrations), recalls some basic properties, and establishes notation. This will be fairly cursory, and we will not give much motivation. For an introduction to fibrations, we refer the reader to Mak93, Jac99.

Part II is organized as follows. In §1, we establish notation and conventions regarding categories, in §§2 and 3, we introduce fibrations, in §4, we introduce $\wedge$-fibrations, and in §5, we introduce $\wedge=$-fibrations.

1 Categorical preliminaries

We begin by establishing some notation and conventions regarding categories. For basic notions of category theory, we refer to ML98.

1.1. Given a category $C$, we denote its set of objects by $\text{Ob } C$ and, for $X,Y \in \text{Ob } C$, the set of morphisms $X \to Y$ by $\text{Hom}(X,Y)$.

Given morphisms $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$, we denote their composite by $gf$, $g \cdot f$ or $g \circ f$. We denote the by $of$ and $go$ the pre- and post-composition functions $\text{Hom}(Y,Z) \to \text{Hom}(X,Z)$ and $\text{Hom}(X,Y) \to \text{Hom}(X,Z)$, respectively.

We write $1_A$, or just 1, for the identity morphism of the object $A$, and $1_C$ for the identity functor of
The main example of a 2-category is \( \text{Cat} \) – the 2-category of categories – having categories as 0-cells, functors as 1-cells, and natural transformations as 2-cells. For categories \( \text{C} \) and \( \text{D} \), \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\text{C}, \text{D}) \) is the usual category of functors, and composition \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\text{C}, \text{D}) \times \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\text{D}, \text{E}) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\text{C}, \text{E}) \) is given on 1-cells by the usual composition of functors, and on 2-cells by “horizontal composition” of natural transformations (see [ML98, p. 42]).

1.4. Let us briefly discuss issues of “size”. A category for us will always consist of a set (as opposed to a class) of objects and a set of morphisms (and similarly with 2-categories). When we need to speak of “large” categories – as we did above in describing the 2-category \( \text{Cat} \), and as we will again in Part V, when we discuss the category \( \text{Top} \) – we are implicitly fixing a universe \( U \), and speaking of the set of all categories, topological spaces, etc., which are elements of \( U \). In some cases – for example when we talk about the pseudo-functor (see Definition 9.1) associated to a “large” fibration – we will need to fix two universes \( U_1 \subseteq U_2 \), so that our pseudo-functor goes, for example, from the category of “\( U_1 \)-small” topological spaces to the 2-category of “\( U_2 \)-small” categories.
2 Fibrations

2.1. Definition. A prefibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^\downarrow$ is just a functor $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{B}$. $\mathcal{C}$ is the total category of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is its base category (and $\mathcal{C}$ is a prefibration over its base category $\mathcal{B}$).

For the rest of §2, fix a prefibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^\downarrow$.

Given an object $B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, the fiber of $\mathcal{C}$ over $B$, denoted $\mathcal{C}^B$, is the subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of objects $P$ with $\mathcal{C}(P) = B$ and morphisms $p : P \to Q$ with $\mathcal{C}(p) = 1_B$. An object in the fiber over $B$ is said to lie over $B$ or to be an object over $B$. Similarly, a morphism $p$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{C}(p) = f$ is said to lie over $f$ or to be a morphism over $f$, and is also said to be a lift of $f$. We might also say $p$ lies over an object $B$ if $p$ lies over $1_B$. Note that the property of, say, $p$ in $\mathcal{C}$ lying over $f$ in $\mathcal{B}$, depends on $\mathcal{C}$, so we should really say something like “$p$ $\mathcal{C}$-lies-over $f$”. However, the prefibration $\mathcal{C}$ will always be clear from context in this and similar expressions.

When displaying diagrams in the total category $\mathcal{C}$ of a prefibration, we will usually display underneath it a diagram in the base category $\mathcal{B}$ so that each displayed object and morphism of $\mathcal{C}$ is positioned (approximately) above the object or morphism of $\mathcal{B}$ over which it lies. For example, in the diagram in Proposition 4.3, $P$ lies over $B$; $Q$, $R$, $Q \wedge R$, $\pi_1$, and $\pi_2$ lie over $C$; and $q$, $r$, and $\langle q,r \rangle$ lie over $g$.

2.2. Definition. A morphism $q : Q \to R$ in $\mathcal{C}$ lying over $g : B \to C$ in $\mathcal{B}$ is cartesian if it satisfies the following property: given any $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and any $r : P \to R$ in $\mathcal{C}$ lying over $gf : A \to C$, there is a unique $p : P \to Q$ over $f$ such that $qp = r$, as shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\xrightarrow{r} & & \xrightarrow{q} \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B & \xrightarrow{g} & C
\end{array}
\]

We will sometimes emphasize that a morphism in a diagram is cartesian with the symbol ε, as above.

$\mathcal{C}$ is said to be a fibration if for each $g : B \to C$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and each object $R$ over $B$, there is a cartesian lift of $g$ with codomain $R$.

2.3. Definition. Given a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and objects $P,Q$ over $A,B$ in $\mathcal{C}$, we denote by $\text{Hom}^F_f(A,B)$, or just $\text{Hom}_f(A,B)$, the set of morphisms $A \to B$ lying over $f$. Note that for an object $A$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and objects $P,Q$ over $A$, $\text{Hom}^1_A(P,Q)$ is the same as $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}^A(P,Q)$.

2.4. Proposition. A morphism $q : Q \to R$ in $\mathcal{C}$ over $g : B \to C$ in $\mathcal{B}$ is cartesian if and only if for each morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, and each $P \in \mathcal{C}^A$, the map $(g \circ) : \text{Hom}_f(P,Q) \to \text{Hom}_{gf}(P,R)$ induced by composition with $q$ is a bijection.

Proof: Immediate from the definitions. □

2.5. Proposition. Given morphisms $q : Q \to R$ and $r : R \to S$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with $r$ cartesian, the composite $rq$ is cartesian if and only if $q$ is.

Proof: Suppose $q$ lies over $g : B \to C$ and $r$ lies over $h : C \to D$. Then, for any $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^A$, we have a commutative triangle

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_f(P,Q) & \xrightarrow{q \circ} & \text{Hom}_{gf}(P,R) \\
\downarrow^{(rq) \circ} & & \downarrow^{r \circ} \\
\text{Hom}_{gf}(P,S).
\end{array}
\]
Since \((r \circ)\) is a bijection (by Proposition 2.4), \((q \circ)\) is a bijection if and only if \((rq)\circ\) is. Since this holds for each \(P\) and \(f\), it follows from Proposition 2.4 that \(q\) is cartesian if and only if \(rq\) is. □

2.6. Proposition. The composite of two cartesian morphisms is cartesian.

Proof: Immediate from Proposition 2.5. □

2.7. Proposition. Isomorphisms are cartesian.

Proof: This follows from Proposition 2.4, since for an isomorphism \(p\), an explicit inverse to \((p \circ)\) is given by \((p \circ)^{-1}\). □

2.8. Proposition. Given morphisms \(p, q : P \to Q\) in \(C\) and a cartesian morphism \(r : Q \to R\), if \(rp = rq\) then \(p = q\).

Proof: Immediate from the definition of cartesian. □

2.9. Proposition. If \(p : P \to Q\) and \(p' : P' \to Q\) in \(C\) are cartesian over \(f : A \to B\) in \(B\), then the unique \(i : P \to P'\) in \(C\) such that \(p' i = p\) is an isomorphism.

Proof: An inverse to \(i\) is obtained, in the usual way, by exchanging the roles of \(p\) and \(p'\). □

3. Cleavages

We now describe some more structure which is present in a fibration, in particular in the presence of a “cleavage”.

3.1. Definition. Let \(C \downarrow_B\) be a fibration and let \(f : A \to B\) be a morphism in \(B\). A choice of cartesian lift \(f^\uparrow\) of \(f\) with codomain \(Q\) for each \(Q \in \text{Ob } C\) determines a functor \(f^* : C \to C\), called the pullback functor along \(f\) (the relation to “pullbacks” in the categorical sense comes from special case of “codomain fibrations”, see Proposition 12.2), as follows.

For an object \(Q\) in \(C\), \(f^* Q\) is the domain of \(f^\uparrow\). For a morphism \(p : P \to Q\) in \(C\), \(f^* p\) is the unique morphism in \(C\) such that the square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  f^* P & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow P} & P \\
  \downarrow f^* p & & \downarrow p \\
  f^* Q & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow Q} & Q \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]

commutes. That \(f^*\) is a functor follows from a diagram chase in the following two diagrams using Proposition 2.8, where \(P \xrightarrow{p} Q \xrightarrow{q} R\) are a pair of composable morphisms in \(C\).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  f^* p & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow p} & P \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  f^* Q & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow Q} & Q \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  f^* R & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow R} & R \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  f^* p & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow p} & P \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  f^* Q & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow Q} & Q \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  f^* R & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow R} & R \\
  \downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
  A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]
We note that the functor $f^*$ is “essentially unique”, in the sense that a different choice of cartesian lifts will produce an isomorphic functor.

3.2. Definition. Given a fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_B$, a cleavage of $\mathcal{C}$ consists of a choice, for each $f : A \to B$ in $B$ and each $Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}_B$, of a cartesian lift of $f$ with codomain $Q$. By a cloven fibration, we mean a fibration together with a cleavage. Assuming the axiom of choice, any fibration admits a cleavage.

It follows from §3.1 that a cleavage induces a pullback functor along $f$ for each morphism $f$ in $B$.

We now make the following notational convention. Whenever we are working with a cloven fibration we will, unless stated otherwise, denote the cartesian lifts in it by $f_!^Q$, $f^*Q \to Q$, or simply $f_!^Q$. Also, given a morphism $p : P \to Q$ over a composite $A \to B \to C$, we will denote by $p$ the unique morphism $P \to g^*Q$ over $f$ such that $f_!^Q p = p$, i.e. such that

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \xrightarrow{g} C
\end{array}
\]

commutes (the notation hides the dependency on $f$, but this will always be clear from context).

In case we are considering a fibration and have not chosen a cleavage, we may still use the above notation, but in this case it will be merely suggestive. For example, if we are considering a cartesian lift of $f$ with codomain $Q$, we may like to call it $f_!^Q$, and call its domain $f^*Q$.

3.3. Proposition. We would like to draw attention to a special case of the induced morphisms $\overline{p}$.

Given a cloven fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_B$, morphisms $h : A \to C$ and $g : B \to C$ in $B$, and an object $P \in \mathcal{C}_B$, we have the two pullbacks $h^*P \to P$ and $g^*P \to P$. Given a morphism $f : A \to B$ such that $gf = h$, we then have the induced morphism $\overline{f} : h^*P \to g^*P$, i.e., the unique morphism over $f$ making the following diagram commute.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
h^*P & \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} & g^*P \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \xrightarrow{g} C
\end{array}
\]

Claim: $\overline{p}$ is cartesian whenever $p$ is. In particular, $\overline{f}$ is always cartesian.

Proof: This follows from Proposition 2.5. □

3.4. Proposition. The equation $\overline{f} \overline{p} = p$ holds whenever it makes sense. That is, given a cloven fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_B$, morphisms $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ in $B$, and a morphism $p : P \to Q$ over $f$, we have $(f^!Q)p = p$.

Proof: This is precisely the definition of $\overline{p}$. □

3.5. Proposition. The equation $\overline{p} \overline{q} = \overline{qp}$ holds whenever it makes sense. That is, given a cloven fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_B$, morphisms $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D$ in $B$ and morphisms $p : P \to Q$ and $q : Q \to R$ over $f$
and $hg$, respectively, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \overset{p}{\rightarrow} & Q \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
A & \overset{f}{\rightarrow} & B \\
\end{array}
\Rightarrow
\begin{array}{ccc}
R & \overset{h^*}{\rightarrow} & h^*R \\
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \overset{p}{\rightarrow} & Q \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
A & \overset{f}{\rightarrow} & B \\
\end{array}
\Rightarrow
\begin{array}{ccc}
R & \overset{h^*}{\rightarrow} & h^*R \\
\end{array}
$$

Proof: This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \overset{p}{\rightarrow} & Q \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi} \\
A & \overset{f}{\rightarrow} & B \\
\end{array}
\Rightarrow
\begin{array}{ccc}
R & \overset{h^*}{\rightarrow} & h^*R \\
\end{array}
$$

□

3.6. Proposition. The equation $f^*p = \overline{p \uparrow}$ holds whenever it makes sense. That is, given a cloven fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$, a morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in $B$, and a morphism $p : P \rightarrow Q$ in $\mathcal{C}B$, we have $f^*p = p \cdot (f \uparrow P) : f^*P \rightarrow f^*Q$.

Proof: Immediate from the definitions. □

4 ∧-fibrations

We now introduce ∧-fibrations. These are fibrations in which each of the fibers have finite products, which are moreover compatible with the pullback functor. The notation comes from logical applications, in which the fibers are usually posets, and hence ∧-semilattices.

4.1. Let us first establish some notational conventions regarding categories with products.

By a finite product category (or f.p. category), we mean a category in which there exists a terminal object, and for each pair of objects $A, B$, there exists a product diagram $A \leftarrow P \rightarrow B$.

A functor between f.p. categories is an f.p. functor if it takes terminal objects to terminal objects and product diagrams to product diagrams.

When considering an f.p. category $B$, we will often assume that $B$ admits a choice of product diagram over each pair of objects, and will fix such a choice, as well as a choice of terminal object. Whenever we have fixed such choices, we will – unless stated otherwise – denote the chosen product of $A$ and $B$ by $A \times B$, the chosen product projections by $\pi_1 : A \times B \rightarrow A$ and $\pi_2 : A \times B \rightarrow B$, and the chosen terminal object by $1_B$ (or just $1$).

However, when the category under consideration is a fiber $\mathcal{C}^A$ of some fibration $\mathcal{C}$, we will instead denote the chosen products by $P \wedge Q$ and the chosen terminal object by $1_A$.

In either case, we denote by $(f, g)$ the morphism $X \rightarrow Y \times Z$ (or $X \rightarrow Y \wedge Z$) induced by $f : X \rightarrow Y$ and $g : X \rightarrow Z$, and by $!_X$ the unique morphism from $X$ to the terminal object. We write $f \times g$ for $(f \pi_1, g \pi_2)$, and $\Delta_X$ for $(1_X, 1_X)$.

We assume the $\times$ and $\wedge$ are left-associative so, e.g., $A \times B \times C = (A \times B) \times C$. We write $(f, g, h)$ for $(f, g) \wedge h)$, $\Delta_{(1_B)}$ for $(1_B, 1_B)$, as well as $\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3 : A \times B \times C \rightarrow A$ for $\pi_1 \pi_1, \pi_2 \pi_1, \pi_2$, and similarly with $(f, g, h, k)$ and so on.
In case we have not chosen distinguished binary products and terminal object, we may still use the above notation, but in this case it will be merely suggestive (this is similar to the convention in §3.2). For example, if we wish to consider a product diagram over objects \( A \) and \( B \), we may like to call its vertex \( A \times B \) and its projections \( \pi_1 \) and \( \pi_2 \).

### 4.2. Definition.

A fibration \( C \downarrow B \) is a \( \wedge \)-fibration if it satisfies the following three conditions:

(i) Each fiber \( C^A \) is an f.p. category.

(ii) Given a cartesian morphism \( f^\uparrow \top_A : f^* \top_B \to \top_B \) in \( C \) over a morphism \( f : A \to B \) in \( B \), where \( \top_B \) is terminal in \( C^B \), \( f^* \top_B \) is terminal in \( C^A \).

(iii) Given a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
f^*(P \wedge Q) \\
\downarrow f^*Q \\
f^*P
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
P \wedge Q \\
Q \\
P
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow f^* \pi_1 \\
\downarrow f^* \pi_2 \\
\downarrow f
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
B
\end{array}
\]

in which \( P \leftarrow P \wedge Q \to Q \) is a product diagram in \( C^B \) and the horizontal arrows are cartesian over \( f \), we have that \( f^* P \leftarrow f^*(P \wedge Q) \to f^* Q \) is a product diagram in \( C^A \).

We will sometimes refer to the last two properties as “stability” of products and terminal objects (under pullbacks). Given a cleavage of \( C \), the conjunction of (ii) and (iii) is equivalent to the condition that each pullback functor \( f^* \) is an f.p. functor.

### 4.3. Proposition.

Let \( C \downarrow B \) be a \( \wedge \)-fibration, let \( g : B \to C \) be a morphism in \( B \), and consider a solid diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Q \wedge R \\
\downarrow \pi_2 \\
\downarrow \pi_1 \\
Q \\
\downarrow q \\
P
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow r \\
\downarrow g \\
B \\
C
\end{array}
\]

where \( Q \leftarrow Q \wedge R \to R \) is a product diagram in \( C^C \), and \( q \) and \( r \) lie over \( g \).

**Claim:** There is a unique morphism \( \langle q, r \rangle \) over \( g \) making the whole diagram commute.

**Proof:** We need to show that the map

\[
\text{Hom}_g(P, Q \wedge R) \xrightarrow{(\pi_1 \circ \pi_2 \circ g)} \text{Hom}_g(P, Q) \times \text{Hom}_g(P, R)
\]

is a bijection.
Choose cartesian lifts of \( g \) with codomain \( Q, R, \) and \( Q \land R \), so that we have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
g^\ast(Q \land R) \ar[r]^\uparrow \ar[d] & Q \land R \ar[d] \ar[r]^\uparrow & R \ar[d] \\
g^\ast Q \ar[r]_\uparrow & Q \ar[r]_\pi_1 & \ast \ar[r]_g & C. \\
\end{array}
\]

(where \( g^\ast \pi_1 \) and \( g^\ast \pi_2 \) of course denote the unique morphisms over \( B \) making the diagram commute).

We then have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}/ \hat{\mathcal{B}}}(P, g^\ast(Q \land R)) \ar[r]^{\uparrow \circ} \ar[d] & \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}(P, Q \land R) \ar[d] \\
\text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}/ \hat{\mathcal{B}}}(P, g^\ast Q) \times \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}/ \hat{\mathcal{B}}}(P, g^\ast R) \ar[r]^{(\uparrow \circ) \times (\uparrow \circ)} & \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}(P, Q) \times \text{Hom}_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}}(P, R). \\
\end{array}
\]

The horizontal maps are bijections since the morphisms \( \uparrow \) are cartesian, and the map on the left is a bijection since \( g^\ast Q \xrightarrow{g^\ast \pi_1} g^\ast(Q \land R) \xrightarrow{g^\ast \pi_2} g^\ast R \) is a product diagram (since \( \hat{\mathcal{E}} \) is a \( \land \)-fibration). Hence the map on the right is a bijection as well, as desired. \( \square \)

4.4. Definition. A \( \land \)-cleavage of a \( \land \)-fibration is a cleavage together with a choice of binary products and terminal object in each fiber.

Let \( \hat{\mathcal{E}} \downarrow \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) be a \( \land \)-cloven fibration, let \( f : A \to B \) be a morphism in \( \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) and \( q : P \to Q \) and \( r : P \to R \) morphisms over \( f \). By Proposition 4.3, we have an induced morphisms \( P \to Q \land R \) over \( f \). We will denote this morphism by \( \langle \langle q, r \rangle \rangle \). Note that if \( A = B \) and \( f = 1_B \), then \( \langle \langle q, r \rangle \rangle = \langle q, r \rangle \). We also write \( q \land r \) for \( \langle \langle q \pi_1, r \pi_2 \rangle \rangle \). Note that if \( q \) and \( r \) lie over an identity morphism then \( q \land r = q \land r \).

Note that the equations

\[
\langle \langle p, q \rangle \rangle r = \langle \langle pq, qr \rangle \rangle, \quad (s \land t) \langle \langle p, q \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle sp, tq \rangle \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad (s \land t)(p \land q) = sp \land tq
\]

(whenever they make sense) follow immediately from the definitions.

Also, for a morphism \( g : B \to C \) in \( \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) and an object \( Q \in \text{Ob} \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) we denote by \( \llbracket g \rrbracket \) (or just \( \llbracket \rrbracket \)) the unique morphism \( Q \to \top \) over \( g \). Note that if \( B = C \) and \( g = 1_B \), then \( \llbracket g \rrbracket = \llbracket 1 \rrbracket \). And that, given a morphism \( p : P \to Q \) over \( f : A \to B \), we have \( \llbracket gp \rrbracket = \llbracket gf \rrbracket : P \to \top \).

As usual (see §§3.2 and 4.1), we may still use these notations even if we have not chosen a \( \land \)-cleavage, but in this case they will be merely suggestive.

5 \( \land \)=fibrations

We now introduce \( \land \)=fibrations. In addition to being \( \land \)=fibrations, these have finite products in the base category, and a notion of “equality objects” in the fiber over each product \( B \times B \). These satisfy a universal property which if formally analogous to the rules governing equality in predicate logic.

For the rest of §5, let \( \hat{\mathcal{E}} \downarrow \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) be a fibration.
5.1. We define the notion of a *cocartesian* morphism in \( C \) to be dual to that of cartesian morphism. Explicitly, \( p : P \to Q \) over \( f : A \to B \) is cocartesian if for every \( g : B \to C \) and object \( R \) lying over \( C \), the map \( (op) : \text{Hom}_g(Q, R) \to \text{Hom}_f(P, R) \) is a bijection. We will sometimes emphasize that a morphism is cocartesian by marking it like so \( \xrightarrow{c} \).

For each of the statements in §2 about cartesian morphisms, we have a dual statement for cocartesian morphisms.

5.2. Proposition. A morphism \( p : P \to Q \) over \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \) is cocartesian if and only if \( (op) : \text{Hom}_g(Q, R) \to \text{Hom}_f(P, R) \) is a bijection for every \( R \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{E}_B \).

Proof: The \( \Rightarrow \) direction is clear, this condition being strictly weaker than the one defining “cocartesian”.

For the \( \Leftarrow \) direction, assume the hypothesis let \( g : B \to C \) be a morphism in \( C \) and \( R \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{E}_B \). We must show that \( (op) : \text{Hom}_f(P, R) \) is a bijection. Choose a cartesian lift \( \uparrow : g^*R \to R \) of \( g \). We then have a commutative square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_g(Q, R) & \xrightarrow{op} & \text{Hom}_f(P, R) \\
\downarrow \circ & & \downarrow \circ \\
\text{Hom}_g(Q, R) & \xrightarrow{op} & \text{Hom}_f(P, R)
\end{array}
\]

in which the top map (by assumption) and the vertical maps (by the cartesianness of \( \uparrow \)) are bijections, and hence the bottom map is also bijection a desired. □

5.3. Definition. Suppose we have a cocartesian morphism \( p : P \to Q \) in \( C \) over \( g : C \to D \) in \( B \), and a morphism \( k : B \to D \) in \( B \). We say that \( p \) is stable along \( k \) if: given any pullback square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow h & & \downarrow k \\
C & \xrightarrow{g} & D
\end{array}
\]

in \( C \) lying over this square with \( s \) and \( t \) cartesian; \( p' \) is also cocartesian (note that in this situation, \( p' \) is uniquely determined by \( p, s, \) and \( t \) since \( t \) is cartesian). This is also known as the Beck-Chevalley condition.

5.4. Definition. We call a morphism \( \pi_2 : X \times Y \to Y \) in any category \( D \) a product projection if there is a morphism \( \pi_1 : X \times Y \to X \) in \( D \) for which \( X \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X \times Y \xrightarrow{\pi_2} Y \) is a product diagram.

We call a morphism \( \Delta_X : X \to X \times X \) in \( D \) a diagonal morphism if there exists a product diagram \( X \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X \times X \xrightarrow{\pi_2} X \) with \( \pi_1 \Delta_X = \pi_2 \Delta_X = 1_X \).

We call a morphism \( 1_X \times \Delta_Y : X \times Y \to X \times Y \times Y \) in \( D \) a generalized diagonal morphism if there exists a pullback diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X \times Y & \xrightarrow{1_X \times \Delta_Y} & X \times Y \times Y \\
\downarrow \pi_2 & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\
Y & \xrightarrow{\Delta_Y} & Y \times Y
\end{array}
\]

with \( \Delta_Y \) a diagonal morphism and \( \pi_2 \) a product projection. Note that it follows that \( \pi'_2 \) is a product projection as well. Note also that in an f.p. category, given the diagonal morphism \( \Delta_Y \) and the product projection \( \pi_2 \), such a pullback diagram always exists.
5.5. Definition. Suppose $C$ is a $\wedge$-fibration, and let $q : Q \to Q'$ in $C$ over $f : A \to B$ in $B$ be cocartesian. We say that $q$ satisfies Frobenius reciprocity if: given any commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{q} & Q' \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
Q \wedge f^*P & \xrightarrow{q \wedge f^!P} & Q' \wedge P \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
f^*P & \xrightarrow{f^!P} & P \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
$$

with $Q \leftarrow Q \wedge f^*P \to f^*P$ and $Q' \leftarrow Q' \wedge P \to P$ product diagrams, and $f^!P$ cartesian over $f$, $q \wedge f^!P$ is also cocartesian.

5.6. Definition. $C$ is a $\wedge$-fibration if it satisfies the following three conditions.

(i) $C$ is a $\wedge$-fibration.

(ii) For every generalized diagonal morphism $1_A \times \Delta_B : A \times B \to A \times B \times B$ in $B$ and every terminal object $\top_{A \times B}$ of $C^{A \times B}$, there is a cocartesian lift of $1_A \times \Delta_B$ with domain $\top_{A \times B}$.

(iii) Every cocartesian lift as in (ii) satisfies Frobenius reciprocity and is stable with respect to all product projections $\pi_2 : C \times A \times B \times B \to A \times B \times B$.

Note that by the stability demanded in (iii) and by the definition of generalized diagonal morphism, it is enough in (ii) to demand cocartesian lifts of (non-generalized) diagonal morphisms.

Also note that all the above conditions are “isomorphism invariant”. Hence, in (ii), for example, it suffices to check the condition for some terminal object $\top_{A \times B}$ in $C^{A \times B}$, and for some pullback $1_A \times \Delta_B$ of some diagonal morphism $\Delta_B : B \to B \times B$ along some product projection $\pi_2 : A \times B \times B \to B \times B$. In particular, if we have chosen a $\wedge$-cleavage (see Definition 5.7 below) of $C$, it suffices to check that above conditions for the specified structure in the $\wedge$-cleavage. This “isomorphism invariance” is not exactly trivial, but is straightforward to (formulate precisely and) check, and we leave it to the reader.

As a final remark, we note that each instance of Frobenius reciprocity produces a new cocartesian morphism; hence, a $\wedge$-fibration necessarily has many cocartesian morphisms not explicitly required in the definition. One might wonder if these other cocartesian morphisms automatically satisfy Frobenius reciprocity and stability along product projections as well. They do (this, too, we leave to the reader).

5.7. Definition. A $\wedge$-cleavage of $C$ is $\wedge$-cleavage together with a choice of binary products and terminal object in $B$, and a choice, for each $B \in \text{Ob} B$, of a cocartesian lift of $\Delta_B : B \to B \times B$ with domain $\top_B$. For $B \in \text{Ob} B$, we will refer to the codomain of this chosen lift by $\text{Eq}_B$, and to the lift itself by $\rho_B : \top_B \to \text{Eq}_B$. ($\rho$ stands for “reflexivity”).

III 2-categorical structure in fibrations

The goal of Part III is to define a 2-category structure on the base category of any (cleavable) $\wedge$-fibration $C \downarrow B$. The 2-cells between two morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ will be “homotopies” between $f$ and $g$. From the logical point of view, these are “proofs according to $C$” that two morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ are equal.

According to this point of view, we think of the objects of $B$ as denoting sets, and the objects in the fiber over the object $A$ as denoting predicates on $A$, the morphisms between them being implications.
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The terminal object \( \top_A \) is then the trivial predicate “true”, and the equality object \( \text{Eq}_{B} \) over \( B \times B \) is the equality predicate “\( b = b' \)”. Moreover, given a morphism \( f : A \to B \), we think of the pullback \( f^* \) as performing “substitution”, i.e. \( f^* \) takes the predicate \( P(b) \) to \( P(f(a)) \). Hence, a “proof that \( f \) and \( g \) are equal” – i.e. that the predicate “\( f(a) = g(a) \)” is always true – should be an implication \( \top_A \to (f,g)^* \text{Eq}_{B} \), or equivalently, a morphisms \( \top_A \to \text{Eq}_{B} \) over \( (f,g) \).

The idea that this (or any) notion of “equality” should have something to do with homotopies – which it does (see Part V) – is familiar from homotopy theory; it often happens that each point of a space represents some (say, geometric) object, and that each path between two points gives rise to an identification between the corresponding objects. Thus one considers spaces rather than sets of objects, and “path-connectedness” rather than equality. This idea is expressed most explicitly in Homotopy Type Theory which, as we mentioned in the introduction, is the inspiration for this work. In [Hel19], we make the logical connection to the present work more explicit.

Having defined homotopies in this manner, it remains to define the 2-categorical structure; i.e., the composition operations. Here, the logical point of view is again helpful. For example, defining the composition of homotopies \( f \to g \) and \( g \to h \) amounts to producing a proof of \( f(a) = h(a) \) from \( f(a) = g(a) \) and \( g(a) = h(a) \). However, this kind of thinking only so goes far; for example, proving associativity of this composition amounts to showing that “two different proofs are equal”, which does not have a formal counterpart in the rules of predicate logic.

We will prove two more properties of this 2-category which are crucial to our application in [Hel19]. The first is that the finite products in \( B \) are also finite products in the 2-categorical sense.

The second is that the pseudo-functor (see §9.1) \( B^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat} \) associated to a cleavage of \( C \) extends to a pseudo-functor of 2-categories. The significance of this is roughly as follows. Given two parallel morphisms \( f,g : A \to B \), we have the two pullback functors \( f^*,g^* : C^B \to C^A \). If \( f \) and \( g \) are homotopic, we would expect these functors to be naturally isomorphic. The pseudo-functoriality says that this is so, and moreover that this association of natural isomorphisms to homotopies takes composition of homotopies to composition of natural transformations.

Part III is organized as follows. In §6, we define the notion of \( C \)-homotopy, and then define the “vertical” composition and show that it defines a category. In §7, we show that this category is in fact a groupoid – i.e., that all the morphisms are invertible. In §8, we define the “horizontal” composition, and show that, together with the “vertical” composition, this forms a 2-category. In §9, we show that the pseudo-functor associated to the fibration is a pseudo-functor of 2-categories, and in §10, we show that the 2-category has finite products. Finally, in §11, we will discuss the extent to which the 2-category structure is uniquely determined by the fibration \( C \).

6 Homotopies in fibrations

We now introduce the notion of homotopies in fibrations, and define the “vertical” composition operation. Throughout §6, let \( C \downarrow B \) be a \( \& \)-cloven \( \& \)-fibration.

The definition of homotopy was sketched above. As we also mentioned there, given three morphisms \( f,g,h : A \to B \), the definition of the composition of homotopies \( f \to g \) and \( g \to h \) can be viewed logically as a proof of transitivity \( f(a) = g(a) \land g(a) = h(a) \Rightarrow f(a) = h(a) \). This, in turn can be reduced to the general statement \( b_1 = b_2 \wedge b_2 = b_3 \Rightarrow b_1 = b_3 \) for \( b_1,b_2,b_3 \in B \). This is how we will proceed, noting that, in terms of the fibration, the predicates \( b_i = b_j \) are represented by the pullback of \( \text{Eq}_B \) along \( \langle \pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle : B^3 \to B \times B \).

6.1. Definition. Given two morphisms \( f,g : A \to B \) in \( B \), a \( C \)-homotopy from \( f \) to \( g \) is a morphism \( \top_A \to \text{Eq}_{B} \) over \( (f,g) : A \to B \times B \).
To denote a \( \mathbf{C} \)-homotopy \( \alpha \) from \( f \) to \( g \), we use the notation \( f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g \) or \( A \xrightarrow{\frac{f}{g}} B \).

**6.2. Definition.** Given \( B \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{C} \) and natural numbers \( 1 \leq i, j \leq n \), we write \( \text{Eq}^{ij}_B \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{C}^n_B \) for the pullback \( \langle \pi_i, \pi_j \rangle^\ast \text{Eq}_B \) of \( \text{Eq}_B \in \mathbf{C}^n \) along \( \langle \pi_i, \pi_j \rangle : B^n \to B \times B \). The notation hides the dependency on \( n \), but it always be clear from context.

**6.3. Definition.** For \( B \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{B} \), let \( \rho^{ij}_B \) be the unique morphism \( \tau_B \to \text{Eq}^{ij}_B \) over \( \Delta^n_B : B \to B^n \) making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Eq}^{ij}_B & \xrightarrow{\rho^{ij}_B} & \text{Eq}_B \\
\tau_B \downarrow & & \downarrow \rho \\
B \xrightarrow{\Delta^n_B} B^n \langle \pi_i, \pi_j \rangle & \xrightarrow{\Delta_B} & B \times B
\end{array}
\]

commute, i.e., \( \rho^{ij}_B = \overline{\rho}_B \). Again, the dependence of \( \rho^{ij}_B \) on \( n \) is concealed in the notation, but it will always be clear from context.

**6.4. Proposition.** For every \( B \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{B} \), the morphism \( \langle \rho^{12}_B, \rho^{23}_B \rangle : \tau_B \to \text{Eq}^{12}_B \land \text{Eq}^{23}_B \) over \( \Delta^1_B \) is cocartesian.

**Proof.** We will show that \( \langle \rho^{12}_B, \rho^{23}_B \rangle \) is the composite of two cocartesian morphisms and hence cocartesian by the dual of Proposition 2.6. The first will just be \( \rho_B : \tau_B \to \text{Eq}_B \) over \( \Delta_B : B \to B \times B \). The second will be a morphism \( \text{Eq}_B \to \text{Eq}^{12}_B \land \text{Eq}^{23}_B \) over \( 1_B \times \Delta_B : B \times B \to B \times B \times B \) (where, abusing notation, we write \( 1_B \times \Delta_B \) for \( \langle \pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3 \rangle \)), which we will now construct.

Let us denote by \( \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \) denote the unique morphism \( \tau_{B \times B} \to \text{Eq}^{23}_B \) over \( 1_{B \times B} \times \Delta_B \) making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tau_{B \times B} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\rho}^{23}_B} & \text{Eq}^{23}_B \\
\tau_B \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\
B \times B & \xrightarrow{1_{B \times B} \times \Delta_B} & B \times B \times B
\end{array}
\]

commute. By the stability of \( \rho_B \) along the product projection \( \langle \pi_2, \pi_3 \rangle \), \( \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \) is cocartesian.

Now, consider the following commutative diagram.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\tau_{B \times B} & \xrightarrow{\rho^{23}_B} & \text{Eq}^{23}_B \\
\tau_B \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_2 \\
\text{Eq}_B & \xrightarrow{\langle \text{Eq}_B, \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \rangle} & \text{Eq}^{12}_B \land \text{Eq}^{23}_B \\
1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_1 \\
\text{Eq}_B & \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}_B} & \text{Eq}^{12}_B \\
B \times B & \xrightarrow{1_{B \times B} \times \Delta_B} & B \times B \times B
\end{array}
\]

Since the left and right sides are product diagrams, \( \text{Eq}_B \) is cartesian (by Proposition 3.3), and \( \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \) is cocartesian, it follows by Frobenius reciprocity that \( \langle \text{Eq}_B, \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \rangle \) is cocartesian.

It remains to show that \( \langle \rho^{12}_B, \rho^{23}_B \rangle \) is equal to the composite \( \langle \text{Eq}_B, \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \rangle \rho_B = \langle \text{Eq}_B \rho_B, \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \rho_B \rangle \). That \( \text{Eq}_B \rho_B \) is equal to \( \rho^{12}_B \) follows immediately from Proposition 3.5 (since \( \rho^{12}_B = \overline{\rho}_B \)), and that
\( \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \rho_B \) is equal to \( \tilde{\rho}^{23}_B \) follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\top_B \longrightarrow \rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_{B^3} \\
\top_B \longrightarrow \rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B
\end{array} \]

6.5. Definition. For an object \( B \) in \( \mathbf{B} \), we define \( \text{tr}_B : \text{Eq}_{B^3} \wedge \text{Eq}_B \rightarrow \text{Eq}_{B^3} \) to be the (by Proposition 6.4 unique) morphism in \( \mathcal{C}^B \) making the following diagram commute. ("tr" stands for "transitivity")

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\langle \langle \rho^{12}_B \rho^{23}_B \rangle \rangle \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \text{tr}_B \quad \downarrow^1 \\
\top_B \longrightarrow \rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_{B^3} \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \text{Eq}_{B^3} \\
\rho_B \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B
\end{array} \]

6.6. Definition. Given morphisms \( f, g, h : A \rightarrow B \) in \( \mathbf{B} \) and \( \mathcal{C}\)-homotopies \( \alpha : f \rightarrow g \rightarrow h \) (i.e., morphisms \( \alpha, \beta : \top_A \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B \) over \( \langle f, g \rangle \) and \( \langle g, h \rangle \) respectively), we define the vertical composite \( \beta \circ \alpha \) to be the \( \mathcal{C}\)-homotopy from \( f \) to \( h \) given by the morphism \( \uparrow \cdot \text{tr}_B \cdot \langle \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \rangle : \top_A \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B \) over \( \langle f, h \rangle \), as shown below.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\langle \langle \pi, \beta \rangle \rangle \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \text{tr}_B \quad \downarrow^1 \\
\top_A \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_{B^3} \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B \\
\langle f, g, h \rangle \longrightarrow B^3 \\
A \longrightarrow B^3
\end{array} \]

In other words, \( \beta \circ \alpha \) is the unique morphism over \( \langle f, h \rangle \) such that the following diagram commutes.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\langle \langle \pi, \beta \rangle \rangle \quad \downarrow^1 \quad \text{tr}_B \quad \downarrow^1 \\
\top_A \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_{B^3} \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B \\
\langle f, g, h \rangle \longrightarrow B^3 \\
A \longrightarrow B^3
\end{array} \]

6.7. Definition. Given a morphism \( f : A \rightarrow B \) in \( \mathbf{B} \), we define the identity \( \mathcal{C}\)-homotopy at \( f \), denoted \( \text{id}_f \), to be the morphism \( \rho_B \cdot \downarrow^f f : \top_A \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B \) over \( \langle f, f \rangle \), as shown below.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\top_A \longrightarrow \text{Eq}_B \\
A \longrightarrow B
\end{array} \]
6.8. **Definition.** Given an object $B \in \text{Ob } B$ and natural numbers $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$, we define $\text{tr}_{ij}^{jk} : \text{Eq}_B^{ij} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{jk} \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B^{ik}$ to be the unique morphism in $\mathcal{C}^n$ making the following diagram commute.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Eq}_B^{ij} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{jk} & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_{ij}^{jk}} & \text{Eq}_B^{ik} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Eq}_B^{ij} & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_B} & \text{Eq}_B^{ik} \\
B^n & \xrightarrow{\langle \pi, \pi_1, \pi_k \rangle} & B^n
\end{array}
$$

6.9. **Lemma.** Given morphisms $f_1, \ldots, f_n : A \rightarrow B$ in $B$ and $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies $f_i \overset{\alpha}{\rightarrow} f_j \overset{\beta}{\rightarrow} f_k$, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}_B^{ij} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{jk}} & \langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_{ij}^{jk}} & \langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle \\
A & \xrightarrow{\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle} & B^n
\end{array}
$$

*Proof:* This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.5 and 3.4).

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}_B^{ij} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{jk}} & \langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_{ij}^{jk}} & \langle \langle \pi, \pi \rangle \rangle \\
A & \xrightarrow{\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle} & B^n
\end{array}
$$

6.10. **Lemma.** For any $B \in \text{Ob } B$ and any $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \langle \rho_B^{ij}, \rho_B^{jk} \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{Eq}_B^{ij} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{jk}} & \langle \langle \rho_B^{ij}, \rho_B^{jk} \rangle \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\langle \langle \rho_B^{ij}, \rho_B^{jk} \rangle \rangle & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_{ij}^{jk}} & \langle \langle \rho_B^{ij}, \rho_B^{jk} \rangle \rangle \\
B & \xrightarrow{\Delta_B^n} & B^n
\end{array}
$$

*Proof:* This is proven in the same way as Lemma 6.9. \( \square \)

6.11. **Lemma.** For every $B \in \text{Ob } B$, the morphism

$$
\langle \langle \rho_B^{12}, \rho_B^{23}, \rho_B^{34} \rangle \rangle : \top_B \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B^{12} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{23} \wedge \text{Eq}_B^{34}
$$

over $\Delta_B^4 : B \rightarrow B^4$ is cocartesian.

*Proof:* This claim is obviously analogous to Proposition 6.4 and the proof is essentially the same.
We write \( \langle \rho_B^{12}, \rho_B^{23}, \rho_B^{34} \rangle \) as the composite of two cocartesian morphisms

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Delta_B^1 \quad \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{12}} \quad B \\
\Delta_B^2 \quad \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{23}} \quad B^3 \\
\Delta_B^3 \quad \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{34}} \quad B^4
\end{array}
\]

The first morphism is cocartesian by Proposition 6.4. The second morphism is defined in the same way as the second morphism in the proof of Proposition 6.4, treating the codomain as a product of \( \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \) and \( \text{Eq}_{B}^{34} \). We leave the remaining details to the reader. \( \square \)

**6.12. Theorem.** Each hom-set \( \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \) is the object set of a category with morphisms the \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies and composition given by vertical composition of \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies. We denote this category by \( \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \). Also, the identity morphisms of \( \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \) are the identity \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies.

**Proof:** We first show that vertical composition is associative.

Let \( f, g, h, k : A \to B \) be morphisms in \( B \) and let \( f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g \to h \to k \) be \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies. To show that

\[
\gamma \circ (\beta \circ \alpha) = (\gamma \circ \beta) \circ \alpha,
\]

we show that the two composites \( \Gamma_A \to \text{Eq}_{B}^{14} \) in the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34} & \xrightarrow{\text{assoc}} & \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land (\text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34}) \\
\text{tr}_{B}^{12} \land \text{tr}_{B}^{23} \land \text{tr}_{B}^{34} & \xrightarrow{\text{assoc}} & \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land (\text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34})
\end{array}
\]

are equal since by Lemma 6.9, they are equal to \( \gamma \circ (\beta \circ \alpha) \) and \( (\gamma \circ \beta) \circ \alpha \), respectively. In fact, we will see that the two composites \( (\text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23}) \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34} \to \text{Eq}_{B}^{14} \) are equal. To see this, it suffices by the dual of Proposition 2.8 to see that their composites with the (by Lemma 6.11) cocartesian morphism

\[
\langle \langle \langle \rho_B^{12}, \rho_B^{23} \rangle, \rho_B^{34} \rangle \rangle : \Gamma_A \to (\text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23}) \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34}
\]

are equal, and by Lemma 6.10, these are both equal to \( \rho_B^{14} \).

Next, we must show that for each \( f : A \to B \), the \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopy \( \text{id}_f \) is an identity with respect to composition of \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies. We will only show that it is an identity on one of the two sides, since the proof for the other side is the same.

Given another morphism \( g : A \to B \) and a \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopy \( f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g \), we must show that \( \alpha \circ \text{id}_f = \alpha \). Now, \( \alpha \circ \text{id}_f \) is by definition the composite

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma_A \xrightarrow{\langle \langle \langle \rho_B^{12}, \rho_B^{23} \rangle, \rho_B^{34} \rangle \rangle} \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34} \\
\Gamma_A \xrightarrow{\langle \langle \langle \rho_B^{12}, \rho_B^{23} \rangle, \rho_B^{34} \rangle \rangle} \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \land \text{Eq}_{B}^{34}
\end{array}
\]

Note that \( \text{id}_f \) and \( \pi \) both factor through \( \alpha : \Gamma_A \to \text{Eq}_B \), namely as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma_A \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Eq}_B \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \Gamma_B \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{12}} \text{Eq}_B^{12} \\
\Gamma_A \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{Eq}_B \xrightarrow{\pi_1} \Gamma_B \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{12}} \text{Eq}_B^{12}
\end{array}
\]

and

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \xrightarrow{(f, g)} B \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_1} B \xrightarrow{\Delta_B^3} B^3 \\
A \xrightarrow{(f, g)} B \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_1} B \xrightarrow{\Delta_B^3} B^3
\end{array}
\]
respectively. Hence, it suffices to see that the composite

$$\mathrm{Eq}_B \langle \langle \rho^{12}_B, \rho^{23}_B \rangle \rangle \to \mathrm{Eq}_B^{12} \land \mathrm{Eq}_B^{23} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{tr}_B} \mathrm{Eq}_B^{13} \uparrow \mathrm{Eq}_B$$

is equal to the identity.

This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using the dual of Proposition 2.8 (and Proposition 3.5).

7 Invertibility of homotopies

Continuing with a $\land=$-clowned $\land=$-fibration $\mathcal{C}_B \downarrow B$, we next show that each hom-category $\overline{\mathrm{Hom}}_B(A, B)$ is in fact a groupoid.

7.1. Definition. For an object $B \in \mathcal{B}$, we define $\text{sym}^B : \mathrm{Eq}_B \to \mathrm{Eq}_B$ to be the unique morphism over $\langle \pi_2, \pi_1 \rangle : B \times B \to B \times B$ making the following diagram commute.

7.2. Definition. Given morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ and a $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy $f \alpha \Rightarrow g$, we define its inverse, $\alpha^{-1}$ to be the $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy from $g$ to $f$ given by the morphism $\text{sym}^B \cdot \alpha$, as shown below.

7.3. Lemma. Given morphisms $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ in $\mathcal{B}$, the following diagram commutes.

Proof: Immediate from the definitions of $\text{id}_g$ and $\text{id}_{gf}$. □
7.4. Theorem. Given morphisms \( f, g : A \to B \) in \( B \), every \( C \)-homotopy \( f \sim g \) is invertible with respect to vertical composition of \( C \)-homotopies, with inverse \( \alpha^{-1} \).

Proof: We will only show that \( \alpha^{-1} \) is an inverse on one side of \( \alpha \), since the proof is identical for the other side.

We must show that the composite \( \uparrow \cdot \tr_B \cdot \langle \alpha, \alpha^{-1} \rangle \) (shown below) is equal to \( \id_f \).

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow_A
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\langle \alpha, \alpha^{-1} \rangle}
\begin{array}{c}
\xrightarrow{\tr_B}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\Eq_B^{12} \wedge \Eq_B^{23}}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B^{13}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\uparrow}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
A \xrightarrow{(f, g)} B \times B \xrightarrow{(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3)} B 
\]

Note that both \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha^{-1} \) factor through \( \alpha : \uparrow_A \to \Eq_B \), namely as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xrightarrow{\alpha}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\uparrow_A}
\xrightarrow{\Eq_B^{12}}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B^{12} \wedge \Eq_B^{23}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\xrightarrow{\tr_B}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B^{13}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\uparrow}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
A \xrightarrow{(f, g)} B \times B \xrightarrow{(\pi_1, \pi_2, \pi_3)} B 
\]

respectively. Hence, it suffices to show that the square in

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\xrightarrow{\uparrow}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\Eq_B^{12} \wedge \Eq_B^{23}}
\begin{array}{c}
\xrightarrow{\tr_B}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B^{13}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\uparrow}
\begin{array}{c}
\Eq_B
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

commutes since by Lemma 7.3, \( \uparrow \cdot \Id_{\Eq_B^{12}, \Eq_B^{23}} = \id_f \).

This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using the dual of Proposition 2.8 (as well as Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 7.3).

8 The 2-categorical structure

8.1. Definition. Given morphisms \( h, k : B \to C \) in \( C \) and a \( C \)-homotopy \( h \sim k \), we denote by \( \hat{\beta} \) the unique morphism \( \Eq_B \to \Eq_C \) over \( h \times k \) making the following diagram commute.
8.2. Definition. Given $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies

$$A \xrightarrow{\gamma} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C,$$

we define the *horizontal composite* of $\alpha$ and $\beta$, which we denote by $\beta \circ \alpha$, to be the $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy from $hf$ to $kg$ given by the composite

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Delta & \Rightarrow & \delta \\
\uparrow & & \downarrow \\
\beta & \Rightarrow & \beta \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\alpha & \Rightarrow & \alpha \\
\end{array}$$

8.3. Proposition. Horizontal composition is associative. That is, given morphisms of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies

$$A \xrightarrow{\gamma} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \xrightarrow{\delta} D,$$

we have $(\gamma \circ \beta) \circ \alpha = \gamma \circ (\beta \circ \alpha)$.

*Proof:* We need to show that $(\gamma \circ \beta) \circ \alpha = \gamma \circ (\beta \circ \alpha)$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\gamma \circ \beta = \gamma \circ \beta$. This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using the dual of Proposition 2.8.

8.4. Proposition. For any objects $A, B, C \in \mathcal{B}$, horizontal composition extends the composition map $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(B, C) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, C)$ to a bifunctor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(B, C) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(A, C)$.

This means that for morphisms $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{k} C$ in $\mathcal{B}$, we have $\text{id}_k \circ \text{id}_f = \text{id}_{kf}$, and that given further morphisms and $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies

$$A \xrightarrow{\delta} B \xrightarrow{\gamma} C,$$

we have $(\delta \circ \gamma) \circ (\beta \circ \alpha) = (\delta \circ \beta) \circ (\gamma \circ \alpha)$. 
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**Proof:** The first claim follows from the commutativity of

![Diagram of commutative square]

For the second claim, we must show that the following two composites are equal.

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta_B & : A \to B \\
\Delta_B & : B \times B \\
\end{align*}
\]

This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using the dual of Proposition 2.8 (and...
Homotopies in Grothendieck fibrations

Propositions 3.5 and 3.4).
9.1. Definition. Let \( C \) and \( D \) be 2-categories. A pseudo-functor \( F : C \rightarrow D \) consists of the following data (1)-(4) satisfying the conditions (i)-(ii).

1. A function \( F : \text{Ob} \, C \rightarrow \text{Ob} \, D \)
2. For each \( A, B \in \text{Ob} \, C \), a functor \( F : \text{Hom}_C(A, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_D(FA, FB) \)
3. For each \( A, B, C \in \text{Ob} \, C \) a natural isomorphism
   \[
   \text{Hom}_C(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_C(B, C) \xrightarrow{\circ} \text{Hom}_C(A, C)
   \]
   \[
   \text{Hom}_D(FA, FB) \times \text{Hom}_D(FB, FC) \xrightarrow{\circ} \text{Hom}_D(FA, FC)
   \]
   where \( \circ \) denotes the composition functor \((f, g) \mapsto g \circ f\).
4. For each \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \), an invertible two-cell
   \[
   F\begin{array}{c} 1_A \\downarrow \\frown \\swarrow \\downarrow 1_{FA} \\
   FA \end{array}
   \]
   (i) For each triple \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \xrightarrow{h} D \) of composable morphisms in \( C \), the following square in \( \text{Hom}_D(A, D) \) commutes.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   F(h) \circ F(g) \circ F(f) & \xrightarrow{1_{F(h)} \circ (FABC)(f,g)} & F(h) \circ F(g \circ f) \\
   \xrightarrow{(FBCD)(g,h) \circ 1_{F(f)}} & & \xrightarrow{(FACD)(g \circ f,h)}
   \end{array}
   \]
   (ii) For each morphism \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \) in \( C \), the following triangles in \( \text{Hom}_D(A, B) \) commute.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   F(f) \circ F(1_A) & \xrightarrow{(FABB)(1_A,f)} & F(f) \\
   \xrightarrow{1_{F(f)} \circ F_A} & & \xrightarrow{1_{F(f)} \circ F_B \circ 1_{F(f)}}
   \end{array}
   \]

The above is a special case of a more general definition, in which \( C \) and \( D \) are allowed to be arbitrary bicategories – but we will not need this greater generality.

9.2. As mentioned above, the original definition of pseudo-functor [SGA71, p. 175] was given in the special case in which \( C = B^{op} \) is a 1-category (i.e., all of its 2-cells are identities) and \( D \) is the 2-category \( \text{Cat} \). In this case, the notion is essentially equivalent to that of a cloven fibration over \( B \). Let us explain how to construct the pseudo-functor \( \hat{C} : B^{op} \rightarrow \text{Cat} \) associated to a cloven fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \).

For \( A \in \text{Ob} \, B \), the category \( \hat{C}(A) \) is just the fiber \( \mathcal{C}^A \), and for \( f : A \rightarrow B \) in \( B \), the functor \( \hat{C}(f) : \hat{C}(B) \rightarrow \hat{C}(A) \) is the pullback functor \( f^* : \mathcal{C}^B \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^A \) associated to the cleavage. Given
morphisms $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ in $\mathbf{C}$, the natural isomorphism $(\mathcal{E}_{ABC})(f,g) : g^* f^* \to (gf)^*$ which we will just denote by $\mathcal{E}_{fg}$ is given, for $Q \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{E}^C$, by $\mathcal{E}_{fg}$, i.e., the unique morphism in $\mathcal{E}^A$ making

$$f^* g^* Q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}_{fg}} g^* f^* Q \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}_{fg}} (gf)^* Q$$

commute. The natural isomorphism $\mathcal{E}_A : (1_A)^* \to 1_{\mathcal{E}^A}$ is given, for $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{E}^A$, by $\mathcal{E}_A P = f^* P$. For a proof that this does in fact constitute a pseudo-functor, see [SGA71, p. 172].

For the rest of §9, fix a $\land$-cloven $\land$-fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$.

9.3. Definition. Given objects $B \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{B}$ and $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}^B$, we define $\text{nat}^B_P : \pi_1^* P \land \text{Eq}_B \to \pi_2^* P$ to be the unique morphism over $B \times B$ making the diagram commute, where $\langle 1_P, \rho_B \rangle$ is cocartesian by Frobenius Reciprocity applied to the following diagram (where $T_P$ is cartesian by Proposition 3.3).

9.4. Definition. Given morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and a $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy $f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g$, we define $\alpha^*_P : f^* P \to g^* P$ to be the unique morphism in $\mathcal{E}^A$ making the following diagram commute.

9.5. Proposition. Given morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and a $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy $f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g$, the morphisms $\alpha^*_P : f^* P \to g^* P$ for $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{B}$ constitute a natural transformation $\alpha^* : f^* \to g^*$; i.e., given a
morphism \( p : P \to Q \) in \( \mathcal{C}^B \), we have a commutative square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    f^*P & \xrightarrow{f^*p} & f^*Q \\
    \downarrow{\alpha_P^*} & & \downarrow{\alpha_Q^*} \\
    g^*P & \xrightarrow{g^*p} & g^*Q.
\end{array}
\]

**Proof:** We wish to show that the front face of the cube

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
    & \pi^*_1P \wedge Eq_B & \xrightarrow{\pi^*_1p \wedge 1} & \pi^*_1Q \wedge Eq_B \\
    f^*P & \xrightarrow{f^*p} & f^*Q & \xrightarrow{\pi^*_1p \wedge 1} & \pi^*_1Q \wedge Eq_B \\
    \downarrow{\alpha_P^*} & \downarrow{\alpha_Q^*} & \downarrow{\alpha_Q^*} & \downarrow{\pi^*_1p \wedge 1} & \downarrow{\pi^*_1Q \wedge Eq_B} \\
    g^*P & \xrightarrow{g^*p} & g^*Q & \xrightarrow{\pi^*_2Q} & \pi^*_2Q.
\end{array}
\]

commutes. By a diagram chase using Proposition 2.8, it suffices to show that the other five faces commute. The left and right faces commute by the definition of \( \alpha^* \), and the top and bottom faces commute by Propositions 3.6, 3.5, and 3.4. That the back face commute follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using the dual of Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.6, 3.5, and 3.4).

**9.6. Definition.** Given objects \( B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B} \) and \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B \) and natural numbers \( 1 \leq i, j \leq n \) we define \( \text{nat}^B_{P,ij} \) to be the unique morphism \( \text{Eq}^i_B \wedge \pi^*_iP \to \pi^*_jP \) in \( \mathcal{C}^{B^n} \) making the following diagram commute, i.e., \( \text{nat}^B_{P,ij} = \langle \uparrow \rangle \cdot \text{nat}^P_{B,\langle \uparrow \rangle \wedge \uparrow} \).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    \pi^*_iP \wedge Eq_B & \xrightarrow{\pi^*_iP \wedge 1_{Eq_B}} & \pi^*_iQ \wedge Eq_B \\
    \downarrow{\text{nat}^P_{B,\langle \uparrow \rangle \wedge \uparrow}} & & \downarrow{\text{nat}^P_{B,\langle \uparrow \rangle \wedge \uparrow}} \\
    \pi^*_jP & \xrightarrow{\pi^*_jP} & \pi^*_jP.
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    B^m & \xrightarrow{(\pi_i, \pi_j)} & B \times B
\end{array}
\]
9.7. Lemma. Given morphisms $f_1, \ldots, f_n : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$, a $\mathcal{C}$-homotopy $f_i \xrightarrow{\alpha} f_j$, and an object $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B$, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_i^* P & \rightarrow & \pi_i^* P \\
\Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} & & \Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \\
\pi_j^* P & \rightarrow & \pi_j^* P
\end{array}
$$

Proof: This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.5 and 3.4).

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \text{Nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \rangle & \rightarrow & \pi_i^* P \wedge \text{Eq}^j_B \\
\Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} & & \Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \\
\pi_j^* P & \rightarrow & \pi_j^* P
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \rightarrow & B^n \\
\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle & \rightarrow & (\pi_i^* \pi_j^*)
\end{array}
$$

9.8. Lemma. Given objects $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $P \in \mathcal{C}^B$ and natural numbers $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, the following diagram commutes.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \text{Nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \rangle & \rightarrow & \pi_i^* P \wedge \text{Eq}^j_B \\
\Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} & & \Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \\
\pi_j^* P & \rightarrow & \pi_j^* P
\end{array}
$$

Proof: This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.5 and 3.4).

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\langle \text{Nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \rangle & \rightarrow & \pi_i^* P \wedge \text{Eq}^j_B \\
\Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} & & \Downarrow \text{nat}_{\beta}^{\alpha} \\
\pi_j^* P & \rightarrow & \pi_j^* P
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \rightarrow & B^n \\
\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle & \rightarrow & (\pi_i^* \pi_j^*)
\end{array}
$$

9.9. Proposition. For each $A, B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}$, the assignment of $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies $f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g$ to natural transformations $\alpha^* : f^* \to g^*$ extends the assignment $f \mapsto f^*$ to a functor $\text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{cat}}(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A)$. In detail, this means that for any $f : A \to B$, we have that $\text{id}_B^* : f^* \to f^*$ is the identity natural transformation, and that for $\mathcal{C}$-homotopies $f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g \xrightarrow{\beta} h$, we have $(\beta \circ \alpha)^* = \beta^* \circ \alpha^*$. 

26
**Proof:** Let \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B \). We must show \((\text{id}_P^*)_P = 1_{f^*P}\) and \((\beta \circ \alpha)_P^* = \beta_P^* \circ \alpha_P^*\). We begin with the second claim. By Lemma 9.7, the following commutative diagrams.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\langle f, g, h \rangle} & B^3 \\
\downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \pi_3^* \\
\pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_B} & \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{13} \\
\downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \beta_P \\
\text{nat}_{B}^{P,12} & & \text{nat}_{B}^{P,13} \\
\end{array}
\]

Hence, it suffices by Proposition 2.8 to see that the following diagram in \( \mathcal{C}^{B^3} \) commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} & \xrightarrow{\text{assoc}} & \pi_2^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \\
\downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,12} \& \text{assoc} & & \downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,13} \\
\pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_B} & \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{13} \\
\downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,13} & & \downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,23} \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, the same reasoning (from §9.3) that showed that \( \langle \langle \text{Id}_P, \rho_B! \rangle \rangle : P \to \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B} \) is cocartesian also shows (using Proposition 6.4) that \( \langle \langle \text{Id}_P, \rho_B!^1 \& \rho_B!^1 \rangle \rangle : P \to \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} \) is cocartesian. Hence, it suffices (by the dual of Proposition 2.8) to see that the two morphisms \( P \to \pi_3^*P \) in

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{\langle \langle \text{Id}_P, \rho_B! \rangle \rangle} & \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B} \\
\downarrow \text{assoc} & & \downarrow \text{assoc} \\
\pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{12} \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{23} & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}_B} & \pi_1^*P \& \text{Eq}_{B}^{13} \\
\downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,13} & & \downarrow \text{nat}_{B}^{P,23} \\
\end{array}
\]

are equal. But by Lemma 9.8 (and the definition of tr\(_B\)), these are both equal to \( \text{Id}_P \).

We now turn to the first claim, namely \((\text{id}_P^*)_P = 1_{f^*P}\). This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram using Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.5 and 3.4).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow \Delta_B & & \downarrow \Delta_B \\
\pi_2^*P & \xrightarrow{\text{nat}_B^P} & \pi_2^*P \\
\end{array}
\]

**9.10. Corollary.** Each natural transformation \( \alpha^* \), where \( \alpha \) is a \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopy, is invertible. In particular, \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopic morphisms induce isomorphic pullback functors.

**Proof:** This follows immediately from Proposition 9.9 and Theorem 7.4. \( \Box \)
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9.11. **Proposition.** The natural isomorphisms \( \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{fg} : f^*g^* \to (gf)^* \), where \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \) are morphisms in \( \mathcal{B} \), are natural in \( f \) and \( g \). That is, given \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopies

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} B & \xrightarrow{\beta} C \\
\downarrow h & & \downarrow k
\end{align*}
\]

we have a commuting square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{fg} & \xrightarrow{\alpha^* \circ \beta^*} & \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{kh} \\
\downarrow h^* \circ k^* & & \downarrow \end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(f \circ g)^* & \xrightarrow{(\beta \circ \alpha)^*} (gh)^*. \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof:** By the definition of the horizontal composite \( \alpha^* \circ \beta^* \) of natural transformations, we need to show, for each \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C} \), that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
f^*g^*P & \xrightarrow{\alpha^* \circ \beta^*} & (\beta \circ \alpha)^*P \\
\downarrow h^* \circ k^* & & \downarrow \end{array}
\]

commutes. A diagram chase in

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(gf)^*P & \xrightarrow{\alpha^* \circ \beta^*} & \pi_1^*P \land \text{Eq}_C \\
\downarrow (\beta \circ \alpha)^*P & & \downarrow \pi_1^*P \land \text{Eq}_B \\
\pi_2^*g^*P & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^* \beta^*} & \pi_2^*k^*P \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
(hk)^*P & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^* \beta^*} & \pi_2^*k^*P \\
\end{array}
\]

using Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.6, 3.5, and 3.4) reduces this to showing that the following diagram commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_1^*g^*P \land \text{Eq}_B & \xrightarrow{\pi_1^* \beta^*} & \pi_1^*P \land \text{Eq}_C \\
\downarrow \pi_2^* \beta^* & & \downarrow \pi_2^* \beta^* \\
\pi_2^*g^*P & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^* \beta^*} & \pi_2^*k^*P \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\pi_2^*k^*P & \xrightarrow{\pi_2^* \beta^*} & \pi_2^*P \\
\end{array}
\]
Homotopies in Grothendieck fibrations

This follows from a diagram chase in

![Diagram](image)

using the dual of Proposition 2.8 (and Propositions 3.6, 3.5, and 3.4). □

9.12. Theorem. The pseudo-functor \( \mathcal{C} : B \to \text{Cat} \) associated to the given cleavage of \( \mathcal{C} \) can be extended to the 2-category structure on \( B \) given by Theorem 8.5, so that the action on 2-cells is given by sending the \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopy \( f \Rightarrow g \) to the natural transformation \( \alpha^* \) of Proposition 9.5.

Proof: This follows immediately from Proposition 9.9 and 9.11. □

10 2-categorical products

In this section, we will show that the 2-categorical structure on the base category of a \( \&= \)-fibration has finite products, in the 2-categorical sense. We first recall what this means.

10.1. Definition. Let \( C \) be a 2-category. Given a pair of objects \( A, B \in \text{Ob} \ C \), a product diagram based on \( A \) and \( B \) consists of an object \( C \in \text{Ob} \ C \) and a pair of morphisms \( A \xleftarrow{f} C \xrightarrow{g} B \) having the following universal property: for any object \( D \), the functor \( \langle f \circ, g \circ \rangle : \text{Hom}_C(D, C) \to \text{Hom}_C(D, A) \times \text{Hom}_C(D, B) \), induced by composition with \( f \) and \( g \), is an isomorphism of categories.

An object \( A \in \text{Ob} \ C \) is a terminal object if, for each object \( X \in \text{Ob} \ C \), the category \( \text{Hom}_C(X, A) \) has a single object and a single morphism.

\( C \) has finite products if it has a terminal object and there is a product diagram based on each pair of objects.

We note that there are other (weaker) notions of 2-categorical products, but this is the only one we will have use for. Note also that a product diagram in a 2-category is also a product diagram in the underlying category, and similarly for the terminal object.

10.2. Proposition. A morphism lying over an isomorphism is cartesian if and only if it is an isomorphism. That is, given a fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \xrightarrow{C} \), an isomorphism \( g : B \xrightarrow{\sim} C \) in \( B \), and a morphism \( q : Q \to R \) over \( g, q \) is an isomorphism if and only if it is cartesian.

Proof: If \( q \) is an isomorphism, then it is cartesian by Proposition 2.7.

Suppose \( q \) is cartesian. To show that it is an isomorphism, it suffices to show that \( (q\circ) : \text{Hom}_C(P, Q) \to \text{Hom}_C(P, R) \) is an isomorphism for each \( P \in \text{Ob} \ P \). This map is injective by Proposition 2.8. To see
that it is surjective, let \( p : P \to R \) be a morphism lying over \( f : A \to C \). Then \( p \) factors through \( q \) since \( f = g(g^{-1}f) \) and \( g \) is cartesian over \( g \). \( \Box \)

**10.3. Theorem.** Let \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow \downarrow B \) be a \( \land=\)-cloven \( \land=\)-fibration.

*Claim:* The 2-categorical structure on \( B \) given in Theorem 8.5 has finite products.

*Proof:* Let \( A, B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B} \). We already know that, for any \( C \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B} \), composition with \( \pi_1 : A \times B \to A \) and \( \pi_2 : A \times B \to B \) induces a bijection \( \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, A \times B) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, A) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, B) \). What we still need to show is that, given morphisms

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xleftarrow{g} & B \\
\downarrow{h} & & \downarrow{k} \\
C & \xrightarrow{f} & \end{array}
\]

composing horizontally with \( \text{id}_{\pi_1} \) and \( \text{id}_{\pi_2} \) induces a bijection

\[
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, A \times B)(\langle f, h \rangle, \langle g, k \rangle) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, A)(f) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(C, B)(h, k).
\]

Now, given a \( \mathcal{C} \)-homotopy \( \bigcirc \) from \( f, h \) to \( g, k \), its image under the above morphism is given by composing with \( \text{id}_{\pi_1} : \text{Eq}_{A \times B} \to \text{Eq}_A \) and \( \text{id}_{\pi_2} : \text{Eq}_{A \times B} \to \text{Eq}_B \). Hence, it suffices to see that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Eq}_{A \times B} & \xrightarrow{\langle \text{id}_{\pi_1}, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle} \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \land \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B \\
(A \times B) \times (A \times B) & \xrightarrow{(\pi_1 \times \pi_2)^*} (A \times A) \times (B \times B)
\end{align*}
\]

is cartesian, since this would give us bijections

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hom}_{\langle f, h \rangle}(\langle \bigcirc \rangle, \text{Eq}_{A \times B}) & \xrightarrow{\langle \text{id}_{\pi_1}, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle} \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \land \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B \\
\text{Hom}_{\langle f, h \rangle}(\langle \bigcirc \rangle, \text{Eq}_{A \times B}) & \xrightarrow{(\pi_1 \times \pi_2)^*} \text{Hom}_{\langle f, h \rangle}(\langle \bigcirc \rangle, \text{Eq}_{A \times B})
\end{align*}
\]

To see that (3) is an isomorphism, it suffices by Proposition 10.2 and its dual to see that it is cocartesian since \( (\pi_1 \times \pi_1, \pi_2 \times \pi_2) \) is an isomorphism. By the dual of Proposition 2.5, it suffices to see that the composite

\[
\begin{align*}
\bigcirc & \xrightarrow{\rho_{A \times B}} \text{Eq}_{A \times B} \\
\xrightarrow{\langle \text{id}_{\pi_1}, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \land \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B \\
\xrightarrow{\langle \text{id}_{\pi_1}, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \land \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B
\end{align*}
\]

is cocartesian. We will show this by a similar argument to that used in Proposition 6.4.
Namely, we will show that each morphism in the following factorization of \(\langle \text{id}_{\pi_1}, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle\) is cocartesian.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\top_{A \times B} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\pi_1}} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \\
A \times B & \xrightarrow{\Delta_A \times 1_B} & (A \times A) \times B \\
\Delta_A & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & (A \times A) \times (B \times B) \\
\end{array}
\]

The first of the morphisms in (4) is cocartesian by the stability of \(\rho_A\) along the product projection \(\pi_1 : (A \times A) \times B \to A \times A\):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\top_{A \times B} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\pi_1}} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \\
\Delta_A & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & (A \times A) \times B \\
\end{array}
\]

Similarly, we have that \(\text{id}_{\pi_2} : \top_{(A \times A) \times B} \to \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B\) over \(1_{A \times A} \times \Delta_B\) is cocartesian. Hence, the second morphism of (4) is cocartesian by Frobenius reciprocity applied to the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A & \xrightarrow{\top} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \\
\pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A & \xrightarrow{\langle \top, \text{id}_{\pi_2} \rangle} & \pi_1^* \text{Eq}_A \land \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B \\
\top_{(A \times A) \times B} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{\pi_2}} & \pi_2^* \text{Eq}_B \\
\end{array}
\]

We have shown that \(\mathcal{B}\) has 2-categorical binary products. It remains to check that the terminal object \(1\) is a 2-categorical terminal object, i.e., that for any \(C \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}\), there is a unique \(\mathcal{C}\)-homotopy \(!_C \to 1_C\). This is the case since \(\text{Eq}_{1_{\mathcal{B}}^1} = \text{terminal in } \mathcal{C} \times 1_{\mathcal{B}}\); indeed, this follows from the dual of Proposition 2.9, since \(\Pi_{\mathcal{B}} : \top_{1_{\mathcal{B}}} \to \top_{1_{\mathcal{B}}^1 \times 1_{\mathcal{B}}} \) is (an isomorphism and hence) cocartesian. □

11 Canonicity

Let us briefly discuss the extent to which the 2-category structure on \(\mathcal{B}\) associated to a \(\land\)=cloven \(\land\)=fibration \(\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B}\) by Theorem 8.5 only depends on the fibration \(\mathcal{C}\). Though the definition of \(\mathcal{C}\)-homotopy and of the vertical and horizontal compositions all depended on the chosen \(\land\)=cleavage, it seems “obvious” that the resulting 2-category structure shouldn’t depend essentially on this choice – i.e., that given any two \(\land\)-cleavages, there is a canonical isomorphism between the resulting 2-categories restricting to the identity functor on the underlying category.

Indeed, given any two \(\land\)-cleavages, there is a canonical bijection between the sets of \(\mathcal{C}\)-homotopies according to the two cleavages, obtained as follows. Let \(B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}\). Let us mark every object associated to the second cleavage with a ‘ so that, for example, in addition to the morphisms \(\Delta_B : B \to B \times B\) and \(\rho_B : \top_B \to \text{Eq}_B\) coming from the first cleavage, we also have \(\Delta'_B : B \to B \times' B\) and \(\rho'_B : \top'_B \to \text{Eq}'_B\) coming from the second cleavage.

There is then a unique isomorphism \(i : B \times B \to B \times' B\) such that \(\pi_1 i = \pi'_1\) and \(\pi_2 i = \pi'_2\), and a unique isomorphism \(j : \text{Eq}_B \to \text{Eq}'_B\) over \(i\) such that \(j \rho_B = \rho'_B\). Composition with \(j\) then gives us our bijection \(\text{Hom}_\mathcal{B}(A, B)(f, g) \to \text{Hom}_\mathcal{B}(A, B)(f, g)\) for any \(f, g : A \to B\).
It then remains to verify that the vertical and horizontal composition operations are compatible with these isomorphisms.

In order to obtain a single, canonical 2-category structure on $B$ independent of any choice of $\land=\text{-cleavage}$, one can employ the usual device of defining the $C$-homotopies between $f, g : A \to B$ as certain equivalence classes, each equivalence class having one element for each possible choice of product $B \times B$, terminal objects $\top_A$ and $\top_B$, and cocartesian lift $\rho_B : \top_B \to \text{Eq}_B$.

As was pointed out to be by Arpon Raksit, a more satisfying solution to this problem would be to find a “universal property” that, given $C$, characterizes the resulting 2-category structure on $B$ uniquely up to isomorphism.

**IV Examples of $\land=$-fibrations**

In Part IV, we give some examples of $\land=$-fibrations, to which the results of Part III can be applied.

The main examples of fibrations are the “codomain fibrations” $F(C) \downarrow C$ (see Definition 12.1), and variations thereof. $F(C)$ is a $\land=$-fibration precisely when $C$ has finite limits, so this gives a large class of examples. However, in this case the resulting 2-categorical structures is trivial (see §12.6).

The main examples of interest to us (of which the above example is, in fact, a special case) come from a Quillen model category $C$ (see Definition 13.1). From $C$, we form a variation of $F(C)$, namely by constructing a fibration $\mathcal{H} o F(C)$ over $C$ whose fiber over $A$ is the homotopy category (see Definition 13.6) of $C/A$ (i.e., of $F(C)^A$). The resulting 2-categorical structure is, in general.

In [War08], it is already observed that the category of fibrations in a model category gives rise to a Grothendieck fibration (our $F(C)$ – see Definition 15.1) and that – under certain conditions – the path objects (see Definition 13.4) satisfy a “weak” analogue of the defining property of equality objects, which is relevant to dependent type theory – roughly, they satisfy the “existence” but not the “uniqueness” part of the universal property. The reason for this “weakness” is (again roughly speaking) that the universal property is really a “homotopical one” – it involves a homotopy-equivalence rather than a bijection on Hom-sets. Hence, one might hope to achieve the stronger universal property by quotient by the homotopy relation – which is precisely what we do.

Of course, the name “homotopies” for the 2-cells defined in Part III is motivated by these examples – indeed, two morphisms in $C$ are homotopic with respect to the associated fibration if and only if they are right-homotopic in the sense of the model structure on $C$. In Part V, we will spell this out in detail, and in particular in the case of topological spaces.

As with the homotopy category of a model category, the fibration $\mathcal{H} o F(C)$ – or rather, its total category $\text{Ho} F(C^-)$ – can be described in two ways. On the one hand, it is a certain localization of $C^-$, and on the other hand, it can be described directly as a quotient of a certain subcategory $(C^+)^{cl}$ consisting of the “cofibrant-fibrant” objects. Alternatively – by thinking in terms of pseudo-functors rather than fibrations – one could try directly to apply the construction “take the homotopy category of each fiber” (see §15.8).

We should mention an important caveat. Though $\mathcal{H} o F(C)$ is always a $\land$-fibration, and always has equality objects, it seems that in order for the equality objects to satisfy Frobenius reciprocity and stability along product projections, we need to demand that $C$ is right proper (see Definition 17.4), and to restrict to the fibrant objects of $C$.
fibration $\mathcal{F} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$, in §16, we show that it is a $\wedge$-fibration, and in §17, we show that its restriction to $C_I$ is a $\wedge$=fibration (if $C$ is right proper).

12 Codomain fibrations

We recall the simplest examples of fibrations, namely the “codomain” or “family” fibration $\mathcal{F}(C) \downarrow C$, for any category $C$ with pullbacks. The name “family fibration” comes from the fact that a morphism $X \to A$ (i.e., an object in $C \downarrow A$) can also be seen as a family of sets indexed by $A$.

These will serve as a fairly uninteresting example of $\wedge$=fibrations, but more importantly will serve as the basis for the more interesting examples below.

For the rest of §12, let $C$ be a category.

12.1. Definition. The arrow category $C \downarrow C$ has objects triples $(X,A,x)$, with $A,X \in \text{Ob } C$ and $x : X \to A$ a morphism of $C$, and the morphisms $(X,A,x) \to (Y,B,y)$ are pairs $(p : X \to Y, f : A \to B)$ such that $yp = fx$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}(C) : C \downarrow C \to C$ the “codomain functor”, which takes $(X,A,x)$ to $A$ and $(p,f)$ to $f$.

For an object $A \in \text{Ob } C$, the slice category $C/A$ of $C$ over $A$ is the fiber $\mathcal{F}(C) \downarrow A$ of the prefibration $\mathcal{F}(C) \downarrow C$ (i.e., the subcategory of $C \downarrow C$ with objects $(X,A,x)$ and morphisms $(p,1_A)$).

We will sometimes write $(X,x)$ instead of $(X,A,x)$ and $p$ instead of $(p,1_A)$.

12.2. Proposition. $\mathcal{F}(C)$ is a fibration if and only if $C$ has pullbacks.

Proof: This is (easy and) well-known (see, e.g., [Jac99, p. 28]), and follows from the fact that a morphism in $C \downarrow C$ is cartesian if and only if it (seen as a square in $C$) is a pullback square. □

12.3. Proposition. A morphism $(p,f) : (X,A,x) \to (Y,B,y)$ in $C \downarrow C$ is cocartesian if and only if $p : X \to Y$ is an isomorphism.

Proof: If $p$ is an isomorphism, then

$$
\circ(p,f) : \text{Hom}_g((Y,B,y),(Z,C,z)) \to \text{Hom}_g((X,A,x),(Z,C,z))
$$

is invertible for any $g : B \to C$ and $z : Z \to C$, with inverse $(q,gf) \mapsto (qp^{-1},g)$.

In particular, we always have that $(1_X,f) : (X,A,x) \to (X,B,fx)$ is cocartesian. Hence, given any cocartesian $(p,f) : (X,A,x) \to (Y,B,y)$, we have by the dual of Proposition 2.9 an isomorphism $(i,1_B) : (X,B,fx) \to (Y,B,y)$ with $(i,1_B)(1_X,f) = (p,f)$; hence $p = i$ is an isomorphism. □

12.4. Proposition. Given a commutative cube

in a category, if the bottom, right and left faces are pullback squares, then the top face is as well.

Proof: This follows from three applications of the “two-of-three” property of pullback squares. □
12.5. Proposition. Suppose \( C \) has finite limits. By Proposition 12.2, we know that \( \mathcal{F}(C) \) is a fibration.

Claim: \( \mathcal{F}(C) \) is in fact a \( \wedge = \) -fibration.

Proof: This is also well-known (see [Jac99, pp. 81,193]).

By assumption, \( C \) has finite products, and the fibers \( C/X \) have finite products since the product diagrams in \( C/X \) are precisely those which are pullback diagrams in \( C \), and the terminal objects in \( C/X \) are precisely those which are isomorphisms in \( C \).

Property (ii) of Definition 4.2 follows from the stability of isomorphisms under pullbacks and property (iii) amounts to the claim that a certain face of a certain cube is a pullback square, which then follows from (a variant of) Proposition 12.4.

From Proposition 12.3, it follows that every morphism \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \) has a cocartesian lift with domain any \( (X, x) \in \text{Ob}(C/X) \) (e.g., \( (1_X, fx) \)). We claim that these satisfy Frobenius reciprocity and are stable along arbitrary morphisms \( g : C \to B \). In both cases, this amounts to the claim that a certain edge of a certain cube is an isomorphism, which then follows from Proposition 12.4 and the stability of isomorphisms under pullback. □

12.6. We now observe that all the \( \mathcal{F}(C) \)-homotopies are identity \( \mathcal{F}(C) \)-homotopies and hence, the 2-categorical structure induced on \( C \) by Theorem 8.5 is trivial.

Indeed, given any equality object \( \rho_B = (p, \Delta_B) : (B', B, b) = \top_B \to \text{Eq}_B = (Y, B \times B, y) \), we have that \( b \) and \( p \) are isomorphisms and hence that \( y : Y \to B \times B \) is a diagonal morphism. It follows that for \( f, g : A \to B \), there can be at most one \( \mathcal{F}(C) \)-homotopy \((q, (f, g)) : (A', A, a) \to (Y, B \times B, y) \), and that it exists if only if \( f = g \).

13 Model categories

We now review some elements of the theory of model categories. These were introduced in [Qui67] as an abstract framework for homotopy theory. This will be fairly brief, and we refer to [MP12, Hov99] for more background.

13.1. Definition. Given morphisms \( i : A \to B \) and \( p : X \to Y \) in a category \( C \), we say that \( i \) satisfies the left lifting condition with respect to \( p \), and \( p \) satisfies the right lifting condition with respect to \( i \) if for every commutative solid diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \longrightarrow & X \\
\downarrow{i} & \swarrow{q} & \downarrow{p} \\
B & \longrightarrow & Y,
\end{array}
\]

there exists a dashed morphism making the whole diagram commute.

A weak factorization system in a category \( C \) consists of two sets \( \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R} \) of morphisms of \( C \) such that (i) any morphism \( f \) of \( C \) admits a factorization \( f = pi \) with \( i \in \mathcal{L} \) and \( p \in \mathcal{R} \), and (ii) a morphism of \( C \) is in \( \mathcal{L} \) (resp. in \( \mathcal{R} \)) if and only if it satisfies the left (resp. right) lifting condition with respect to every morphism in \( \mathcal{R} \) (resp. in \( \mathcal{L} \)).

A model structure on a category \( C \) consists of three sets \( \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{W} \) of morphisms of \( C \), called the cofibrations, fibrations\(^1\), and weak equivalences of the model structure, such that (i) both \( (\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{W}, \mathcal{F}) \)

\(^1\)Of course, this means we are now considering two different notions called “fibration” – Grothendieck fibrations, and fibrations in a model category. However, this shouldn’t cause any confusion.
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and \((\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{W})\) are weak factorization systems, and (ii) given a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & C \\
& \searrow_{h} & \swarrow_{g} \\
& B,
\end{array}
\]

in which two of the morphisms are weak equivalences, the third is as well.

We refer to property (ii) as the “two-of-three axiom”.

A **model category** is a category \(\mathcal{C}\) having finite limits and colimits, together with a model structure.

We note that this is what Quillen originally called a **closed model category** [Qui67] but is now normally just called a model category. The above is a slight reformulation of the definition from [Qui67], and can be found, e.g., in [Joy08, p. 427]. We note that sometimes (for example in [Hov99]), it is demanded

\[
\text{(ii) given a commutative diagram}
\]

that \(\mathcal{C}\) be (not just finitely) complete and cocomplete, and that the cofibration-fibration factorizations are given by specified functors \(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\).

We will denote by \(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\) the chosen coproduct of \(\mathcal{C}\) initial object of \(\mathcal{C}\) can be found, e.g., in [Joy08, p. 427]. We note that sometimes (for example in [Hov99]), it is demanded that \(\mathcal{C}\) be (not just finitely) complete and cocomplete, and that the cofibration-fibration factorizations are given by specified functors \(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\).

We will make the usual abuse of notation of identifying a model category with its underlying category.

### 13.2. Let us fix some notational conventions for finite coproducts.

For a category \(\mathcal{C}\) having specified finite coproducts, we will use the notation \(0_\mathcal{C}\) to denote the chosen initial object of \(\mathcal{C}\), and \(1_A : 0_\mathcal{C} \rightarrow A\) to denote the unique morphism from \(0_\mathcal{C}\) to \(A\). Given \(A, B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}\), we will usually denote the chosen coproduct of \(A\) and \(B\) by \(A + B\) and, for morphisms \(f : A \rightarrow C\) and \(g : B \rightarrow C\), we will denote by \([f, g] : A + B \rightarrow C\) the map induced by \(f\) and \(g\). We denote by \(\nabla_A\) the **codiagonal morphism** \([1_A, 1_A] : A + A \rightarrow A\).

As usual (see §§3.2, 4.1 and 4.4), we may still use this notation even if finite coproducts are only assumed to exist but have not been specified, but in this case it will be merely suggestive.

### 13.3. Definition. An object \(A\) in a model category \(\mathcal{C}\) is **fibrant** if the unique morphism \(!_A : A \rightarrow I_\mathcal{C}\) to some (and hence – since the fibrations include isomorphisms and are closed under composition – any) terminal object is a fibration, and is **cofibrant** if the unique morphism \(_!_A : 0_\mathcal{C} \rightarrow A\) from some (and hence any) initial object is a cofibration.

We denote by \(\mathcal{C}_f\) (resp. \(\mathcal{C}_l\) and \(\mathcal{C}_{cf}\)) the full subcategory on the fibrant (resp. cofibrant and cofibrant-fibrant) objects.

A morphism \(f : A \rightarrow B\) in \(\mathcal{C}\) is called a **trivial fibration** if it is both a fibration and a weak equivalence, and a **trivial cofibration** if it is both a cofibration and a weak equivalence.

By using the factorization axiom on the morphisms \(_!_A : 0_\mathcal{C} \rightarrow A\) and \(!_A : A \rightarrow 1_\mathcal{C}\), we can always find a trivial fibration \(q : QA \rightarrow A\) with \(QA\) cofibrant and a trivial cofibration \(r : A \rightarrow RA\) with \(RA\) fibrant. These are called **cofibrant** and **fibrant replacements** for \(A\).

### 13.4. Definition. Given an object \(A\) in a model category \(\mathcal{C}\), a **cylinder object** for \(A\) is a factorization

\[A + A \xrightarrow{[\partial_1, \partial_2]} A \times I \xrightarrow{\sigma} A\]

of a codiagonal map \(\nabla : A + A \rightarrow A\), in which \(\sigma\) is a weak equivalence.\(^2\)

Note that by the factorization axiom, every \(A \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}\) has a cylinder object, and we can even assume that \([\partial_1, \partial_2]\) is a cofibration and that \(\sigma\) is a trivial fibration.

We follow [Qui67] in using the suggestive notation \(A \times I\), but this does not mean that the object \(A \times I\) is really a product – however, we note that in §19, \(I\) will actually denote the unit interval and this will be a product. We will generally use this notation (as well as \(\partial_1, \partial_2, \text{ and } \sigma\) for cylinder objects.

\(^2\)This is different from Quillen’s notion of cylinder object, which requires \([\partial_1, \partial_2]\) to be a cofibration, and similarly with definition of path object below. For our purposes, we could also take his definition.
Similarly, a path object for $A$ is a factorization $A \xrightarrow{\sim} A^I \xrightarrow{(d_1, d_2)} A \times A$ of a diagonal map $A \to A \times A$ with $s$ a weak equivalence.

Again, there exists a path object for every object, in which $s$ is a cofibration and $(d_1, d_2)$ is a fibration, and again, the notation $A^I$ is merely suggestive (except for in §19).

Given two morphisms $f, g : A \to B$ in $C$, a left-homotopy from $f$ to $g$ is a factorization of the induced map $[f, g] : A + A \to B$ through some cylinder object $[\partial_1, \partial_2] : A + A \to A \times I$, and we say that $f$ and $g$ are left-homotopic, and write $f \sim_{L} g$ if there exists a left-homotopy between them. Similarly, a right-homotopy from $f$ to $g$ is a factorization of $(f, g) : A \to B \times B$ through some cylinder object $[d_1, d_2] : A \times A \to A$, and we say that $f$ and $g$ are right-homotopic, and write $f \sim_{R} g$, if there exists a right-homotopy between them.

We denote by $\pi_\ell^C(A, B)$ and $\pi_\ell^C(A, B)$ (or just $\pi_\ell^C(A, B)$ and $\pi_\ell^C(A, B)$) the quotient of $\text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ by the equivalence relation generated by $\sim_{L}$ and $\sim_{R}$, respectively. We denote the image of a morphism $f : A \to B$ in either of these sets by $[f]$.

13.5. Proposition. We record some basic facts about model categories, all of which can be found in [Qui67, Hov99]. Each statement below also comes with a dual statement (in which the direction of morphisms are reversed, the words “fibration” and “cofibration” are interchanged, and so on).

Let $C$ be a model category, $A, B, C \in \text{Ob} C$, and let $f, g : A \to B$ and $h : B \to C$ be morphisms in $C$.

Claim:

(i) If $A$ is cofibrant, then $\sim_{L}$ is an equivalence relation on $\text{Hom}(A, B)$.

(ii) If $B$ is fibrant and $A \times I$ is a cylinder object for $A$ with $A \xrightarrow{[\partial_1, \partial_2]} A \times I$ a cofibration, then $f \sim_{R} g$ implies that there is a left-homotopy $A \times I \to B$ from $f$ to $g$. (In particular, if $B$ is fibrant, then $f \sim_{R} g$ implies $f \sim_{L} g$.)

(iii) Composition with $h$ induces a well-defined map $\pi_\ell^C(A, B) \to \pi_\ell^C(A, C)$

(iv) If $C$ is fibrant, then composition with $h$ induces a well-defined map $\pi_\ell^C(B, C) \to \pi_\ell^C(A, C)$.

(v) If $A$ is cofibrant and $h$ is a trivial fibration, then composition with $h$ induces a bijection $\pi_\ell^C(A, B) \to \pi_\ell^C(B, C)$.

(vi) Any functor $F : C_{cf} \to D$ to a category $D$ which takes weak equivalences to isomorphisms identifies (left- or right-)homotopic maps, i.e., if $f \sim_{L} g$ or $f \sim_{R} g$, then $Ff = Fg$.

Proof: (i)-(v) are part of [Hov99, p. 9, Proposition 1.2.5]. (vi) is [Qui67, p. 1.12, Lemma 8 (i)].

13.6. We recall the construction of the homotopy category associated to a model category $C$.

First note that, if $A \in \text{Ob} C_{cf}$, then by Proposition 13.5 (i) and (ii) and their duals, the relations $\sim_{L}$ and $\sim_{R}$ on $\text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ agree and are equivalence relations. In this case, we write $\pi(A, B)$ for the set $\pi_\ell^C(A, B) = \pi_\ell^C(A, B)$. If moreover $B \in \text{Ob} C_{cf}$, then composition induces a well-defined map $\pi(A, B) \times \pi(B, C) \to \pi(A, C)$ for any $C \in \text{Ob} C_{cf}$, by Proposition 13.5 (iii) and (iv) and their duals.

Hence, we can form the quotient category $\pi C_{cf}$ of $C_{cf}$ by the relation $\sim_{L} = \sim_{R}$. We denote by $\gamma$ the canonical functor $C_{cf} \to \pi C_{cf}$.

Besides having the universal property of the quotient, the functor $\gamma : C_{cf} \to \pi C_{cf}$ enjoys another universal property: it exhibits $\pi(C_{cf})$ as the localization of $C$ at the set of weak equivalences. This
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means that (i) \( \gamma \) sends weak equivalences to isomorphisms, and (ii), any other functor \( F : C_{cf} \to D \) satisfying (i) factors uniquely through \( \gamma \). That (i) holds follows from Proposition 13.5 (v) and its dual, since any weak equivalence can be factored as a trivial cofibration and a trivial fibration. That (ii) holds then follows from Proposition 13.5 (vi) and the universal property of \( \pi C_{cf} \) as a quotient.

Next, we construct the homotopy category \( \text{Ho}(C) \), which will be equivalent to \( \pi(C_{cf}) \) and have the universal property of being the localization of \( C \) at the weak equivalences.

For each object \( A \in \text{Ob} C \), choose a cofibrant replacement \( q : QA \to A \) and fibrant replacement \( r : QA \to RQA \), in such a way that \( QA = A \) and \( q = 1_A \) if \( A \) is cofibrant, and \( RQA = QA \) and \( r = 1_{QA} \) if \( A \) (and hence \( QA \)) is fibrant.

We define \( \text{Ho}(C) \) to be the category whose objects are those of \( C \), and for \( A, B \in \text{Ob} C = \text{Ob} \text{Ho}(C) \), we set \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C)}(A, B) = \pi(RQA, RQB) \). Composition is given in the obvious manner.

For any \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \), it follows from Proposition 13.5 (v) and its dual that there exists a unique-up-to-homotopy morphism \( \tilde{f} : RQA \to RQB \) for which there exists a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow q & & \downarrow q \\
QA & \xrightarrow{r} & QB \\
\downarrow r & & \downarrow r \\
RQA & \xrightarrow{\tilde{f}} & RQB.
\end{array}
\] (5)

This gives rise to a functor \( \gamma : C \to \text{Ho}(C) \).

Since \( RQA = A \) whenever \( A \in C_{cf} \), we have a full inclusion \( \pi(C_{cf}) \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C) \). Note that by the two-of-three axiom for weak equivalences, if \( f \) in (5) is a weak equivalence, then so is \( \tilde{f} \). It follows that \( [\tilde{f}] \in \pi(RQA, RQB) \) is an isomorphism in \( \pi(C_{cf}) \), and hence that \( \gamma f \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C)}(A, B) \) is an isomorphism. It then follows that the inclusion \( \pi(C_{cf}) \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C) \) is essentially surjective (and hence an equivalence), since every object in \( C \) is weakly equivalent to one in \( C_{cf} \).

Let us see that \( \gamma : C \to \text{Ho}(C) \) is a localization of \( C \) at the weak equivalences. We have just seen that \( \gamma \) takes weak equivalences to isomorphisms. Suppose \( F : C \to D \) does the same. We want to show that there is a unique \( \theta : \text{Ho}(C) \to D \) with \( \theta \gamma = F \). We must have \( \theta(A) = F(A) \) for \( A \in \text{Ob} \text{Ho}(C) = \text{Ob} C \). For \([g] \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C)}(A, B) = \pi_{C}(RQA, RQB)\), the morphism \( Fg : F(RQA) \to F(RQB) \) is, by Proposition 13.5 (vi), independent of the representative \( g \) of \([g]\), and we can define \( \theta[g] \) to be the unique morphism for which there exists a commutative diagram (a) as show below.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F(A) & \xrightarrow{\theta[g]} & F(B) \\
\downarrow Fq & & \downarrow Fq \\
F(QA) & \xrightarrow{Fr} & F(QB) \\
\downarrow Fr & \uparrow Fr & \downarrow Fr \\
F(RQA) & \xrightarrow{Fg} & F(RQB)
\end{array}
\] (a)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\gamma A & \xrightarrow{[g]} & \gamma B \\
\gamma q=q & \uparrow \gamma q \equiv [1_{RQA}] & \gamma q \equiv [1_{RQA}] \\
\gamma QA & \xrightarrow{[g]} & \gamma QB \\
\gamma r=q & \uparrow \gamma r \equiv [1_{RQA}] & \gamma r \equiv [1_{RQA}] \\
\gamma RQA & \xrightarrow{\gamma g \equiv [g]} & \gamma RQB
\end{array}
\] (b)

This clearly makes \( \theta \) a functor. If \([g] = \gamma f \) for some \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \), then with \( \tilde{f} \) as in (5), we have \([g] = [\tilde{f}]\), and we can take (a) to be the image of (5) under \( F \). This shows that \( \theta \gamma = F \). To see that \( \theta \) is the only such functor, we note that for every \( g : RQA \to RQB \) in \( C \), the above diagram (b) in \( \text{Ho}(C) \) commutes, and hence (a) must commute for any \( \theta \) with \( \theta \gamma = F \). In the diagram (b), we are
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using the facts that for every \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \), the image of both \( q : QA \to A \) and \( r : QA \to RQA \) under \( \gamma \) is \([1]_{RQA} \in \pi(RQA,RQA)\), and that for \( f : A \to B \) in \( C_{cf} \), the image of \( f \) under \( \gamma : C \to \text{Ho}(C) \) is \([f] \in \pi(A,B)\).

For \( * \in \{c,f\} \) we define \( \text{Ho}(C_*) \) to be full subcategory of \( \text{Ho}(C) \) on the objects in \( \text{Ob} \, C_* \subseteq \text{Ob} \, C = \text{Ob} \, \text{Ho}(C) \). The same proof as above shows that the restriction \( \gamma : C_* \to \text{Ho}(C_*) \) is a localization of \( C_* \) at the weak equivalences, and that the inclusion \( \pi C_* \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C_*) \) (and hence also the inclusion \( \text{Ho}(C_*) \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C) \)) is an equivalence.

We mention one more important property of \( \text{Ho}(C) \): if \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C_\ast \), and \( B \in \text{Ob} \, C_\ast \), then the map \( \gamma : \text{Hom}_C(A,B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C)}(A,B) \) induces a bijection \( \pi C(A,B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C)}(A,B) \). This follows from Proposition 13.5 (v) and its dual and from the definition of \( \gamma \).

14 Fiberwise homotopy

We will now introduce the concept of fiberwise-homotopy of morphisms in \( C^{\rightarrow} \), with \( C \) a model category, which will be essential for the construction of the category \( \text{Ho}(C) \) in §15. This notion is similar to that of (left-)homotopy in a model category (and in fact, in a sense, a special case of it).

We will then prove several properties of fiberwise-homotopy, analogous to the properties of left-homotopies mentioned in Proposition 13.5.

For the rest of §14, let \( C \) be a model category unless stated otherwise.

14.1. Definition. Let \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \). We can put a model structure on \( C/A \) by declaring a morphism \( (p,1_A) : (X,x) \to (Y,y) \) in \( C/A \) to be a fibration, cofibration, or weak equivalence if and only if \( p \) is.

It is then easily verified (and well-known, see [Hov99, p. 5]) that this is indeed a model structure. We call it the induced model structure on \( C/X \). Whenever we consider \( C/X \) as a model category, it will implicitly be with respect to the induced model structure.

14.2. Proposition. Let \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \) and \( (p,1_A), (q,1_A) : (X,x) \to (Y,y) \) morphisms in \( C/A \).

Claim: \( (p,1_A) \) and \( (q,1_A) \) are left-homotopic if and only if there is a left-homotopy \( h : X \times I \to Y \) from \( p \) to \( q \) in \( C \) such that the following diagram commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X \times I & \xrightarrow{h} & Y \\
\downarrow \sigma & & \downarrow y \\
X & \xrightarrow{x} & A \\
\end{array}
\]

Proof: This follows from the fact that, if \( \nabla_X : X + X \to X \) is a codiagonal morphism in \( C \), then \( \nabla_X : (X + X,[x,x]) \to (X,x) \) is a codiagonal morphism in \( C/A \), and hence given any cylinder object

\[
X + X \xrightarrow{[\partial_1,\partial_2]} X \times I \xrightarrow{\sigma} X
\]

for \( X \),

\[
(X + X,[x,x]) \xrightarrow{[\partial_1,\partial_2]} (X \times I,x) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (X,x)
\]

is a cylinder object for \( (X,x) \). \( \Box \)

14.3. Definition. Given two objects \( (X,A,x) \) and \( (Y,B,y) \) of \( C^{\rightarrow} \), a morphism \( f : A \to B \), and two morphisms \( (p,f), (q,f) : (X,A,x) \to (Y,B,y) \) in \( C^{\rightarrow} \) over \( f \), we define a fiberwise-homotopy from
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$(p,f)$ to $(q,f)$ to be a left-homotopy $h : X \times I \to Y$ from $p$ to $q$ in $C$ for which the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X \times I & \xrightarrow{h} & Y \\
\downarrow \sigma & & \downarrow g \\
X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Two morphisms are fiberwise-homotopic if there is a fiberwise-homotopy from one to the other. It follows from Proposition 14.2 that if $A = B$ and $f = 1_A$, then $p$ and $q$ are fiberwise-homotopic if and only if they are left-homotopic as morphisms of $C/A$.

Given $f : A \to B$, $P \in \text{Ob } C/A$ and $Q \in \text{Ob } C/B$, we write $\pi_f(P,Q)$ for the quotient of $\text{Hom}_f(P,Q)$ by the equivalence relation generated by fiberwise-homotopy.

**14.4.** Just for §14.4, let $C$ be a category (rather than a model category, as stipulated in §14).

We saw in Proposition 12.2 that $\mathcal{F}(C) \xrightarrow{\pi} C$ is a fibration whenever $C$ has pullbacks. However, for any $C$, it follows from Proposition 12.3 that $\mathcal{F}(C)$ is always an op-fibration – i.e. that $\mathcal{F}(C)^{\text{op}} : (C^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \to C^{\text{op}}$ is a fibration, or in other words, that every morphism in $f : A \to B$ in $C$ admits a cocartesian lift with domain any $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{F}(C)^A$.

Moreover, this op-fibration comes with a canonical cleavage. Namely, given $f : A \to B$ in $C$ and $(X,x) \in \text{Ob } C/A$, we have the cocartesian lift $(1_X,f) : (X,x) \to (X,fx)$.

Given $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{F}(C)^A$, we will denote the codomain of this cocartesian lift by $\sum_f P$, and the cocartesian lift itself by $f^*P : P \to \sum_f P$ (or, usually, just by $\downarrow : P \to \sum_f P$). Given a morphism $p : P \to Q$ over $f$, we will denote by $p^* : \sum_f P \to Q$ the unique morphism over $B$ such that $p \downarrow = f$.

We note that this cleavage is in fact split, in the sense that $(g \downarrow \sum_f P)(f^*P) = (gf)^*P$ for morphisms $A \xleftarrow{\ell} B \xrightarrow{r} C$, and that $1_A^*P = 1_P$ for each $A \in \text{Ob } C$ and $P$ lying over $A$.

Note that we have dual statements to Propositions 3.4 and 3.5 concerning the induced morphisms $p$.

**14.5. Proposition.** Let $f : A \to B$ be a morphism in $C$ and $p,q : P \to Q$ morphisms in $C^{\text{op}}$ lying over $f$.

Claim: $p$ and $q$ are fiberwise-homotopic if and only if $p^*q : \sum_f P \to Q$ are left-homotopic in $C/B$. Hence, $(\circ \downarrow) : \text{Hom}_{C/B}(\sum_f P,Q) \to \text{Hom}_f(P,Q)$ induces a bijection $\pi_f(\sum_f P,Q) \to \pi_f(P,Q)$.

**Proof:** Immediate from Proposition 14.2 and the definitions of $\sum_f P$ and of fiberwise-homotopy. □

**14.6. Proposition.** Let $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ be morphisms in $C$, $p,q : P \to Q$ morphisms in $C^{\text{op}}$ over $f$, and $r : Q \to R$ a morphism over $g$.

Claim: If $p$ and $q$ are fiberwise-homotopic, then so are $rp$ and $rq$. Hence, composition with $r$ induces a well-defined map $\pi_f(P,Q) \to \pi_{gf}(P,R)$.

**Proof:** Immediate from the definition of fiberwise-homotopic. □

**14.7. Proposition.** For any morphism $f : A \to B$ in $C$, the functor $\sum_f : \mathcal{F}(C)^A \to \mathcal{F}(C)^B$ preserves fibrations, cofibrations, weak equivalences, and cofibrant objects (but not necessarily fibrant objects).

**Proof:** Immediate from the definitions. □
14.8. Proposition. Let \( f : A \to B \) be a morphism in \( C \), \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{F}(C)^A \), and \( Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{F}(C)^B \).

**Claim:** If \( P \) is cofibrant (in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^A \)), then fiberwise-homotopy is an equivalence relation on \( \text{Hom}_f(P,Q) \).

**Proof:** This follows by Proposition 14.5 and Proposition 13.5 (i), since by Proposition 14.7, \( \sum_f P \) is cofibrant in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^B \). \( \Box \)

14.9. Proposition. Let \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \) be morphisms in \( C \), \( p : P \to Q \) a morphism in \( C \) over \( f \), and \( q_1, q_2 : Q \to R \) morphisms over \( g \).

**Claim:** If \( R \) is fibrant (in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^C \)) and \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are fiberwise-homotopic, then \( q_1 \circ p \) and \( q_2 \circ p \) are fiberwise-homotopic. Hence, composition with \( p \) induces a well-defined map \( \pi_f(Q,R) \to \pi_f(P,R) \).

**Proof:** By Proposition 14.5, it suffices to show that \( q_1 \circ p, q_2 \circ p : \sum_g P \to R \) are left-homotopic. Now, we also have the induced morphisms \( q_1, q_2, \downarrow p \), as shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
& \searrow_{q_2} & \uparrow_{\downarrow p} \\
& & \sum_g P \\
& \searrow_{q_1} & \uparrow_{\downarrow p} \\
& & \sum_g P
\end{array}
\]

By the duals of Propositions 3.5 and 3.4, \( q_1 \circ p = q_1 \cdot \downarrow p \). Hence we need to show that \( q_1 \cdot \downarrow p \) and \( q_2 \cdot \downarrow p \) are left-homotopic. This follows from Proposition 13.5 (iv), since by Proposition 14.5, \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are left-homotopic. \( \Box \)

14.10. Proposition. Let \( f : A \to B \) be a morphism in \( C \), \( P \) an object in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^A \), and \( q : Q \to R \) a morphism in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^B \).

**Claim:** If \( P \) is cofibrant (in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^A \)) and \( q \) a trivial fibration (in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^B \)), then composition with \( q \) induces a bijection \( \pi_f(P,Q) \to \pi_f(P,R) \).

**Proof:** The map in question is well-defined by Proposition 14.6. To see that it is a bijection, note that we have a commutative square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\pi_f^A(P,Q) & \xrightarrow{q_1} & \pi_f^A(P,R) \\
\downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \gamma \\
\pi_f(P,Q) & \xrightarrow{q} & \pi_f(P,R)
\end{array}
\]

where the vertical maps are bijections by Proposition 14.5 and the top map is a bijection by Proposition 13.5 (v), since by Proposition 14.7, \( \sum_f P \) is cofibrant. \( \Box \)

14.11. Proposition. Let \( f : A \to B \) be a morphism in \( C \), \( p : P \to Q \) a morphism in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^A \), and \( R \) an object in \( \mathcal{F}(C)^B \).

**Claim:** If \( p \) is a trivial cofibration and \( R \) is fibrant, then composition with \( p \) induces a bijection \( \pi_f(Q,R) \to \pi_f(P,R) \).

**Proof:** The proof is similar to that of Proposition 14.10.

The map is well-defined by Proposition 14.9. To see that it is a bijection, note that we have a
commutative square
\[
\pi^f_{\mathcal{F}(C)B}(\sum_f Q,R) \xrightarrow{\sum_f p} \pi_{\mathcal{F}(C)B}(\sum_f P,R) \\
\downarrow \circl \downarrow \circl \downarrow \circl \\
\pi_f(Q,R) \xrightarrow{\circp} \pi_f(P,R)
\]
where the vertical map are bijections by Proposition 14.5. The top map is a bijection with \( \pi^f \) replaced by \( \pi^r \) by the dual of Proposition 13.5 (v), since by Proposition 14.7, \( \sum_f p \) is a trivial cofibration. Finally, since \( R \) is fibrant, we can replace \( \pi^r \) by \( \pi^f \) by Proposition 13.5 (ii). \( \square \)

15. The fibration \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C) \)

We will now define the prefibration \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C) \)
\[
\text{Ho}(C^\to)
\]
which primarily means constructing its total category \( \text{Ho}(C^\to) \). This will closely resemble the construction of the homotopy category \( \text{Ho}(C) \) in §13.6: \( \text{Ho}(C) \) will admit a description both as a localization of \( C^\to \) at the “vertical weak equivalences” and – up to equivalence – as a quotient of a full subcategory of “cofibrant-fibrant objects” by the relation of fiberwise-homotopy.

In order to carry out this construction, we will use the various properties needed for the construction of \( \text{Ho}(C) \) – namely, those in Proposition 13.5 – which, as we showed in §14, hold in this context as well. The reason that this is necessary is that our “vertical weak equivalences” and “cofibrant and fibrant” objects of \( C^\to \) are not actually – as far as we can tell – the weak equivalence and the cofibrant and fibrant objects of a model structure on \( C^\to \) (though there is one that comes quite close)\(^3\). If there were such a model structure, we could avoid this labor and simply apply the construction from §13.6 to this special case.

In §15.8, we will describe a possible alternative construction of \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C) \).

For the rest of §15, let \( C \) be a model category.

15.1. Definition. We define \((C^\to)_c\), \((C^\to)_f\), \((C^\to)_{cf}\) to be the full subcategories of \( C^\to \) on the cofibrant, fibrant, and cofibrant-fibrant objects, respectively. Here, an object \( P \in \text{Ob} C^\to \) over \( A \) is said to be cofibrant or fibrant if it cofibrant or fibrant as an object of \( C/A \); explicitly, \((X,A,x)\) is cofibrant if \( X \) is cofibrant in \( C \) and fibrant if \( x \) is a fibration.

For \( \ast \in \{c,f,cf\} \), we define the pre-fibration \( \mathcal{F}_\ast(C) \)
\[
\mathcal{F}_\ast(C)^\downarrow \\
\text{(C^\to)_{\ast}}
\]
to be the restriction to \((C^\to)_\ast\) of the functor \( \mathcal{F}(C) : (C^\to) \to C \). Note that the fiber \( \mathcal{F}_\ast(C)^A \) of \( \mathcal{F}_\ast(C) \) over \( A \) is precisely the category \((C/A)^\ast\).

15.2. Definition. We call a morphism \( p : P \to Q \) in \( C^\to \) over \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \) a vertical weak equivalence if \( A = B \) and \( f = 1_A \), and \( p \) is a weak equivalence in the category \( \mathcal{F}(C)^A \).

15.3. Proposition. Given a functor \( F : (C^\to)_{cf} \to D \), if \( F \) takes vertical weak equivalences to isomorphisms then it identifies fiberwise-homotopic morphisms, i.e., if \( p,q : P \to Q \) in \((C^\to)_{cf}\) are fiberwise-homotopic, then \( FP = FQ \).

\textit{Proof:} It suffices to see that \( FP = FQ : F \sum_f P \to FQ \) (where \( f : A \to B \) is the morphism in \( C \) over which \( p \) and \( q \) lie), since \( p = p \downarrow \) and \( q = q \downarrow \). But this holds by Proposition 13.5 (vi) by considering the restriction of \( F \) to \( \mathcal{F}^{cf}(C)^P \), since by Proposition 14.5, \( p \) and \( q \) are left-homotopic. \( \square \)

\[^3\text{Since we first wrote this, P. Cagne has explained to us that there is in fact such a model structure, defined in [Cag18].}\]
15.4. Definition. Given two prefibrations \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \) and \( \mathcal{C}' \downarrow B \) over a category \( B \), a morphism of prefibrations \( F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}' \) is a functor \( F : C \to C' \) for which

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{F} & C' \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
B & & B
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Note that by restriction, \( F \) induces functors \( \mathcal{C}^A \to \mathcal{C}'^A \) for each \( A \in \text{Ob} B \).

If \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{C}' \) are fibrations, then \( F \) is a morphism of fibrations if it takes cartesian morphisms to cartesian morphisms.

If \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{C}' \) are \( \wedge \)-fibrations, then \( F \) is a morphism of \( \wedge \)-fibrations if, in addition, the induced functors \( \mathcal{C}^A \to \mathcal{C}'^A \) are all f.p. functors.

15.5. Definition. By Proposition 14.8, fiberwise-homotopy is an equivalence relation on the Hom-sets of \( (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \), and by Proposition 14.6 and Proposition 14.9, composition in \( (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) respects fiberwise-homotopy. Hence, we can form the quotient of \( (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) by this equivalence relation. We denote this quotient by \( \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \), and the canonical functor \( (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \to \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) by \( \gamma \).

The functor \( \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^{(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}}} \downarrow C \) clearly respects fiberwise-homotopy, hence induces a prefibration \( \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}} \) over \( C \).

Note that \( (\pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C))^A = \pi(\mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^A) \); i.e., the fiber of \( \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C) \) over \( A \) is the category \( \pi(C/A)^{\text{cf}} \).

The functor \( \gamma : (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \to \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) induces a morphism \( \gamma : \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C) \to \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C) \) of prefibrations over \( C \). Note that the induced functor \( \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^A \to \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^A \) is just the functor \( \gamma : (C/A)^{\text{cf}} \to \pi(C/A)^{\text{cf}} \).

15.6. Proposition. The functor \( \gamma : (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \to \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) exhibits \( \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) as the localization of \( (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \) at the vertical weak equivalences.

Proof: That \( \gamma \) takes vertical weak equivalences to isomorphisms follows from the fact that this already holds for the restrictions \( \gamma : \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^A \to \pi \mathcal{F}_{\text{cf}}(C)^A \). That any other functor \( F : (C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \to \mathcal{D} \) satisfying this condition factors uniquely through \( \gamma \) follows from Proposition 15.3 and the universal property of \( \gamma \) as a quotient functor. \( \square \)

15.7. Definition. We now define the category \( \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \).

The objects are those of \( C^\rightarrow \). For each \( P \in \text{Ob} C^\rightarrow \) lying over \( A \in \text{Ob} B \), choose a cofibrant replacement \( q : QP \to P \) and a fibrant replacement \( p : RQP \to P \) (in \( C/A \)), taking \( q = 1_P \) if \( P \) is cofibrant and \( p = 1_{QP} \) if \( P \) (and hence \( QP \)) is fibrant. We set \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow)}(P, P') = \text{Hom}_{(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}}}(RQP, RQP') \).

Composition is given in the obvious manner, and this clearly forms a category.

Just as in the definition of \( \text{Ho}(C) \) in §13.6, we have, for each \( f : P \to P' \) in \( C^\rightarrow \), a diagram like (5) (but with \( A, B \) replaced by \( P, P' \)) and again – but now using Propositions 14.10 and 14.11 – we have that \( \tilde{f} \) is uniquely determined up to fiberwise-homotopy. This defines a functor \( \gamma : C^\rightarrow \to \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \).

By the same reasoning as in §13.6, we have an inclusion \( \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \) which is an equivalence, and we have that \( \gamma : (C^\rightarrow) \to \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \) exhibits \( \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \) as the localization of \( C^\rightarrow \) at the vertical weak equivalences.

We can again define \( \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow)_* \) (for \( * \in \{c, f\} \)) to be the full subcategory of \( \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \) on the objects in \( (C^\rightarrow)_* \), and we then have that \( \gamma : (C^\rightarrow) \to \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow)_* \) is a localization, and that the inclusions \( \pi(C^\rightarrow)^{\text{cf}} \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow)_* \hookrightarrow \text{Ho}(C^\rightarrow) \) are equivalences.
Since the functor $\mathcal{F}(C) \downarrow C$ obviously takes the vertical weak equivalences to isomorphisms (in fact, to identity morphisms), we have induced prefibrations $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C) \downarrow C$ and $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C) \downarrow C$ and morphisms $\gamma : \mathcal{F}(C) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ and $\gamma : \mathcal{F}_i(C) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$ of prefibrations over $C$.

The category $\text{Ho}(C^{-})$ has a property analogous to the last one mentioned in §13.6: if $A \in \text{Ob}(C^{-})_c$ and $B \in \text{Ob}(C^{-})_f$, then the map $\gamma : \text{Hom}_{C^{-}}(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C^{-})}(A, B)$ induces a bijection $\pi(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C^{-})}(A, B)$. This follows from Proposition 14.10 and 14.11 and from the definition of $\gamma$.

15.8. We now sketch a possible alternative approach to the construction of the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ which more directly implements the idea “pass to the homotopy category of each fiber of $\mathcal{F}(C)$”.

In [Hov99, p.26], it is shown that the passage from a model category to its homotopy category is described by a pseudo-functor $\text{Ho} : \text{Mod} \to \text{Cat}$ from the 2-category $\text{Mod}$ of model categories and “Quillen adjunctions” to the 2-category of categories. Given a model category $C$, the pseudo-functor $\mathcal{F}(C) : C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat}$ associated to any cleavage of $\mathcal{F}(C)$ factors through this the inclusion $\text{Mod} \hookrightarrow \text{Cat}$, since the left-adjoint $\sum_f$ to each pullback functor $f^*$ is a “left Quillen functor”. Our fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ should then be the one associated to the composition $\text{Ho} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ of the factored pseudo-functor $\mathcal{F}(C) : C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Mod}$ with the pseudo-functor $\text{Ho} : \text{Mod} \to \text{Cat}$ (though we have not checked this). In any case, it is useful for our purposes that we have an explicit description of the total category $\text{Ho}(C^{-})$ of the prefibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$.

16 $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$ is a $\wedge$-fibration

We will now show that $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ is a $\wedge$-fibration. For this purpose, it will be more convenient to work with the equivalent fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$, since $\mathcal{F}_i(C)$ is itself a $\wedge$-fibration and, as we will show, the morphism $\gamma : \mathcal{F}_i(C) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$ is a morphism of $\wedge$-fibrations, which gives us a very explicit description of the $\wedge$-fibration structure of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$.

16.1. We recall that the fibrations in any model category are stable under pullbacks: if

$$
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow p'
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow p
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
B
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
C
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow \downarrow
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
D
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\downarrow
\end{array}
$$

is a pullback square in and $p$ is a fibration, so is $p'$. In fact, the elements of $\mathcal{R}$ in any weak factorization system $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ are stable under pullbacks (and dually, the elements of $\mathcal{L}$ are stable under pushouts).

In particular, if $A \xrightarrow{\pi_1} A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_2} B$ is a product diagram and $A$ (resp. $B$) is fibrant, then $\pi_2$ (resp. $\pi_1$) is a fibration.

16.2. Proposition. For any model category $C$, the category $C_\wedge$ is an f.p. category, and the inclusion $C_\wedge \hookrightarrow C$ is an f.p. functor.

Proof: Since $C_\wedge$ is a full subcategory of $C$, it suffices to see that a finite product of fibrant objects is fibrant. That terminal objects are always fibrant is immediate, and that the binary product of fibrant objects is fibrant follows from §16.1. □

16.3. Proposition. For any model category $C$, the prefibration $\mathcal{F}_i(C) \downarrow C$ is a $\wedge$-fibration, and the inclusion $\mathcal{F}_i(C) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(C)$ is a morphism of $\wedge$-fibrations.
Homotopies in Grothendieck fibrations

Proof: We first prove the claim with “∧” removed. Since \((C^-)_I\) is a full subcategory of \(C^-\), it suffices to see that any cartesian morphism in \(C^-\) with codomain in \((C^-)_I\) has its domain in \((C^-)_I\). But this follows from §16.1 since the cartesian morphisms in \(C^-\) are precisely the pullback squares.

That the fibers of \(\mathcal{F}_I(C)\) have finite products which are preserved by the inclusion \(\mathcal{F}_I(C)^A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(C)^A\) follows from Proposition 16.2. That the finite products in \(\mathcal{F}_I(C)\) are stable under pullbacks is immediate from the corresponding property in \(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E})\). □

16.4. Proposition. For any model category \(C\), the category \(\text{Ho}(C_I)\) (hence also \(\text{Ho}(C)\)) is an f.p. category, and \(\gamma : C_I \to \text{Ho}(C_I)\) is an f.p. functor.

Proof. Let \(1\) be terminal in \(C_I\). We need to see that for each \(A \in \text{Ob} C_I\), there is a unique morphism \(A \to 1\) in \(\text{Ho}(C_I)\). It suffices to see this for cofibrant \(A\), since every object in \(\text{Ho}(C_I)\) is isomorphic to such an \(A\). But in this case, by the last property mentioned in §13.6, the morphisms \(A \to 1\) in \(\text{Ho}(C_I)\) are just homotopy classes of morphisms \(A \to 1\) in \(C\), of which there is of course just one.

Next, let \(B \xleftarrow{\pi_1} B \times C \xrightarrow{\pi_2} C\) be a product in \(C_I\). We need to see that for each \(A \in \text{Ob} C_I\), composition with \(\pi_1\) and \(\pi_2\) induces a bijection \(\text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C_I)}(A, B \times C) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C_I)}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_{\text{Ho}(C_I)}(A, C)\). Again, it suffices to consider \(A\) cofibrant, so that we need to show that

\[
\langle \pi_1 \circ, \pi_2 \circ \rangle : \pi(A, B \times C) \to \pi(A, B) \times \pi(A, C)
\]
is a bijection. That it is surjective is immediate, since

\[
\langle \pi_1 \circ, \pi_2 \circ \rangle : \text{Hom}_{C_I}(A, B \times C) \to \text{Hom}_{C_I}(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_{C_I}(A, C)
\]
is already surjective pointwise, and not just on homotopy classes.

To see that it is injective, we need to check that given homotopic maps \(f_1, f_2 : A \to B\) and homotopic maps \(g_1, g_2 : A \to C\), the induced maps \(\langle f_1, g_1 \rangle, \langle f_2, g_2 \rangle : A \to B \times C\) are homotopic. By Proposition 13.5 (ii), we can choose left-homotopies \(h_f : A \times I \to B\) from \(f_1\) to \(f_2\) and \(h_g : A \times I \to C\) from \(g_1\) to \(g_2\) with a common cylinder object \(A + A \xrightarrow{[\partial_1, \partial_2]} A \times I\). We then have an induced left-homotopy \(\langle h_f, h_g \rangle : A \times I \to B \times C\). To show that this is a left-homotopy between \(\langle f_1, g_1 \rangle\) and \(\langle f_2, g_2 \rangle\), we need to show that \((h_f, h_g) [\partial_1, \partial_2] = [\langle f_1, g_1 \rangle, \langle f_2, g_2 \rangle]\). But

\[
(h_f, h_g) [\partial_1, \partial_2] = [(h_f, h_g) \partial_1, (h_f, h_g) \partial_2] = [(h_f \partial_1, h_g \partial_1), (h_f \partial_2, h_g \partial_2)] = [(f_1, g_1), (f_2, g_2)].
\]

□

16.5. Proposition. For any model category \(C\), \(\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)\) is a ∧-fibration and \(\gamma : \mathcal{F}_I(C) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)\) is a morphism of ∧-fibrations.

Proof. That the fibers of \(\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)\) are f.p. categories, and that functors \(\mathcal{F}_I(C)^A \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)^A\) induced by \(\gamma\) are f.p. functors, follows from Proposition 16.4.

Let \(p : Q \to R\) in \((C^-)_I\) be a cartesian morphism over \(g : B \to C\) in \(C\). We need to see that the image \(\gamma p\) in \(\text{Ho}(C^-)_I\) is still cartesian; i.e., that for \(f : A \to B\) in \(C\) and \(P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)^A\), the map \((\gamma p) \circ : \text{Hom}_f(P, Q) \to \text{Hom}_{\gamma f}(P, R)\) is a bijection. We argue as in Proposition 16.4. First, we can assume that \(P\) is cofibrant, and hence we must show that \((p \circ) : \pi_f(P, Q) \to \pi_{\gamma f}(P, R)\) is a bijection. Surjectivity is clear, and injectivity follows by a similar – but simpler – argument to the one in Proposition 16.4.

It remains to see that the products in the fibers of \(\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)\) are stable under pullbacks. Let \(f : A \to B\) be a morphism in \(C\) and \(P, Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(C)^B\). It suffices to see that for some product \(P \land Q\), and
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some pullbacks $f^*P$, $f^*Q$, and $f^*(P \land Q)$ as in

\[
\begin{array}{c}
P \land Q \\
\downarrow^{f^*\pi_1} \\
\downarrow^{f^*\pi_2} \\
P
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\downarrow^{f^*\pi_1} \\
\downarrow^{f^*\pi_2} \\
P
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
Q \\
\downarrow^{f^*Q} \\
\downarrow^{f^*Q} \\
Q
\end{array}
\]

\[A \xrightarrow{f} B,\]

$f^*P \xleftarrow{f^*\pi_1} P \land Q \xrightarrow{f^*\pi_2} f^*Q$ is also a product diagram. Now, by Proposition 16.4 and what we have just shown, we can obtain such a product $P \land Q$ and such cartesian morphisms by first choosing a product diagram and cartesian morphisms in $(C \to f)$, and then taking their images in $\text{Ho}(C \to f)$.

But now the diagram $f^*P \xleftarrow{f^*\pi_1} P \land Q \xrightarrow{f^*\pi_2} f^*Q$ in $\mathcal{F}(C)^A$ is a product diagram in $\text{Ho}(C \to f)^A$ as desired.

The proof that terminal objects in $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)^B$ are stable under pullback is similar, but simpler. □

17 $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ is a $\land=\text{-fibration}$

We now want to show that $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)$ is a $\land=\text{-fibration}$. We will show that the necessary cocartesian lifts always exist; in fact, as with the fibration $\mathcal{F}(C)$ (see Proposition 12.5), we will show that any $f : A \to B$ in $C$ has a cartesian lift with domain any $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C)^A$. However, in order to show that these satisfy Frobenius reciprocity, it seems we need to make the (mild) assumption that $C$ is right-proper (see Definition 17.4), and to show that they are stable along product projections, we need further to restrict to the fibrant objects of $C$.

For the rest of §17, let $C$ be a model category.

17.1. Proposition. We recall another important basic fact about model categories: a morphism $f$ in $C$ is a weak equivalence if and only if its image $\gamma f$ in $\text{Ho}(C)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof: The $\Rightarrow$ direction is trivial. For the $\Leftarrow$ direction, see [Hov99, p. 11, Proposition 1.2.8]. □

17.2. Proposition. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a morphism in $C$ and let $(\hat{f}, f) : (X, A, x) \rightarrow (Y, B, y)$ be a morphism in $(C\leftarrow)_{f}$ lying over $f$.

Claim: The image $\gamma(\hat{f}, f)$ in $\text{Ho}(C\leftarrow)_{f}$ of $(\hat{f}, f)$ is cocartesian if and only if $\hat{f}$ is a weak equivalence.

Proof: Let us set $P = (X, A, x)$, $Q = (Y, B, y)$, and $p = (\hat{f}, f)$.

By passing to cofibrant replacements for $P$ and $Q$, we can assume that they are both cofibrant. Indeed, given cofibrant replacements $q : \tilde{P} \rightarrow P$ and $q : \tilde{Q} \rightarrow Q$, we obtain, by Proposition 14.10 a (unique up to fiberwise homotopy) morphism $\tilde{p} = (\hat{f}, f) : \tilde{P} \rightarrow \tilde{Q}$ making

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\tilde{P} \\
\downarrow^{\tilde{p}} \\
\tilde{Q}
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{q} 
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\downarrow^{p} \\
Q
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{q}
\begin{array}{c}
A \\
\downarrow^{f} \\
B
\end{array}
\]
commute. Since each of the morphisms $\gamma q$ is an isomorphism, it follows (from the dual of Proposition 2.5) that $\gamma p$ is cocartesian if and only if $\tilde{\gamma}p$ is, and since each morphism $q$ is a weak equivalence, it follows (from the two-of-three axiom) that $\tilde{f}$ is a weak equivalence if and only if $\tilde{f}$ is.

Now, by Proposition 5.2, $\gamma p$ is cocartesian if and only if $\circ(\gamma p) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{C})}(Q, R) \to \text{Hom}_f(P, R)$ is a bijection for each $R \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{K}$. Since $P$ and $Q$ are cofibrant and $R$ is fibrant, this amounts to $(\circ p) : \pi_{\mathcal{C}/B}(Q, R) \to \pi_f(P, R)$ being a bijection. Now we can factor this map as

$$
\pi_{\mathcal{C}/B}(Q, R) \xrightarrow{\circ p} \pi_{\mathcal{C}/B}(\sum_f P, R) \xrightarrow{\circ 1} \pi_f(P, R)
$$

where the second factor is a bijection by Proposition 14.5. Hence it remains to see that the first factor is a bijection for each $R$ if and only if $\tilde{f}$ is a weak equivalence.

But $p = (\tilde{f}, 1_B) : \sum_f P = (X, B, f x) \to (Y, B, y)$ is a weak equivalence if and only if $\tilde{f}$ is, and by Proposition 17.1, $p$ is a weak equivalence if and only if its image $\gamma p$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C}/B)$ is an isomorphism – and finally (by Yoneda’s lemma), $\gamma p$ is an isomorphism if and only if $\circ p : \pi_{\mathcal{C}/B}(Q, R) \to \pi_{\mathcal{C}/B}(\sum_f P, R)$ is a bijection for every $R \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{K}$. □

17.3. Proposition. For each $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and each $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{K}$, there is a cocartesian lift of $\bar{f}$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C}^{-})$ with domain $P$.

Proof: Suppose $P = (X, A, x)$, and factor $fx : X \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}$ as a trivial cofibration $\tilde{f} : X \to X'$ followed by a fibration $x' : X' \to B$. Then $(X', B, x') \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C}^{-})$, and by Proposition 17.2, the image of $(\tilde{f}, f) : (X, A, x) \to (X', B, x')$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C}^{-})$ is cocartesian. □

17.4. Definition. The model category $\mathcal{C}$ is right proper if weak equivalences in $\mathcal{C}$ are stable under pullbacks along fibrations; i.e., given a pullback square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \rightarrow & B \\
\downarrow^g & \downarrow^p & \\
C & \rightarrow & D
\end{array}
$$

in $\mathcal{C}$ in which $g$ is a fibration and $p$ is a weak equivalence, $p'$ is also a weak equivalence.

17.5. Proposition. If $\mathcal{C}$ is right proper, then the cocartesian morphisms in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C}^{-})$ are stable along the fibrations in $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof: It suffices, for each $g : C \to D$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and each $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{K}$, to see that some cocartesian lift of $\bar{g}$ with domain $P$ is stable along every fibration $k : B \to D$.

By Proposition 17.2, we can take as our cocartesian morphism the image $\gamma p : P \to Q$ of some morphism $p = (\bar{g}, g) : P \to Q$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathcal{C}^{-})$ with $\bar{g}$ a weak equivalence. Again, to see that $\gamma p$ is stable along the fibration $\bar{k}$, it suffices to see that for each pullback square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \rightarrow & B \\
\downarrow^h & \downarrow^k & \\
C & \rightarrow & D
\end{array}
$$

in $\mathcal{C}$, there exist some cartesian morphisms $\uparrow : h^*P \to P$ over $h$ and $\uparrow : k^*Q \to Q$ over $k$, such that the unique morphism $p'$ over $f$ making the following diagram commute is cocartesian.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
h^*P & \rightarrow & k^*Q \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \\
P & \rightarrow & Q
\end{array}
$$
Now, by Proposition 16.5, we can take our cartesian lifts $h^*P \to P$ and $k^*Q \to Q$ to be the image under $\gamma$ of cartesian lifts of $h$ and $k$ in $(C^\to)_f$ — where we recall that “cartesian” in $(C^\to)_f$ means “pullback square”.

We thus have a commutative cube

```
  f
  ↓
  g
  ↓
  h
  ↓
  A
  ↓
  B
  ↓
  C
  ↓
  D
```

in $C$ in which the right, left, and bottom faces are pullback squares, and $\hat{g}$ is a weak equivalence. We want to show that $\hat{f}$ is a weak equivalence (since this would imply, by Proposition 17.2, that $p'$ is cocartesian). But by §16.1, $\hat{k}$ is a fibration, and by Proposition 12.4, the top face is a pullback square, and hence $\hat{f}$ is a weak equivalence by the right properness of $C$. □

17.6. Proposition. If $C$ is right proper, then the cocartesian morphisms in $\mathbf{Ho}(C^\to)_f$ satisfy Frobenius reciprocity.

**Proof**: The argument is similar to the one in Proposition 17.5.

Let $f : A \to B$ be a morphism in $C$. It suffices to check that for each $Q \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_f(C)^A$ and each $P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_f(C)^B$, there is some cocartesian lift $q : Q \to Q'$ of $f$, some cartesian lift $\uparrow : f^*P \to P$ and some product diagrams $Q \starr ProductDiagram \to Q \wedge f^*P \starr ProductDiagram \to f^*Q' \wedge P \starr ProductDiagram \to P$ for which the induced morphism $q \wedge \uparrow$ — i.e., the unique morphism over $f$ making the following diagram commute — is cocartesian.

```
  Q  \downarrow^g \rightarrow Q'
       | \uparrow^\pi_1
       v \downarrow^\pi_2
Q \wedge f^*P \larr \rightarrow Q' \wedge P

  \downarrow^\pi_2
  f^*P \uparrow \rightarrow P
```

Now, as in Proposition 17.5, we choose the cartesian morphism $\uparrow : f^*P \to P$ to be the image of a cartesian lift of $f$ in $(C^\to)_f$, and the cocartesian lift $q$ to be the image a morphism $(\hat{f}, f) : Q \to Q'$ in $(C^\to)$ with $\hat{f}$ a weak equivalence. Similarly, we choose (using Proposition 16.4) the product diagrams to be the images of product diagrams in $(C/A)_f$ and $(C/B)_f$ — which, we recall, are pullback diagrams in $C$.

We then, as in Proposition 17.5, end up with a cube in $C$ in which the same three faces are pullbacks and the same edge is a weak equivalence, and we have to show that the same edge is a weak equivalence. And of course, we do this using the same argument we used in Proposition 17.5. □

17.7. Definition. If $D \subseteq C$ is any full subcategory and $\ast$ is one of $c$, $f$, or $cf$ (the case of interest being $D = C_f \subseteq C$ and $\ast = f$), we define the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_\ast(D)$ to be the restriction of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_\ast(C)$ to $D$. 
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D – i.e., the total category of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathfrak{F}_s(\mathbf{D})$ is the subcategory of $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{C}^{\rightarrow})$, consisting of those objects and morphisms lying over $\mathbf{D}$.

In general, the restriction of any $\wedge$-fibration to a full subcategory is still a $\wedge$-fibration; in particular, $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathfrak{F}_t(\mathbf{C}_t)$ is a $\wedge$-fibration.

**17.8. Theorem.** If $\mathbf{C}$ is right proper, then the $\wedge$-fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathfrak{F}_t(\mathbf{C}_t)$ is a $\wedge$-$\text{-fibration.}$

**Proof:** By Proposition 17.3, every morphism in $\mathbf{C}_t$ admits a cocartesian lift and by Proposition 17.6, these satisfy Frobenius reciprocity.

Since $\mathbf{C}_t$ has only fibrant objects, every product projection in $\mathbf{C}_t$ is a fibration. Hence, by Proposition 17.5, the cocartesian morphisms are stable along all product projections. □

## V The classical homotopy 2-category

By the results of Parts III and IV, we now have a 2-categorical structure on $\mathbf{C}_t$ for any right proper model category $\mathbf{C}$. In Part V, we want to compare this, in the case of the category of topological spaces, with the “classical” 2-category of topological spaces. Of course, one first needs to say what one means by the latter, for example which class of topological spaces we are considering.\footnote{One could also consider other “space-like” categories, for example the category of simplicial sets. In the latter case, one can give a similar treatment to the one we give below, though one must restrict to the fibrant objects, i.e., Kan complexes. Another very interesting example is the category of groupoids, with the right-proper model structure given in [Str00]; in this case, everything is fibrant and cofibrant, and one recovers the usual 2-category of groupoids.} However, the idea of the homotopy 2-category is clear enough: 0-cells are spaces, 1-cells are continuous maps, and 2-cells are homotopy-classes of homotopies – the reason one needs to take homotopy-classes of the fundamental group.

In more detail (but still informally), given two continuous maps $f, g : A \to B$, the 2-cells $f \to g$ should be equivalence classes of homotopies – i.e., of continuous maps $h : A \times I \to B$ (here $I = [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the unit interval) such that $h(a, 0) = f(a)$ and $h(a, 1) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$. The equivalence relation should be “homotopy-rel-endpoints” – i.e. two homotopies $h_1$ and $h_2$ from $f$ to $g$ are equivalent if there is a continuous map $H : A \times I \times I \to B$ such that $H(a, t, 0) = h_1(a, t)$ and $H(a, t, 1) = h_2(a, t)$ for all $t \in I$ and $a \in A$, and $H(a, 0, s) = f(a)$ and $H(1, s) = g(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $s \in I$.

“Vertical” composition should be given as follows: given $f_1, f_2, f_3 : A \to B$ and homotopies $h_1 : f_1 \to f_2$ and $h_2 : f_2 \to f_3$, their composite should be given by “concatenation”:

$$(a, t) \mapsto \begin{cases} h_1(a, 2t) & \text{if } t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ h_2(a, 2t - 1) & \text{if } t \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

(6)

“Horizontal” composition should be given as follows. Given maps $f_1, f_2 : A \to B$, $g_1, g_2 : B \to C$ and homotopies $h_1 : f_1 \to f_2$ and $h_2 : g_1 \to g_2$, we have for each $a \in A$ a square $(s, t) \mapsto h_2(h_1(a, s), t)$ in $C$. The composite homotopy should take $a \in A$ to any of the homotopic paths through this square from $h_2(h_1(a, 0), 0) = g_1(f_1(a))$ to $h_2(h_1(a, 1), 1) = g_2(f_2(a))$. The most obvious choice is the diagonal

$$(a, t) \mapsto h_2(h_1(a, t), t).$$

(7)

Now, the extent to which we will show that the 2-category we obtain is isomorphic to the “standard” 2-category of spaces will be just that we verify that the 2-cells and compositions in it correspond to the informal description given above.
18 $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$-homotopies

18.1. Let $C$ be a right proper model category. We want to identify the 2-cells in the induced 2-categorical structure on $C_t$ given by Theorems 17.8 and 8.5, at least among the cofibrant-fibrant objects.

In fact, strictly speaking, the 2-categorical structure in Theorem 8.5 is associated to a particular $\wedge=$-cleavage of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$ (see §11). For now, we do not care very much what this $\wedge=$-cleavage is, but it will be convenient for us to make a particular choice of terminal object $\top_B$ and equality objects Eq$_B$.

Namely, we take as our terminal object $\top_B$ the identity morphism $(B,1_B) \in \mathcal{Ho}(C/B)$. For the equality object Eq$_B$, we have to choose a cocartesian lift of $\Delta_B : B \to B \times B$. Choosing a factorization $B \xrightarrow{s} B^I \xrightarrow{(d_1,d_2)} B \times B$ of $\Delta_B : B \to B \times B$ as a weak equivalence followed by a fibration (i.e., a path object for $B$), we have by Proposition 17.2 that the image of $(s,\Delta_B) : (B,B,1_B) \to (B^I,B \times B,\langle d_1,d_2 \rangle)$ in $\mathcal{Ho}(C \to B)$ is cocartesian, and we take this as our chosen equality object.

Now, given two morphisms $f,g : A \to B$ in $C_t$, we have that $f$ and $g$ are $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$-homotopic if and only if there exists a morphism $\top_A \to Eq_B$ over $B \times B$. If $A$ is cofibrant (otherwise we cannot say anything about this) this amounts to the existence of a commutative square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{1_A} & B^I \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow^{(d_1,d_2)} \\
A & \xrightarrow{(f,g)} & B \times B,
\end{array}
$$

which just means that $f$ and $g$ are right-homotopic with respect to the model-structure on $C$.

The $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$-homotopies from $f$ to $g$ – i.e., the 2-cells $f \to g$ with respect to the 2-categorical structure – are then (still assuming $A$ is cofibrant) equivalence classes of morphisms $A \to B^I$ making the above square commute, where two such morphisms are equivalent if there is a left-homotopy $A \times I \to B^I$ between them making the following square commute.

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
A \times I & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & B^I \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow^{(d_1,d_2)} \\
A & \xrightarrow{(f,g)} & B \times B.
\end{array}
$$

19 $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(\text{Top})$-homotopies

19.1. We now consider the specific case of topological spaces.

To do so, we must first declare which category of topological space we want to consider, and then which model structure. There is some freedom in this. Everything we say below holds both if $\text{Top}$ refers to the whole category of topological spaces, or to the full subcategory of compactly generated spaces (see [Hov99, p. 58] for the definition) frequently used in algebraic topology; and everything holds both for the so called Hurewicz (or Strøm) model structure and the mixed model structure (see [Col06] for the definitions).

The advantage of using the Hurewicz model structure is that in it, every object is cofibrant (and fibrant), with the consequence that we recover the classical homotopy 2-category structure on the entire category $\text{Top}$. In the mixed model structure, only the objects homotopy equivalent to a cell complex are cofibrant (though everything is still fibrant), and so we only recover the restriction of the classical homotopy 2-category to these objects; on the other objects, we get something else.

Hence, it would seem that it is simply better to use the Hurewicz model structure. However, in [Hel19],
we show that the fibration \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(\text{Top}) \) actually has considerably more structure than that of a \( \land \)-fibration, and for this we will need the mixed model structure\(^5\). The important feature is that the weak equivalences in the mixed model structure are the weak homotopy equivalences, rather than the (strong) homotopy equivalences as in the Hurewicz model structure, and this is needed to produce the “correct” homotopy categories of the fibers \( \text{Top}/X \).

Rather than recalling the definitions of these model structures, we will simply record the properties we will need:

(i) The unit interval \( I = [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R} \) is exponentiable in \( \text{Top} \): the product functor \( - \times I : \text{Top} \to \text{Top} \) has a right adjoint \( (-)^I : \text{Top} \to \text{Top} \). Moreover, (this right adjoint can be chosen so that) the underlying set of \( B^I \) is the set of continuous functions \( I \to B \).

(ii) The model structure is right proper (hence Theorem 17.8 applies), and with respect to it, every object in \( \text{Top} \) is fibrant.

(iii) For every \( A \in \text{Ob} \text{Top} \), applying \( A(-) \) to the maps \( \{0, 1\} \to I \to \{\ast\} \) provides a factorization \( A \to A^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} A \times A \) of \( \Delta_A \) as a weak equivalence followed by a fibration; and, for \( A \) cofibrant, applying \( A \times (-) \) to the same maps provides a factorization \( A + A \xrightarrow{[d_1, d_2]} A \times I \xrightarrow{\sigma} A \) of \( \nabla_A \) as a cofibration followed by a weak equivalence.

Property (i) holds not just for \( I \) but for any locally compact Hausdorff space (see [Mun00, p. 287]). The first part of Property (ii) follows from the second by [MP12, Theorem 15.4.2], and the second part follows easily from the definition of the fibrations in the model structure (namely, the Hurewicz fibrations).

As for Property (iii), it is easily seen directly that the maps \( A \xrightarrow{\sigma} A^I \) and \( \sigma : A \times I \to A \) are homotopy equivalences (in fact, deformation retracts). That \( \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle : A^I \to A \times A \) is a fibration follows from [May99, p. 48], and that \( \langle \partial_1, \partial_2 \rangle : A + A \to A \times I \) is a cofibration in the mixed model structure follows by [MP12, Proposition 17.3.4] from the corresponding fact in the Hurewicz model structure, and for the Hurewicz model structure it follows from [May99, p.43], since \( A + A \) is an NDR of \( A \times I \).

Property (iii) implies that we can choose the map \( \langle d_0, d_1 \rangle : B^I \to B \times B \) as our equality objects with \( \rho_B = \langle [s, \Delta_B] \rangle : (B, B, 1_B) \to (B^I, B \times B, \langle d_0, d_1 \rangle) \), and we do so (as part of our chosen \( \land \)-cleavage).

19.2. We now identify the \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(\text{Top}) \)-homotopies (note that we write \( \text{Top} \) instead of \( \text{Top}_I \), since these are the same by property (ii) above) between morphisms with cofibrant domain.

Let \( A, B \in \text{Ob} \text{Top}, \) with \( A \) cofibrant. According to §18.1, two maps \( f, g : A \to B \) in \( \text{Top} \) are \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(\text{Top}) \)-homotopic if and only if they are homotopic with respect to the model structure. Of course, the model structure is arranged so that this happens precisely if \( f \) and \( g \) are homotopic in the classical sense. We can also see this directly. According to §18.1, a \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_I(\text{Top}) \)-homotopy is an equivalence class of lifts

\[
A \xrightarrow{\langle f, g \rangle} B \times B \\
\downarrow^{\langle d_0, d_1 \rangle} \\
B^I
\]

and using the adjunction \( (-) \times I - (-)^I \), it is easily seen that such a lift exists if and only if \( [f, g] : A + A \to B \) factors through \( A \times I \).

\(^5\)We could also use the Quillen model structure – the original model structure on topological spaces, introduced in [Qui67]. This would work just as well as the mixed model structure, but it would have even fewer cofibrant objects.
Next, let us determine the equivalence relation on these lifts, for which the equivalence classes are the \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{R}_{\ast}(\text{Top}) \)-homotopies. Two such lifts are equivalent if there is a homotopy \( A \times I \to B^I \) making the square (8) commute. Now, we note that in (8), “\( A \times I \)” referred to an arbitrary cylinder object. However, by Proposition 13.5 (ii) and property (iii) above, we can take \( A \times I \) to mean the actual product of \( A \) with \( I \).

Now given two homotopies \( h_1, h_2 : A \to B^I \) between \( f \) and \( g \), a homotopy \( A \times I \to B^I \) corresponds by adjunction to a map \( H : A \times I \times I \to B \) with \( H(a, 0, t) = h_1(a, t) \) and \( H(a, 0, t) = h_2(a, t) \) for all \( a, t \). Moreover, it is easy to check directly that the commutativity of (8) amounts to the conditions \( H(a, s, 0) = f(a) \) and \( H(a, s, 1) = g(a) \) for all \( a, s \). Hence, the equivalence relation on homotopies \( A \to B^I \) between \( f \) and \( g \) is indeed “homotopy rel-endpoints” as desired.

\[ \text{19.3.} \] Now we turn to the description of the “vertical composition” in the 2-categorical structure.

Referring to the definition in \(|6.6|\), we see that we must first describe \( \text{tr}_B : \text{Eq}_B^{12} \land \text{Eq}_B^{23} \to \text{Eq}_B^{13} \), and for this, we should describe the objects \( \text{Eq}_{ij}^{3} \in \text{Ob}(\text{Top}/B^3)_I \).

We have that \( \text{Eq}_B \) is the path space fibration \( \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle : B^I \to B \times B \). Now \( \text{Eq}_{ij}^{ij} \) is defined as the pullback of \( \text{Eq}_B \) along \( \langle \pi_i, \pi_j \rangle \). According to Proposition 16.5, we can compute the pullback as in \( \mathcal{F}_{\ast}(\text{Top}) \), where it is just a pullback (in the categorical sense) – i.e., we can choose these particular pullbacks as part of our cleavage. In particular, \( \text{Eq}_{ij}^{ij} \subseteq \text{Ob}(\text{Top}/B^3)_I \) is just the map \( \langle \nu_{ij}^1, \nu_{ij}^2, \nu_{ij}^3 \rangle : B^I \times B \to B^3 \), where \( \nu_{ij}^i \) is \( d_1 \pi_1 \) if \( n = i \), \( d_2 \pi_1 \) if \( n = j \), and \( \pi_2 \) otherwise.

Next, again by Proposition 16.5, we can compute the product \( \text{Eq}_B^{12} \land \text{Eq}_B^{23} \) as in \( \text{Top}/B^3 \), where it is just a pullback over \( B^3 \). In particular, \( \text{Eq}_B^{12} \land \text{Eq}_B^{23} \) is the map \( \mu = \langle d_0 \pi_1, d_1 \pi_1, d_2 \pi_2 \rangle : B^I \times_B B^I \to B^3 \); i.e., the domain consists of those pairs of paths \( (\gamma, \eta) \) with \( \gamma(1) = \eta(0) \), and the map takes \( (\gamma, \eta) \) to \( (\gamma(0), \gamma(1), \eta(1)) \).

Next, we need to describe \( \rho_B^{ij} : \top_B \to \text{Eq}_{ij}^{ij} \); suppose that this is represented by some morphism \( (\rho_B^{ij}, \Delta_B^3) : (B, B, 1_B) \to (B^I \times B, B^3, \nu^{ij}) \) in \( \text{Top}^{-\ast} \) (where we just write \( \nu^{ij} \) for the above map \( \langle \nu_{ij}^1, \nu_{ij}^2, \nu_{ij}^3 \rangle \)). Then \( \rho_B^{ij} \) is by definition the (unique up to fiberwise-homotopy) map over \( \Delta_B^3 \) making

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & B^I \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \pi_1 \\
\pi_0 & \xrightarrow{\rho_B^{ij}} & B^I \\
\end{array}
\]

commute up to fiberwise-homotopy. Obviously, we can take this to be \( \langle \sigma, 1_B \rangle \), as this makes the diagram commute on the nose.

Next, writing \( \langle \text{tr}_B, 1_B \rangle : (B^I \times_B B^I, B, \mu) \to (B^I \times B, \nu^{ij}) \) for a representative of the morphism \( \text{tr}_B : \text{Eq}_B^{12} \land \text{Eq}_B^{23} \to \text{Eq}_B^{13} \), we have by definition that \( \text{tr}_B \) is the (unique up to fiberwise-homotopy) map over \( 1_B \), making

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\langle \sigma, \sigma \rangle} & B^I \times B^I \\
\downarrow \text{tr}_B & & \downarrow \rho_B^{ij} \\
B & \xrightarrow{\langle \sigma, 1_B \rangle} & B^I \times B \\
\end{array}
\]

commute up to fiberwise-homotopy (here, \( \langle \sigma, \sigma \rangle \) is the induced map into the fiber product, and we have left out the verification that this in fact represents \( \langle \rho_B^{ij}, \rho_B^{ij} \rangle \)). Now we can define a map \( m : B^I \times_B B^I \to B^I \) taking \( (\gamma, \eta) \) to

\[
t \mapsto \begin{cases} 
\gamma(2t) & \text{if } t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\
\eta(2t - 1) & \text{if } t \geq \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}
\]
i.e., by concatenating paths. [To see that this is continuous, we can use that the functor $B^{(-)}$ takes pushout squares to pullback squares, and define this map via a corresponding map $I \to I \sqcup_{\{*\}} I$.] Hence, we take $\hat{tr}_B$ to be $\langle m, \pi_2 \mu \rangle$, where $\pi_2 \mu$ takes $(\gamma, \eta)$ to the point $\gamma(1) = \eta(0)$.

Finally, it follows from this definition of $tr_B$ that the composite of two composable $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Top})$-homotopies $h_1$ and $h_2$ is given by (6), as desired. We leave the rest of the details to the reader.

19.4. Finally, we describe the horizontal composition of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Top})$-homotopies.

Referring to Definition 8.2, we see that we must first describe the construction $\beta \mapsto \hat{\beta}$.

Given a $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Top})$-homotopy $\beta = (h_2, (g_1, g_2)) : \top_B \to \mathbf{Eq}_C$, between $g_1, g_2 : B \to C$, if we write $(\hat{h}_2, (g_1 \times g_2)) : (B^I, B \times B, (d_1, d_2)) \to (C^I, C \times C, (d_1, d_2))$ for a representative of $\hat{\beta} : \mathbf{Eq}_B \to \mathbf{Eq}_C$, then $\hat{h}_2$ is defined as the (up to fiberwise-homotopy unique) map over $g_1 \times g_2$ making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & B^I \\
\downarrow{h} & & \downarrow{\hat{h}_2} \\
C & \xrightarrow{} & C^I
\end{array}
\]

commute up to fiberwise-homotopy.

Now, using the adjunction, we can define a map $B^I \to C^I$ taking $\gamma$ to the path $(t \mapsto h(\gamma(t))(t))$. This lies over $g_1 \times g_2$ and makes the above diagram commute on the nose, and so we can take it as our definition of $h_2$.

Finally, given another $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Top})$-homotopy $\alpha = (h_1, (f_1, f_2)) : \top_A \to \mathbf{Eq}_B$, we see that their horizontal composite will be the homotopy given by (8) as desired. We leave the rest of the details to the reader.
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