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Abstract

We introduce a homotopy-theoretic interpretation of intuitionistic first-order logic based on ideas from Homotopy Type Theory. We provide a categorical formulation of this interpretation using the framework of Grothendieck fibrations. We then use this formulation to prove the central property of this interpretation, namely homotopy invariance. To do this, we use the result from [Hel19] that any Grothendieck fibration of the kind being considered can automatically be upgraded to a 2-dimensional fibration, after which the invariance property is reduced to an abstract theorem concerning pseudonatural transformations of morphisms into 2-dimensional fibrations.

Contents

Ideas

I Overview
1 Type theory ................................................. 2
2 Propositions as sets ........................................ 3
3 Propositions as objects of C ................................ 8
4 Homotopical semantics ...................................... 9
5 Basic properties; invariance ................................ 10

II Fibrational formulation of the homotopical semantics
6 Propositional logic .......................................... 11
7 Predicate logic ............................................ 12
8 Homotopical semantics .................................... 14

Details

III The \( h^\sim \)-fibration of spaces ...................... 16
9 \( h^\sim \)-fibrations ....................................... 16
10 \( \mathcal{F}_1(\text{Kan}) \) is an \( h \)-fibration ............. 23
11 \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(\text{Kan}) \) is an \( h^\sim \)-fibration .... 25
12 Topological spaces ...................................... 27

IV 1-discrete 2-fibrations and the invariance theorem .... 29
13 2-categorical preliminaries ............................... 30
14 1-discrete 2-fibrations .................................. 31
15 The abstract invariance theorem ......................... 36
16 Homotopy homomorphisms ................................ 40
17 The special invariance theorem ......................... 43
I  Overview

The goal of this paper is to introduce a “homotopy-invariant” interpretation of first-order logic with equality, to give a description of this interpretation within the framework of categorical logic, and to give an abstract formulation and proof of the homotopy-invariance property within this framework.

The interpretation can be concisely described by the following commutative diagram.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{MLTT} \\
\text{Voevodsky-Awodey-Warren-Kapulkin-Lumsdaine} \\
\text{Simplicial Sets} \\
\text{IFOL} \\
\text{First-order homotopical logic} \\
\text{Martin-Löf 1972} \\
\text{I} \end{array} \]

On the bottom left we have intuitionistic first-order logic, on the top-left we have Martin-Löf type theory, and the vertical arrow is the interpretation of IFOL into MLTT which was described in Martin-Löf’s original paper [ML98]. The long horizontal arrow is the homotopy-theoretic interpretation of type theory [AW09, KLL12, War08] which initiated the subject of Homotopy Type Theory. Hence, composing these two interpretations, one obtains a homotopy-theoretic interpretation of first-order logic, which is the purpose of this paper to elaborate.

In fact, one does not need to go through these two interpretations, as the homotopical semantics for first-order logic can be described directly and very simply (in fact, this simplicity, as compared to the interpretation of Martin-Löf type theory, was one of our original motivations for considering this interpretation). Nonetheless, we will give a brief, informal, and somewhat idiosyncratic introduction to Martin-Löf type theory, in order to makes sense of the above commutative diagram.

We consider this paper to be a continuation of [Hel19] and the reader should be prepared to refer to the latter. The expository first half of this paper (Parts I-II) is basically self-contained, but in the technical second half, we will rely heavily on the definitions and results from [Hel19].

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to McGill’s Logic, Category Theory, and Computation seminar and Carnegie Mellon’s Homotopy Type Theory seminar for allowing us to speak about this project at a very early stage, and to Steve Awodey for encouraging us to write it up, and also for pointing out an interesting connection between our invariance theorem and the Univalence Axiom (which was also independently observed by Ulrik Buchholtz).
1 Type theory

1.1. We begin with the classical notion of type theory – also known as “higher-order logic” – which originated in Russell’s and Whitehead’s Principia Mathematica – though we have in mind the later formulation from Lambek’s and Scott’s Higher-Order Categorical Logic [LS86], where it was related to the theory of elementary toposes.

To begin with, we put ourselves in the familiar “ZF-style” set theory – i.e., in an axiomatic theory, with two undefined notions, namely “set” and “membership”, and a collection of axioms concerning these notions, from which we derive consequences. We have in mind, of course, the axioms of ZF itself, but we also want to allow the possibility of leaving off some of the axioms, and working with only a fragment of the theory, keeping track as one proceeds of what one is actually using. In particular, we want to allow the possibility of working only within the intuitionistic fragment of first-order logic.

Now, we begin by singling out two particular sets, namely the one-element \(1\) \(= \{\ast\}\), as well as its power set \(\{x \mid x \subset 1\}\), which we denote by \(\Omega\). Next, we note that \(\Omega\) has the structure of a Heyting algebra: it has a partial order \(\le\), given by inclusion of subsets, which is a bounded lattice having “relative pseudo-complements” (also known as exponentials or implications) – i.e., for any elements \(q, r \in \Omega\), there is a least element \(s\) such that \(q \land s \le r\) – namely \(\{x \in 1 \mid x \in p \Rightarrow x \in q\}\).

Now, the point we want to emphasize is that every assertion is set theory is equivalent to one of the form \(p = q\) for some \(p, q \in \Omega\) – and in fact, one can even take \(q = 1\) – so that we can dispense with the membership relation “\(\in\)” altogether and restrict ourselves to statements of this form. In a sense, this is obvious: for any proposition \(\varphi\), we can set \(p = \{x \mid x \in 1 \land \varphi\}\), and then \(\varphi\) is equivalent to \(p = 1\).

However, we have clearly not dispensed with “\(\in\)”, as we used it in the definition of \(p\). The point is that for many propositions \(\varphi\) of actual mathematical interest (in particular, outside of set theory itself), we can define \(p\) directly with the use of a few basic operations (including the Heyting-algebra operations \(\top, \bot, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow\)), starting with a few basic elements of \(\Omega\).

In particular, most interesting elements of \(\Omega\) will arise as specific values of some predicates, i.e. functions \(X \to \Omega\) from some set \(X\). In order to specify particular predicates, let us introduce the “function abstraction” notation; given sets \(X\) and \(Y\), we have the usual set of functions

\[Y^X = \{f \mid f \subseteq X \times Y \land \forall x \exists y((x, y) \in f)\},\]

and we write \(\lambda(x : X)t\) for \(\{z \mid \exists x(x \in X \land z = (x, t))\} \in Y^X\) (where \(t\) is some expression involving \(x\) and denoting an element of \(Y\)). Next, for a predicate \(P : X \to \Omega\), let us write \(\forall P\) for \(\bigcap_{x \in X} P_x\) and \(\exists P\) for \(\bigcup_{x \in X} P_x\). Let us also write \((-) =_X (-)\) for the predicate \(X \times X \to \Omega\) taking \(a, b \in X\) to \(\{x \in 1 \mid a = b\}\).

Then, for example, we can express the predicate “\(n\) is prime” as

\[\lambda(n : \mathbb{N})\left(\forall (\lambda(d : \mathbb{N})(\exists(\lambda(e : \mathbb{N})(d \cdot e =_\mathbb{N} n)) \Rightarrow (d =_\mathbb{N} 1 \lor d =_\mathbb{N} n))\right)\]

and (now abbreviating \(\forall(x : X)t\) as \(\forall_{x : X}t\)), the principle of induction can be stated as

\[\forall_{P : \Omega^\mathbb{N}}\left(\left(P(0) \land \forall_{n : \mathbb{N}}(P(n) \Rightarrow P(n + 1))\right) \Rightarrow \forall P\right)\]  

(2)

– or rather, the principle of induction states \(p = 1\), where \(p \in \Omega\) is the element (2).

The upshot is that we obtain a very elegant and concise language for stating mathematical facts, which consists entirely of operations for forming terms of various types (i.e., elements of various sets) – in

\footnote{Of course, assuming the law of the excluded middle, \(\Omega\) is just \(\{\emptyset, 1\}\), but in general, it needn’t be.}
particular, of the set \( \Omega \) – together with the single binary relation \( "(-) = (-)" \), taking two arguments of type \( \Omega \), which we use to make assertions.

Importantly, we can use this language not only to express, but also to prove mathematical facts – thus making it in a sense self-contained – using an appropriate system of rules. For example, from \( p \Rightarrow q = 1 \) and \( p = 1 \), we can conclude \( q = 1 \). Thus, we end up being able to do much of mathematics in what is essentially a very small fragment of set theory; in particular one in which every statement is atomic – i.e. consists of a single equation \( p = q \) with no further logical connectives.

We now observe that, when something is proven within this system, one has actually proven something stronger than the corresponding fact in set theory, since the assumptions are weaker, but the conclusion is the same. For example, the assumptions made in the type theory about the sets \( \mathbb{N} \) are satisfied not only by the usual set of natural numbers, or the usual product and function-set operations, but, for example, by any sets isomorphic to these.

It would seem that this only involves an obvious and trivial generalization, since when we proved our statement in ZF, we had no doubt that it would also hold, say, with \( \mathbb{N} \) replaced by any other system \( (\mathbb{N}, 0, S) \) satisfying the Peano axioms. But there are also more surprising generalizations. In particular, if we drop the assumption that the notion of “set” (or rather, “type”) in the theory be interpreted as meaning an actual set, we find that there are interesting “non-standard” models\(^2\). In particular, we can interpret the types as denoting objects of an arbitrary elementary topos – for example, the category of sheaves on any topological space – and the terms as denoting certain morphisms.

1.2. We now move on to “Martin-Löf type theory” (or “dependent type theory”). The main point here will be that, by a variation on the above scheme, we can see that every sentence in set theory is equivalent, not only to one of the form \( "p = 1" \) with \( p \in \Omega \), but also to one of the form \( \exists x: x \in X \), so that we can dispense with the set of truth values \( \Omega \). In fact, this is again in a sense obvious, since for \( p \in \Omega \), the statement \( p = 1 \) is equivalent to \( \exists x: x \in p \) – however, again, this is not what we want, since we are still making reference to (elements of) the set \( \Omega \).

The key observation is that, for any element \( p \in \Omega \) defined using the operations on \( \Omega \) included in the type theory sketched above, one can, using just the set-forming operations \( 1, \times \) and \( (\cdot)(-) \) – as well as the empty set \( \emptyset \), disjoint union \( + \) and, most importantly, the indexed product \( \prod_{x \in X} \) and sum \( \sum_{x \in X} \) – define a set \( X \) whose inhabitedness is equivalent to that of \( p \). A concise way to explain this is to say that, under the correspondence of sets with elements of \( \Omega \) taking each set \( P \) to \( \{ z \in 1 \mid \exists y: y \in P \} \in \Omega \) – and more generally, taking any family of sets \( \{ P_x \}_{x \in X} \) to the function \( X \to \Omega; x \mapsto \{ z \in 1 \mid \exists y: y \in P_x \} \) – each of the following operations in the top row is taken the adjacent operation in the bottom row.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c}
1 & 0 & + & (\cdot)(-) & \prod_{x \in X} & \sum_{x \in X} \\
0 & \emptyset & \lor & \land & \Rightarrow & \forall_{x \in X} \\
\end{array}
\]

That this is so is seen directly by inspection. For example, given two sets \( X \) and \( Y \), we have that \( \exists z(z \in X) \land \exists z(z \in Y) \) is equivalent to \( \exists z(z \in X \times Y) \).

Actually, what we just said is only true assuming the law of the excluded middle: intuitionistically, the statement that \( Q \) or \( \prod_{x \in X} P_x \) is inhabited is stronger than the statement \( \exists x(x \in Q) \) or \( \forall x \in X \exists y(y \in P_x) \). However, this is not necessarily a disadvantage; it simply means that one is forced in dependent type theory to prove stronger statements than one normally would.

This correspondence between set-building operations and logical operations has a complicated history (involving Kleene’s notion of realizability, Gödel’s “Dialectica interpretation”, and the “Curry-Howard

\(^2\)We are using “non-standard” in a somewhat non-standard way.

\(^3\)I.e., “\( X \) is inhabited”. Assuming the law of the excluded middle, this is equivalent to \( X \neq \emptyset \).
isomorphism" – see [Tro91] for a detailed account), but originates in the "BHK" (Brouwer-Heyting-Kolmogorov) interpretation of intuitionistic logic, and was given the above, simple, set-theoretic formulation by Läuchli [Läu70].

Hence, by using a type theory – that is, a formal system which allows the construction of types and of elements of these types – which includes the above type-forming operations, and which has in addition the single unary relation $\exists x : x \in X$ (with $X$ a type), one can express everything that was expressible in the above type theory using the type $\Omega$ of truth values\footnote{This is a drastic oversimplification. Though we can reproduce all the logical operations, we still do not have the set $\Omega$ itself; hence, for example, we cannot express the induction principle as stated in (2) above. It is a non-trivial empirical fact that one can still reproduce mathematics in this a priori restricted context – though this does almost immediately require the introduction of universe types, which to some extent serve as a substitute for $\Omega$.}. Actually, in dependent type theory, one does not have the unary relation $\exists x : x \in X$, but only the binary relation $x \in X$ (with $x$ an element and $X$ a type), usually written $x : X$ – thus, instead of proving the statement, $\exists x : x \in X$, one just constructs a particular term $t$ for which $t : X$ holds.

This may seem to undermine what we set out to do – namely, dispense with the membership relation "$\in$" – since now we have reintroduced it. In fact, in dependent type theory, we also need an equality relation between terms and between types, so that we seem not to have eliminated anything! The point is that, as with the type theory from the previous section, the important thing is that everything is now expressed by atomic formulas $x : y$ or $x = y$, with no need for further logical connectives.

In order to generate sets representing propositions of mathematical interest, we need sets corresponding to atomic formulas – i.e., equalities. Thus, for each type $A$ in the type theory, and each pair of terms $s, t : A$, we introduce a type $s =_A t$ denoting the $(X \times X)$-indexed family of sets $\{ \{z \in 1 \mid x = y\} \}_{x, y \in X}$, where $X$ is the set denoted by $\tilde{A}$.

We are now in a position to describe the vertical arrow in (1) – i.e., the interpretation of first-order logic into dependent type theory; here, we consider the case of first-order logic with equality, but in which there are no other relation symbols. Given a (possibly multi-sorted) first-order signature $\sigma$ – i.e., a set $\text{Ob} \sigma$ of “sorts”, and a (possibly empty) set $\sigma(\tilde{A}, B)$ of “function symbols” with “arity” $\tilde{A}$ and “codomain sort” $B$, where $\tilde{A}$ is a finite sequence of sorts, and $B$ is a sort – we consider dependent type theory augmented with a type constant $[A]$ for each sort $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, and a term-constant $f$ of type $[A_1] \times \cdots \times [A_n] \to [B]$ for each $f \in \sigma(\tilde{A}, B)$.

There is then an obvious, recursively defined assignment, taking each term $t$ of $\sigma$ of sort $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$ to a term $[t]$ in dependent type theory of type $[A]$. Then, we can recursively assign to each formula $\varphi$ of $\sigma$ a type $[\varphi]$ of dependent type theory. In particular, an atomic formula $s = t$ (with $s$ and $t$ terms of some sort $A$) is interpreted as the equality type $[s] =_{[A]} [t]$; and to interpret formulas built up using the logical connectives, we use the correspondence displayed in (3) – for example, $\varphi \land \psi$ is interpreted as $[\varphi] \times [\psi]$.

Now, the fundamental fact about this interpretation, which was proven in [ML98], is that it is sound, in the sense that for any formula $\varphi$ of $L$ which is intuitionistically valid, there exists a term $t$ in dependent type theory with $t : [\varphi]$.

1.3. Now, as was the case with the first type theory we described, there are interesting interpretations of dependent type theory besides the obvious set-theoretic one that we used to motivate it. Namely,
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again, it can be interpreted into any elementary topos – and more generally, any so-called \textit{locally cartesian closed category with finite coproducts} [See84, Hof95] – $\mathbf{C}$ by interpreting the types and terms as certain objects and morphisms of $\mathbf{C}$ (to be more precise, of the various slice categories $\mathbf{C}/X$).

But with dependent type theory, there is yet another new and very interesting interpretation whose discovery initiated the subject of Homotopy Type Theory; namely, when interpreting it into certain categories (for example, the category of simplicial sets, which is in fact a topos), one can interpret the \textit{equality types} in a non-standard way.

Now, we have not actually said anything about the \textit{rules} of dependent type theory, which are quite interesting, and to some extent surprising, in their own right. In particular, the rules governing the use of the equality type are such that they bear a certain similarity to properties of path-spaces in homotopy theory, and it is this similarity which is exploited in the homotopy-theoretic interpretation.

However, even without going into the details of the rules of dependent type theory, this re-interpretation of equality can be motivated as follows. In the obvious, set-theoretic interpretation described above, we took the equality type $s =_A t$ to be a set containing at most one element. However, it is natural to ask whether there are also interpretations in which the sets $s =_A t$ can have more than one element (i.e., in which $s$ and $t$ can be equal “in different ways”).

In fact, this question has a counterpart within the type theory itself – known as the UIP (“uniqueness of identity proofs”) principle: is it the case that for any two terms $e, e' : s =_A t$, there exists a term of type $e =_{s =_A t} e'$? In [HS98], this question is given a negative answer by defining an interpretation of dependent type theory in \textit{groupoids}, so that a type $A$ is interpreted as a groupoid $X$, terms $s, t : A$ as objects $x, y \in \text{Ob} X$, and the equality type $s =_A t$ as the discrete groupoid (i.e., set) $\text{Hom}_X(x, y)$. At the end of that paper, they also remark that, under this interpretation, although the equality types $s =_A t$ can have more than one element, the “iterated” equality types $e =_{s =_A t} e'$ can still only have at most one. They therefore suggest looking for interpretations in which all the “iterated” equality types can have more than one element by considering \textit{higher-dimensional groupoids}.

We do not want to delve into the complicated and fascinating story of higher-dimensional categories here. We mention only that one of the driving ideas in this subject has been the connection, known as the “homotopy hypothesis”, drawn by Grothendieck (in [Gro83]) between higher-category theory and homotopy theory. Specifically, the idea is that the notion of “infinite-dimensional groupoid” (whatever that may mean) should in some sense be equivalent to that of “homotopy type” (i.e., topological space up to homotopy-equivalence). The analogy begins with the construction of the \textit{fundamental groupoid} $\Pi(X)$ of a topological space, whose objects are the points of $X$ and whose morphisms $p \to q$ are homotopy classes of paths from $p$ to $q$, composition being given by concatenation of paths. But now, in an infinite-dimensional groupoid, the morphisms between two objects should form not a \textit{set}, but \textit{another infinite-dimensional groupoid}. Similarly, while the \textit{homotopy-classes} of paths between two points in a space naturally form a \textit{set}, the collection of all paths naturally form \textit{another topological space}. Thus the suggestion is that, by iteratively considering points, paths, paths between paths, and so on, one should be able to build an infinite-dimensional groupoid from each topological space, and that every infinite-dimensional groupoid should arise this way.

Now, without worrying about whether such a correspondence can actually be established, one can just go ahead and define an interpretation of dependent type theory into topological spaces (or rather – since the category of topological spaces is not locally cartesian closed – into simplicial sets) in such a way that the equality types are interpreted as path-spaces. This is precisely what was carried out in the horizontal arrow in (1).

This ends our description of the vertical and horizontal arrows in (1). From this, it is easy to see what the diagonal arrow should do. Namely, it should interpret each \textit{sort} of the given first-order language as a \textit{space}, and then interpret each \textit{formula} as another space, with equality being interpreted as a
path space, and with other formulas being interpreted according to the analogues in the category of simplicial sets of the set-theoretic operations in (3). However, we will now “start over”, and explain the homotopical semantics for first-order logic directly.

Before we do that, we mention an important caveat, namely that in composing with the vertical arrow in (1), much expressivity is lost. That is, there are many interesting homotopy-theoretic properties of spaces which can be expressed in dependent type theory (to give one example: that of being n-connected for each n), but which cannot be expressed in first-order logic. In fact, first-order logic is very limited in this respect (we discuss this further in §19), though some important properties are still expressible, such as contractibility or path-connectedness (see §18).

2 Propositions as sets

We now explain directly how to define the homotopical semantics for first-order logic. To do this, we will first explain an analogous, but simpler, semantics, in which formulas are interpreted not as spaces but rater as sets. This corresponds, in the type-theoretic formulation of the semantics given above, to replacing the horizontal arrow in (1) with the obvious, set-theoretic interpretation of type theory.

As we mentioned in §1.2, our starting point for the homotopical semantics is the BHK interpretation of intuitionistic logic, the general idea of which is that the meaning of a proposition φ is given by explaining what it takes to prove φ – or, put another way, by describing the set of proofs of φ. Each logical connective then corresponds to an operation on sets, when applied to the set of proofs of the constituent propositions, yields the set of proofs of the resulting proposition.

The easiest way to make this into a concrete mathematical definition, essentially due to Läuchli [Läu70], is as follows. Let us again, as in §1.2, fix some signature σ, and let us also fix some σ-structure M – i.e., a set M(A) for each A ∈ Ob σ and functions M(f) : M(A_1)×⋯×M(A_n) → M(B) for each f ∈ σ(Ā,B).

To each closed formula φ over σ, we wish to assign a certain set τ(φ) (the set of “abstract proofs” of the formula). More generally, to a formula φ with free variables x_1,…,x_n of sorts A_1,…,A_n, we wish to assign a family of sets τ(φ)[a_1,…,a_n], indexed by elements a_1 ∈ M(A_1),…,a_n ∈ M(A_n).

The definition is given by induction on the complexity of φ as follows (where we omit the indices [a_1,…,a_n] when they are the same in all instance of τ appearing on one line):

\[ τ(\top) = 1 \]
\[ τ(\bot) = \emptyset \]
\[ τ(φ ∧ ψ) = τ(φ) × τ(ψ) \]
\[ τ(φ ∨ ψ) = τ(φ) + τ(ψ) \]
\[ τ(φ → ψ) = τ(ψ)^{τ(φ)} \]
\[ τ(∀x_n)φ → [a_1,…,a_{n-1}] = \prod_{a_n ∈ M(A_n)} τ(φ)[a_1,…,a_n] \]
\[ τ(∃x_n)φ → [a_1,…,a_{n-1}] = \prod_{a_n ∈ M(A_n)} τ(φ)[a_1,…,a_n] \]

Note that we are including the atomic formulas ⊤, ⊥ (“true” and “false”) as part of first-order logic, and omitting negation, which we define as φ → ⊥. As in §1.2, 1 denotes some fixed one-element set, + denotes disjoint union, Y^X denotes the set of functions from X to Y, and \prod and \coprod denote indexed product and indexed disjoint union.

It remains to define the set τ(s = t)[a_1,…,a_n], where s and t are terms over the signature of the same sort A. Here, we note that, in the usual way, s and t can be interpreted as some elements M(s)[a_1,…,a_n], M(t)[a_1,…,a_n] ∈ M(A), and we then define τ(s = t)[a_1,…,a_n] to be 1 if M(s)[a_1,…,a_n] = M(t)[a_1,…,a_n], and \emptyset otherwise.
Now, the main observation (which is proven easily by induction) is that a formula is satisfied in the structure $M$ (with respect to an interpretation of its free variables) in the usual (Tarskian) sense if and only if the corresponding set of “abstract proofs” is non-empty.

It may come somewhat as a surprise that this interpretation is equivalent to the classical one – in particular, that it satisfies the law of the excluded middle – given that it is supposed to implement an interpretation for intuitionistic logic. In fact, what Läuchli defined was a variation on what we have described, and is in fact sound and complete for intuitionistic predicate logic.

We would also like to emphasize that, though this interpretation is equivalent to the classical one in terms of which formulas it designates as true, it is still interesting. We give an example. Let $\varphi$ be the sentence

$$\forall m, n \exists k, l (k \cdot d = m \land l \cdot d = n)$$

in the usual language of arithmetic (“every pair of numbers has a greatest common divisor”), and consider its interpretation $\tau(\varphi)$ in the standard model. By carrying out the definitions, one easily sees that the set $\tau(\varphi)$ is isomorphic to

$$\{ f \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}} \mid \forall m, n (f(m, n) \text{ divides } m, n)\}.$$ 

Now, we know this set is inhabited, since $\varphi$ is true; indeed, given $m$ and $n$ we could take $d$ to be their greatest common divisor – or, alternatively, take $d = 1$. Note that, each of these proofs of $\varphi$ gives an element of $\tau(\varphi)$ – namely, the functions $f(m, n) = \gcd(m, n)$ and $f(m, n) = 1$. Indeed, one can refine this interpretation so as to give for each proof (in some formal system) of a given formula $\varphi$, an element of the set $\tau(\varphi)$. In fact, such a refinement is an automatic byproduct of the fibrational formulation of the semantics which we give later on (see Part II).

$\section{Propositions as objects of C}$

The idea for the homotopical semantics is to repeat the above definition but replace “set” with “space”. Here, we will take space to mean simplicial set; in order to handle topological structures, we can first apply the singular simplicial set functor Sing : Top $\rightarrow$ sSet, and then proceed as below.

In fact, at this stage, the choice of simplicial sets is (almost) immaterial; objects in any sufficiently nice category will do.

There is a well-known way, due to Lawvere, of interpreting a first-order signature $\sigma$ into any category $C$ with finite products (see Definition 16.4 below). Given such an interpretation $M$ with associated objects $M(A)$ for $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, we then want to associate to each closed formula over this signature, not a set, but an object of $C$. And more generally, to each formula with free variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of sorts $A_1, \ldots, A_n$, we want, rather than a family of sets indexed by $M(A_1) \times \cdots \times M(A_n)$, an arrow in $C$ with codomain $M(A_1) \times \cdots \times M(A_n)$.

We now proceed to define the interpretation of formulas in the same way as we did before, by generalizing each of the operations in (4) from sets to objects in an arbitrary (sufficiently nice) category.

In the clauses for “$\wedge$” and “$\lor$”, the operations are “indexwise product or disjoint sum of two indexed families of sets”. Here, we recall that a family of sets indexed by $I$ is the same as an object of the slice category $\text{Set}/I$; and it is then seen that these operations are just given by the categorical product and coproduct in $\text{Set}/I$. Similarly, the operation for “$\Rightarrow$”; namely, “indexwise set of functions” is given by the exponential objects (Definition 9.2) in this category.

As for the quantifiers, the associated operations take a family indexed by a product of sets $I \times J$, and give the product or disjoint sum over (say) the second factor, returning a family indexed by $I$. Hence, these should be described by functors $\text{Set}/(I \times J) \rightarrow \text{Set}/I$. In fact, we have natural functors
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\[ \text{Set}/I \to \text{Set}(I \times J), \text{taking} \ p : X \to I \text{ to} \ p \times 1_J : X \times J \to I \times J, \text{and the functors in question turn out to be the right and left adjoints to this functor.} \]

We conclude that we can carry out our definition of “Propositions-as-objects-of-\( C \)” whenever: \( C \) has finite products; each slice \( C/I \) has finite products, coproducts, and exponentials; and each of the functors \( (\_ \times 1_J) : C/I \to C/(I \times J) \) has a left and right adjoint. These are precisely the so-called “locally cartesian closed categories with finite coproducts” (\( \text{sSet} \) is such a category; \( \text{Top} \) is not).

Actually, there is an important part of the “Propositions-as-sets” definition that we have yet to treat for a general category \( C \) – namely, the interpretation of equality. The categorical description of this is as follows. For a given set \( X \), the \( (X \times X) \)-indexed family of sets

\[
\text{Id}^X_{ab} = \begin{cases} 1 & a = b \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

is given by the diagonal map \( \Delta_X : X \to X \times X \); hence, taking \( X = M(A) \), this is the interpretation of the formula \( x = y \) (with \( x, y \) variables of sort \( A \)). In general, if the terms \( s \) and \( t \) have free variables \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), then \( s = t \) should be interpreted as a family \( X \to M(\vec{A}) \) (where we write \( M(\vec{A}) \) for \( M(A_1) \times \cdots M(A_n) \), with \( n \) the length of \( \vec{A} \)); it is given by the following pullback.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M(\vec{A}) \times_{M(\vec{A}) \times M(\vec{A})} M(\vec{A}) & \longrightarrow & M(\vec{A}) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \Delta_{M(\vec{A})} \\
M(\vec{A}) & \longrightarrow & M(\vec{A}) \times M(\vec{A})
\end{array}
\]

Since any locally cartesian closed category \( C \) has diagonal maps and pullbacks, we see that we can interpret equality in \( C \) as well.

4 Homotopical semantics

\textit{However, for the homotopical semantics, this is not how we want to interpret equality!} Indeed, the whole point of the homotopical semantics is that we want to interpret equality as the \textit{space of paths}. Hence, for the homotopical semantics in \( \text{sSet} \), we interpret all the logical connectives as above, but we change the interpretation of equality; this is the first place where we really need to use simplicial sets (or some similar category of “spaces”) and not an arbitrary locally cartesian closed category with finite coproducts.

The one additional fact that we need about simplicial sets is that for each simplicial set \( A \), there is another one \( A^I \) – the “path-space of \( X \)” – which comes with a natural map \( A^I \to A \times A \). Hence, to interpret equality, we repeat the construction (5), but replace \( \Delta : A \to A \times A \) with this map \( A^I \to A \times A \).

This completes the definition of the homotopical semantics.

In analogy to the set-based version, we say that a closed formula is \textit{true} under the homotopical semantics if the associated simplicial set is non-empty. We also reiterate that, given a structure for our signature in the category of topological spaces, we can apply the singular simplicial set functor \( \text{Sing} : \text{Top} \to \text{sSet} \) and, since this functor preserves finite products, obtain a structure in \( \text{sSet} \). The interpretation of formulas with respect to this structure in \( \text{Top} \) is then defined to be the interpretation with respect to the resulting structure in \( \text{sSet} \).

\footnote{This interpretation of logic in a locally cartesian closed category has also been considered E. Palmgren \cite{Pal04}.}
5 Basic properties; invariance

Having defined the homotopical semantics, we would now like to be able to say something about it.

The first, most obvious question is whether it is sound; i.e., is it the case that every closed formula which is deducible by the usual rules of first-order logic with equality is true under the homotopical semantics in every structure? The answer to this is yes, provided we restrict ourselves to intuitionistic first-order logic. This will follow more or less automatically from the fibrational formulation which we introduce below. That the semantics are not sound with respect to classical logic (i.e., the law of the excluded middle) will be shown in §18.

We next want to consider the question of homotopy invariance, which will be our chief occupation for most of the remainder of this paper. We first consider the analogous question – namely isomorphism-invariance – in the classical case. An easy and well-known property of the classical semantics for first-order logic is that any two isomorphic structures satisfy the same closed formulas; more generally, if a formula has free-variables \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\), and these are interpreted as elements \(a_1, \ldots, a_n\) in one structure and as corresponding \((\text{under the isomorphism})\) elements \(b_1, \ldots, b_n\) in the second structure, then the resulting truth values are the same. This is one justification of the intuitive idea that isomorphic structures have “all the same properties”. One proves this by an induction on the complexity of the formula.

We next consider the “propositions-as-sets” semantics defined above in §2. Here, we can ask for a slightly stronger property; namely that, given two isomorphic structures, the two sets associated to any closed formula are isomorphic (and an obvious analogous property for general formulas). Again, this is easily proved by induction on the complexity of the formula.

Now for the homotopical semantics, we consider homotopy-equivalence of structures – i.e., a homotopy-equivalence between the underlying spaces of the structures (say, \(h_A : M(A) \rightleftharpoons N(A) : k_A\)) such that, for the interpretations \(M(f) : M(\vec{A}) \to M(B)\) and \(N(f) : N(\vec{A}) \to N(B)\) of each operation in the signature, the squares

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M(\vec{A}) & \xrightarrow{h_{\vec{A}}} & N(\vec{A}) \\
M(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow N(f) \\
M(B) & \xrightarrow{h} & N(B) \\
\end{array}
\quad \quad \quad 
\begin{array}{ccc}
N(\vec{A}) & \xleftarrow{k_{\vec{A}}} & M(\vec{A}) \\
N(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow M(f) \\
N(B) & \xleftarrow{k} & M(B) \\
\end{array}
\]

commute up to homotopy (where \(h_{\vec{A}}\) is short for \(h_{A_1} \times \cdots \times h_{A_n}\) and similarly with \(k_{\vec{A}}\)). In case these are topological structures, “homotopy” and “homotopy-equivalence” are to be understood in the usual way. In the case of simplicial sets, there is again a notion of homotopy and (hence) of homotopy-equivalence, and this is what is meant.

Now, the property we would like to hold is that, in this situation, every closed formula has the same truth value with respect to the two structures\(^7\). Next, the natural statement corresponding to the above invariance property for the propositions-as-sets semantics is that the two simplicial sets associated to any closed formula with respect to the two structures are homotopy-equivalent (rather than isomorphic). The statement for general formulas is as follows. Such a formula is interpreted with respect to the two structures as morphisms \(x : X \to M(\vec{A})\) and \(y : Y \to N(\vec{A})\), respectively; we then demand that there be a homotopy-equivalence \(X \simeq Y\) over the homotopy-equivalence \(h : M(\vec{A}) \rightleftharpoons N(\vec{A}) : k\) – i.e., that there be a homotopy-equivalence \(p : X \rightleftharpoons Y : q\), with associated homotopies \(X \times I \to X\) and

\(^7\)Actually, this will not hold without further (fairly mild) assumptions; for example, that the topological spaces are homotopy-equivalent to CW-complexes, or that the simplicial sets are Kan complexes.
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\[ Y \times I \to Y \] making the following squares (strictly) commute.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
X & \xrightarrow{p} & Y & \quad & X \times I & \xrightarrow{h} & X \\
\downarrow{x} & & \downarrow{y} & \quad & \downarrow{x \times 1_I} & & \downarrow{y} \\
M(\vec{A}) & \xrightarrow{f} & N(\vec{A}) & \quad & M(\vec{A}) \times I & \xrightarrow{M(\vec{A}) \times 1_I} & N(\vec{A}) \\
\end{array}
\]

(where the bottom vertical maps in the last two diagrams are the homotopies associated to the homotopy-equivalence \( h : M(\vec{A}) \Rightarrow N(\vec{A}) \)).

We note that this homotopy-invariance property is a generalization of certain familiar facts from algebraic topology, such as that any continuous binary operation on a space which is homotopy-equivalent to a topological group is (not necessarily associative but) homotopy associative. This follows from the above general homotopy-invariance property since a binary operation on a space is homotopy-associative if and only if it satisfies (under the homotopical semantics) the sentence

\[ \forall x, y, z \ ((x \cdot y) \cdot z) = (x \cdot (y \cdot z)) \]

(see \S 18). In fact, this notion of “homotopy-invariant algebraic structures” is the beginning of a large and interesting story which plays a central role in modern homotopy theory (see, for example, [BV73, Vog99, Lur17]).

In \S 18, we will give more examples of sentences and their interpretations under the homotopical semantics.

II Fibrational formulation of the homotopical semantics

We now introduce the “algebraic” or “functorial” (or “fibrational”) presentation of the homotopical semantics. Let us first review the idea of functorial semantics in general (see [MR12] for a thorough history of these and related ideas).

Schematically, we might represent the general idea of semantics as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Language} \\
\xrightarrow{\text{Semantics}} \\
\text{The Universe}
\end{array}
\]

That is, we assign to each linguistic entity some other (not necessarily linguistic) entity, in some consistent manner. Now, Lawvere’s idea of “functorial semantics” [Law04] consists roughly in replacing each element of the above scheme as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Some category} \\
\xrightarrow{\text{Some functor}} \\
\text{Some other category (probably Set)}
\end{array}
\]

That is, the linguistic entities are gathered together into some categorical structure, the universe is gathered together into some other structure (somewhat miraculously, of the same kind), and then the semantics is mediated by a structure preserving map from the first structure to the second.

6 Propositional logic

The simplest instance of this setup – which long predated Lawvere – arises in the case of propositional logic, in which very special kinds of categories come into play, namely Boolean (or – in the case of intuitionistic logic – Heyting) algebras. Here, given some set \( \Sigma \) of propositional atoms, we take the category on the left of (6) to be the “Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra” \( B_\Sigma \) associated to \( \Sigma \): the elements are equivalence classes propositions built (using \( \top, \bot, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow \)) from the elements of \( \Sigma \), in which \( P \leq Q \) if and only if \( Q \) is derivable from \( P \) by the rules of propositional logic.
The category on the right of (6) is then traditionally taken to be the 2-element Boolean algebra $2$, and the functor is taken to be an arbitrary homomorphism of Boolean algebras.

6.1. Freeness. What we want to emphasize here is that the Boolean (or Heyting) algebra $B_\Sigma$ is free on $\Sigma$: there is a natural inclusion $\Sigma \hookrightarrow B_\Sigma$ from $\Sigma$ into the underlying set of $B_\Sigma$, such that any map $\Sigma \rightarrow B$ from $\Sigma$ to the underlying set of some Boolean (or Heyting) algebra admits a unique extension to a homomorphism $B_\Sigma \rightarrow B$ of Boolean (or Heyting) algebras. In particular, any map $\Sigma \rightarrow 2$ – i.e., an “assignment of truth values” – extends uniquely to a homomorphism $B_\Sigma$ – this is “evaluation by truth tables”.

6.2. Propositions as sets. Above, we used that a Heyting algebra – being by definition a poset satisfying certain conditions – is in particular a category. We now observe that the conditions that a poset needs to satisfy to be a Heyting algebra are all such that they make sense for arbitrary categories and not just for posets (for example, the existence of finite meets and joins is the same as the existence of finite products and coproducts). Hence, we can consider the notion of a non-posetal Heyting algebra, defined so that a Heyting algebra is precisely a non-posetal Heyting algebra which is also a poset.

In particular, instead of the free Heyting algebra $B_\Sigma$ considered above, we can consider the free non-posetal Heyting algebra $C_\Sigma$ – i.e., a non-posetal Heyting algebra admitting a map $\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Ob } \Sigma$ having the same universal property as above, but with respect to morphisms of free non-posetal Heyting algebras. This is Lambek’s “category of proofs” (see [HM92]), so called because the morphisms $P \rightarrow Q$ can be interpreted as (equivalence classes) of proofs of $Q$ from $P$.

If we now take $2$ on the right side of (6) as before, we obtain the same notion of semantics, since every morphism $C_\Sigma \rightarrow 2$ of non-posetal Heyting algebras factors through $B_\Sigma$ (which is the “posetal reflection” of $C_\Sigma$ – the poset obtained by identifying any two parallel morphisms). However, we can now put other non-posetal Heyting algebras on the right of (6) – for instance $\text{Set}$. Doing this, we recover the “propositions-as-sets” semantics for propositional logic: a map $\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Ob } \text{Set}$ assigns to each atomic proposition $P$ a set – to be thought of as the set of “primitive proofs” of $P$ – and then the induced functor $C_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Set}$ associates to each proposition a set according to the rules in (4) on p. 7.

6.3. Invariance. We can now obtain a “baby” version of the isomorphism invariance property (see §5), but one whose proof will serve as a template for proofs of similar properties below. Namely, one can show that $C_\Sigma$ actually satisfies a stronger (“2-categorical”) universal property than the one which defines it.

Namely, the defining universal property says that the map $\text{Ob } \text{HAFun}(C_\Sigma, D) \rightarrow \text{Ob } \text{Fun}(\Sigma, D)$ obtained by composing with the functor $\Sigma \hookrightarrow C_\Sigma$ is a bijection, where $\text{Fun}$ denotes the usual functor category. $\text{HAFun}$ denotes the full subcategory thereof on the morphisms of non-posetal Heyting algebras, and where the set $\Sigma$ is considered as a discrete category. But what is also true is that the functor $\text{HAFun}(C_\sigma, D)^{\text{iso}} \rightarrow \text{Fun}(\Sigma, D)^{\text{iso}}$ is an isomorphism of categories, where $(\cdot)^{\text{iso}}$ denotes the “maximal subgroupoid” – the subcategory containing only the isomorphisms.

In particular, any (pointwise) isomorphism between assignments $M, M' : \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Set}$ of sets to atomic propositions induces a natural isomorphism between the induced functors $M, M' : C_\Sigma \rightarrow \text{Set}$ – thus the objects $M(P)$ and $M'(P)$ are isomorphic for every proposition $P$.

Of course, this isomorphism-invariance is easy to prove directly by induction, but the point is that we now have a more conceptual proof, which we can generalize.

7 Predicate logic

We now ask: if Heyting algebras were the appropriate kinds of structures to use in the scheme (6) in order to describe the semantics for propositional logic, what are the structures appropriate to the semantics for predicate logic?
There are different possible answers to this question (again, we refer the interested reader to [MR12]), but the one which will be relevant for us is given by Lawvere’s notion of hyperdoctrine\(^8\) [Law06, Law70]. This involves Grothendieck fibrations (see [Hel19, §2]). Given a (possibly multi-sorted) algebraic signature \(\sigma\), we associate to it a fibration \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\) (roughly) as follows (we describe this in detail in the appendix). The base category \(\mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\) is the finite product category associated by Lawvere to (the empty theory over) this signature: the objects are “contexts” – i.e., finite sequences of sorts of \(\sigma\) – and the morphisms are given by sequences of terms of \(\sigma\). The objects of \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma}\) are first-order formulas over \(\sigma\), and in particular, the fiber \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma} \hat{\mathcal{A}}\) over a context \(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\) is a Heyting algebra, whose objects are formulas with free variables in the context \(\hat{\mathcal{A}}\), and with the ordering given by intuitionistically provable implication of formulas.

7.1. Propositions as sets. The “universe” in (6) is now given by the “subobject fibration” \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Set}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Set}\) (see [Mak93a, p. 349]), in which the fiber \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Set})^\mathcal{A}\) over a set \(\mathcal{A}\) is the power set \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})\). This fibration has the same kind of structure as \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma}\) – namely, it is an \(h^=\)-fibration (Definition 9.5) – and the arrow in (6) is now given by a morphism of \(h^=\)-fibrations \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Set})\) (Definition 9.6). In particular, such a morphism associates to each sort of \(\sigma\) a set, and to each formula \(\varphi\) with free variables \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) a subset of the set \(A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n\) (the “set of elements satisfying \(\varphi\)”), where \(A_i\) is the set associated to the sort of \(x_i\). Moreover, this gives the correct interpretation of the formulas, since each of the logical connectives is given by a certain operation in \(\mathcal{F}orm_{\sigma}\) (or better, is characterized by a certain universal property), the corresponding operations in \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Set})\) are given by the usual ones used to interpret the logical connectives (intersection, union, etc.), and a morphism of \(h^=\)-fibrations by definition preserves these operations.

As in §6.2, we again have a “non-posetal” version \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\), in which the fibers of \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma}\) have the same objects as before, but are now non-posetal Heyting algebras (the morphisms between two formulas \(\varphi\) and \(\psi\) being equivalence classes of proofs of \(\psi\) from \(\varphi\)). Again as in §6.2, if we keep the same fibration \(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Set})\) on the right-hand side of (6), we obtain the same semantics. But if we instead take the “codomain fibration” \(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Set}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Set}\) (see [Hel19, §12]), we now recover the “proposition-as-sets” semantics from §2. Indeed, in this case, a morphism \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Set})\) assigns to each formula over \(\sigma\) with free variables \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\) a map with codomain the corresponding product \(A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n\) – i.e., a family of sets over \(A \times \cdots \times A_n\) – and the formulas are interpreted correctly for the same reason as above.

7.2. Freeness. Again, the important feature of the fibration \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma}\) is that it is free, in fact in two senses. Firstly, the f.p. (finite product) category \(\mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\) admits an interpretation of the algebraic signature \(\sigma\) (in the sense of Definition 16.4), and it is the initial such f.p. category, in the sense that any other interpretation of \(\sigma\) into an f.p. category \(\mathcal{C}\) is obtained by composing the interpretation of \(\sigma\) into \(\mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\) with a unique (up to isomorphism) f.p. functor from \(\mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\). Secondly, \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma}\) is the free \(h^=\)-fibration over \(\mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma}\) (Definition 15.4), i.e., given any \(h^=\)-fibration \(\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\) and an f.p. functor \(M : \mathcal{Tm}_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}\) there is a unique (up to isomorphism) functor \(\hat{M} : \mathcal{P}f_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}\) such that \((M, \hat{M})\) is a morphism of \(h^=\)-fibrations \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\). Combining these two freeness properties, we have that any interpretation of \(\sigma\) into \(\mathcal{Set}\) gives rise to a unique (up to isomorphism) morphism \(\mathcal{P}f_{\sigma} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{Set})\) of \(h^=\) fibrations.

---

\(^8\)More specifically, we use the “first-order” variant of the notion of hyperdoctrine. These are simply called “hyperdoctrines” in [See83]. The special case of the notion in which the fibers are preorders is called “first-order hyperdoctrines” in [Pit89] and “first-order fibrations” in [Jac99]. In [Mak93a], they are called “\(h^=\)-fibrations” (short for “Heyting fibration”), which is also the name we use. We also use the corresponding name \(h^=\)-fibration for the version with equality, though note that in this case our definition (Definition 9.5) differs from that in [Mak93a], as we demand only finite products and not all finite limits in the base category.
7.3. Isomorphism invariance. We now come again to the question of isomorphism invariance. This will again result from our free structure having an additional, stronger universal property. Firstly, the interpretations of \( \sigma \) into a finite product category \( D \) are the objects of a category \( \text{Int}(\sigma, D) \), in which the morphisms are homomorphisms of \( \sigma \)-structures in \( D \). The freeness property of \( \text{Tm}_\sigma \) mentioned above is that the functor \( \text{FPFun}(\text{Tm}_\sigma, D) \to \text{Int}(\sigma, D) \) (where \( \text{FPFun} \) is the category of f.p. functors) induced by composing with the canonical interpretation of \( \sigma \) into \( \text{Tm}_\sigma \) is surjective on objects and “essentially injective” – i.e., any two objects with the same image are isomorphic. However, it is in fact an equivalence of categories.

The second freeness property of \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) mentioned above amounts to saying that the restriction functor \( h^= \text{Mor}(\text{Pf}_\sigma, \mathcal{D}) \to \text{FPFun}(\text{Tm}_\sigma, B) \) (where \( h^= \text{Mor} \) denotes the category of morphisms of \( h^= \)-fibrations) is surjective on objects and “essentially injective”. Again, we have the stronger property that the induced functor \( h^= \text{Mor}(\text{Pf}_\sigma, \mathcal{D})^{\text{iso}} \to \text{FPFun}(\text{Tm}_\sigma, B)^{\text{iso}} \) is in fact an equivalence of categories.\(^9\)

Combining these two freeness properties immediately yields the isomorphism-invariance property for the proposition-as-sets semantics. Indeed, they imply that any isomorphism of \( \sigma \)-structures – i.e., of objects in \( \text{Int}(\sigma, \text{Set}) \) – yields an isomorphism between the induced functors \( \text{Tm}_\sigma \to \text{Set} \), and an induced isomorphism between the induced functors \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \to \text{Set} \) lying over this. Unwinding the definitions, this amounts precisely to the desired isomorphism-invariance property.

We note that, in the above proof of isomorphism-invariance, the only thing we needed to know about the fibration \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) was this (strengthened) freeness property. In this sense – and since moreover the universal property (even the weaker one) determines \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) up to equivalence – the precise description of \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) is not really important. However, in order to know that such a fibration in fact exists – and moreover, that the above “abstract” isomorphism-invariance proof really implies the actual isomorphism-invariance property for the propositions-as-sets semantics – we must explicitly construct the fibration \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) along the lines sketched above, and show that it has the desired universal property (this we do in the appendix).

8 Homotopical semantics

Having seen the general setup of the “fibrational semantics”, the path toward adapting it to our homotopical semantics should be clear: simply replace the “target” fibration \( \mathcal{F}(\text{Set}) \) with one that is suitable to our purposes.

The most obvious choice would be \( \mathcal{F}(\text{Top}) \) – or rather, \( \mathcal{F}(\text{sSet}) \), since the former is not an \( h^= \)-fibration, while the latter is (since \( \text{sSet} \) is a locally cartesian closed category with finite coproducts – see Proposition 9.15). As was the case in §4, this “almost” does the right thing, but not quite: the interpretation of equality is wrong.

In an \( h^= \)-fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \), the equality object \( \text{Eq}_B \in \mathcal{C}^{B \times B} \) associated to an object \( B \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B} \) is described by a certain universal property (see [Hel19, §5]). In a codomain fibration \( \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C}) \), this is satisfied by the diagonal morphism \( (\Delta : B \to B \times B) \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})^{B \times B} \). As in §4, the consequence of this is that, in the resulting semantics, equality is interpreted as “identity”, and not “existence of a path”. Hence it seems, at first sight, that the framework of fibrational semantics, as it stands, will not serve our purposes. Fortunately, however, we can fix the situation by suitably modifying the fibration \( \mathcal{F}(\text{sSet}) \).

We recall that our desired equality object \( \text{Eq}_B \) is the path space \( B^I \to B \times B \). Since this is not (in general) isomorphic to the diagonal \( \Delta_B \), it cannot itself be an equality object. However, as we explain in [Hel19, p.32] – and this is, in a sense, the fact at the heart of this work, and of Homotopy Type

\(^9\)The need to restrict to isomorphisms comes from the fact that not every morphism of structures is an “elementary embedding” – i.e., preserves all logic formulas.
First-order homotopical logic

Theory – it is “almost” an equality object. The “almost” is because the universal property is only satisfied, in some sense, “up to homotopy”. We might therefore try to coerce the path space into having the desired universal property by “modding out by homotopy”.

Indeed, in [Hel19], we show that for any right-proper model category $C$ (of which $\text{Top}$ and $s\text{Set}$ are both examples), the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C_t) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C_t)$, obtained by passing to the homotopy category of each fiber in $\mathcal{F}(C)$ and restricting to the fibrant objects, is a “$\wedge$-fibration”, and in §§11 and 12 below, we show that it is in fact an $h^\wedge$-fibration for appropriate $C$, including $s\text{Set}$ and $\text{Top}$. Moreover, in the case of $C = s\text{Set}$, the localization morphism $\mathcal{F}(C_t) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C_t)$ and the inclusion $\mathcal{F}(C_t) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(C)$ are both morphisms of $h$-fibrations, which means that the “operations” in $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(C_t)$ corresponding to the logical connectives are computed as in $\mathcal{F}(C)$ – i.e., according to the prescription in §410. In the case of $\text{Top}$, we have that the morphism $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Kan})$ (where $\text{Kan} := s\text{Set}_t$) induced by the singular set functor $\text{Top} \to \text{Kan}$ is a morphism of $h^\wedge$-fibrations and induces an equivalence on each fiber, hence the interpretation in $\text{Top}$ can be computed as in §4 by first passing to $s\text{Set}$.

8.1. Homotopy invariance. With this fibration in place, we can now deploy the above argument to obtain the isomorphism-invariance property for the homotopical semantics. But of course, what we are interested in is homotopy-invariance. It is not even clear how to express, let alone prove, homotopy invariance with this setup. In particular, the notion of isomorphism of $\sigma$-structures (in some category $C$) was readily expressible by natural isomorphism of f.p. functors $\text{Top} \to \text{C}$. But what of the notion of homotopy-equivalence?

One way to express homotopy-equivalence of $\sigma$-structures in $\text{Top}$ or $s\text{Set}$ is to use the 2-categorical structure on these categories, in which the 2-cells are given by (homotopy-classes of) homotopies between maps. In fact, the notion of homotopy-equivalence of $\sigma$-structures in either of these categories is captured precisely by the notion of pseudonatural equivalence of functors $\text{Top} \to \text{Top}$ (Definition 13.1).

Next, we use the alternative description of fibrations over a category $C$ in terms of pseudo-functors $C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat}$ (see [Hel19, §9]), and in particular the fact that the pseudo-functor $\text{Top}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat}$ (we can also use $s\text{Set}$ here) associated to the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Top})$ is compatible with the 2-categorical structure on $\text{Top}$ (we prove this in [Hel19]). It follows from this that the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Top})$ can be upgraded to a so-called 1-discrete 2-fibration (Definition 14.2) – and in particular, that the total category $\mathcal{H}(\text{Top})^\wedge$ can give a 2-categorical structure. We can thus also consider pseudonatural equivalences between functors from $\text{Top} \to \mathcal{H}(\text{Top})^\wedge$ lying over a given pseudonatural equivalence between functors $\text{Top} \to \mathcal{H}(\text{Top})^\wedge$; and it turns out that (once we restrict to the category $\text{Top}$ of spaces homotopy equivalent to a cell complex) these are given precisely by “fiberwise homotopy-equivalences” as in §5.

Hence, the proof – which is given in §15 – is finished by showing that the freeness property of $\mathcal{F}(\text{Top})$ extends to pseudonatural equivalence, i.e., that for any 1-discrete 2-fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow \text{B}$ and any pseudonatural equivalence between functors $\text{Top} \to \text{B}$, there is a pseudonatural equivalence lying over it between the induced functors $\mathcal{F}(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{C}$. This is done using a device which reduces it to the original freeness property.

There is one lingering blemish on this proof of homotopy-invariance. Namely, in the above proof of isomorphism-invariance, nothing at all was used about the fibration $\mathcal{F}(\text{Set})$ – the argument would have gone through with any other $h^\wedge$-fibration in its place. However, when proving the homotopy-invariance, we have made use of the special 2-categorical structure occurring on $\text{Top}$ (or $s\text{Set}$). Hence,
in order to set this argument in its proper context, we should (ideally) show that in any $h^\simeq$-fibration $\mathcal{C}_B$, the base category $B$ carries a 2-categorical structure satisfying the necessary properties, and such that in the case of $\text{Top}$ or $\text{sSet}$, this recovers the usual 2-categorical structure. This is precisely what was done in [Hel19].

This ends our overview of the fibrational presentation of the homotopical semantics. We now must tie up the many loose ends in the above account. We must construct $Pf_\sigma$ and show that it has the desired universal property (this we do in the appendix), we must prove that $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Kan})$ and $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Top})$ are really $h^\simeq$-fibrations (this we do in Part III), and we must fill in the details of the above homotopy-invariance argument (this we do in Part IV).

## III The $h^\simeq$-fibration of spaces

We now formally introduce the concept of $h^\simeq$-fibration which was discussed in Part II.

As was mentioned there, there are two (classes of) of $h^\simeq$-fibrations which are of interest to us: the “syntactic” – or “free” – ones, and the “semantic” ones, morphisms into which give rise to the various notions of semantics; in particular, we are interested in fibrations built out of some kind of spaces, thus giving rise to the homotopical semantics. Here in Part III, we will only be defining the “semantic” fibrations; as for the former, we describe the relevant universal property in Part IV, and prove the existence in the appendix.

In fact, much of the work involved in defining the “semantic” fibration was already carried out in [Hel19]. There, we defined the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ for any right-proper model category $\mathcal{C}$, and showed that it was a $\wedge^\simeq$-fibration, which was all we needed at that point. Hence, to see that it is an $h^\simeq$-fibration, it remains to show that this fibration has the necessary extra structure – namely, that it supports the “logical” operations $\lor, \Rightarrow, \forall, \exists$. In order to do this, we need to impose further restrictions on the model category $\mathcal{C}$ (see Definition 10.1). The category $\text{Top}$ will not satisfy these restrictions, but we will still be able to show that $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\text{Top})$ is an $h^\simeq$-fibration; the reason, essentially, is that $\text{Top}$ is Quillen-equivalent to $\text{sSet}$, which does satisfy the requirements.

### 9 $h^\simeq$-fibrations

We will use the definitions and notation concerning fibrations from [Hel19]. In particular, we take everything from [Hel19, Part II] for granted, and our present discussion of fibrations will, so to speak, continue from there. We will also use material from other parts of [Hel19], but we will indicate when we do so.

#### 9.1 Definition. A fibration $\mathcal{C}$ has fiberwise finite coproducts if every fiber of $\mathcal{C}$ has finite coproducts.

We have the notion of a coproduct diagram in a fiber of $\mathcal{C}$ being stable (under pullbacks), analogous the corresponding notion for products (see [Hel19, Definition 4.2]).

We follow the conventions concerning coproducts from [Hel19, §13.2], except that we use the symbols $\lor$ and $\bot$ instead of $+$ and $0$ when the category under consideration is the fiber of some fibration. Also, we denote by $in_1$ and $in_2$ the coprojections into a coproduct.

#### 9.2 Definition. We recall the definition of exponential objects.

Given objects $B, C$ in a category $\mathcal{C}$, an exponential diagram based on $B$ and $C$ is a diagram

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{C}^B \times B & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} C \\
\mathcal{C}^B & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} B
\end{align*}
$$
in which $C^B \xrightarrow{\times_2} C^B \times B \xrightarrow{\times_3} B$ is a product diagram, and $\varepsilon$ (the evaluation morphism of the exponential object $C^B$) has the following universal property: given any product $A \xrightarrow{\pi_1} A \times B \xrightarrow{\times_3} B$ in $\mathbf{C}$ and any morphism $f : A \times B \rightarrow C$, there is a unique $\tilde{f} : A \rightarrow C^B$ such that, with the induced morphism $\tilde{f} \times 1_B : A \times B \rightarrow C^B \times B$, the following diagram commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C^B \times B & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & C \\
\uparrow_{f \times 1_B} & \nearrow f & \\
A \times B & & \\
\end{array}
\]

In other words, the following composite must be a bijection.

$$\text{Hom}(A, C^B) \xrightarrow{(-) \times 1_B} \text{Hom}(A \times B, C^B \times B) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_\circ} \text{Hom}(A \times B, C)$$

A category is cartesian closed if it has finite products, and there is an exponential object based on each pair of objects. It is bicartesian closed if it is cartesian closed and has finite coproducts. A functor between cartesian closed categories is cartesian closed if it preserves finite products and takes exponential diagrams to exponential diagrams, and a bicartesian closed functor is defined similarly.

We will generally use the above notation for exponential objects, except when the category in question is the fiber of some fibration, in which case we will write $B \Rightarrow C$ instead of $C^B$.

A $\land$-fibration $\mathcal{C}$ has fiberwise exponentials if each fiber of $\mathcal{C}$ is cartesian closed. We have the notion of stability (under pullbacks) of exponential diagrams in fibers, analogous to that of product and coproduct diagrams.

9.3. Definition. Let $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$ be a fibration, $f : A \rightarrow B$ a morphism in $\mathbf{B}$, and $P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^A$. A $\Pi$-diagram over $f$ based on $P$ is a diagram

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

in $\mathbf{C}$ in which $\uparrow$ is cartesian over $f$, and $\varepsilon$ lies over $A$ and has the following universal property: given any cartesian morphism $\uparrow : f^*Q \rightarrow Q$ over $f$ and any morphism $p : f^*Q \rightarrow P$, there is a unique morphism $\bar{p} : Q \rightarrow \Pi f P$ over $B$ such that, with the induced morphism $f^*\bar{p} : f^*Q \rightarrow f^*\Pi f P$, the following diagram commutes (actually, the trapezoid commutes by definition of $f^*\bar{p}$, so the condition is just that the triangle commutes).

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

In other words, the following composite must be a bijection.

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^B}(Q, \Pi f P) \xrightarrow{f^*} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^A}(f^*Q, f^*\Pi f P) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_\circ} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^A}(f^*Q, P)$$
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We will usually use the above notation when dealing with \( \Pi \)-diagrams.

9.4. **Definition.** Given a fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow B \) and morphisms \( g : C \rightarrow D \) and \( k : B \rightarrow D \) in \( B \), we say that a \( \Pi \)-diagram

\[
g^* \Pi_g P \xrightarrow{\uparrow} \Pi_g P \\
\downarrow \epsilon \\
\uparrow \nonumber \end{align*}

over \( g \) is **stable along** \( k \) if for every pullback diagram

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

in \( B \) and every commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
h^* g^* \Pi_g P & \xrightarrow{q} & k^* \Pi_g P \\
\downarrow h^* \epsilon & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
h^* P & \xrightarrow{\uparrow} & \Pi_g P \\
\downarrow \uparrow & & \downarrow \uparrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow h & & \downarrow g \\
C & \xrightarrow{g} & D
\end{array}
\]

in which the morphisms \( \uparrow \) are cartesian and each morphism in \( C \) lies over the corresponding morphism in \( B \) as shown, the diagram

\[
h^* g^* \Pi_g P \xrightarrow{q} k^* \Pi_g P \\
h^* \epsilon \\
h^* P
\]

is also a \( \Pi \)-diagram. This condition is also known as the **Beck-Chevalley condition**.

9.5. **Definition.** A fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow \downarrow \downarrow B \) is a \( h \)-**fibration** if it satisfies the following four conditions.

(i) \( \mathcal{C} \) has stable fiberwise finite products and coproducts and exponentials.

(ii) \( B \) has finite products.

(iii) For any product projection \( \pi_2 : A \times B \rightarrow B \) in \( B \) and any \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^{A \times B} \), there is a cocartesian lift of \( \pi_2 \) with domain \( P \) and a \( \Pi \)-diagram over \( g \) based on \( P \).

(iv) All cocartesian lifts of product projections and \( \Pi \)-diagrams over product projections are stable along all morphisms.

\( \mathcal{C} \) is an \( h^{=\text{-}} \)-fibration if, in addition

(v) Each diagonal \( \Delta_B : B \rightarrow B \times B \) has a cocartesian lift with domain any terminal object \( \top_B \in \mathcal{C}^B \).
9.6. Definition. In [Hel19, Definition 15.4], we give the definition of morphism of fibrations, and of $\wedge$-fibrations, over a given category $B$. This is a special case of the following definition.

Given prefibrations $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$ and $\mathcal{C}' \downarrow B'$, a morphism of prefibrations $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$ is a pair $(\varphi, \Phi)$, where $\varphi : B \to B'$ and $\Phi : C \to C'$ are functors such that the square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & C' \\
\downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow \varphi' \\
B & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & B'
\end{array}
$$

commutes (strictly). We say that $(\varphi, \Phi)$ is a morphism of prefibrations over $\varphi$. If $B = B'$ and $\varphi = 1_B$, we may just write $\Phi$ instead of $(1_B, \Phi)$, and we say in this case that $\Phi$ is over $B$. If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ are fibrations, then $(\varphi, \Phi)$ is a morphism of fibrations if $\Phi$ takes cartesian morphisms to cartesian morphisms.

Note that for each $A \in \text{Ob} B$, $(\varphi, \Phi)$ induces a functor $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{C}'$ are $*\text{-fibrations}$ (where $*$ is one of $\wedge$, $h$, $\wedge=, h=,$), we say that $(\varphi, \Phi)$ is a morphism of $*\text{-fibrations}$ if preserves the relevant structure: (i) in all cases, the induced functors on fibers should be f.p. (ii) if $* \text{ is } h \text{ or } h=,$ the induced functors on fibers should moreover be bicartesian closed, and $\Phi : C \to C'$ should preserve $\prod$-diagrams, and cocartesian morphisms, over product projections (iii) if $* \text{ is } \wedge=, h$, or $h=,$ $\varphi : B \to B'$ should preserve finite products (iv) if $* \text{ is } h= \text{ or } \wedge=,$ $\Phi$ should preserve cocartesian lifts of diagonal morphisms with domain a terminal object.

9.7. Proposition. Every $h=\text{-fibration}$ is a $\wedge=\text{-fibration}$.

Proof: Referring to the definition of $\wedge=\text{-fibration}$ from [Hel19, Definition 5.6], we see that we are only missing the Frobenius reciprocity and stability conditions. These follow from Propositions 9.8 and 9.10 below. □

9.8. Proposition. In a fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$ with stable fiberwise products and exponentials, every cocartesian morphism satisfies Frobenius reciprocity\footnote{This proposition and its converse, Proposition 9.9, are well-known and appear (in a different form) in [Law70, p. 6].}.

Proof: Given a commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{\downarrow} & \sum_f P \\
\pi_1 & & \pi_1 \\
P \wedge f^* Q & \xrightarrow{\downarrow\Lambda^\uparrow} & \sum_f P \wedge Q \\
\pi_2 & & \pi_2 \\
f^* Q & \xrightarrow{\uparrow} & Q \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
$$

in $\mathcal{C}$ with $\uparrow$ cartesian, $\downarrow$ cocartesian, and the two sides product diagrams, we need to show that $\downarrow\Lambda^\uparrow$ is cocartesian. By [Hel19, Proposition 5.2] it suffices to show that for each $R \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}B$, the map $\circ(\downarrow\Lambda^\uparrow) : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}B}(\sum_f P \wedge Q, R) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}B}(P \wedge f^* Q, R)$ is a bijection.

Choose an exponential object $Q \Rightarrow R$, pullbacks $f^* R$ and $f^*(Q \Rightarrow R)$, and a product $f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^* R$. By Proposition 25.2 below, the induced morphism $\uparrow \Lambda^\uparrow : f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^* Q \to (Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge Q$ is cartesian.
We also have an induced morphism $$\varepsilon(\uup\uup) : f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^*Q \to f^*R$$ — i.e., the unique morphism over $$A$$ making the following diagram commute.

$${\begin{array}{c}
\varepsilon(\uup\uup) \\
\downarrow \\
f^*R \\
\end{array}}_{f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^*Q \to f^*R}$$

It then follows from the stability of exponentials in $$\mathcal{C}$$ that the following is an exponential diagram.

$${\begin{array}{c}
\pi_1 \\
\downarrow \\
f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \\
\end{array}}_{f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^*Q \to f^*R}$$

The claim now follows from the commutativity of the following diagram, and the fact that the vertical composites on the left and right are isomorphisms. Here, we abbreviate $$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\cdots)$$ by $$[\cdots]$$ and $$\text{Hom}_{f}(\cdots)$$ by $$[\cdots]_f$$.

$${\begin{array}{c}
[P \wedge f^*Q, f^*R]_A \\
\uparrow \sim \\
[\varepsilon(\uup\uup)]_o \\
\uparrow \\
[P \wedge f^*Q, f^*(Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge f^*Q]_A \\
\sim \downarrow \\
[P \wedge f^*Q, (Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge Q]_f \\
\downarrow \\
[\sum_f P \wedge Q, R]_B \\
\leftarrow \\
\varepsilon \circ [\sum_f P \wedge Q, (Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge Q]_f \\
\downarrow \\
[\sum_f P \wedge Q, (Q \Rightarrow R) \wedge Q]_B \\
\leftarrow \\
\varepsilon \circ [\sum_f P \wedge Q, R]_B \\
\downarrow \\
[P, f^*(Q \Rightarrow R)]_A \\
\uparrow \sim \\
[P, Q \Rightarrow R]_f \\
\downarrow \\
[\sum_f P, Q \Rightarrow R]_B \\
\leftarrow \\
\varepsilon \circ [\sum_f P, Q \Rightarrow R]_f \\
\downarrow \\
[\sum_f P, Q \Rightarrow R]_B \\
\end{array}}$$

9.9. Proposition. The following converse of 9.8 holds: if $$\mathcal{C}$$ has fiberwise exponentials and stable fiberwise products, then for any morphism $$f : A \to B$$ in $$\mathcal{B}$$, if $$f$$ admits a cocartesian lift with domain $$P$$ satisfying Frobenius reciprocity for each $$P \in \mathcal{C}^A$$, then the exponential diagrams in $$\mathcal{C}^B$$ are stable along $$f$$.

Proof: The proof is essentially the same as that of Proposition 9.8.

It suffices to show that for each exponential diagram (say, with exponential object $$Q \Rightarrow R$$) in $$\mathcal{C}^B$$, some pullback along $$f$$ is an exponential diagram in $$\mathcal{C}^A$$. We choose one as in the proof of Proposition 9.8. We then need to show the universal property for each $$P \in \mathcal{C}^A$$. We then choose a cocartesian morphism $$\downarrow : P \to \sum_f P$$, conclude by Frobenius reciprocity that the induced morphism $$\downarrow \uup$$ is cocartesian, and now the commutativity of the last diagram in the proof of Proposition 9.8 gives us the desired universal property. □

9.10. Proposition. Let $$\mathcal{C} \mathcal{B}$$ be a fibration, and let $$g : C \to D$$ and $$k : B \to D$$ be morphisms in $$\mathcal{B}$$.

Claim: If there is a $$\prod$$-diagram over $$k$$ based on $$Q$$ that is stable along $$g$$ for each $$Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B$$, then every cocartesian lift of $$g$$ is stable along $$k$$.

Proof: Suppose we have a pullback diagram in $$\mathcal{B}$$ and a diagram lying over it, as shown below, with

\[\text{This proposition and its converse, Proposition 9.11, are well-known and are mentioned in [Mak93a, p. 343] and [Jac99, Lemma 1.9.7].}\]
cartesian and cocartesian morphisms as indicated.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\
\downarrow{k} & & \downarrow{k} \\
C & \xrightarrow{g} & D
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
h^*P & \xrightarrow{\prod} & k^*\sum_g P \\
\downarrow{\uparrow} & & \downarrow{\uparrow} \\
P & \xrightarrow{\uparrow} & \sum_g P
\end{array}
\]

We need to show that \(\uparrow\) is cocartesian. By [Hel19, Proposition 5.2] it suffices to show that for each \(Q \in \mathcal{C}^B\), the map \(\circ \, \uparrow : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^B}(k^*\sum_g P, Q) \to \text{Hom}_f(h^*P, Q)\) is a bijection.

Choose a \(\prod\)-diagram over \(k\) based on \(Q\), as shown below, and choose pullbacks \(f^*Q\), \(f^*k^* \prod_k Q\) and \(g^* \prod_k Q\), so that we have, by stability, an induced \(\prod\)-diagram over \(h\).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
k^* \prod_k Q & \uparrow & \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
Q & & \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
f^*k^* \prod_k Q & \xrightarrow{\uparrow} & g^* \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow{\uparrow} & & \downarrow{\uparrow} \\
B & \xrightarrow{k} & D \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{h} & C
\end{array}
\]

The claim now follows from the commutativity of the following diagram since the vertical composites on the left and right are isomorphisms. We use the same abbreviations as in the proof of 9.8.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
[k^* \sum_g P, Q]_B & \xrightarrow{\circ \uparrow} & [h^*P, Q]_f & \xleftarrow{\uparrow \circ} & [h^*P, f^*Q]_A \\
k^* \prod_k Q & \uparrow & \prod_k Q & \uparrow & \\
\downarrow{\circ \uparrow} & & \downarrow{\uparrow \circ} & & \downarrow{\uparrow \circ} \\
[k^* \sum_g P, k^* \prod_k Q] & \xrightarrow{\circ \uparrow} & [h^*P, k^* \prod_k Q]_f & \xleftarrow{\uparrow \circ} & [h^*P, f^*k^* \prod_k Q]_A \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow{\uparrow \circ} & & \downarrow{\uparrow \circ} \\
[\sum_g P, \prod_k Q]_D & \xrightarrow{\circ \uparrow} & [P, \prod_k Q]_f & \xleftarrow{\uparrow \circ} & [P, g^* \prod_k Q]_C
\end{array}
\]

The commutativity of the individual squares follows from [Hel19, Propositions 3.4, 3.5, 3.6] and their duals (those propositions were stated in the context of a fixed cleavage, but they still hold in this context). Finally, we note that the strange-looking map \(\uparrow(-) \uparrow\) is just the “pullback functor” – i.e., for \(p : P \to g^* \prod_k Q\) over \(C\), \(\uparrow p \uparrow\) is the unique morphism over \(A\) making the following diagram commute (this again follows from loc. cit. and the fact \(\uparrow p \uparrow = p \uparrow : h^*P \to g^* \prod_k Q\)).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
h^*P & \uparrow & P \\
\uparrow p & & \downarrow p \\
f^*k^* \prod_k Q & \xrightarrow{\uparrow} & g^* \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{h} & C
\end{array}
\]

9.11. **Proposition.** The converse of Proposition 9.10 holds: if there is a cocartesian lift of \(g\) with domain \(P\) that is stable along \(k\) for every \(P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^C\), then every \(\prod\)-diagram over \(k\) is stable along \(g\).

**Proof.** The proof is the same as that of Proposition 9.10. There, we fixed a \(P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^A\) and a cocartesian lift of \(g\) with domain \(P\), and then for each \(Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B\), chose a \(\prod\)-diagram over \(k\) based on \(Q\). Now, we do the opposite, first fixing a \(Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B\) and \(\prod\)-diagram, and then, for each \(P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^A\), choosing a cocartesian lift. In the commutative diagram (7), we then have that the morphism \(\uparrow(-) \uparrow\) is an isomorphism, and it follows that the vertical composite on the right is an isomorphism as desired. □
9.12. Proposition. Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a cartesian closed category. We recall the well-known way to compute the objects $\prod_{x_A} (X, A, x) \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{C}/1_{\mathbf{C}}) \cong \mathbf{C}$ in the codomain fibration $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{C})$ as the “object of sections” of the morphism $x : X \to A$ (see [Joh02, Lemma 1.5.2] and Remark 9.13 below).

Let $A, Y \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{C}$ and $(X, x) \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{C}/A)$. Also, fix a terminal object $1_{\mathbf{C}}$, a cartesian morphism $(\pi_1, !_A) : (Y \times A, A, \pi_2) \to (Y, 1_{\mathbf{C}}, !_Y)$ over $!_A$, and exponential objects $X^A$ and $A^A$.

Note that since $Y \xrightarrow{\pi_1} Y \times A \xrightarrow{\pi_2} A$ is a product, for any $p : Y \times A \to X$, we have an induced $\tilde{p} : Y \to X^A$.

Claim: The diagram

$$(Y \times A, \pi_2) \xrightarrow{\pi_1} (Y, !_Y)
\downarrow p
(X, x)
A \xrightarrow{!_A} 1_{\mathbf{C}}$$

is a $\prod_{x_A}$-diagram if and only if the following is a pullback square, where $\cap \pi_1$ denotes the morphism induced by $\pi_2 : 1_{\mathbf{C}} \times A \to A$.

$$Y \xrightarrow{\tilde{p}} X^A
\downarrow !_Y
1_{\mathbf{C}} \xrightarrow{\cap !_A} A^A$$

Proof: The first condition amounts to the composite

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}/1_{\mathbf{C}}}((Z, !_Z), (Y, !_Y)) \xrightarrow{x_A} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}/A}((Z \times A, \pi_2), (Y \times A, \pi_2)) \xrightarrow{p_{\mathbf{C}}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}/A}((Z \times A, \pi_2), (X, x))$$

being a bijection for each $Z \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{C}$, while the second condition amounts to the map

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, Y) \xrightarrow{(\tilde{p}_*, !_Y \circ \phi)} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, X^A) \times_{\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, A^A)} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, 1_{\mathbf{C}})$$

being a bijection for each $Z \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{C}$.

Clearly, the domains of (8) and (9) are in bijection with one another. The codomains are isomorphic, respectively, to the following sets:

$$\{ p \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z \times A, X) \mid xp = \pi_2 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ p \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, X^A) \mid x^A \cdot p = \cap !_A \cdot !_Z \}.$$  

The canonical bijection $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z \times A, X) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{C}}(Z, X^A)$ restricts to a bijection between these sets.

The morphisms (8) and (9), together with the above two bijections, form a commuting square, and hence (8) is a bijection if and only if (9) is. □

9.13. Remark. It is easy to see (and well-known – see [Mak93a]) that, given a fibration $\mathbf{C} \downarrow \mathbf{B}$ and a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathbf{B}$, “the” associated pullback functor $f^* : \mathbf{C}^B \to \mathbf{C}^A$ has a left or right adjoint if and only there exists a choice, for each $P \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{C}^A$ of a cocartesian lift of $f$ with domain $P$ or $\prod$-diagram over $f$ based on $P$, respectively.

To formulate this in a way which does not refer to any choices (and is hence more general in the absence of the axiom of choice) is to say there is always a canonical anafunctor (see [Mak96]) $f^* : \mathbf{C}^B \to \mathbf{C}^A$ and that this anafunctor has a left or right adjoint anafunctor (which is then also canonically defined) if and only if there exists, for each $P \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{C}^A$, a cocartesian lift of $f$ with domain $P$ or $\prod$-diagram over $f$ based on $P$, respectively.
9.14. **Definition.** A category \(C\) is **locally cartesian closed** if each slice category \(C/X\) is cartesian closed and \(C\) has a terminal object (so in particular, \(C \cong C/1\) is itself cartesian closed).

9.15. **Proposition.** \(\mathcal{F}(C)\) is an \(h\)-fibration (in fact, an \(h^\kappa\)-fibration) if and only if \(C\) is locally cartesian closed and has finite coproducts.

**Proof:** This amounts to various easy or well-known facts, all of which can be found in [Joh02]. By [Hel19, Proposition 12.5], we know that \(\mathcal{F}(C)\) is a fibration if and only if \(C\) has finite limits. If \(\mathcal{F}(C)\) also has fibrewise exponentials, then \(C\) is clearly locally cartesian closed (hence, in this direction, we actually need much less than \(\mathcal{F}(C)\) being an \(h\)-fibration).

In the other direction, if \(C\) is locally cartesian closed, then \(\mathcal{F}(C)\) clearly has fibrewise exponentials, and moreover these are stable by Proposition 9.9, since, as noted in the proof of [Hel19, Proposition 12.5], every morphism in \(C\) admits a cocartesian lift with any domain, and these satisfy Frobenius reciprocity. Since (as was also noted in loc. cit) all cocartesian morphisms in \(C^{op}\) are stable, this also gives us the required stable cocartesian lifts of product projection.

To see that for every product projection (in fact, every morphism) \(f : A \to B\), there is a \(\prod\)-diagram based on which \(P \in \text{Ob } C/A\) – i.e., by Remark 9.13, that \(f^*\) has a right-adjoint – we first reduce to the case in which \(B\) is terminal, by noting that there are canonical isomorphisms \((C/A) \cong (C/B)/(A,f)\) and \((C/B) \cong (C/B)/(B,1_B)\) under which the functor \(\sum_f : C/A \to C/B\) corresponds to the functor \(\sum_f : (C/B)/(A,f) \to (C/B)/(B,1_B)\), and hence their right adjoints \(f^*\) correspond as well. When \(B\) is terminal, we can construct a \(\prod f\)-diagram as the “object of sections” of \(f\) as in Proposition 9.12. The stability of the \(\prod f\)-diagrams in \(C^{op}\) follows by Proposition 9.11 from the stability of the cocartesian morphisms.

Finally, coproducts in the fibers are given by \((A,a) + (B,b) = (A+B, [a,b])\), and these are preserved by the pullback functors since – by Remark 9.13 – the latter have right adjoints. \(\Box\)

10 \(\mathcal{F}_I(\text{Kan})\) is an \(h\)-fibration

In [Hel19, Proposition 16.3], we showed that for any model category \(C\), the fibration \(\mathcal{F}_I(C)\) – and hence also \(\mathcal{F}_I(\text{C}_f)\) (see Definition 10.6) – is a \(\wedge\)-fibration. We now want to show in the particular case \(C = \text{sSet}\), that \(\mathcal{F}_I(\text{sSet}) = \mathcal{F}_I(\text{Kan})\) is in fact an \(h\)-fibration. To begin with, we isolate, in Definition 10.1, the exact properties of \(\text{sSet}\) which allow the proof to go through.

10.1. **Definition.** We call a model category \(C\) **suitable** if the following four conditions are satisfied.

(i) \(C\) is **right-proper**, i.e. weak equivalences are closed under pullbacks along fibrations.

(ii) The cofibrations are precisely the monomorphisms.

(iii) \([f,g] : A + B \to C\) is a fibration whenever \(f : A \to C\) and \(g : B \to C\) are, and the unique morphism \(0 \to A\) is always a fibration.

(iv) \(C\) is locally cartesian closed (as a category).

We note that the standard model structure on simplicial sets (see [Qui67, II.3.14]) is suitable. Condition (ii) holds by definition. Condition (i) is non-trivial, but well-known, and follows from the existence of finite-limit and pullback preserving fibrant replacement functors (see, e.g. [MP12, p. 370]). As for (iv), it is well-known that any presheaf category is locally cartesian closed (see [Joh02, p. 48]).

To see (iii), note that the “horns” \(\Lambda^n_k\) are all **connected**, in the sense that any two vertices are connected by a path of edges (in fact, for \(n > 2\), by a single edge). It follows that any morphism \(\Lambda^n_k \to A + B\) to a coproduct must factor through one of the summands \(A, B\). Now, for \([f,g] : A + B \to C\) to be fibrant, it must lift against each horn inclusion \(\Lambda^n_k \to \Delta^n\). But if \(f\) and \(g\) are both fibrant, this follows immediately from the fact that any given morphism \(\Lambda^n_k \to A + B\) factors through \(A\) or \(B\).
corresponding lifting problem for morphisms $0 \to A$ is trivial, since there are no morphisms $\Lambda^n_k \to 0$.

We suspect there are other interesting suitable model structures (we have in mind the so-called Cisinski model structures, which always satisfy (2) and (4)).

10.2. Proposition. If $C$ is a suitable model category, then any slice category $C/A$ of $C$, with its induced model structure, is also suitable.

Proof: It is well-known (and easy to see) that each slice of a locally cartesian closed category is locally cartesian closed; this follows from the existence of the canonical isomorphisms $(C/A)/B \cong C/B$. Condition (ii) is immediate since a morphism $(p, 1_A)$ in $C/A$ is a monomorphism or a cofibration if and only if $p$ is. Condition (i) is immediate since a square in a slice category $C/A$ is a pullback square if and only if its image under the forgetful functor $C/A \to C$ is. Condition (iii) follows similarly since the forgetful functor preserves and creates coproducts. □

10.3. Proposition. In a suitable model category $C$, every object is cofibrant. Hence $C_{cf} = C_f$, and $\text{Ho}(C_f) = \pi(C_{cf})$.

Proof: Since the cofibrations are the monomorphisms, this amount to checking that each morphism from the initial object is a monomorphism. It is well-known that this holds in any cartesian closed category (see [McL92, p. 61]). □

10.4. Proposition. Let $C$ be a suitable model category, let $p : X \to Y$ be a fibration, and let $C$ be any object. We then have an induced map $p^C : X^C \to Y^C$.

Claim: $p^C$ is a fibration.

Proof: We must show that for any and solid commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \longrightarrow & X^C \\
\downarrow i & & \downarrow p^C \\
B & \longrightarrow & Y^C
\end{array}
\]

with $i$ a trivial cofibration, there exists a dashed morphism making the diagram commute.

Using the adjunction $(- \times C) \dashv (-)^C$, this is seen to be equivalent to the existence of a dashed morphism making the corresponding diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A \times C & \longrightarrow & X \\
\downarrow i \times 1_C & & \downarrow p \\
B \times C & \longrightarrow & Y
\end{array}
\]

commute. For this, it suffices that $i \times 1_C$ be an trivial cofibration. Noting that it is the pullback of $i$ along the projection $B \times C \to B$ (which is a fibration since $C$ is fibrant), we have that $i \times 1_C$ is a cofibration since monomorphisms are stable under pullback, and is a weak-equivalence, since $C$ is right-proper. □

10.5. Proposition. Let $C$ be a suitable model category. We know from [Hel19, Proposition 16.2] that $C_f$ is an f.p. category and that the inclusion $C_f \hookrightarrow C$ is an f.p. functor.

Claim: $C_f$ and the inclusion $C_f \hookrightarrow C$ are bicartesian closed.

Proof: Since $C_f$ is a full subcategory of $C$, it suffices to show that the fibrant objects in $C$ are closed under exponentials and coproducts.
Condition (iii) of “suitable” (Definition 10.1) implies that the fibrant objects are closed under coproducts. That they objects are closed under exponentials follows from Proposition 10.4. □

10.6. Definition. In [Hel19, Definition 17.7], for a model category $C$ and a full subcategory $D \subseteq C$, we defined $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(D)$ to be the restriction of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_h(C)$ to $D$. We similarly define $\mathcal{F}_t(D)$ to be the restriction of $\mathcal{F}_t(C)$ to $D$, and we denote the total categories of the fibrations $\mathcal{F}_t(D)$ and $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_h(D)$ by $(D^\to)_*$ and $\text{Ho}(D^\to)_*$, respectively.\footnote{This notation is somewhat misleading, since the domains of the morphisms in $(D^\to)_*$ and $\text{Ho}(D^\to)_*$ are not required to be in $D$; however, whenever we use this notation (such as in $(C^\to)_t$ and $(C^\to)_{cl}$), that will happen to be the case.}

We note that, in general, the restriction of a $\land^=\text{-fibration}$, $h\text{-fibration}$ or $h^=\text{-fibration}$ to any full subcategory having finite products is again an $\land^=\text{-fibration}$, $h\text{-fibration}$ or $h^=\text{-fibration}$.

10.7. Proposition. Let $C$ be a suitable model category. Since $C$ is locally cartesian closed, we know by Proposition 9.15 that $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$, and hence $\mathcal{F}(C_t)$, is an $h\text{-fibration}$, and by [Hel19, Proposition 16.3], we know that $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$ is a $\land$-fibration, and that the inclusion $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(C_t)$ is a morphism of $\land$-fibrations.

Claim: $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$ is an $h\text{-fibration}$ and the inclusion $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(C_t)$ is a morphism of $h\text{-fibrations}$.

Proof: It follows from Propositions 10.2 and 10.5 that the fibers of $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)$, and the functors on fibers induced by the inclusion, are bicartesian closed.

Next, we need to check that, given a product projection $\pi_2 : A \times B \to B$ in $C_t$ and a cocartesian morphism $(p, \pi_2) : (X, A \times B, x) \to (Y, B, y)$ in $C^\to$ lying over $\pi_2$, if $(X, x)$ is in $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)^{A \times B}$, then $(Y, y)$ is in $\mathcal{F}_t(C_t)^B$—i.e., if $x$ is a fibration, then so is $y$. But the product projection $\pi_2$ is a fibration since $A$ is fibrant, and by [Hel19, Proposition 12.3], $p$ is an isomorphism, hence $y = \pi_2 p^{-1}$ is a fibration as well.

Similarly, we need to check that if $(X, x)$ is a fibration, then $\prod_{\pi_2} (X, x)$ is a fibration (actually, for this, we don’t need $\pi_2$ to be a product projection). In the case where $B \cong 1_C$, this follows from Propositions 9.12 and 10.4 since fibrations are stable under pullback. The general case is reduced to this case, as in the proof of Proposition 9.15, by using the isomorphism $(C/A \times B) \cong (C/B)/(A \times B, \pi_2)$ and Proposition 10.2.

It remains to see that all the operations are “stable”, i.e., that the pullback functors are bicartesian closed, and that the cocartesian morphisms and $\prod_{\pi}$-diagrams over projections are stable. In each case, this follows immediately from the corresponding fact in $\mathcal{F}(C_t)$. □

11 $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_t(\text{Kan})$ is an $h^=\text{-fibration}$

11.1. Proposition. Let $C$ be a suitable model category. We know from Proposition 10.5 that $C_t$ is bicartesian closed, and we know from [Hel19, Proposition 16.4] that $\text{Ho}(C_t)$ is an f.p. category and that the functor $\gamma : C_t \to \text{Ho}(C_t)$ is an f.p. functor.

Claim: The category $C_t$ and the functor $\gamma : C_t \to \text{Ho}(C_t)$ are bicartesian closed.

Proof: That $\text{Ho}(C_t)$ has, and $\gamma$ preserves, finite coproducts, follows from an argument dual to the one given in [Hel19, Proposition 16.4].
We already know that \( C^B \times B \) is still a product in \( \text{Ho}(C_t) \), so it remains to see that for any \( A \in \text{Ob} C_t \) and product \( A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_1} A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_2} B \), the composite
\[
\pi(A, C^B) \xrightarrow{(-) \times 1_B} \pi(A \times B, C^B \times B) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_0} \pi(A \times B, C)
\]
is a bijection. That this map is surjective is clear, since it is already surjective before passing to homotopy classes. To show injectivity, we need to show that if two morphisms \( f_1, f_2 : A \times B \to C \) are homotopic, then the corresponding morphisms \( \tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2 : A \to C^B \) are.

Let \( A + A \xrightarrow{[\partial_1, \partial_2]} A \times I \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} A \) be a cylinder object for \( A \) with \( [\partial_1, \partial_2] \) a cofibration. Because the functor \( (- \times B) \) is a left-adjoint, it preserves coproducts, and hence the canonical morphism \([([\pi_1, \pi_2], [\pi_2, \pi_2]) : A \times B + A \times B \to (A + A) \times B\) is an isomorphism. Applying \( (- \times B) \) to our cylinder object for \( A \), we have a sequence of morphisms
\[
A \times B + A \times B \xrightarrow{\partial_1} (A + A) \times B \xrightarrow{[\partial_1, \partial_2] \times 1_B} (A \times I) \times B \xrightarrow{\pi \times 1_B} A \times B
\]
and we claim that this exhibits \( (A \times I) \times B \) as a cylinder object for \( A \times B \). Indeed, the composite is clearly equal to \( \nabla_{A \times B} \), and \( \sigma \times 1_B \) is a weak equivalence by the right-properness of \( C \), since it is the pullback of a weak equivalence along the projection \( A \times I \times B \to A \times I \), which is a fibration since \( B \) is fibrant. Moreover, the first two morphisms are cofibrations (the first being an isomorphism and the second being the pullback of a monomorphism and hence a monomorphism).

Hence, by [Hel19, Proposition 13.5 (ii)], given two homotopic maps \( f_1, f_2 : A \times B \to C \), we obtain a left-homotopy \( h : (A \times I) \times B \to C \) between them, and hence a morphism \( \tilde{h} : A \times I \to C^B \). It remains to see that this is a homotopy between \( \tilde{f}_1 \) and \( \tilde{f}_2 \), i.e. that \( \tilde{h} \partial_i = \tilde{f}_i : A \to C^B \). It suffices to see that \( \varepsilon \cdot ((\tilde{h} \partial_i) \times 1_B) = f_i \), which follows from the definition of \( \tilde{h} \).

**11.2. Theorem.** Let \( C \) be a suitable model category. By Proposition 10.7, we know that \( \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) is an \( h \)-fibration, and by [Hel19, Propositions 16.5 and 17.8], we know that \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) is a \( \wedge \)-fibration and that \( \gamma : \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) is a morphism of \( \wedge \)-fibrations.

**Claim:** \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) is in fact an \( h^\wedge \)-fibration, and the localization morphism \( \gamma : \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) is a morphism of \( h^\wedge \)-fibrations.

**Proof:** By Proposition 11.1, we know that the fibers of \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) and the functors on the fibers induced by \( \gamma : \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_1(C_t) \) are bicartesian closed.

Next, we consider sum objects \( \sum_{\pi_2} P \). That is, we need to show that the image under \( \gamma \) of any cocartesian morphism in \( (C_t^\to) \) over a product projection is cocartesian in \( \text{Ho}(C_t^\to) \). This follows from [Hel19, Propositions 12.3 and 17.2] and the fact that every isomorphism is a weak equivalence.

We next consider product objects \( \prod_{\pi_2} P \). Let \( \pi_2 : A \times B \to B \) be a product projection in \( C_t \), and let
\[
\pi_2 \xrightarrow{\uparrow} \prod_{\pi_2} P \\
\varepsilon \downarrow \\
P \\
A \times B \xrightarrow{\pi_2} B
\]
be a \( \prod \)-diagram in \( (C_t^\to) \). We need to see that its image in \( \text{Ho}(C_t^\to) \) is also a \( \prod_{\pi_2} \)-diagram.

We know already that the image of \( \uparrow \) is cartesian. Hence, it remains to show that for each \( Q \in (C/B)_t \) and cartesian \( \uparrow : f^*Q \to Q \) over \( \pi_2 \), the composite
\[
\pi(Q, \prod_{\pi_2} P) \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \pi(\prod_{\pi_2} Q, \prod_{\pi_2} P) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_0} \pi(\pi_2^*Q, P)
\]

is a bijection. As in the proof of Proposition 10.5, it is immediate that it is surjective, and injectivity follows by a similar argument to the one there.

It remains to check the various “stability” conditions for $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(C)$. These are proven in the same way as the stability of products in [Hel19, Proposition 16.5]. Namely, in each case, we reduce to showing the stability of some (rather than every) diagram of the appropriate kind, and then we choose the diagram coming from $(C_i)^\diamond$, where we already know that stability holds. □

12 Topological spaces

We now explain how to extend the above considerations in order to include the category Top of topological spaces – which, as it stands, is excluded, since Top is not a suitable model category (Definition 10.1), as it is not locally cartesian closed. Here, we are considering Top to be endowed with the mixed model structure (see [Hel19, §19.1]).

In particular, we cannot directly apply Theorem 11.2 in the case of topological spaces. However, it turns out that the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top})$ is, after all, an $h$-fibration.

The reason is that the singular simplicial set functor $\text{Sing} : \text{Top} \to s\text{Set}$ gives us a morphism of fibrations $\mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{F}_i(s\text{Set})$ and hence, upon passage to homotopy categories, a morphism of fibrations $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(s\text{Set})$. This turns out to be a fiberwise equivalence, which then implies that $\mathcal{F}(\text{Top}_c)$ is an $h$-fibration and that that the morphism is a morphism of $h$-fibrations.

In practice, we will want to consider the cofibrant objects in Top (i.e., the spaces homotopy equivalent to a cell complex), so we will use the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_c(\text{Top}_c)$; this is equivalent to the fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ_1(\text{Top}_c)$, which is an $h$-fibration since Top$_c \subseteq \text{Top}$ has finite products.

12.1. Proposition. Let $C$ and $D$ be categories, $F : C \rightleftarrows D : U$ functors, and $(\eta, \varepsilon) : F \dashv U$ an adjunction. Recall from [Hel19, §14.4] that, for each morphism $f : A \to B$ in $D$, we have a functor $\sum f : D/A \to D/B$. Note also that, for each $A \in \text{Ob } D$ the functor $U$ induces a functor $U : D/A \to C/U A$ sending $(X, x)$ to $(UX, UX)$ and $p : (X, x) \to (Y, y)$ to $Up : (UX, UX) \to (UY, UY)$, and similarly $F$ induces a functor $F : C/U A \to D/FUA$.

Claim: For each $A \in \text{Ob } D$, the functor $U : D/A \to C/U A$ is right adjoint to the composite functor $C/U A \xrightarrow{F} D/FU A \xrightarrow{\sum A} D/A$.

Proof: Let us show that, for $(X, x) \in \text{Ob } D/A$ and $(Z, z) \in \text{Ob } C/U A$, we have a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_{C/U A}((Z, z), U(X, x)) \cong \text{Hom}_{D/U A}(\sum_{\varepsilon A} F(Z, z), (X, x)).$$

(10)

These two sets are in bijection with certain subsets of $\text{Hom}_C(Z, UX)$ and $\text{Hom}_D(FZ, X)$, respectively. Now, the adjunction $F \dashv U$ gives us a bijection between the two latter sets, and it is easily seen (using the naturality of this bijection) that it restricts to give a bijection (10). It remains to see that this bijection is natural. This follows from the fact that it is equal to the following composite of natural transformations:

$$\text{Hom}_{C/U A}((Z, z), U(X, x)) \xrightarrow{F} \text{Hom}_{D/FUA}(F(Z, z), FU(X, x)) \xrightarrow{\sum_{\varepsilon A}} \text{Hom}_{D/U A}(\sum_{\varepsilon A} F(Z, z), \sum_{\varepsilon A} FU(X, x)) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon x \circ} \text{Hom}_{D/U A}(\sum_{\varepsilon A} F(Z, z), (X, x)).$$

12.2. Definition. Given model categories $C$ and $D$, a functor $U : D \to C$ is a right Quillen functor if it is a right adjoint and preserves fibrations and trivial fibrations. $U$ is a right Quillen equivalence if it is a right Quillen functor, and admits a left adjoint $F : C \to D$ for which the
The important fact about Quillen equivalences, for our purposes, is that, if \( U \) is a right Quillen equivalence and preserves weak equivalences, then the induced functor \( U : \text{Ho}(D) \to \text{Ho}(C) \) is an equivalence of categories (see [Hov99]).

12.3. Proposition. For any right Quillen equivalence \( U : D \to C \) and any fibrant \( A \in \text{Ob} \ D \), the induced functor \( U : D/A \to C/UA \) is a right Quillen equivalence with respect to the induced model structures.

Proof: By Proposition 12.1, we know that \( U : D/A \to C/UA \) is a right adjoint. It clearly preserves fibrations and trivial fibrations, since a morphism \( p : (X, x) \to (Y, y) \) is a fibration or trivial fibration if and only if \( p : X \to Y \) is, in which case \( Up : UX \to UY \), and hence \( Up : U(X, x) \to U(Y, y) \), is also a fibration or trivial fibration, since \( U \) is a right Quillen functor. Hence \( U : C/A \to D/UA \) is a right Quillen functor.

To see that \( U \) is a right Quillen equivalence, note that in the proof of Proposition 12.1, the bijection \( \text{Hom}_D(F(Z, z), (X, x)) \cong \text{Hom}_{D/A}((Z, z), U(X, x)) \) establishing \( U : C/A \to D/UA \) as a right adjoint is a restriction of the bijection \( \text{Hom}_C(FZ, X) \cong \text{Hom}_D(Z, UX) \). Now, if \( (Z, z) \) is cofibrant in \( D/A \), then \( Z \) is cofibrant in \( D \), and if \( (X, x) \) is fibrant in \( C/A \), then \( X \) is fibrant in \( C \) since \( A \) is fibrant. Hence, since \( U \) is a right Quillen equivalence, the latter bijection preserves weak equivalences, and hence the former bijection preserves weak equivalences as well. \( \square \)

12.4. Definition. A morphism \( (\varphi, \Phi) : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}' \) of prefibrations is a fiberwise equivalence if the induced functor \( \mathcal{C}A \to \mathcal{C}'A \) is an equivalence for each \( A \in \text{Ob} \ B \). If \( \mathcal{C} \) and \( \mathcal{C}' \) are fibrations, \( B = B' \), \( \varphi = 1_B \), and \( \Phi \) is a morphism of fibrations over \( B \), this is the same as \( \Phi : C \to C' \) being an equivalence of categories.

12.5. Proposition. If \( (\varphi, \Phi) : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}' \) is a morphism of fibrations which is a fiberwise equivalence, \( B \) and \( B' \) are f.p. categories and \( \varphi \) an f.p. functor, and \( \mathcal{C}' \) is an \( h^= \)-fibration, then \( \mathcal{C} \) is an \( h^= \)-fibration and \( (\varphi, \Phi) \) is a morphism of \( h^= \)-fibrations.

Proof: This follows from the considerations in Definition 15.1 below, since if \( (\varphi, \Phi) \) is a fiberwise equivalence, then the induced morphism \( \Phi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}' \) of fibrations over \( B \) is an equivalence. It then remains to see that a fibration equivalent to an \( h^= \)-fibration is again one (and the equivalence is a morphism of \( h^= \)-fibrations). \( \square \)

12.6. Proposition. The singular simplicial set functor \( \text{Sing} : \text{Top} \to \text{sSet} \) is a right Quillen equivalence and preserves weak equivalences (in fact, we will not define \( \text{Sing} \), as this is all we will need about it).

Proof: That \( \text{Sing} \) is a right Quillen equivalence when \( \text{Top} \) has the Quillen model structure is well-known, and is in fact the archetypical example of a Quillen equivalence (see, e.g., [MP12, Theorem 17.5.2]); for the case of the mixed model structure, see [MP12, Theorem 17.4.2]. That \( \text{Sing} \) preserves weak equivalences follows from [MP12, Corollary 17.5.11] and the definition of weak equivalences in \( \text{sSet} \). \( \square \)

12.7. Theorem. Since \( \text{Sing} : \text{Top} \to \text{sSet} \) preserves fibrations (being a right Quillen functor), it induces a morphism \( F_{\text{q}}(\text{Top}) \to F_{\text{q}}(\text{sSet}) \) of prefibrations, which is a morphism of fibrations since \( \text{Sing} \) is right adjoint and hence preserves pullback squares. We can then restrict to obtain a morphism of fibrations \( F_{\text{cf}}(\text{Top}) \) \( \to F_{\text{q}}(\text{sSet}) \). The functor \( \text{Sing} : (\text{Top}^\to_{\text{cf}})_{\text{cf}} \to (\text{sSet}^\to_{\text{cf}})_{\text{cf}} \) preserves vertical weak
evolutions, and hence descends to localizations, giving a morphism \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}_c) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet}) \) of prefibrations.

Claim: \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}_c) \) is an \( h^\infty \)-fibration, and the morphism \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}_c) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet}) \) induced by Sing is a morphism of \( h^\infty \)-fibrations.

Proof: This will follow from Proposition 12.5 once we show that the morphism in question is a morphism of fibrations and a fiberwise equivalence.

The inclusion \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}_c) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}) \) is obviously a morphism of fibrations and fiberwise equivalence, and the inclusion \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(\text{Top}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \) is a morphism of fibrations and fiberwise equivalence by [Hel19, §§13.6,15.7]. Hence, it remains to consider \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet}) \).

To see that it is a morphism of fibrations, note that any cartesian morphism in \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \) is isomorphic to one which is in the image of the localization morphism \( \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \to \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) \), hence its image in \( \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet}) \) will be cartesian, since we have a commuting square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet}) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{Top}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_i(\text{sSet})
\end{array}
\]

where the top and right morphisms are morphisms of fibrations.

That it is a fiberwise equivalence follows Proposition 12.3. □

IV 1-discrete 2-fibrations and the invariance theorem

We now formulate and prove the “abstract” version of the homotopy-invariance property of the homotopical semantics, and deduce from it the concrete version.

The main new ingredient which will be involved in this is that of 1-discrete 2-fibrations (Definition 14.2). Let us say something about the significance of this notion.

We have already seen, in [Hel19, §9.2], part of the correspondence between Grothendieck fibrations and pseudo-functors – namely, that a pseudo-functor \( \hat{G} : C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat} \) can be associated to a cloven fibration over \( C \). One can also go the other way, and construct a fibration from a given pseudo-functor – this is known as the Grothendieck construction. These operations are inverse to each other, in the sense that they establish an equivalence between naturally defined 2-categories of pseudo-functors \( C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat} \) and of fibrations over \( C \).

By applying the Grothendieck construction to the identity functor \( \text{Cat} \to \text{Cat} \), one obtains a universal fibration over \( \text{Cat}^{\text{op}} \) (in which the fiber over a category \( D \) is \( D \) itself), so that the Grothendieck construction can be described as simply pulling back the universal fibration along a given pseudo-functor \( C \to \text{Cat}^{\text{op}} \) (however, note that this is not entirely trivial to make precise, as one must clarify the notion of pulling back a fibration along a pseudo-functor).

There is a simpler and well-known version of the Grothendieck construction, in the case that the given pseudo-functor \( C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat} \) is valued in discrete categories – i.e., it is just a functor \( C^{\text{op}} \to \text{Set} \). In this case, the Grothendieck construction is the usual “category of elements”. The fibrations obtained in this way are precisely the discrete fibrations (these are prefibrations for which every morphism has a unique lift with a given codomain). In this case, the universal fibration is simply the forgetful functor \( (\text{Set}_*)^{\text{op}} \to \text{Set}^{\text{op}} \) from the category of pointed sets.
Now, we note that, in the case of discrete fibrations, we are considering prefibrations of

*1-categories* with *0-categories* as fibers, and a particular *1-category* \( \text{Set} \)

with a universal such prefibration over it. By contrast, in the case of general fibrations, we are considering prefibrations of

*1-categories* with *1-categories* as fibers, and a particular *2-category* \( \text{Cat} \)

with a universal such prefibration over it. Hence, we see that in generalizing discrete fibrations, we should consider an arbitrary *2-category* as a base but (still) *1-categories* as fibers – this is the notion of *1-discrete 2-fibration* which, as we see, is in a sense *more* natural than the notion of fibration.

Now, just as the notion of discrete fibration can be defined without reference to general fibrations, the notion of 1-discrete 2-fibration can be defined without reference to general 2-fibrations, and this is what we will do. More generally, when it comes to such higher-categorical generalities, there tends to be a lot of natural elegant extra structure lurking close at hand, as well as the ever-present possibility of “weakening” the notions being considered (pseudo-functors instead of strict 2-functors, etc.), but the elaboration of this extra structure tends to increase very quickly in complexity. Thus, below, we try to be as economical as possible, and define only those notions that we need, foregoing certain natural more general formulations.

### 13 2-categorical preliminaries

We begin with some generalities about 2-categories. The totality of 2-categories forms a *3-dimensional structure* (i.e., the collection of morphisms between 2-categories is 2-dimensional), and this comes in various flavours according to the weakness of the notions being considered. Here, we elaborate a very small part of this 3-dimensional structure.

#### 13.1. Definition. Given a category \( C \), a 2-category \( D \) and functors \( F, G : C \to D \), a *pseudonatural transformation* \( \alpha : F \to G \) consists of the following data (i)-(ii), subject to the conditions (iii)-(iv):

(i) A 1-cell \( \alpha_A : FA \to GA \) for each \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \)

(ii) An isomorphism 2-cell

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
FA & \xrightarrow{Ff} & FB \\
\downarrow \alpha_A & \searrow \alpha_f & \downarrow \alpha_B \\
GA & \xrightarrow{Gf} & GB \\
\end{array}
\]

for each morphism \( f : A \to B \) in \( C \)

(iii) For each pair \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \) of composable morphisms in \( C \), we have \((1_{Gg} \circ \alpha_f)(\alpha_g \circ 1_{Ff}) = \alpha gf\)

(iv) For each \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \), we have \( \alpha_A \) is an equivalence in \( D \)

Given pseudonatural transformations \( F \xrightarrow{\alpha} G \xrightarrow{\beta} H \), their *composite* \( \beta \circ \alpha \) is defined by the prescriptions \((\beta \circ \alpha)_A = \beta_A \circ \alpha_A \) and \((\beta \circ \alpha)_f = (\beta_f \circ \alpha_A)(\beta_A \circ \alpha_f)\). We leave it to the reader to verify that this is again a pseudonatural transformation.

A 1-cell \( f : A \to B \) in a 2-category is an *equivalence* if there exists a 1-cell \( g : B \to A \) and isomorphism 2-cells \( g \circ f \cong 1_A \) and \( f \circ g \cong 1_B \) – such a \( g \) is called a *quasi-inverse* to \( f \). The pseudonatural transformation \( \alpha : F \to G \) is a *pseudonatural equivalence* if \( \alpha_A \) is an equivalence in \( D \) for each \( A \in \text{Ob} \, C \).

#### 13.2. Definition. Given categories \( B \) and \( C \), 2-categories \( D \) and \( E \), functors \( F : B \to C \) and
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$G, H : C \rightarrow D$, a 2-functor $K : D \rightarrow E$ and a pseudonatural transformation $\alpha : G \rightarrow H$, as in

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
B & \xrightarrow{F} & C \\
\downarrow & \alpha & \downarrow \\
D & \xrightarrow{K} & E,
\end{array}
$$

we define (i) the whiskering of $\alpha$ by $K$, which we denote by $K \circ \alpha$, to be the pseudonatural transformation $K G \rightarrow K H$ defined by $(K \circ \alpha)_A = K(\alpha_A)$ and $(K \circ \alpha)_f = K(\alpha_f)$ for $A \in \text{Ob} C$ and $f \in \text{Ar} C$; and (ii) the whiskering of $\alpha$ by $F$, denoted by $\alpha \circ F$ to be the pseudonatural transformation $G F \rightarrow H F$ defined by $(\alpha \circ F)_A = \alpha_{F A}$ and $(\alpha \circ F)_f = \alpha_{F f}$.

We leave to the reader the easy proof that these are in fact pseudonatural transformations as claimed.

We note that the whiskering of a pseudonatural equivalence (on either side) is again a pseudonatural equivalence.

14 1-discrete 2-fibrations

We now introduce 1-discrete 2-fibrations (1D2Fs). We then prove some analogues for 1D2Fs of basic properties of fibrations. We also describe (a part of) the “Grothendieck construction” for 1D2Fs.

14.1. Definition. Given 2-categories $C$ and $D$, we define a 2-functor $\mathcal{F} : C \rightarrow D$ to be a pseudo-functor such that $\mathcal{F} f, g$ and $\mathcal{F} A$ are identity 2-cells for every $A \in \text{Ob} C$ and $A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$ in $C$.

More concretely, a 2-functor is a “homomorphism” in the obvious sense from $C$ to $D$; it takes $i$-cells to $i$-cells (for $i = 0, 1, 2$) and preserves all compositions and identities. Note that a 2-functor induces a functor on underlying 1-categories.

14.2. Definition. A pre-2-fibration is simply a 2-functor $\mathcal{C} \downarrow \uparrow B$. We use similar terminology for pre-2-fibrations as we do for prefibrations: $B$ is the base 2-category; $C$ is the total 2-category; a 0-, 1-, or 2-cell in $C$ lies over its image in $B$; and so on. The fiber $\mathcal{C}^A$ of $\mathcal{C}$ over $A \in \text{Ob} B$ is the sub-2-category consisting of 0-cells, 1-cells, and 2-cells lying over $A, 1_A$, and $1_{1A}$, respectively. The underlying prefibration of a pre-2-fibration is just the induced functor on the underlying 1-categories.

The pre-2-fibration $\mathcal{C}$ is a 1-discrete 2-fibration (or 1D2F) if (i) the underlying prefibration is a fibration, and (ii) for every 2-cell $\alpha : f \rightarrow g$ in $B$ and every 1-cell $p$ over $f$, there is a unique 2-cell over $\alpha$ with domain $p$, as depicted below (this says that the functor $\text{Hom}_C(P, Q) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(A, B)$ is a discrete op-fibration).

Note that the fibers of a 1D2F are 1-categories and that, if $B$ is a 1-category, then a 1D2F over $B$ (seen as a 2-category with only trivial 2-cells) is the same thing as a fibration over $B$.

14.3. Proposition. In a 1D2F, we have the following generalization of the universal property for cartesian morphisms.

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\downarrow & \alpha & \downarrow \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}\]
Let \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \) be a 1D2F, and suppose we have a solid diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\end{array}
\]

with \( q \) cartesian over \( g \), \( r \) lying over \( h \), and \( \alpha \) a 2-cell \( h \to gf \).

**Claim:** There exists a unique 1-cell \( p : P \to Q \) over \( f \) for which there exists a (necessarily unique) 2-cell \( r \to qp \) over \( \alpha \).

**Proof:** We know that there is a unique 2-cell \( \sigma : r \to r' \) over \( \alpha \) with domain \( r \), and we can (and must) then take \( p \) to be unique morphism \( P \to Q \) over \( f \) such that \( qp = r' \):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\end{array}
\]

14.4. **Proposition.** Next, we have a generalization in 1D2Fs of the uniqueness up to isomorphism of cartesian morphisms in fibrations [Hel19, Proposition 2.9].

Given a 1D2F \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow B \) and a diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & Q \\
\end{array}
\]

in which \( r, p, q, \sigma \) lie over \( 1_A, f, g, \alpha \), respectively, and \( q \) and \( r \) are cartesian: if \( \alpha \) (and hence \( \sigma \)) is an isomorphism 2-cell, then \( r \) is an isomorphism 1-cell.

**Proof:** By Proposition 14.3, there is a unique morphism \( r' : Q \to P \) over \( A \) for which there exists a
(necessarily unique) 2-cell $\sigma' : q \to pr'$ over $\alpha^{-1}$:

Then $r'r$ and $1_P$ are both the unique morphism $t : P \to P'$ over $1_A$ for which there exists a 2-cell $p \to pt$; hence $r'r = 1_P$. Similarly, $rr' = 1_Q$. □

14.5. Proposition. We also have a generalization in 1D2Fs of the “2-of-3” property [Hel19, Proposition 2.5] of cartesian morphisms in fibrations.

Given a 1D2F $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$ and a diagram

with $p, q, r, \sigma$ lying over $f, g, h, \alpha$, respectively: if $\alpha$ (and hence $\sigma$) is invertible, and $q$ and $r$ are cartesian, then so is $p$.

Proof: Choosing a cartesian lift $\uparrow: f^*Q \to Q$ of $f$, we obtain a factorization $p = \uparrow p$ as in

It then follows from Proposition 14.4 that $\uparrow p$ is an isomorphism, and hence (by [Hel19, Propositions 2.6 and 2.7]) that $p$ is cartesian. □

14.6. Construction. In [Hel19, § 9.2], we reviewed the well-known construction of a pseudo-functor $B^{op} \to \text{Cat}$ from a cloven fibration $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$.

We now show how, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a 1D2F, the resulting pseudo-functor can be extended to a pseudo-functor on the 2-category $B^{op}$.

To do this, we need to (i) extend the map $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} : \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A)$ to a functor $\text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Cat}}(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A)$ for each $A, B \in \text{Ob} B$ – and in particular, define a natural transformation $\alpha^* : f^* \to g^*$ for each 2-cell $\alpha : f \to g$ in $B$ – and (ii) prove that the 2-cells $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{fg} : f^*g^* \to (gf)^*$ are then natural in $f$ an $g$. 33
Given 1-cells \( f, g : A \to B \) and a 2-cell \( \alpha : f \to g \) in \( \mathbf{B} \), we define \( \alpha_Q^* : f^*Q \to g^*Q \) for each \( Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B \) to be the (by Proposition 14.3) unique morphism \( f^*Q \to g^*Q \) over \( A \) for which there exists a 2-cell \( f^*Q \to g^*Q \cdot \alpha_Q^* \) over \( \alpha : f \to g \):  

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  f^*Q & \xrightarrow{\alpha_Q^*} & g^*Q \\
  \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
  f^\uparrow Q & \xrightarrow{\alpha^\uparrow} & g^\uparrow Q \\
  \hline
  A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B.
\end{array}
\]

To see that \( \alpha^* \), thus defined, is natural, let \( p : P \to Q \) be a morphism in \( \mathcal{C}^B \), and observe that we have 2-cells from \( p \cdot f^\uparrow P \) to both \( g^\uparrow Q \cdot (g^*p \cdot \alpha^*_P) \) and \( g^\uparrow Q \cdot (\alpha^*_Q \cdot f^*p) \):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  f^*P & \xrightarrow{f^\uparrow P} & f^\uparrow P \\
  \downarrow \alpha_P^* \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \alpha_P^* \\
  g^*P & \xrightarrow{g^\uparrow P} & g^\uparrow P \\
  \hline
  F^*Q & \xrightarrow{\alpha_Q^*} & g^\uparrow Q \\
  \downarrow \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow \alpha^\uparrow \\
  \hline
  g^\uparrow Q & \xrightarrow{g^*p} & g^\uparrow Q \\
  \hline
  A & \xrightarrow{f} & B.
\end{array}
\]

Hence \((\alpha_Q^* f^*p)\) and \((\alpha_Q^* f^*p)\) are equal by Proposition 14.3.

The proofs that the association \( \alpha \mapsto \alpha^* \) defines a functor \( \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^B}(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A) \), and that that the 2-cells \( \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{gf} : f^*g^* \to (gf)^* \) are natural in \( f \) an \( g \), are similar – in each case, it must be shown that two morphisms are equal, and this is shown by exhibiting certain 2-cells and applying Proposition 14.3.

**14.7. Construction.** We now give the “reverse” construction to Construction 14.6. Namely, given a 2-category \( \mathbf{B} \) with underlying category \( |\mathbf{B}| \), a cloven fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow |\mathbf{B}| \), and a pseudo-functor \( \mathbf{B}^{op} \to \mathbf{Cat} \) extending the pseudo-functor \( \hat{\mathcal{C}} : |\mathbf{B}|^{op} \to \mathbf{Cat} \) associated to \( \mathcal{C} \), we will put a 2-category structure on \( \mathcal{C} \) and extend \( \mathcal{C} \) to a 1D2F.

Since \( \hat{\mathcal{C}} \) is to be a 1D2F, there can be at most one 2-cell with given domain and codomain in \( \mathcal{C} \) over a given 2-cell in \( \mathbf{B} \); hence, we must simply declare when there is in fact one. We declare that, given \( p, q : P \to Q \) in \( \mathcal{C} \) lying over \( f, g : A \to B \) (respectively) in \( \mathbf{B} \) and a 2-cell \( \alpha : f \to g \), there is a 2-cell \( p \to q \) lying over \( \alpha \) if and only if the triangle

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  P & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & Q \\
  \downarrow p \quad \quad \quad \downarrow q \\
  \hline
  P & \xrightarrow{\alpha_Q^*} & Q \\
\end{array}
\]
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in \( \mathcal{C}^A \) commutes, where we write \( \alpha^* \) for \( \hat{C}\alpha \).

The composition operations in \( \mathcal{C} \) are uniquely determined. The composite of 2-cells \( p \xrightarrow{\alpha} q \xrightarrow{\beta} r \) lying over \( f \xrightarrow{\alpha} g \xrightarrow{\beta} h \) in \( \mathcal{B} \) must be the unique 2-cell lying over \( \beta \cdot \alpha \), if such a 2-cell exists. That such a 2-cell does in fact exist follow from the commutativity of

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & g^*Q \\
\downarrow_{\pi} & \Downarrow_{\alpha Q} & \Downarrow_{(\beta \cdot \alpha)^* Q} \\
\downarrow_{\tau} & \Downarrow_{\beta Q} & \downarrow_{h^*Q},
\end{array}
\]

where we have used the functoriality of \( \hat{C} : \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_B(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A) \) – i.e., that \( (\beta \cdot \alpha)^* = \beta^* \cdot \alpha^* \).

That this composition is associative is immediate. That it is unital follows immediately from the fact that there is a 2-cell \( p \to p \) lying over \( 1_f : f \to f \) for each \( f : A \to B \) in \( \mathcal{B} \), which in turn follows from the commutativity of

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{p} & f^*Q \\
\downarrow_{\pi} & \Downarrow_{1_Q} & \downarrow_{f^*Q},
\end{array}
\]

where we have again used the functoriality of \( \hat{C} : \text{Hom}_B(A, B) \to \text{Hom}_B(\mathcal{C}^B, \mathcal{C}^A) \).

The “horizontal” composite of 2-cells \( \sigma \) and \( \tau \) lying over \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) as in

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & Q & \xrightarrow{\beta^*} & Q \\
\downarrow_{\pi} & \downarrow_{q} & \downarrow_{s} & \downarrow_{r} & \downarrow_{\beta Q} \\
A & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & B & \xrightarrow{\beta} & B
\end{array}
\]

must, again, be the unique 2-cell \( rp \to sq \) over \( \beta \circ \alpha \). That such a 2-cell exists follows from the commutativity of the following diagram, in which we use the naturality of \( \hat{C}_{ABC} \) (see [Hel19, Definition 9.1] for this notation).
The remaining conditions for $\mathcal{C}$ to be a 2-category – namely, the associativity and unitality of the horizontal composition, and that horizontal composition is functorial – all follow immediately from the “1-discreteness” of $\mathcal{C}$ – i.e., the fact that there is at most one 2-cell in $\mathcal{C}$ with given domain and codomain over a given 2-cell in $\mathcal{B}$.

14.8. **Definition.** Given any $\wedge=\text{-}\text{cloven }\wedge=\text{-}\text{fibration }\mathcal{C} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$, we have by [Hel19, Theorems 8.5 and 9.12] a 2-categorical structure on $\mathcal{B}$ and an extension of the pseudo-functor $\hat{\mathcal{C}} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat}$ associated to the cleavage to a pseudo-functor of 2-categories. Hence, Construction 14.7 extends $\mathcal{C}$ to a 1D2F. We call this 1D2F the **canonical extension of $\mathcal{C}$**.

14.9. **Definition.** Let $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ be a fibration, $\mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}'}$ be a 1D2F, $\varphi, \psi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}'$ functors, and $\Phi, \Psi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$ functors lying over $\varphi$ and $\psi$. We say that a pseudonatural transformation $\beta : \Phi \to \Psi$ lies over a pseudonatural transformation $\alpha : \varphi \to \psi$ if $\mathcal{C}' \circ \beta = \alpha \circ \mathcal{C}$ (here we are using the “whiskering” operations from 13.2).

15 **The abstract invariance theorem**

We now come to the proof of the abstract version of the homotopy-invariance property. In this generality, the theorem states that a free $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibration satisfies with respect to pseudonatural transformations the property which it is required by definition to satisfy with respect to natural transformations.

We make a small digression to discuss freeness. In classical (“0-categorical”) algebra, a free object (group, ring, etc.) is required to satisfy a certain universal property, which then determines it up to isomorphism. In the case of categorical structures, it is often more natural to impose conditions that determine the object under consideration up to equivalence. However, there are usually different conditions which do this.

In the case at hand, namely that of $\mathcal{C} \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ being a free $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibration over $\mathcal{B}$, the weakest such condition one could impose is that, for any other $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibration $\mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{\mathcal{B}}$ over $\mathcal{B}$, there exists a morphism $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$ of fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$, and that, any two such morphisms are isomorphic; and this is in fact the definition we use.

A slightly stronger condition one could demand is that, given any $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibration $\mathcal{C}'$, any f.p. functor $\varphi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}'$ can be extended to a morphism $(\varphi, \Phi) : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$ of $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibrations, and for any natural isomorphism $\varphi \to \psi$ to another f.p. functor, there is a natural isomorphism $\Phi \to \Psi$ lying over it. In fact, a free $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibration (in the above sense) automatically satisfies this stronger universal property; the invariance theorem then says that, when $\mathcal{C}'$ is a 1D2F, $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies this property with respect to pseudonatural equivalences and not just natural isomorphisms.

The proof that $\mathcal{C}$ satisfies the stronger universal property proceeds (roughly speaking) by pulling back the fibration $\mathcal{C}'$ along the given functors $\varphi, \psi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}'$, showing that the natural isomorphism $\varphi \to \psi$ induces an equivalence of fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$ between these pullbacks, and then appealing to the universal property of $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to $h^\mathcal{C}$-fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$.

It is easy to see why this should work for pseudonatural transformations and not just natural transformations. Namely, from the “pseudo-functor to $\text{Cat}$” perspective, the pullback $\varphi^* \mathcal{C}'$ of a fibration $\mathcal{C}'$ along a morphism $\varphi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}'$ is just given by composing $\varphi^{\text{op}} : \mathcal{B}^{\text{op}} \to \mathcal{B}'^{\text{op}}$ with the pseudo-functor $\hat{\mathcal{C}}' : \mathcal{B}'^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat}$. On the other hand, a morphism of fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$ corresponds to a pseudonatural transformation of pseudo-functors from $\mathcal{B}^{\text{op}}$ to $\text{Cat}$. Hence, given a natural isomorphism $\alpha : \varphi \to \psi$, the induced equivalence $\varphi^* \mathcal{C}' \simeq \psi^* \mathcal{C}'$ between the pullbacks along $\varphi$ and $\psi$ is obtained as
the whiskering

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
B^\text{op} & \xrightarrow{\psi^\text{op}} & B'^\text{op} \\
\uparrow_{\alpha^\text{op}} & & \downarrow_{\psi^\text{op}} \\
\check{C} & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & \check{C}'
\end{array} \]

The point is now that this whiskering can be carried out just as well if \( \alpha \) is a pseudo-natural transformation.

**15.1. Definition.** Given a prefibration \( \mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{B'} \) and a functor \( F : B \to B' \), we define the pullback \( F^* \mathcal{C} \downarrow_{B} \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) along \( F \) to be the usual pullback

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
F^* \mathcal{C}' & \xrightarrow{F^* \mathcal{C}'} & \mathcal{C}' \\
\downarrow_{f^* \mathcal{C}} & & \downarrow_{\mathcal{C}'} \\
B & \xrightarrow{F} & B'
\end{array} \]

in the category of categories, where we write \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \), as indicated, for the associated functor \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \to \mathcal{C}' \). Explicitly, the objects of \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) are pairs \((A, P)\) with \( A \in \text{Ob} B \) and \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}'F^A \), and the morphisms are pairs \((f, p)\) with \( f \in \text{Ar} B \) and \( p \in \text{Ar} \mathcal{C}' \) lying over \( Ff \).

The prefibration \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) is a fibration if \( \mathcal{C}' \) is, and inherits many properties from \( \mathcal{C}' \) – in particular, if \( B \) is an f.p. category and \( F \) is an f.p. functor, then if \( \mathcal{C}' \) is an \( h^\infty \)-fibration, \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) is as well. The reason is that \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) induces isomorphisms \( (F^* \mathcal{C}'^A)^A \to \mathcal{C}'^F^A \) on fibers for each \( A \in \text{Ob} B \), and – if \( \mathcal{C}' \) is a fibration – a morphism in \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) is cartesian or cocartesian if and only if its image under \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) is, and similarly the \( \prod \)-diagrams in \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) are exactly those whose images under \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) are \( \prod \)-diagrams.

By the universal property of the pullback, given any other prefibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow_{B} \) over \( B \) and any morphism \( \Phi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}' \) of prefibrations over \( B \), we have a unique morphism \( \Phi_B : \mathcal{C} \to F^* \mathcal{C}' \) of prefibrations over \( B \) such that \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \cdot \Phi_B = \Phi \). It follows from the above observations that \( \Phi_B \) is a morphism of \( (h^\infty) \)-fibrations whenever \( \mathcal{C}' \) and \( \mathcal{C} \) are \( (h^\infty) \)-fibrations and \( (\varphi, \Phi) \) is a morphism thereof.

If \( \mathcal{C}' \) is a 1D2F, then \( F^* \mathcal{C}' \) is defined as the pullback of the underlying fibration of \( \mathcal{C}' \).

**15.2. Construction.** Let \( B \) be a category, \( \mathcal{C}' \downarrow_{B'} \) a cloven 1D2F, let \( F, G : B \to B' \) be functors, and let \( \alpha : F \to G \) be a pseudonatural transformation. We will construct from this a morphism \( \check{\alpha} : G^* \mathcal{C}' \to F^* \mathcal{C}' \) of fibrations over \( B \) between the associated pullback fibrations, as well as a pseudonatural transformation \( \check{\alpha} : F^\dagger \mathcal{C}' \cdot \check{\alpha} \to G^\dagger \mathcal{C}' \) over \( \alpha \), as shown below. We will define these
simultaneously.

Given $A \in \text{Ob } B$ and $(A, P) \in (G^* \mathcal{C}')^A$ (i.e., $P \in \mathcal{C}'^A$), we set $\tilde{\alpha}(A, P) = (A, (\alpha_A)^* P) \in (F^* \mathcal{C}')^A$, and we set $\tilde{\alpha}_{(A, P)}$ to be the morphism $(\alpha_A)^* P : \alpha_A^* P \to P$.

Next, let $(f, p) : (A, P) \to (B, Q)$ be a morphism in $G^* \mathcal{C}'$. Since we want $\tilde{\alpha}(f, p)$ to be a morphism over $f : A \to B$ in $B$, it must be of the form $(f, p')$ for some $p' : (\alpha_A)^* P \to (\alpha_B)^* Q$ over $Ff$. Seeing as we want there to be a 2-cell $\tilde{\alpha}(f, p) : \tilde{\alpha}_{(B, Q)} \cdot (F^* \mathcal{C}')(\tilde{\alpha}(f, p)) = (\alpha_B)^* Q \cdot p' \to p \cdot (\alpha_A)^* P = (G^* \mathcal{C}')(f, p) \cdot \tilde{\alpha}_{(A, P)}$ lying over $\alpha_f$, we see that we are forced to define $p'$ to be the unique morphism over $Ff$ for which there exists a 2-cell

$$
(\alpha_A)^* P \xrightarrow{p'} (\alpha_B)^* Q
$$

lying over $\alpha_f$ (such a $p'$ exists by Proposition 14.3 since $\alpha_{(f, p)}$ is invertible), and we must take $\tilde{\alpha}_f$ to be this 2-cell lying over $\alpha_f$.

We now prove simultaneously that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is a functor and that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is a pseudonatural transformation.

Let $(A, P) \xrightarrow{(f, p)} (B, Q) \xrightarrow{(g, q)} (C, R)$ be morphisms in $G^* \mathcal{C}'$. Let us write $(f, p')$ and $(g, q')$ for $\tilde{\alpha}(f, p)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}(g, q)$, as well as $(gf, qp')$ for $\tilde{\alpha}(gf, qp)$. We must show that the 2-cells

$$
\alpha_A^* P \xrightarrow{(gf)^*} \alpha_C^* R
$$

and

$$
\alpha_A^* P \xrightarrow{(qp)^*} \alpha_C^* R
$$

are compatible.
are equal – i.e., that \((1_q \circ \tilde{\alpha}_{f,p}) \circ 1_{p'} = \tilde{\alpha}_{(gf,qp)}\) – and also that \(q'p' = (qp')\). The first claim follows at once from the second by 1-discreteness. The second claim is true since \((qp')\) is by definition the unique morphism \(\alpha_A^* P \to \alpha_C^* R\) over \(F(gf)\) for which there exists a 2-cell as above on the right, and \(q'p'\) also has this property.

The proof of the remaining (unitality) property of \(\tilde{\alpha}\) and \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is similar.

Finally, we must see that \(\tilde{\alpha}\) preserves cartesian morphisms. This follows from the definition of \(\tilde{\alpha}\), Proposition 14.5, and the fact that a morphism \((f,p)\) in \(F^* C'\) is cartesian if and only if \(p\) is.

**15.3. Proposition.** Let \(\mathcal{C}, F, G,\) and \(\alpha\) be as in Construction 15.2

**Claim:** If \(\alpha\) is a pseudonatural equivalence, then \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a fiberwise-equivalence and \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a pseudonatural equivalence.

**Proof:** To see that \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a fiberwise equivalence, note that the induced functor \(\tilde{\alpha} : (G^* \mathcal{C})^A \to (F^* \mathcal{C})^A\) is (with respect to the identifications \((F^* \mathcal{C})^A \cong \mathcal{C}^{FA}\) and \((G^* \mathcal{C})^A \cong \mathcal{C}^{FA})\) just the pullback functor 

\[
(\alpha_A)^* : \mathcal{C}^{GA} \to \mathcal{C}^{FA}.
\]

This is an equivalence, since, given a quasi-inverse \(\tilde{\beta}_A\) for \(\alpha_A\), we obtain a quasi-inverse \((\tilde{\beta}_A)^*\) for \((\alpha_A)^*\).

We now prove that \(\tilde{\alpha}\) is a pseudonatural equivalence. Since each \(\alpha_A\) is an equivalence in \(\mathcal{C}\) and each \(\tilde{\alpha}_A\) is a cartesian lift of \(\alpha_A\), it suffices to prove that any cartesian lift of an equivalence in a 1D2F is again an equivalence.

Let \(f : A \to B\) be an equivalence with quasi-inverse \(g : B \to A\), so that there exist isomorphism 2-cells \(\alpha : 1_A \cong gf\) and \(\beta : 1_B \cong fg\), and let \(p : P \to Q\) be a cartesian lift of \(f\). By Proposition 14.3, there exists a unique morphism \(q : Q \to P\) over \(g\) for which there exists a (necessarily invertible) 2-cell \(1_Q \cong pq\) over \(\beta\). It remains to see that \(qp \cong 1_P\). By Proposition 14.5, \(q\) is cartesian, and hence, by the argument we just gave, there exists \(p' : P \to Q\) with \(qp' \cong 1_P\). We then have \(p \cong pqp' \cong p'\) and hence \(qp \cong qp' \cong 1_P\). \(\square\)

**15.4. Definition.** An \(h=\)-fibration \(\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B}\) is free over \(\mathcal{B}\) if, for any \(h=\)-fibration \(\mathcal{C}' \downarrow \mathcal{B}\) over \(\mathcal{B}\), there is up to isomorphism a unique morphism \(\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'\) of \(h=\)-fibrations over \(\mathcal{B}\); i.e., there exists such a morphism, and for any two such, there exists a natural isomorphism of morphisms of fibrations over \(\mathcal{B}\) between them.

**15.5. Proposition.** If \(\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B}\) is a free \(h=\)-fibration over \(\mathcal{B}\) and \(\mathcal{C}' \downarrow \mathcal{B}'\) is any \(h=\)-fibration, then for any f.p. functor \(\varphi : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}'\), there exists a morphism of \(h=\)-fibrations \((\varphi, \Phi) : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'\) over \(\mathcal{B}\).

**Proof:** Taking the pullback \((\tilde{\varphi}, \tilde{\varphi}^* \mathcal{C}') : \mathcal{C}^* \mathcal{C}' \to \mathcal{C}^* \mathcal{C}'\) along \(\varphi\), we have by the discussion in Definition 15.1 that \(\varphi^* \mathcal{C}'\) is an \(h=\)-fibration. Hence, by the freeness of \(\mathcal{C}\), we then have a morphism \(\Psi : \mathcal{C} \to \varphi^* \mathcal{C}'\) of \(h=\)-fibrations over \(\mathcal{B}\). Since the composite of a morphism of \(h=\)-fibrations is again one, \((\Phi \circ \Psi, \varphi)\) is as desired. \(\square\)

**15.6. Theorem.** Suppose \(\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B}\) is a free \(h=\)-fibration, \(\mathcal{C}' \downarrow \mathcal{B}'\) is a 1D2F which is also an \(h=\)-fibration, \((\varphi, \Phi)\) and \((\psi, \Psi)\) are morphisms \(\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{C}' \downarrow \mathcal{B}'\) of \(h=\)-fibrations, and \(\alpha : \varphi \to \psi\) is a pseudonatural equivalence.

**Claim:** There exists a pseudonatural equivalence \(\Phi \to \Psi\) lying over \(\alpha\).

In particular, for each \(P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}\) over some \(A \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{B}\), there is an equivalence \(p : \Phi P \to \Psi P\) lying over the equivalence \(\alpha_A : \varphi A \to \psi A\) (i.e., \(p\) lies over \(\alpha_A\), there is a quasi-inverse \(q\) of \(p\) lying over a
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quasi-inverse of $\alpha_A$, and the associated 2-cells $1_{\psi} \Rightarrow p_\psi$ and $1_{\psi} \Rightarrow p_q$ in $C$ lie over the corresponding ones in $B$).

Proof: To begin, we choose a cleavage of $C'$ (which we can do by the axiom of choice – otherwise, we must assume explicitly that $C'$ admits a cleavage). Consider the pullbacks of $C'$ along $\varphi$ and $\psi$. We then have the situation depicted in Construction 15.2, with $F = \varphi$ and $G = \psi$. By Proposition 15.3 the morphism $\tilde{\alpha} : \psi^*C' \to \varphi^*C'$ of fibrations is a fiberwise equivalence and hence, by Proposition 15.7 below, a morphism of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$.

By the definition of the pullback, we have morphisms of fibrations $\Phi : C \to \varphi^*C'$ and $\Psi : C \to \psi^*C'$ over $B$ such that $\varphi^*C' \circ \Phi = \Phi$ and $\psi^*C' \circ \Psi = \Psi$ – and by the discussion in Definition 15.2, these are morphisms of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$. Hence, since the composite of morphisms of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$ over $B$ is again one, we have that $\tilde{\alpha} \circ \Phi : C \to \varphi^*C'$ is a morphism of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$. Hence, by the freeness of $C$, we have a natural isomorphism $\eta : \Phi \to \tilde{\alpha} \Psi$ of morphisms of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$ over $B$:

Hence, the “pasting” of $\eta$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$ – i.e. the composite pseudonatural transformation $(\tilde{\alpha} \circ 1_{\Phi}) \circ (1_{\psi^*C'} \circ \eta)$ – is as desired.

The final statement in the theorem follows from the definition of “pseudonatural equivalence over $\alpha$” (where, to arrange the described situation with the quasi-inverse and 2-cells in $C$ lying over those in $B$, we simply choose the ones in $C$ first, and let the ones in $B$ be their image under $\alpha$).

15.7. Proposition. Suppose $C \downarrow B$ and $C' \downarrow B'$ are $h^=\text{-fibrations}$, and $(\Phi, \varphi) : C \downarrow B \to C' \downarrow B'$ is a morphism of fibrations which is a fiberwise equivalence and such that $\varphi$ is product-preserving.

Claim: $(\Phi, \varphi)$ is a morphism of $h^=\text{-fibrations}$.

Proof: $\varphi$ is product-preserving by assumption, and the induced functors $\mathcal{C}^B \to \mathcal{C}^B$ are clearly bicartesian closed since they are equivalences. Hence, it only remains to see that the relevant co-cartesian morphisms and $\prod^*$-diagrams are preserved.

In fact, all co-cartesian morphisms and $\prod^*$-diagrams are preserved. This follows easily from the fact that, in the present situation, given a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $B$ and objects $P$ and $Q$ in $\mathcal{C}^A$ and $\mathcal{C}^B$, $\Phi$ induces a bijection between morphisms $P \to Q$ lying over $f$ and morphisms $\Phi P \to \Phi Q$ lying over $\varphi f$, and moreover that $p : P \to Q$ is cartesian if and only if $\Phi p$ is.

16 Homotopy homomorphisms

The abstract invariance theorem proven in the previous section was stated with respect to an arbitrary free $h^=\text{-fibration}$ $\mathcal{C} \downarrow B$. However, in practice, we are interested in particular base categories $B$, namely
the free f.p. category $\text{Tm}_\sigma$ built out of the terms of a given signature $\sigma$ (see §7).

In this situation, the invariance theorem admits a certain refinement, which we will ultimately need to recover, in §17 below, the invariance property of the homotopical semantics as described in §5. Namely, in Theorem 15.6, we begin with two f.p. functors $B \to C$ and a pseudonatural equivalence between them. When $B = \text{Tm}_\sigma$, we know, by the freeness property of $\text{Tm}_\sigma$, that each of these functors comes from an interpretation $\sigma \to C$. However, given a homotopy-equivalence between these interpretations (which is what we are ultimately interested in), its not clear a priori that the induced f.p. functors $\text{Tm}_\sigma \to C$ will be pseudonaturally equivalent. This is what we prove in this section.

The proof proceeds by considering a modified arrow category $C\sim\cdot$, such that the f.p. functors into $C\sim\cdot$ are pseudonatural equivalences of f.p. functors into $C$, and the $\sigma$-interpretations in $C\sim\cdot$ are homotopy-equivalences of $\sigma$-interpretations into $C$; this reduces the claim to the original freeness property of $\text{Tm}_\sigma$.

16.1. Definition. Given a 2-category $C$, we define $C\sim$, the pseudo-arrow category of $C$, to have objects functors $2 \to C$ – i.e., 1-cells in $C$ – and to have morphisms pseudonatural transformations, with composition being given by composition of pseudonatural transformations which, as we leave to the reader to verify, is associative and has identities

In other words a morphism $\alpha$ from $f_1 : A_1 \to B_1$ to $f_2 : A_2 \to B_2$ in $C\sim$ is a triple $(\alpha_A, \alpha_B, \alpha_f)$ with $\alpha_A : A_1 \to A_2$, $\alpha_B : B_1 \to B_2$, and $\alpha_f : \alpha_B \circ f_1 \sim \to f_2 \circ \alpha_A$.

There are obvious domain and codomain functors dom, cod : $C\sim \to C$.

We define $C\sim\cdot$ to be the full subcategory of $C\sim$ with objects the equivalences in $C$.

16.2. Proposition. Given a 2-category $C$, if $C$ has finite 2-categorical products (see [Hel19, Definition 10.1]), then the categories $C\sim$ and $C\sim\cdot$ have finite products. Moreover, the inclusion functor $C\sim\cdot \hookrightarrow C\sim$, as well as the functors dom, cod : $C\sim \to C$, are f.p. functors.

Proof: Given 1-cells $g : A \to C$ and $h : B \to D$ and products $A \times B$ and $C \times D$ in $C$, we will show that the morphisms $g \times h \to g$ and $g \times h \to h$ in $C\sim$ given by $(\pi_1, \pi_1, 1_{g\pi_1})$ and $(\pi_2, \pi_2, 1_{h\pi_2})$ exhibit $g \times h$ as a product of $g$ and $h$. It follows that dom and cod are f.p.

Given a 1-cell $f : X \to Y$ in $C$ and morphisms $(s, t, \alpha) : f \to g$ and $(u, v, \beta) : f \to h$ in $C\sim$, we must show that there is a unique morphism $(w, x, \gamma) : f \to g \times h$ such that $\pi_1 w = s$, $\pi_2 w = u$, $\pi_1 x = t$, $\pi_2 x = v$, $1_{\pi_1} \circ \gamma = \alpha$, and $1_{\pi_2} \circ \gamma = \beta$. Clearly, we must take $w = (s, u)$ and $x = (t, v)$. Then, since $C \times D$ is a 2-categorical product, there is a unique 2-cell $\gamma : \langle gs, hu \rangle \to \langle tf, vf \rangle$ such that $1_{\pi_1} \circ \gamma = \alpha$ and $1_{\pi_2} \circ \gamma = \beta$.

Finally, we must see that if $f$ and $g$ are equivalences in $C$, then $f \times g$ is one as well. In fact, if $f^{-1}$ and $g^{-1}$ are quasi-inverses to $f$ and $g$, then $f^{-1} \times g^{-1}$ is easily seen to be a quasi-inverse to $f \times g$. □

16.3. Proposition. Given a category $A$, a 2-category $D$, and functors $F, G : A \to D$, the functors $F$ and $G$ are pseudonaturally equivalent if and only if there exists a functor $H : A \to D\sim$ such that dom$\circ H = F$ and cod$\circ H = G$.

Proof: The proof is by inspection, the point being that the data of a functor $H : A \to D\sim$ is precisely the data of a pseudonatural equivalence dom$\circ H \to$ cod$\circ H$, and the condition that $H$ be a functor is equivalent to the given data defining a pseudonatural transformation. □

16.4. Definition. A (multi-sorted) algebraic signature $\sigma$ is given by a set $\text{Ob} \sigma$ of sorts and, for each finite sequence $\tilde{A}$ of sorts and each sort $B$, a set $\sigma(\tilde{A}, B)$ of function symbols (with “arity” $\tilde{A}$ and
“codomain sort” $B$). We denote the set of finite sequences in a set $X$ by $X^{<\omega}$, and write $\ell(\vec{A})$ for the length of a finite sequence.

Given a finite product category $\mathbf{C}$, an interpretation $M$ of $\sigma$ in $\mathbf{C}$ consists of the following data (i)-(iii):

(i) A map $M : \text{Ob}\sigma \to \text{Ob}\mathbf{C}$

(ii) A choice $\{\pi_i^M : M\vec{A} \to MA_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell(\vec{A})}$ of product diagram on $MA_1, \ldots, MA_{\ell(\vec{A})}$ for each sequence $\vec{A} \in (\text{Ob}\sigma)^{<\omega}$ (where we require that $M(A) = MA$ and $\pi_i^M = 1_{MA} : M(A) \to MA$ for each $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$)

(iii) A morphism $Mf : M\vec{A} \to MB$ for each $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B)$.

We write $M : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$ to indicate that $M$ is an interpretation of $\sigma$ in $\mathbf{C}$.

Given two interpretations $M, N : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$, a homomorphism $\alpha : M \to N$ consists of morphisms $\alpha_A : MA \to NA$ for each sort $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$, such that for each $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B)$, the following diagram commutes, where we write $\alpha_{\vec{A}}$ for $\alpha_{A_1} \times \cdots \times \alpha_{A_{\ell(\vec{A})}}$:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
M\vec{A} \\
\downarrow Mf \\
MB
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{\alpha_{\vec{A}}} 
\begin{array}{c}
N\vec{A} \\
\downarrow Nf \\
NB
\end{array}
$$

Interpretations $\sigma \to \mathbf{C}$ and homomorphisms form a category $\text{Int}(\sigma, \mathbf{C})$ in an obvious manner.

Given an interpretation $M : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$ and an f.p. functor $F : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$, we obtain an interpretation $F \circ M : \sigma \to \mathbf{D}$ by setting $(F \circ M)(A) = F(MA)$ for $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$; $(F \circ M)(\vec{A}) = F(M\vec{A})$ and $\pi_i^{F \circ M} = F\pi_i^M : (F \circ M)(\vec{A}) \to (F \circ M)A_i$ for $\vec{A} \in (\text{Ob}\sigma)^{<\omega}$ and $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A})$; and $(F \circ M)(f) = F(Mf)$ for $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B)$.

Similarly, given another f.p. functor $G : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ and a natural transformation $\alpha : F \Rightarrow G$, we obtain a homomorphism $\alpha \circ M : F \circ M \to G \circ M$ by setting $(\alpha \circ M)_A = \alpha_{MA}$.

This defines, for each $M : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$, a functor $\sigma : \text{FPFun}(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}) \to \text{Int}(\sigma, \mathbf{D})$. Given an interpretation $M : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$, we say that the f.p. category $\mathbf{C}$ is free on $\sigma$ (via $M$) if $\sigma : \text{FPFun}(\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}) \to \text{Int}(\sigma, \mathbf{D})$ is an isomorphism of categories for each f.p. category $\mathbf{D}$.

Finally, given a 2-category $\mathbf{C}$ with finite 2-categorical products, the underlying category of $\mathbf{C}$ also has finite products, and we can consider interpretations $\sigma \to \mathbf{C}$. Given two such interpretations $M, N : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$, a homotopy homomorphism $\alpha : M \to N$ consists of a 1-cell $\alpha_A : MA \to NA$ for each $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$, together with an invertible 2-cell $\alpha_f : \alpha_B \circ Mf \Rightarrow NF \circ \alpha_A$ for each $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B)$. A homotopy homomorphism $\alpha : M \to N$ is a homotopy-equivalence if $\alpha_A$ is an equivalence in $\mathbf{C}$ for each $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$.

16.5. Proposition. Two interpretations $M, N : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}$ are homotopy-equivalent if and only if there exists an interpretation $H : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}^{\sim}$ such that $\text{dom} \circ H = M$ and $\text{cod} \circ H = N$.

Proof: Given a homotopy-equivalence $\alpha : M \to N$, we define the interpretation $H : \sigma \to \mathbf{C}^{\sim}$ by setting $HA = \alpha_A : MA \to NA$ for $A \in \text{Ob}\sigma$; $H\vec{A} = \alpha_{\vec{A}} : M\vec{A} \to N\vec{A}$ for $\vec{A} \in (\text{Ob}\sigma)^{<\omega}$; and $HF = \alpha_f$ for $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B)$.

The proof of the converse is more subtle, but as we will not actually need this direction, we leave it to the reader. \[\Box\]

\[\text{It would be more natural, perhaps, to demand that this is only an equivalence, and not an isomorphism, but the free f.p. category we construct in the appendix has this stronger property, and it is convenient to assume it.}\]
16.6. Theorem. If \( C \) is a free f.p. category on the algebraic signature \( \sigma \) and \( M, N : \sigma \to D \) are two interpretations into a 2-category \( D \), then \( M \) and \( N \) are homotopy-equivalent if and only if the induced f.p. functors \( M, N : C \to D \) are pseudonaturally equivalent.

**Proof.** We have, by definition, that \( M \circ i = M \) and \( N \circ i = N \) (where \( i : \sigma \to C \) is the interpretation via which \( C \) is free on \( \sigma \)).

Given a pseudonatural equivalence \( \alpha : \tilde{M} \to \tilde{N} \), we thus have a homotopy-equivalence

\[
M = \tilde{M} \circ i \overset{\alpha i}{\longrightarrow} \tilde{N} \circ i = N,
\]

where \( \alpha \circ i \) is the homotopy-equivalence given by \( (\alpha \circ i)_A = \alpha_i \) and \( (\alpha \circ i)_f = \alpha_i f \).

Conversely, given a homotopy-equivalence \( \alpha : M \to N \), we have by Proposition 16.15 an interpretation \( H : \sigma \to D \) with \( \text{dom} H = M \) and \( \text{cod} H = N \). Hence, we have an induced f.p. functor \( \tilde{H} : C \to D \)
with \( \tilde{H} \circ i = H \) and hence

\[
(\text{dom} \circ \tilde{H}) \circ i = M \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{cod} \circ \tilde{H}) \circ i = N
\]

(here, we are using that composition of f.p. functors is associative with composition of an interpretation and an f.p. functor). Hence, using the freeness of \( C \) again, we have that \( \text{dom} \circ \tilde{H} = \tilde{M} \) and \( \text{cod} \circ \tilde{H} = \tilde{N} \).

By Propositions 16.3, we have a pseudonatural equivalence \( \tilde{\alpha} : \text{dom} \circ \tilde{H} \to \text{cod} \circ \tilde{H} \), and hence we obtain the desired pseudonatural equivalence

\[
\tilde{M} = \text{dom} \circ \tilde{H} \overset{\tilde{\alpha}}{\longrightarrow} \text{cod} \circ \tilde{H} = \tilde{N}.
\]

\[\square\]

17 The special invariance theorem

We now discuss the application of the abstract invariance theorem to the particular case of the homotopical semantics.

Let us first summarize what we have done so far. Given an algebraic signature \( \sigma \) and an \( h^\sim \)-fibration \( \mathcal{C} \), we have the canonical extension (Definition 14.8) which is a 1D2F, and can therefore apply Theorem 15.6 to it, and to the free \( h^\sim \)-fibration \( \mathcal{F}_\sigma \overset{\text{Pf}_\sigma}{\to} \text{Tm}_\sigma \) constructed in the appendix, in which \( \text{Ob Tm}_\sigma = (\text{Ob } \sigma)^{<\omega} \) and an object in \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \) over \( \tilde{A} \) is a formula \( \varphi \) with free variables of sorts \( A_1, \ldots, A_{t(\tilde{A})} \).

In particular, we may take \( \mathcal{C} \) to be the fibration \( \mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_\text{cf}(\text{Top}_c) \), which is an \( h^\sim \)-fibration by Theorem 12.7. Given a \( \sigma \)-interpretation \( M : \sigma \to \text{Top}_c \) (with induced functors \( M : \text{Tm}_\sigma \to \text{Top}_c \) and \( M : \text{Pf}_\sigma \to \text{Ho}(\text{Top}_c^\sim)_{\text{cf}} \)), we have by Theorem 12.7, the theorem of the appendix, as well as Proposition 10.7 and Theorem 11.2, that for each \( \tilde{A} \in \text{Tm}_\sigma \) and each formula \( \varphi \) in \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \tilde{A} \), the object \( M(\varphi) \) in \( \text{Ho}(\text{Top}_c^\sim)_{\text{cf}} \) is computed according to the prescription in \( \S 4 \).

Next, given a second interpretation \( N : \sigma \to \text{Top}_c \) and a homotopy-equivalence \( \alpha : M \to N \), we have by Theorems 15.6 and 16.6, for each \( \tilde{A} \in \text{Tm}_\sigma \) and each formula \( \varphi \) in \( \text{Pf}_\sigma \tilde{A} \), an equivalence \( h : M(\tilde{A}) \to N(\tilde{A}) \) in \( B \), and an equivalence \( M(\varphi) \to N(\psi) \) over \( h \).

Hence, to deduce the homotopy-invariance property promised in \( \S 5 \), it remains to verify the following two facts, the proofs of which are the goal of this section. The first is that a homotopy-equivalence of \( \sigma \)-interpretations in \( \sigma \to \text{Top}_c \) is the same thing as a homotopy-equivalence of \( \sigma \)-structures as described in \( \S 5 \). This is quite easy based on what we have already done. The second is to show that an equivalence in \( \text{Ho}(\text{Top}_c^\sim)_{\text{cf}} \) over an equivalence in \( \text{Top}_c \) gives a homotopy-equivalence over a homotopy-equivalence in the sense of in the sense of \( \S 5 \).
17.1. Proposition. Two interpretations \(M, N : \sigma \to \text{Top}_c\) of \(\sigma\), with the 2-categorical structure coming from the canonical extension of \(\mathcal{K} o \mathcal{F}_c(\text{Top}_c)\), are homotopy-equivalent if and only if they are homotopy-equivalent structures in the sense of \(\S 5\). The same statement holds with \(\text{Kan}\) (or \(\text{C}_{cf}\) for any right-proper model category \(C\)) instead of \(\text{Top}_c\).

Proof: By [Hel19, \S 19], we know that a 2-cell \(\xymatrix{A \ar[r]^f \ar[dr]_g & B} \) in \(\text{Top}_c\) is given by a homotopy class of homotopies between the continuous maps \(f\) and \(g\). Accordingly, an equivalence in this 2-category is a homotopy-equivalence in the usual sense. Hence, a homotopy-equivalence \(\alpha : M \to N\) of \(\sigma\)-interpretations is given by a homotopy-equivalence \(\alpha_A : MA \to NA\) for each \(A \in \text{Ob} \sigma\) and, for each \(f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, \vec{B})\), a homotopy (class of homotopies) \(M\vec{A} \sim N\vec{B}\), which is precisely the definition of a homotopy-equivalence of \(\sigma\)-structures from \(\S 5\).

The proof is the same for \(\text{Kan}\) or \(\text{C}_{cf}\). \(\square\)

17.2. Lemma. Given any factorization \(B \xrightarrow{s} B^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} B \times B\) of a diagonal \(\Delta_B : B \to B \times B\) as a weak equivalence followed by a fibration in a model category \(C\), and any fibration \(p : E \to B\), there exists a factorization \(E \xrightarrow{s} E^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} E \times E\) of a diagonal \(\Delta_E : E \to E \times E\) as a trivial cofibration followed by a fibration, and a fibration \(p^I : E^I \to B^I\), making the following diagram commute.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
E & \xrightarrow{s} & E^I \\
p \downarrow & & \downarrow \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle \\
B & \xrightarrow{s} & B^I
\end{array}
\]

Moreover, if \(C\) is \(\text{Top}\) with the mixed model structure, and \(B^I\) denotes the actual exponential object, with \(I = [0, 1]\), then \(E^I\) can be taken to be the corresponding exponential object and \(p^I\) the induced map.

Proof: The following construction comes from [Qui67, I.3.1].

We factor \(E \xrightarrow{\langle 1, sp, 1_E \rangle} E \times_B B^I \times_B E\) as a trivial cofibration \(E \xrightarrow{s} E^I\) followed by a fibration \(E^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, p^I, d_2 \rangle} E \times_B B^I \times_B E\). Here \(E \times_B B^I \times_B E\) is defined as the pullback

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
E \times E & \xrightarrow{p \times p} & B \times B \\
\downarrow \langle \pi_1, \pi_3 \rangle & & \downarrow \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle \\
E \times E & \xrightarrow{p \times p} & B \times B
\end{array}
\]

Since the bottom and right morphisms in the above diagram are fibrations, so are the top and left morphisms. Hence \(p^I : E^I \to B^I\) and \(\langle d_1, d : 2 \rangle : E^I \to E \times E\) are fibrations as desired, each being the composite of fibrations.

The “Moreover” statement is much simpler and simply amounts to the two well-known facts that \(s : E \to E^I\) is a trivial cofibration (it is a deformation retract with closed image) and that \(p^I\) is a Hurewicz fibration (this follows directly from the lifting property). \(\square\)
17.3. Theorem. Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a suitable model category or the category of topological spaces with the mixed model structure, and consider the $h^\omega$-fibration $\mathcal{H}_{\omega}(\mathbf{C}_{\text{cf}})$ as a 1D2F via its canonical extension (Definition 14.8).

Let $A \xrightarrow{f} \xrightarrow{g} B$ be a 2-cell in $\mathbf{C}_{\text{cf}}$. According to [Hel19, §18], such a 2-cell is given by an equivalence class of homotopies $f \to g$. Let $h : A \to B^I$ be a representative of $\alpha$.

Next, let $(p, f), (q, g) : (X, A, x) \to (Y, B, y)$ be morphisms in $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{C}^{-})_{\text{cf}}$ lying over $f$ and $g$, respectively:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{p} & Y \\
\downarrow{x} & & \downarrow{y} \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]

Claim: If there exists a 2-cell $(p, f) \to (q, g)$ in $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{C}^{-})_{\text{cf}}$ lying over $\alpha$, then there is a homotopy from $p$ to $q$ lying over $h$ – i.e., there is a homotopy $k : X \to Y^I$ from $p$ to $q$ such that the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{k} & Y^I \\
\downarrow{x} & & \downarrow{y'} \\
A & \xrightarrow{h} & B^I
\end{array}
\]

commutes, where $y'$ is as in Lemma 17.2.

Proof: We first unwind the definition of the 2-cells in $\text{Ho}(\mathbf{C}^{-})_{\text{cf}}$.

Let us write $P, Q$ for $(X, x)$ and $(Y, y)$. By Construction 14.7, there exists a 2-cell $(p, f) \to (q, g)$ if and only if the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{(p, f)} & f^*Q \\
\downarrow{(q, g)} & & \downarrow{g^*Q} \\
Q & \xrightarrow{\alpha_Q} & Q
\end{array}
\]

commutes. Now, referring to [Hel19, Definition 9.4], $\alpha^*_Q$ is defined to be the unique morphism making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
f^*Q & \xrightarrow{\langle (\bar{f}, \alpha^! \rangle)} & \pi^*_1 Q \land \text{Eq}_B \\
\downarrow{\alpha_Q^!} & & \downarrow{\text{nat}^Q_B} \\
g^*Q & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & \pi^*_2 Q \\
A & \xrightarrow{(f, g)} & B \times B
\end{array}
\]

commute. Putting these together, we see the existence of a 2-cell amounts to the commutativity of

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \xrightarrow{(p, f)} & \pi^*_1 Q \land \text{Eq}_B \\
\downarrow{(q, g)} & & \downarrow{\text{nat}^Q_B} \\
A & \xrightarrow{(f, g)} & B \times B
\end{array}
\]
Now, inserting the definitions of $P$ and $Q$, and of the pullback functors $\pi_1^*$ and $\pi_2^*$ and the equality object $\text{Eq}_B$ in the $\wedge=\text{-cloven} \land=\text{-fibration}$ $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_d(C_{cf})$, the above amounts to the commutativity of the diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y \times_B B^I \\
\downarrow \nu \\
X \overset{(f \times q)}{\longrightarrow} B \times Y
\end{array}
\]

up to fiberwise-homotopy over $\langle f, g \rangle$, where $\nu$ is any morphism such that $(\nu, 1_{B \times B})$ is a representative of $\text{nat}_B^Q$ \text{– in fact, we will want to pick a particular $\nu$ below \text{–}} and where the fiber product $Y \times_B B^I$ is taken with respect to $d_1 : B^I \to B$.

Now, we will show that the morphisms $Y \times_B B^I \overset{\pi_1}{\to} Y$ and $Y \times_B B^I \overset{\nu}{\to} B \times Y \overset{\pi_2}{\to} Y$ are homotopic, and in fact, that there is a homotopy $j : Y \times_B B^I \to Y^I$ from $\pi_1$ to $\pi_2 \nu$ making

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y^I \\
\downarrow \nu^I \\
Y \times_B B^I \overset{\pi_2}{\longrightarrow} B^I
\end{array}
\]

commute, from which the proposition follows by precomposing $j$ with $\langle p, hx \rangle : X \to Y \times_B B^I$.

To define $j$ making the above triangle commute, we consider the solid commutative square:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y \\
\downarrow \nu \\
Y \times_B B^I \overset{\pi_2}{\longrightarrow} B^I
\end{array}
\]

We wish to show that there exists a dashed morphism making the diagram commute. We know from Lemma 17.2 that $y^I$ is a fibration, hence so is the pullback $\langle d_1, y^I \rangle$ of $y^I$ along $\pi_2 : Y \times_B B^I$. Thus, it remains to see that $\langle 1_Y, sy \rangle$ is a trivial cofibration. If $C$ is a suitable model category, then it is a cofibration since it is a monomorphism, and is a weak-equivalence by the right-properness of $C$, since it is the pullback of $s : B \to B^I$ along $\pi_2 : Y \times_B B^I \to B^I$. In case $C = \text{Top}$, then $\langle 1_Y, sy \rangle$ is a trivial cofibration since it is a deformation retract with closed image.

Finally, it remains to see that $j$ is a homotopy form $\pi_1$ to $\pi_2 \nu$. It is immediate from the definition that $d_1 j = \pi_1$. To see that $d_2 j = \pi_2 \nu$, we use our freedom in the choice $\nu$. Namely, we define it to be the composite $Y \times_B B^I \overset{\nu}{\to} Y^I \overset{\langle y^I, d^I \rangle}{\to} B \times Y$. For this to be a legitimate definition, we need $(\nu, 1_{B \times B})$ to be a representative of $\text{nat}_B^Q$; by definition, this means that the triangle

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y \times_B B^I \\
\downarrow \nu \\
Y \overset{(y, 1_Y)}{\longrightarrow} B \times Y
\end{array}
\]

commutes up to fiberwise homotopy. In fact, it commutes on the nose. \qed

V Examples and further questions

We now give some examples of sentences and their interpretation under the homotopical semantics. In each case, we fix some algebraic signature $\sigma$ and a $\sigma$-structure in $\text{Top}_c$. We then take some first-order
sentence over this signature and see what it means for it to be true in the $h^\omega$-fibration $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}_{cl}(\text{Top}_c)$; i.e., for its interpretation to be a non-empty space.

By the discussion in the introduction to Part III, this just amounts to using the homotopical semantics, as defined directly in §4 – i.e., we first apply the singular simplicial set functor to obtain a structure in $\text{sSet}$, and then interpret the formula using the locally cartesian closed structure on $\text{sSet}$, except for equality, which is interpreted as the path-space fibration.

Hence, in each case, we will first see what the sentence means for an arbitrary $\sigma$-structure in $\text{Kan}$, and from this draw a conclusion about an arbitrary $\sigma$-structure in $\text{Top}_c$ to which $\text{Sing}$ has been applied (note that $\text{Sing}(X)$ is in $\text{Kan}$ for every $X$ in $\text{Top}$).

After the examples, we consider some further questions regarding the material of this paper.

18 Examples of interpretations of sentences

18.1. Contractibility. First, we consider the signature $\sigma$ consisting of a single sort $A$ and having no operation symbols, and the sentence in this language

$$\exists x \forall y \ (x = y).$$

We claim that this is interpreted under the semantics as “$A$ is contractible”.

Fix a structure for $\sigma$ in $\text{Kan}$, i.e., a Kan complex $X$.

Now, the formula $x = y$ in the context $(x,y)$ is interpreted as a path-space fibration $X^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} X \times X$. Next, the formula $\forall y (x = y)$ is interpreted as an image $\prod_{\pi_1}(X^I, \langle d_2, d_2 \rangle)$ under a right-adjoint to the pull-back functor $\pi_1^* : C/X \to C/(X \times X)$. Finally, $\exists x \forall y (x = y)$ is interpreted (as always, up to isomorphism) as the domain of $\prod_{\pi_1}(X^I, \langle d_2, d_2 \rangle)$.

Hence, we are interested in when the domain of $\prod_{\pi_1}(X^I, \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle)$ is non-empty. This will hold if and only if there is a morphism $(\text{sSet}, x) \to \prod_{\pi_1}(X^I, \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle)$ in $\text{sSet}/X$ for some $x : \text{sSet} \to X$. By the adjunction, this is equivalent to having a morphism from $\pi_1^*(\text{sSet}, x) \cong (X, \langle x, 1x \rangle)$ to $(X^I, \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle)$ in $C/X \times X$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X^I & \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} & X \times X \\
\downarrow^{(x,1x)} & & \\
X & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & X \times X.
\end{array}$$

But this is by definition a (right-)homotopy between $X$ and the constant map $x!$, i.e. a contraction of $X$ onto $x$.

If we start with a topological space $X \in \text{Ob Top}$, instead of a Kan complex, then the above shows that $X$ satisfies the sentence in question if and only if the singular simplicial set of $X$ is contractible. But as is well-known, this holds if and only if $X$ itself is contractible.

18.2. Homotopies. Now let $\sigma$ be the signature consisting of two sorts $A, B$ and two function symbols $f, g : A \to B$. We consider the sentence

$$\forall x \in A \ (f(x) = g(x)).$$

We claim that this is interpreted as “$f$ is homotopic to $g$”.

Suppose we have a structure for $\sigma$ in $\text{Kan}$; that is, two Kan complexes $X, Y$, and two morphisms $f, g : X \to Y$. The formula $y_1 = y_2$ (in the context $(y_1, y_2)$) will (again) be interpreted as the path-space fibration $Y^I \xrightarrow{\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle} Y \times Y$. Now, we have the morphism $\langle f, g \rangle : X \to Y \times Y$, and $f(x) = g(x)$
(in the context \((x)\)) will be interpreted as \(\langle f, g \rangle^* (Y^I, \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle)\). Finally, the above sentence will be interpreted as \(\prod f, g \rangle^* (Y^I, p)\), the points which are (by the adjunction) in bijection with the sections of \(\langle f, g \rangle^* (Y^I, \langle d_1, d_2 \rangle)\), which are in turn in bijection with the lifts

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Y^I \\
\downarrow^{d_1, d_2} \\
Y \times Y
\end{array}
\xrightarrow{(f,g)} X
\]

which are, of course, by definition (right-)homotopies \(f \sim g\).

For a \(\sigma\)-structure in \(\text{Top}_e\), i.e., a pair of maps \(f, g : X \to Y\), we thus see that the above sentence is satisfied if and only \(\text{Sing}(f)\) and \(\text{Sing}(g)\) are homotopic and, again, this is the case if and only if \(f\) and \(g\) are homotopic.

Now considering a signature with two sorts \(A, B\) and two function symbols \(f : A \to B\) and \(g : B \to A\), we have by the same reasoning as above that

\[
\forall x \in A \ (g(f(x)) = x) \land \forall y \in B \ (f(g(y)) = y)
\]

is interpreted (in both \(\text{Top}_e\) and \(\text{Kan}\)) as “\(f\) and \(g\) constitute a homotopy equivalence” (i.e., both composites are homotopic to the identity).

Similarly, for the signature consisting of a single sort \(A\) and binary function symbol \(f : A \times A \to A\),

\[
\forall x, y, z \in A \ [f(f(x, y), z) = f(x, f(y, z))]
\]

is interpreted as “\(f\) is homotopy-associative”.

18.3. Classical logic. We now give an example showing that the homotopical semantics are not sound for classical logic. By this we mean that there is a formula of the form \(\neg\neg P \Rightarrow P\) over some signature \(\sigma\) and a structure for \(\sigma\) (in \(\text{Top}_e\) and \(\text{Kan}\)) under which the interpretation of this formula is empty.

First, we note that it is important that \(P\) is not a closed formula. Indeed, a closed formula is interpreted as a Kan complex \(X\), and its negation is interpreted as an empty Kan complex or one-point Kan complex according to whether \(X\) is non-empty or empty. From this it follows that the interpretation of \(\neg\neg P \Rightarrow P\) (and similarly \(P \lor \neg P\)) is always non-empty. This circumstance is familiar, for example, from Kleene’s realizability semantics for intuitionistic arithmetic.

Now, for our example, we consider, in the signature \(\sigma\) consisting of a single sort \(A\) and no function symbols, the sentence

\[
(\exists x \forall y \ (\neg\neg x = y)) \Rightarrow (\exists x \forall y \ (x = y))
\]

Now, given a structure \(X\) (in \(\text{Kan}\) or \(\text{Top}_e\)) for \(\sigma\) we have already seen that the interpretation of the right side of this implication is inhabited if and only if \(X\) is contractible. Let us consider the left side. We first consider the case of \(X\) in \(\text{Kan}\). We will show that this sentence is satisfied if and only if \(X\) is non-empty and path-connected (i.e., for any vertices \(x, y \in X_0\) there is an edge \(e \in X_1\) from \(x\) to \(y\)).

We have, again, that \(x = y\) is interpreted as the path space \((X^I, p, X)\). We recall that \(\neg\neg x = y\) is an abbreviation of \((x = y \Rightarrow \bot) \Rightarrow \bot\). Here, \(\bot\) is interpreted as the initial Kan fibration \((\emptyset, i, X)\).

Now, it easy to see that in any category (such as \(\text{Kan}/X\)) with a strong initial object \(0\) (i.e. every morphism with codomain \(0\) is an isomorphism), any exponential object \(A \Rightarrow 0\) is a subsingleton (i.e, the morphism \(!_{A \Rightarrow 0}\) to the terminal object is a monomorphism). Since there exists a morphism \(A \to ((A \Rightarrow 0) \Rightarrow 0)\), it follows that the unique morphism \(A \to 1\) factors through \((A \Rightarrow 0) \Rightarrow 0\).
In the case of a Kan fibration \((E, e)\) in \(\text{Kan}/X\), this tells us that \(\neg\neg(E, e)\) is a monomorphism into \(X\) whose image contains the image of \(e\). In particular, if \(E\) is surjective onto \(X\), then \(\neg\neg(E, e)\) is an isomorphism.

Now, if \(X\) is path-connected, then the path space \(X^I\) is clearly surjective on vertices. But as an easy inductive argument shows, any Kan fibration which is surjective on vertices is surjective. Hence, for \(X\) path-connected, \(\neg\neg x = y\) is interpreted as an isomorphism, whence it follows that, for \(X\) non-empty and path-connected, the following sentence is satisfied.

\[
\exists x \forall y (\neg\neg x = y).
\]

(11)

For the other direction, it suffices to see that if a Kan fibration \((E, e)\) in \(\text{Kan}/X\) is not surjective, then neither is \(\neg\neg(E, e)\), since if \(\neg\neg x = y\) is interpreted as a non-surjective morphism, the interpretation of (11) must be empty. Suppose \(e\) is not surjective and let \(p \in X_0\) be a vertex not in the image of \(e\). Then the minimal sub-simplicial set \((p)\) of \(X\) containing \(p\) is disjoint from the image of \(e\). Hence \((\langle p \rangle, i) \land (E, e) \cong \emptyset\), where \(i : \langle p \rangle \to E\) is the inclusion, so we have a morphism \((\langle p \rangle, i) \to \neg\neg(E, e)\). In particular, \((\langle p \rangle, i) \land \neg\neg(E, e)\) is non-empty, so there cannot be a morphism \((\langle p \rangle, i) \to \neg\neg(E, e)\).

Note that by the same kind of argument as in the previous examples, we also have that the interpretation of the sentence (11) in \(\text{Top}_e\) is “\(A\) is path-connected”.

Now suppose \(X\) is a Kan complex or a topological space in \(\text{Top}_e\) which is path-connected but not contractible (for instance, the circle). Then the antecedent of the above sentence is interpreted as a non-empty Kan complex, whereas the conclusion is interpreted as the empty Kan complex. Hence the implication is empty.

Finally, we note that this implies that

\[
\neg\neg x = y \Rightarrow x = y
\]

cannot be satisfied for such an \(X\) since this would imply (by the soundness of the interpretation with respect to intuitionistic logic) that the above sentence would also be satisfied.

18.4. Homotopy-equivalence. We saw above that we can easily express that two morphisms constitute a homotopy equivalence, in the same way as we would classically express that they constitute a bijection. We can also classically express that a single function \(f : A \to B\) is a bijection by

\[
\forall b \in B \exists a \in A (fa = b) \land \forall a' \in A (fa' = b \Rightarrow a' = a)).
\]

Let us see that the interpretation of this sentence (in \(\text{Kan}\), and hence in \(\text{Top}_e\)) is non-empty if and only if the interpretation of \(f\) is a homotopy equivalence.

First of all, the sentence is equivalent to the conjunction of

\[
\forall b \in B \exists a \in A (fa = b) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall b \in B \exists a' \in A \forall a'' \in A (fa'' = b \Rightarrow a'' = a)).
\]

The same reasoning as in §18.2 shows that the first part is satisfied by a map \(f : X \to Y\) if and only if there exists a map \(g : Y \to X\) such that \(f \circ g\) is homotopic to \(1_Y\).

The second part, with the quantifiers removed, is interpreted as a certain fibration over \(Y \times X \times X\). By making use of the relevant adjunctions, we can see that the space which is the interpretation of the quantified sentence is inhabited if and only if there exists a map \(g : Y \to X\) and a dotted lift in the following diagram.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Y \times X^I & \to & Y \times X^I \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
(Y \times X) \times_{Y \times X \times X} (X \times (X \times Y)^I) & \longrightarrow & Y \times X \times X
\end{array}
\]
Here, in $X \times_Y Y^I$, $X$ is mapping to $Y$ via $f$ and $Y^I$ is mapping to $Y$ via $d_1$; and in the object on the bottom-left of the diagram, $Y \times X$ is mapping to $Y \times X \times X$ via $\langle \pi_1, g\pi_1, \pi_2 \rangle$, and $X \times (X \times_Y Y^I)$ is mapping to $Y \times X \times X$ via $\langle d_2\pi_2\pi_2, \pi_1, \pi_1\pi_2 \rangle$.

We claim that such a lift exists if and only if $g \circ f$ is homotopic to $1_X$.

In one direction, we have a map $g : X \rightarrow (Y \times X) \times_Y X \times X \times (X \times (X \times_Y Y^I))$ which is given by $\langle (f, 1_X), \langle gf, (1_X, sf) \rangle \rangle$ (where $s$ is, as usual, the canonical map $Y \rightarrow Y^I$). Hence, given a lift $k$ as above, the composite $\pi_2kq$ gives a homotopy $X \rightarrow X^I$ from $1_X$ to $gf$.

In the other direction, suppose we have a homotopy $h : X \rightarrow X^I$ from $1_X$ to $gf$. We then define $k$ as $\langle \pi_1\pi_1, h' \rangle$, where $h'$ is the composite

$$
(Y \times X) \times_Y X \times X \times (X \times (X \times_Y Y^I)) \xrightarrow{(h\pi_1\pi_1, g'\pi_2\pi_2)} X^I \times X \times X \rightarrow X^I
$$

in which the second map is composition of paths.

### 19 Further problems and questions

We mention some possible further directions.

**Completeness.** This is probably the most natural question to ask about the homotopical semantics: are they a complete semantics for intuitionistic logic? I.e., is it the case that, if a sentence $\varphi$ over a signature $\sigma$ is interpreted as a non-empty space in every $\sigma$-structure in $\text{Kan}$, then $\varphi$ is intuitionistically provable?

**Limited expressivity.** We mentioned at the end of §1.3 that first-order homotopical logic is much less expressive than homotopy type theory. However, we have not proven that any particular property is inexpressible, and it would be interesting to do so; for example, to prove that over the trivial signature with a single sort $A$ and no function symbols, there is no sentence $\varphi$ satisfied by exactly those spaces $X$ which are simply connected. Or to give another example, there should be no sentence over the signature consisting of one sort and a single binary operation which is satisfied exactly by those operations satisfying the “$A_1$” (or “Stasheff pentagon”) condition.

**Two-dimensional universal algebra.** The construction in the appendix not only produces a free $h^\omega$-fibration, but one which is described explicitly in terms of first-order formulas. However, if the question is simply that of the existence of a free $h^\omega$-fibration – without requiring it to have anything to do with syntax – we might hope to be able to prove it on purely formal grounds, as we can in universal algebras, using the adjoint functor theorem. One difficulty is that we are dealing with a “two-dimensional” universal property. There has, however, been substantial work on “two-dimensional universal algebra” (see, e.g., [BKP89]), and perhaps this could be brought to bear on this problem.

**Higher-dimensional generalizations.** Given the lack of expressiveness mentioned above, it is natural to seek extensions of first-order logic which increase this expressiveness. For example, one could add some, but not all, of what is present in type theory – say, an additional sort $s =_A t$ for any two terms $s$ and $t$ of sort $A$, so that one could express that “two homotopies are homotopic”: $e =_{s = A t} e'$.

One would hope to have a nice categorical formulation of the corresponding semantics, as we have for first-order homotopical logic. Indeed, it is also natural to seek “higher-dimensional” generalizations of the fibrational semantics. For example, the fact that we can only express “one level” of homotopies in the language seems to correspond to the fact that the fibrations we are considering are (“only”) two-dimensional. On the “semantic” side, there are natural higher-dimensional categories close at hand – for example, instead of having the fibers of $\mathcal{H} \circ \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ be the homotopy categories of the slices $\mathcal{C}/A$, one could try to take the corresponding $\infty$-categories (or some truncation thereof). We might then seek a higher-dimensional analogue of the syntactic fibration, morphisms out of which would give the semantics for such “higher-dimensional” extensions of first-order logic.
In this appendix, we construct, for each signature $\sigma$, a free finite product category $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ on $\sigma$, and a free $h^\succeq$-fibration $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma \downarrow_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}$ over $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$, out of the terms and formulas (and proofs) of $\sigma$.

The category $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ is the well-known “Lawvere algebraic theory” associated to the signature $\sigma$, and its construction is described, for example, in [Mak93b, p. 475]. However, as our construction of $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma$ relies delicately on the nature of $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$, we give a careful construction of the latter as well.

In [HM92], a construction (due to Lambek) analogous to the present one but for propositional logic is carried out, and our construction proceeds along the same lines (also, see [HM92] for a thorough discussion of and motivation behind the construction).

However, there are added difficulties in the case of predicate logic. In addition to the general increased complexity due to the presence of variables and quantifiers, there is also the following problem. In the case of propositional logic, the associated syntactic category happens to be free in a stricter sense, since the propositional connectives correspond precisely to the associated categorical operations (namely, finite products and coproducts and exponentials).

In the case of predicate logic, however, this is not quite so. The point is that, from the perspective of the fibration, “substitution” is a primitive operation, whereas in the syntax it is not. Thus, in the “strictly” free $h^\succeq$-fibration, $(x = y)[y := z]$ and $x = z$ would be two different objects.

Finally, we note that the above references consider the more general – and very familiar – situation in which one has not only a language, but a theory over that language, and constructs an associated fibration so that the morphisms out of it are models of the theory. We do not do this, as it makes things more complicated, and it is not necessary for our purposes, though it would be desirable in general.

We now summarize the main properties of the syntactic fibration, which are need to deduce the homotopy invariance of the homotopical semantics explained in §5 from the special invariance theorem of §17. The proof of this theorem will occupy the remainder of the appendix.

**Theorem.** For each algebraic signature $\sigma$, there exists an $h^\succeq$-fibration $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma \downarrow_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}$ and an interpretation $M : \sigma \to \mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ (see Definition 16.4) with the following properties:

(i) $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ is a free f.p. category on $\sigma$ via $M$ and $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma$ is a free $h^\succeq$-fibration over $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$.

(ii) Each object of $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ is of the form $M(\vec{A})$ for a unique $\vec{A} \in (\text{Ob } \sigma)^{<\omega}$.

(iii) The objects in the fiber $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma^{M(\vec{A})}$ over $M(\vec{A})$ are formulas whose free variables have sorts $A_1, \ldots, A_{\ell(\vec{A})}$, up to renaming of variables. More precisely, an object in $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma^{M(\vec{A})}$ is an equivalent class of pairs $(\varphi, \vec{x})$, in which $\vec{x}$ is a sequence of length $\ell(\vec{A})$ of distinct variables, containing all the free variables of $\varphi$ and where $x_i$ has sort $A_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A})$; and where two such pairs $(\varphi, \vec{x})$ and $(\psi, \vec{y})$ are equivalent if $\psi$ is obtained by (possibly renaming the bound variables) and renaming the variables in $\vec{x}$ to those in $\vec{y}$.

(iv) The morphisms $M(\vec{A}) \to M(B)$ in $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ are given by terms over $\sigma$ of sort $B$ whose free variables have sorts $A_1, \ldots, A_{\ell(\vec{A})}$, up to renaming of variables (in the same sense as in (iii)); in particular, the morphism $\pi^M : M(\vec{A}) \to M(A_i)$ is given by the term $x_i$ consisting of a single variable of sort $A_i$; and for any morphisms $p_i : M(\vec{A}) \to M(B_i)$ given by terms $t_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{B})$ and a function symbol $f \in \sigma(\vec{B}, C)$, the composite $M(\vec{A}) \xrightarrow{\langle p_1, \ldots, p_n \rangle} M(\vec{B}) \xrightarrow{M(f)} M(C)$ is given by the term $ft_1 \ldots t_{\ell(\vec{B})}$.
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The logical operations on formulas are given by the various \( h^n \)-fibration operations, in the sense of properties (vi)-(ix) below.

For any two objects \( P \) and \( Q \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) given by formulas \( \varphi \) and \( \psi \), the conjunction \( \varphi \land \psi \), disjunction \( \varphi \lor \psi \), and implication \( \varphi \Rightarrow \psi \) of these formulas represent objects in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) which are a product \( P \land Q \), coproduct \( P \lor Q \), and exponential object \( P \Rightarrow Q \) of \( P \) and \( Q \), respectively.

The formulas “true” \( \top \) and “false” \( \bot \) are terminal and initial objects in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \).

For any object \( P \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}(B)) \) (here, \( \vec{A}(B) \) denotes concatenation of finite sequences) given by a formula \( \varphi \), the objects \( Q \) and \( R \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) given by \( \exists x \varphi \) and \( \forall x \varphi \) (where \( x \) is the specified variable of sort \( B \) in \( \varphi \)) are, respectively, the codomain \( \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{X}(B)} P \) of a cocartesian lift of \( \pi \vec{A}(B) \) with domain \( P \), and the object \( \prod_{\pi \in \mathcal{X}(B)} P \) associated to a \( \prod \)-diagram over \( \pi \vec{A}(B) \) based on \( P \), where \( \pi \vec{A}(B) \) is the canonical projection \( \langle \pi_1^M, \ldots, \pi_n^M, \ell_A \rangle : M(\vec{A}(B)) \to M(\vec{A}) \).

Given a pair of terms \( s, t \) over \( \sigma \) of sort \( B \) with free variables in \( \vec{A} \), the object \( P \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) given by the formula \( s = t \) is the domain \( (s, t)^* \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Q}_{B} \) of a cartesian lift \( P \to \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Q}_{B} \) of the morphism \( M(\vec{A}) \to M(B) \times M(B) = M((B, B)) \) given the terms \( s \) and \( t \), where \( \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Q}_{B} \) is an equality object (i.e., there exists a cocartesian morphism \( \top \to \mathcal{E} \mathcal{Q}_{B} \) over \( \Delta_B : B \to B \times B \)).

In addition, we have the following property:

For any two objects \( P \) and \( Q \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) given by formulas \( \varphi \) and \( \psi \), there is a morphism \( P \to Q \) in \( \mathcal{P} f^M(\vec{A}) \) if and only if \( \varphi \Rightarrow \psi \) is an intuitionistic validity.

## 20 The syntax of first-order logic

To begin with, we define the syntax of the first-order language over a given algebraic signature \( \sigma \) – i.e., the set of terms and the set of formulas over \( \sigma \) – upon which the rest of the construction will be based. The particular identity of the sets of terms and formulas is not important, but rather only the universal properties defining these sets (Proposition 20.4) – namely, that they are freely generated by the various syntactic operations. Nonetheless, for definiteness, we will define these sets very explicitly.

For the rest of the appendix, fix an algebraic signature \( \sigma \), as well as an arbitrary infinite set \( \text{Varn} \) of “variable names” (for definiteness, we could take \( \text{Varn} = \mathbb{N} \)). Since we are fixing \( \sigma \), we will sometimes omit the prefix “\( \sigma \)-” or the subscript \( \sigma \) from expressions such as “\( \sigma \)-term” and \( \text{Var} \_\sigma \) below.

We maintain from Definition 16.4 the notation \( \ell(\vec{t}) \) for the length of a finite sequence. Also, we write \( \vec{st} \) for the concatenation of finite sequences \( \vec{s} \) and \( \vec{t} \), and we will sometimes conflate a finite sequence with the set of its elements.

### 20.1. Definition

Given a sort \( A \in \text{Ob} \sigma \) and any thing \( s \), we write \( s : A \) to indicate that \( s \) is a non-empty sequence whose first element is \( A \). Given a sequence \( \vec{A} \in (\text{Ob} \sigma)^{<\omega} \) of sorts and any sequence \( \vec{t} \), we write \( \vec{t} : \vec{A} \) to indicate that \( \ell(\vec{t}) = \ell(\vec{A}) \) and that \( t_i : A_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A}) \).

Next, we define the set \( \text{Tm}^n \_\sigma \) of level-\( n \) \( \sigma \)-terms for \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) inductively as follows. The set \( \text{Tm}_0 \_\sigma \) is empty. A level-(\( n + 1 \)) \( \sigma \)-term is either (i) a length-2 sequence \( (A, v) \) where \( A \in \text{Ob} \sigma \) is a sort, and \( v \in \text{Varn} \) is a variable name, or (ii) a sequence \( (B, f, t_1, \ldots, t_k) \) where \( f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, B) \) for some \( \vec{A} \) with \( \ell(\vec{A}) = k \), each \( t_i \) is a level-\( n \) \( \sigma \)-term, and \( t_i : A_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). The set \( \text{Tm} = \text{Tm}_\sigma \) of \( \sigma \)-terms is \( \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Tm}^n \_\sigma \).

We define the set \( \text{Var} = \text{Var}_\sigma \) of \( \sigma \)-variables to be \( \text{Ob} \sigma \times \text{Varn} \subseteq \text{Tm}_\sigma \), and for each \( A \in \text{Ob} \sigma \), we set \( \text{Var} \_A = \{ A \} \times \text{Varn} \subseteq \text{Var} \).

Note that every term is a non-empty sequence whose first element is a sort. For a term \( t \), we write \( \text{tp}(t) \) for the first element of \( t \); hence \( t : \text{tp}(t) \). For a sequence \( \vec{t} \) of terms, we write \( \text{tp}(\vec{t}) \) for the sequence
A level-$n$ of level-$n$ formulas for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ inductively as follows. The set $\text{Frm}^n_0$ is empty. A level-$(n+1)$ formula is either (i) a length-3 sequence $\langle s, t, \sigma \rangle$, where $s$ and $t$ are terms with $\text{tp}(s) = \text{tp}(t)$, (ii) one of the length-1 sequences $\langle \top \rangle$ or $\langle \bot \rangle$, (iii) a triple $\langle X, \varphi, \psi \rangle$, where $X \in \{\land, \lor, \implies\}$ and $\varphi, \psi$ are level-$n$ formulas, or (iv) a triple $\langle X, v, \varphi \rangle$ with $X \in \{\forall, \exists\}$, $v \in \text{Var}$, and $\varphi$ a level-$n$ formula. The set $\text{Frm} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Frm}_n^n$. We call level-1 formulas atomic formulas.

For $B \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, we denote by $\text{Tm}_B \subseteq \text{Tm}$ the subset consisting of $t \in \text{Tm}$ with $t : B$. For each $f \in \sigma(A, B)$, we denote by $f$ the function $\text{Tm}_{A_1} \times \cdots \times \text{Tm}_{A_n} \to \text{Tm}_B$ (where $n = \ell(A)$) taking $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ to $f(t_1 \ldots t_n) := (B, f(t_1, \ldots, t_n))$.

Similarly, we have binary operations $\land, \lor, \implies : \text{Tm} \times \text{Tm} \to \text{Tm}$, “0-ary” operations $\top, \bot \in \text{Tm}$, unary operations $\forall v, \exists v : \text{Tm} \to \text{Tm}$ for $v \in \text{Var}$, and a binary operation $\equiv_A : \text{Tm}_A \times \text{Tm}_A \to \text{Tm}$ for each sort $A$. For the above binary operations, we use infix notation ($\varphi \land \psi$, $s =_A t$, etc.).

**20.2. Proposition (Principle of induction).** $\text{Tm}$ is the least subset $S \subseteq \text{Tm}$ containing $\text{Var}$ and closed under the operations $f : (\text{Tm}_{A_1} \cap S) \times \cdots \times (\text{Tm}_{A_{\ell(A)}} \cap S) \to \text{Tm}$ for each $f \in \sigma(A, B)$.

Similarly $\text{Frm}$ is the least subset of $\text{Tm}$ containing the image of $\equiv_A : \text{Tm} \times \text{Tm} \to \text{Frm}$, and closed under each of the operations $\land, \lor, \implies : \text{Frm} \times \text{Frm} \to \text{Frm}$.

**Proof:** Immediate from the definitions of $\text{Tm}$ and $\text{Frm}$. □

**20.3. Proposition (Unique readability).** Each element of $\text{Frm}$ is in the image of exactly one of the maps $\land, \lor, \implies : \text{Tm} \times \text{Tm} \to \text{Tm}$ and has a unique preimage under this map. In other words, the map

$$
\text{Frm}^2 \sqcup \text{Frm}^2 \sqcup \text{Frm}^2 \sqcup \text{Frm}^0 \sqcup \text{Frm}^0 \sqcup \text{Var} \sqcup \text{Var} \sqcup \bigcup_{B \in \text{Ob} \sigma}(\text{Tm}_B \times \text{Tm}_B) \to \text{Frm}
$$

obtained by putting all of these maps together is a bijection.

Similarly, the map

$$
\text{Var} \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{A \in (\text{Ob} \sigma)^{<\omega}} \bigcup_{f \in \sigma(A, B)} \text{Tm}_{A_1} \times \cdots \times \text{Tm}_{A_{\ell(A)}} \right) \to \text{Tm}
$$

induced from the inclusion $\text{Var} \hookrightarrow \text{Tm}$ and the maps $f : \text{Tm}_{A_1} \times \cdots \times \text{Tm}_{A_{\ell(A)}} \to \text{Tm}$ is a bijection.

**Proof:** Immediate from the definitions of $\text{Tm}$ and $\text{Frm}$. □

**20.4. Proposition (Principle of recursion).** Given any set $X$ with maps $\equiv_A : \text{Tm}_A \times \text{Tm}_A \to X$ for $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, elements $\top, \bot \in X$, binary operations $\land, \lor, \implies : X \times X \to X$, and unary operations $\forall v, \exists v : X \to X$ for each $v \in \text{Var}$, there is a unique map $\text{Tm} \to X$ taking the operation $\land$ to $\land$, $\lor$ to $\lor$, and so on.

Similarly, given any family $\{X_A\}_{A \in \text{Ob} \sigma}$, together with maps $\beta : \text{Tm}_A \to X_A$ for each $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, and operations $\hat{f} : X_{A_1} \times \cdots X_{A_{\ell(A)}} \to X_B$ for each $f \in \sigma(A, B)$, there is a unique map $\text{Tm} \to \bigcup_{A \in \text{Ob} \sigma} X_A$ taking $\text{Tm}_A$ to $X_A$ for each $A$, taking each operation $f$ to $\hat{f}$ for $f \in \sigma(A, B)$, and taking each variable $v \in \text{Tm}$ to $\beta(v)$.

**Proof:** By induction on $n$, we can show that there is a unique $\text{Frm}^n_\sigma \to X$ (or $\text{Tm}^n_\sigma \to \bigcup_{A \in \text{Ob} \sigma} X_A$) satisfying the required condition; in the induction step, we use Proposition 20.3. From this, we conclude that there is a unique function $\text{Tm} \to X$ (or $\text{Tm} \to \bigcup_{A \in \text{Ob} \sigma} X_A$) as desired. □
20.5. Definition. Given a sequence $\vec{x} \in \text{Var}^{<\omega}$ of distinct variables and a sequence $\vec{t} \in \text{Tm}^{<\omega}$ of terms with $\text{tp}(\vec{x}) = \text{tp}(\vec{t})$, we define substitution of $\vec{t}$ for $\vec{x}$, which is a map $\text{Tm} \to \text{Tm}; s \mapsto s[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$, taking $\text{Tm}_A$ to $\text{Tm}_A$ for each $A \in \text{Ob} \sigma$, by recursion on $s$. We set

$$v[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \begin{cases} t_i & \text{if } v = x_i \text{ for some (necessarily unique) } 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{x}) \\ v & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for a variable $v$, and we define $(f t_1 \ldots t_n)[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$ to be $f(t_1[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]) \ldots (t_n[\vec{x} := \vec{t}])$. Given a sequence $\vec{s} \in \text{Tm}^{<\omega}$ of terms, we define $s[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$ to be $(s_1[\vec{x} := \vec{t}], \ldots, s_{\ell(\vec{t})}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}])$.

We similarly define substitution for formulas by recursion. We set $\varphi[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$ to be (i) $\varphi$ if $\varphi$ is $\top$ or $\bot$, (ii) $s[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] =_A s'[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$ if $\varphi$ is $s =_A s'$, (iii) $\psi[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] \Box \psi'[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]$ if $\varphi = \psi \Box \psi'$, where $\Box$ is one of $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow$, (iv) $\Box v(\delta(\vec{x},v) := \vec{s}(\vec{x},v)))$ if $\varphi = \Box v\psi$, where $\Box$ is one of $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow$. Here, for any sequence $\vec{r}$, we write $^r\vec{s}(\vec{x},v)$ for the sequence which is obtained from $\vec{r}$ by removing the $i$-th entry in case $y = x_i$ for some (necessarily unique) $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{x})$, and which is just $\vec{r}$ itself otherwise.

Next, we define the set of free variables $\text{FV}(\tau) \subseteq \text{Var}$ and bound variables $\text{BV}(\tau) \subseteq \text{Var}$ in a term or a formula $\tau$ by recursion. If $\tau$ is a term, we set $\text{BV}(\tau) = \emptyset$, and we define $\text{FV}(\tau)$ to be $\{v\}$ if $\tau = v \in \text{Var}$, and to be $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{FV}(t_i)$ if $\tau = f t_1 \ldots t_n$. If $\tau$ is a formula, we define (i) $\text{FV}(\tau) = \text{FV}(s) \cup \text{FV}(t)$ if $\tau$ is $s =_A t$, (ii) $\text{FV}(\tau) = \emptyset$ if $\tau$ is $\top$ or $\bot$, (iii) $\text{FV}(\tau) = \text{FV}(\varphi) \cup \text{FV}(\psi)$ if $\tau$ is $\varphi \Box \psi$, where $\Box$ is one of $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow$, and (iv) $\text{FV}(\tau) = \text{FV}(\varphi) \setminus \{v\}$ if $\tau = \Box v\varphi$ where $\Box$ is one of $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow$. The defining clauses for $\text{BV}$ are the same as those of $\text{FV}$, except we replace (iv) by $\text{BV}(\Box v\varphi) = \text{BV}(\varphi) \cup \{v\}$.

We define the set $V(\tau)$ of variables in a term or formula $\tau$ to be $\text{FV}(\tau) \cup \text{BV}(\tau)$.

21 Free finite product categories

We now construct the free finite product category $\text{Tm}_\sigma$ on a given algebraic signature $\sigma$. As an intermediate step, we will construct an equivalent category $\overline{\text{Tm}}_\sigma$. The difference between the two is that the objects of $\overline{\text{Tm}}_\sigma$ are arbitrary sequences of (distinct) variables, while those of $\text{Tm}_\sigma$ are sequences of sorts. Thus, $\text{Tm}_\sigma$ is more canonical, as it does not depend on the choice of the set $\text{Var}$ of variable names. It also satisfies the “strict” universal property of being free on $\sigma$ from Definition 16.4, which determines it up to isomorphism, while $\overline{\text{Tm}}_\sigma$ does not.

21.1. Proposition. Given any sequence $\vec{s}$ of terms:

(i) If $\text{FV}(\vec{s}) \subseteq \vec{x}$, then $\text{FV}(\vec{s}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]) \subseteq \text{FV}(\vec{t})$.

(ii) $\vec{t}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \vec{t}$

(iii) If $\text{FV}(\vec{s}) \subseteq \vec{x}$, then $\vec{s}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}][\vec{y} := \vec{u}] = \vec{s}[\vec{x} := (\vec{t}[\vec{y} := \vec{u}])]$.

Proof: By induction. □

21.2. Definition. We define a category $\text{Tm} = \text{Tm}_\sigma$ as follows. The objects of $\overline{\text{Tm}}_\sigma$ are (possibly empty) finite sequences of distinct variables. A morphism $\vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ is a sequence $\vec{t} \in \text{Tm}^{<\omega}$ such that $\text{tp}(\vec{t}) = \text{tp}(\vec{y})$ and $\text{FV}(\vec{t}) \subseteq \vec{x}$.

The composite of $\vec{s} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ and $\vec{t} : \vec{y} \to \vec{z}$ is $\vec{t}[\vec{y} := \vec{s}]$, which by Proposition 21.1 (i) has free variables in $\vec{x}$ as required. Associativity and the existence of identities follow from Proposition 21.1 (ii)-(iii).

Let us call a morphism $\vec{t} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ in $\text{Tm}$ a renaming if $\ell = \vec{x}$ (and hence $\text{tp}(\vec{x}) = \text{tp}(\vec{y})$). It follows that $\ell$ is an isomorphism with inverse $\vec{y} : \vec{y} \to \vec{x}$. Note that there exists a renaming $\vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ if and only if $\text{tp}(\vec{x}) = \text{tp}(\vec{y})$, and in this case there exists exactly one. We say that two morphisms $p$ and $q$ in $\text{Tm}$ (not necessarily having the same domain and codomain) are equivalent if $p = r \cdot q$ or $p = q \cdot r$ for some renaming $r$. 
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We now define $\mathbf{Tm} = \mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ to be the category obtained by identifying equivalent morphisms in $\mathbf{Tm}$; the objects of $\mathbf{Tm}$ are finite sequences of sorts, and a morphism $\vec{A} \to \vec{B}$ is an equivalence class of morphisms $\vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$ with $\text{tp}(\vec{x}) = \vec{A}$ and $\text{tp}(\vec{y}) = \vec{B}$. We leave to the reader the easy verification that the composition on $\mathbf{Tm}$ descends to $\mathbf{Tm}$, and that the canonical functor $\mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{Tm}$ is initial among functors taking each renaming to an identity morphism.

Note that the canonical functor $\mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{Tm}$ is in fact an equivalence; it is clearly full and surjective on objects, and it is faithful, since if two morphisms $\vec{x}, \vec{y} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$ have the same image in $\mathbf{Tm}$, then $\vec{f} = \vec{s} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ for a renaming $\vec{s}$, which can only be the identity morphism. Choosing a section $\mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{Tm}$ (note that we can find a section even without the axiom of choice, assuming there exists an injection $\mathbb{N} \to \text{Varn}$), we then have that, given a functor $F : \mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{D}$ taking renamings to identity morphisms, the induced functor $\mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{D}$ is equal (not just isomorphic) to $F$ composed with the section $\mathbf{Tm} \to \mathbf{Tm}$.

We denote by $[\vec{f}, \vec{x}]$ the morphism $\text{tp}(\vec{x}) \to \text{tp}(\vec{y})$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$ represented by $\vec{f} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$. Composition in $\mathbf{Tm}$ is then given by $[\vec{f}, \vec{y}] \cdot [\vec{s}, \vec{x}] = [\vec{s}_1 \vec{f} : \vec{s}_1 \vec{x} := \vec{s}, \vec{x}]$.

For each $\vec{A} \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm}$ and $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A})$, we denote by $\pi_i^{\vec{A}}$ the morphism $[x_i, \vec{x}] : \vec{A} \to \langle A_i \rangle$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$, where $\vec{x} : \vec{A}$. For a term $t$, we also write $[t, \vec{x}]$ for $[(t), \vec{x}]$.

For each function symbol $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, \vec{B})$, we denote simply by $f$ the morphism $[fx_1 \ldots x_{\ell(\vec{A})}, \vec{x}] : \vec{A} \to \langle B \rangle$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$, where again $\vec{x} : \vec{A}$.

21.3. Proposition. Each $\vec{A} \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm}$, is the product of the objects $\langle A_i \rangle$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A})$, with product projections the $\pi_i^{\vec{A}} : \vec{A} \to \langle A_i \rangle$.

Proof: Given $\vec{B} \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ and morphisms $\vec{B} \to \langle A_i \rangle$ – i.e., terms $t_i : A_i$ with $\text{FV}(t_i) \subseteq \vec{x}$ for some $\vec{x} : \vec{B}$ – we want to show that there is a unique morphism $\vec{B} \to \vec{A}$ – i.e., a sequence $s_1, \ldots, s_{\ell(\vec{A})}$ of terms with $\text{FV}(s_i) \subseteq \vec{x}$ and $s_i : A_i$ – whose composites with the $\pi_i^{\vec{A}}$ are the given morphisms $t_i$ – i.e., such that $x_i[x_i := s_i] = t_i$. Clearly, we can and must take $s_i = t_i$ for all $i$. □

21.4. Proposition. The category $\mathbf{Tm}$ has binary products given by $\vec{A} \times \vec{B} = \vec{A} \vec{B}$ (concatenation of sequences) with projections $\pi_1 = [\vec{x}, \vec{xy}]$ and $\pi_2 = [\vec{y}, \vec{x}y]$, where $\vec{x} : \vec{A}$ and $\vec{y} : \vec{B}$. Also the empty sequence is a (actually, the unique) terminal object.

Hereafter, we will consider $\mathbf{Tm}$ to be endowed with these specified binary products and terminal object.

Proof: This follows from the fact that $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ are the maps into the products $\vec{A}$ and $\vec{B}$ induced by the product projections $\pi_i^{\vec{A} \vec{B}}$. □

21.5. Definition. We define an interpretation $M = M_\sigma : \sigma \to \mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ by setting $MA = \langle A \rangle$ for $A \in \text{Ob } \Sigma$, defining $M\vec{A}$ to be the product $\{\pi_i^{\vec{A}} : \vec{A} \to \langle A_i \rangle\}_{i=1}^{\ell(\vec{A})}$, and setting $MF = f : M\vec{A} \to MB$ for $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, \vec{B})$.

We now want to show that $\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma$ is free on $\sigma$ via $M_\sigma$.

21.6. Proposition. The $(\text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm} \times \text{Ob } \sigma)$-indexed family of sets $(\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle))_{\vec{A}, \vec{B}}$ is freely generated by the operations

(1) $\pi_i^{\vec{A}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}(\vec{A}, \langle A_i \rangle)$ for $\vec{A} \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm}$ and $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\vec{A})$

(2) The operation $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}(\vec{C}, \langle A_1 \rangle) \times \cdots \times \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}(\vec{C}, \langle A_{\ell(\vec{A})} \rangle) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Tm}_\sigma}(\vec{C}, \langle B \rangle)$ taking $t_1, \ldots, t_{\ell(\vec{A})}$

to the composite $\overset{(t_1, \ldots, t_{\ell(\vec{A})})}{\vec{C}} \overset{\ell(\vec{A})}{\to} \vec{A} \overset{f}{\to} \langle B \rangle$ for each $f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, \vec{B})$ and each $\vec{C} \in \text{Ob } \mathbf{Tm}$.
in the following sense:

(i) For any \((\text{Ob } \text{Tm} \times \text{Ob } \sigma)\)-indexed family of subsets \(X_{\vec{A}B} \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)\) which is closed under these operations, we have \(X_{\vec{A}B} = \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)\) for all \(\vec{A}, B\).

(ii) We have a “unique readability” property as in Proposition 20.3; that is, the function

\[
\bigcup_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob } \text{Tm}} \{1, \ldots, \ell(\vec{A})\} \sqcup \bigcup_{\vec{B} \in \text{Ob } \sigma} \bigcup_{f \in \sigma(\vec{A}, \vec{B})} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\vec{A})} \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{C}, \langle A_i \rangle) \to \bigcup_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob } \text{Tm}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)
\]

induced by these operations is a bijection.

(iii) Given an \((\text{Ob } \text{Tm} \times \text{Ob } \sigma)\)-indexed family of sets \(X_{\vec{A}B}\) together with operations as in (1)-(2), there is a unique family of maps \(\text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \to X_{\vec{A}B}\) preserving all the operations.

**Proof:** To prove (i), given any such family \((\mathcal{S}_{\vec{A}B})_{\vec{A}B}\) we can show by induction on \(t\) that \([t, \vec{x}] \in S_{\text{tp}(\vec{x})\text{tp} t}\) for every \(\vec{x}\) with \(V(t) \subseteq \vec{x}\).

As for (ii), surjectivity follow from (i), and injectivity follows from unique readability for terms (Proposition 20.3) and the definition of renaming.

We prove (iii) in the same way as in Proposition 20.4. Suppose we are given a family \((\mathcal{S}_{\vec{A}B})_{\vec{A}B}\) with the indicated operations. We now let \(\text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{0}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) = \emptyset\) for each \(\vec{A}\) and \(B\), and let \(\text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{n+1}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{n}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)\) consist of all the elements obtained by applying one of the operations to the elements of the sets \(\text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{n}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)\). By (i), \(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{n}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)\).

We can now show by induction on \(n\) that for each \(n\), there exists a unique family of functions \((\text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}^{n}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \to X_{\vec{A}B})_{\vec{A}B}\) respecting the operations, where the induction step uses unique readability. The claim follows. \(\square\)

21.7. Proposition. Given an f.p. category \(\text{D}\) and an interpretation \(\vec{F} : \sigma \to \text{D}\), there is a unique f.p. functor \(F : \text{Tm} \to \text{D}\) such that \(F \circ M = \vec{F}\).

**Proof:** For every object \(\vec{A}\) of \(\text{Tm}\), we have \(\vec{A} = M\vec{A}\), and hence we are forced to take \(FA = \vec{F}\vec{A}\).

We next define the action of \(F\) on morphisms of the form \(t : \vec{A} \to \langle B \rangle\) by recursion on \(t\) (using Proposition 21.6 (iii)).

If \(t = \pi_{i}^{M}\), then the requirement \(F \circ M = \vec{F}\) forces us to take \(Ft\) to be the product projection \(\pi_{i}^{F} : FA \to FA_{i}\).

Suppose \(t = f \langle t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n} \rangle\) for some \(f \in \sigma(\vec{C}, B)\). Then the requirements that \(F \circ M = \vec{F}\) and that \(F\) be a functor force us to take \(Ft\) to be the composite of \(\vec{F}f\) with \(\langle Ft_{1}, \ldots, Ft_{n} \rangle : FA \rightarrow FC\).

Finally, any morphism \(\vec{A} \to \vec{B}\) with \(\ell(\vec{B}) \neq 1\) is of the form \(\langle t_{1}, \ldots, t_{n} \rangle : \vec{A} \to \vec{B}\). Hence, we are forced to take \(Ft\) to be \(\langle Ft_{1}, \ldots, Ft_{n} \rangle : FA \to FB\).

It remains to see that \(F\), so defined, is an f.p. functor. The identity morphism \(\vec{A} \to \vec{A}\) in \(\text{Tm}\) is \(\langle \pi_{1}^{A}, \ldots, \pi_{\ell(\vec{A})}^{A} \rangle\). This is taken by \(F\) to \(\langle F\pi_{1}^{A}, \ldots, F\pi_{\ell(\vec{A})}^{A} \rangle : FA \to FA\), which is the identity morphism, since \(F\pi_{i}^{A}\) is by definition the product projection \(\pi_{i}^{F} : FA \to FA_{i}\).

Next, consider a composite \(\vec{A} \xrightarrow{s} \vec{B} \xrightarrow{t} \langle C \rangle\), where \(s = \langle s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n} \rangle\). We show by induction on \(t\) that this is to taken by \(F\) to the corresponding composite in \(\text{D}\).

First, we recall that \(Fs\) is by definition \(\langle Fs_{1}, \ldots, Fs_{n} \rangle : FA \to FB\).
Now, if $t = \pi^B_i$, then $ts$ is just $s_i$, and $Ft = \pi^F_i$, hence $Ft \cdot Fs = \pi^F_i \cdot \langle Fs_1, \ldots, Fs_n \rangle = Fs_i$ as desired.

If $t = f \langle t_1 \ldots t_m \rangle$, where $f \in \sigma(\overline{D}, C)$, then $ts$ is the composite of $f$ with $\langle t_1 s, \ldots, t_m s \rangle : \overline{A} \to \overline{D}$. By definition, $F$ takes this composite to the composite of $Ff : F\overline{D} \to F(C)$ with $\langle F(t_1 s), \ldots, F(t_m s) \rangle$.

By induction, we have that $F(t s) = Ft \cdot Fs$ for each $i$. Hence, $F(ts)$ is

$$Ff \cdot \langle Ft_1 \cdot Fs, \ldots, Ft_n \cdot Fs \rangle = F \cdot \langle Ft_1, \ldots, Ft_n \rangle \cdot Fs$$

which is by definition $Ft \cdot Fs$. The proof that $F$ preserves composites of the form $\langle t_1, \ldots, t_n \rangle$’s with $n > 1$ is similar.

Finally, to see that $F$ is f.p., it suffices to see that it preserves the specified terminal object and binary products. It preserves the terminal object by definition. By definition, $F$ preserves each of the products $\overline{A}$ of the $\langle A_i \rangle$ with projections $\pi^M_i$. It follows that $F$ also preserves the specified products $\overline{A} \overset{\pi_1}{\to} \overline{AB} \overset{\pi_2}{\to} \overline{B}$ since $\pi_1$ and $\pi_2$ are induced by the projections $\pi^M_i$. \(\square\)

**21.8. Proposition.** Given an f.p. category $D$, two f.p. functors $F, G : \mathbf{Tm} \to D$, and a homomorphism $\overline{\alpha} : F \circ M \to G \circ M$, there is a unique natural transformation $\alpha : F \to G$ with $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha \circ i$.

**Proof:** For objects in $\mathbf{Tm}$ of the form $\langle A \rangle$, we must take $\alpha_{\langle A \rangle} = \overline{\alpha}_A$. For any other object $\overline{A}$, the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{c}
F\overline{A} \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\overline{A}}} G\overline{A} \\
F\pi^F_i \downarrow \hspace{1cm} \hspace{1cm} \downarrow G\pi^G_i \\
F\langle A_i \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\langle A_i \rangle}} G\langle A_i \rangle
\end{array}
$$

must commute for each $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\overline{A})$, and (having already defined the $\alpha_{\langle A_i \rangle}$) there is exactly one morphism $\alpha_{\overline{A}}$ satisfying this condition, since $G\overline{A}$ is a product of the $GA_i$ with projections $G\pi^A_i$.

Hence, $\alpha$ is determined uniquely, and it remains to see that the above prescription really defines a natural transformation. We first prove, by induction on $t$, that the naturality square commutes for morphisms $t : \overline{A} \to \langle B \rangle$ in $\mathbf{Tm}$.

The case $t = \pi^A_i$ follows from the definition. Suppose $t = f \langle t_1 \ldots t_n \rangle$ for some $f \in \sigma(\overline{C}, B)$. The naturality squares for each $t_i$ commute by the induction hypothesis. This means that the outside of each diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
F\overline{A} & \to & F\overline{C} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
G\overline{A} & \to & G\overline{C}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{ccc}
F\langle t_1 \ldots t_n \rangle & \to & F\langle C_1 \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
G\langle t_1 \ldots t_n \rangle & \to & G\langle C_1 \rangle
\end{array}
$$

commutes, since the morphisms on the top and bottom are $Ft_i$ and $Gt_i$. Since the right square also commutes by the base case of the induction, it follows that the left square commutes by the universal property of the product $G\overline{C}$.

Hence, we have the commutativity of the naturality square for $t$, since this is the outside of the diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
F\overline{A} & \to & F\overline{C} & \to & F\langle B \rangle \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
G\overline{A} & \to & G\overline{C} & \to & G\langle B \rangle
\end{array}
$$

and the right square commutes since $\overline{\alpha}$ is a homomorphism.
It remains to show naturality for morphisms $\vec{A} \to \vec{B}$ with $\ell(B) \neq 1$, but in fact we essentially already gave the argument for this above. □

21.9. Theorem. $\text{Tm}$ is free on $\sigma$ via $M$.

Proof: This is precisely the content of Propositions 21.7 and 21.8. □

22 The syntactic fibration

Our next task is to define a functor $\text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Set}$ sending $\vec{x}$ to the set $\text{Form}(\vec{x})$ of formulas with free variables in $\vec{x}$, the action on morphisms being given by substitution.

Unfortunately, if we do this in the most obvious way, the result is not functorial. For example, consider the morphisms (in fact, renamings) $(x) \xrightarrow{(x)} (y) \xrightarrow{(y)} (z)$ in $\text{Tm}$, and the formula $\varphi$ given by $\forall y(y =_A z)$ (where $x, y, z : A$). Then $\varphi[z := x]$ is $\forall y(y =_A x)$ whereas $\varphi[z := y][y := x]$ is $\forall y(y =_A y)$. To solve this, we must employ the usual device of identifying formulas when they differ only by renaming of bound variables.

This construction can be described in a more abstract manner as follows. Though the mapping $\text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Set}$ described above does not yield a functor, it does yield what we might call a “partial functor” $\text{Form} : \text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Set}$ i.e., we assign to each morphism $\vec{t} : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}$ the partial function $\text{Form}(\vec{y}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{x})$ given by the restriction of $[\vec{y} := \vec{t}]$ to those formulas $\varphi$ with $\text{BV}(\varphi) \cap \vec{x} = \emptyset$; by Proposition 22.4 (ii), this then satisfies the functoriality condition $\varphi[\vec{y} := \vec{t}][\vec{y} := \vec{s}] = \varphi[\vec{t}][\vec{y} := \vec{s}]$ whenever both sides of the equation are defined.\footnote{The reader may wonder if this is just a functor $F$ from $\text{Tm}^{op}$ to the category of sets and partial functions. It is not, because the domain of the composite $Fg \cdot Ff$ is in general smaller than that of $F(f \cdot g)$. However – if one is so inclined – it can be described as a lax pseudo-functor into the poset-enriched category of sets and partial functions.}

Given such a “partial functor” $F : C \to \text{Set}$, let us say that a saturation of $F$ is a (total) functor $G : C \to \text{Set}$ together with a natural transformation $\alpha : F \to G$ (i.e. (total) functions $\alpha_A : FA \to GA$ for $A \in \text{Ob}C$, satisfying the naturality equations whenever both sides of the equation are defined). Now, the functor $\text{Form} : \text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Set}$ obtained by identifying formulas differing by a renaming of bound variables will be a saturation of the partial functor $\text{Form}$, and we would like to say that it is in some sense the universal such saturation. This is true in the following sense (we will not prove this, though it will be more or less implicit in what follows). The partial functor $\text{Form}$, and the functor $\text{Form}$, have the additional structure of the operations $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow, \forall, \exists$ on and between the sets in its image, as well as the distinguished elements $\top, \bot, s =_A \top$, and these are all preserved, in an appropriate sense, by the action of the functor on morphisms, as well as by the natural transformation $\text{Form} \to \text{Form}$. If we consider only functors equipped with such additional structure, and natural transformations preserving it, then every saturation $\text{Form} \to F$ will factor uniquely through the saturation $\text{Form} \to \text{Form}$.

The functor $\text{Form} : \text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Set}$ will give rise to a functor $\text{Form} : \text{Tm} \to \text{Set}$. Our next task will then be to lift this to a functor $\text{Form} : \text{Tm}^{op} \to \text{Cat}$. The morphisms of the category $\text{Form}(A)$ will be given by (equivalence classes of) “deductions” of one formula from another. In particular, such a morphism will exist if and only if the codomain is an intuitionistic consequence of the domain.

22.1. Definition. We define the relation $\varphi \sim _{\alpha} \psi$ on formulas (“$\varphi$ and $\psi$ are alphabetic variants”) by recursion on $\varphi$: \!(i) If $\varphi$ is $s =_A t$ or $\top$ or $\bot$, then $\varphi \sim _{\alpha} \psi$ if and only if $\varphi = \psi$.

(ii) If $\varphi$ is $\varphi_1 \Box \varphi_2$ with $\Box$ one of $\land, \lor, \Rightarrow$, then $\varphi \sim _{\alpha} \psi$ if and only if $\psi$ is $\psi_1 \Box \psi_2$ where $\varphi_1 \sim _{\alpha} \psi_1$ and $\varphi_2 \sim _{\alpha} \psi_2$.

(iii) If $\varphi$ is $\Box x \varphi$ with $\Box$ one of $\forall, \exists$, then $\varphi \sim _{\alpha} \psi$ if and only if $\psi$ is $\Box y \psi$ where $\varphi^x_u \sim _{\alpha} \psi^y_u$ for
every \( u \in \text{Var}_{tp(a)} \setminus (V(\varphi) \cup V(\psi)) \), where we write \( \omega_{b}^{a} \) for \( \omega[(a) := (b)] \). (It will follow from Proposition 22.2 (ii) below that we can replace “every” with “some”.)

**22.2. Proposition.** We record some important properties of the relation \( \sim_{\alpha} \):

(i) If \( \varphi \sim_{\alpha} \psi \), then \( \text{FV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\psi) \).
(ii) If \( \varphi^{u} \sim_{\alpha} \varphi^{v} \) for some \( u \notin \{x, y\} \cup V(\varphi) \cup V(\psi) \), then this holds for every such \( u \).
(iii) \( \sim_{\alpha} \) is an equivalence relation.
(iv) If \( \varphi \sim_{\alpha} \psi \) and \( \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) \cap \text{BV}(\varphi) = \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) \cap \text{BV}(\psi) = \emptyset \), then \( \varphi[x := \tilde{t}] \sim_{\alpha} \psi[x := \tilde{t}] \).
(v) For any formula \( \varphi \) and any finite \( S \subseteq \text{Var} \), there is a formula \( \psi \) with \( \varphi \sim_{\alpha} \psi \) and \( \text{BV}(\psi) \cap S = \emptyset \).

**Proof:** The proofs of these statements are all straightforward inductions. However, some of them are somewhat tricky, as they require lemmas which themselves need to be proven by induction. Also, in some cases, rather than using the induction principle from Proposition 20.2, we must do an induction on the length/complexity of a formula (i.e., the claim is proven for level-\( n \) formulas by induction on \( n \) – see Definition 20.1).

The needed lemmas are:

(vi) \( \text{FV}(\varphi^{u}) \setminus \{u\} = \text{FV}(\varphi) \setminus \{x\} \) whenever \( u \notin V(\varphi) \).
(vii) \( (\varphi^{w})^{u} = (\varphi^{u})^{w} \) whenever \( w \neq x \), \( v \neq x \), and \( u \neq w \).
(viii) More generally, \( (\varphi[w := \tilde{t}])^{u} = (\varphi^{u})[w := \tilde{t}] \) whenever \( x \notin \bar{w} \), \( u \notin \bar{w} \), and \( x \notin \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) \).
(ix) \( u \in \text{FV}(\varphi^{u}) \) whenever \( u \notin \text{BV}(\varphi) \) and \( x \in \text{FV}(\varphi) \).
(x) \( \varphi^{x} = \varphi \) whenever \( x \notin \text{FV}(\varphi) \).
(xi) More generally, \( \varphi[x := \tilde{t}] = \varphi[\bar{x}(\bar{x}, v) := \tilde{t}[\bar{x}, v]] \) whenever \( v \notin \text{FV}(\varphi) \) (see Definition 20.5 for the notation).
(xii) \( (\varphi^{u})^{v} = \varphi^{v} \) whenever \( u \notin V(\varphi) \).

**22.3. Definition.** Let \( \varphi \in \text{Frm}/\sim_{\alpha} \). We denote by \( \varphi[x := \tilde{t}] \) the \( \sim_{\alpha} \)-equivalence class of \( \varphi[x := \tilde{t}] \) where \( \varphi \) is a representative of \( \varphi \) with \( \text{BV}(\varphi) \cap \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) = \emptyset \). By Proposition 22.2 (v), such a representative exists, and by Proposition 22.2 (iv), the result is independent of the choice of \( \varphi \).

**22.4. Proposition.**

(i) If \( \text{FV}(\varphi) \subseteq \bar{x} \), then \( \text{FV}(\varphi[x := \tilde{t}]) \subseteq \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) \).
(ii) If \( \varphi \) is a formula and \( \text{BV}(\varphi[x := \tilde{s}]) = \text{BV}(\varphi) \cap \text{FV}(\tilde{t}) = \emptyset \), then

\[
\varphi[x := \tilde{s}][y := \tilde{t}] = \varphi[x := (\tilde{s}[y := \tilde{t}])].
\]

In particular, if \( \varphi \) is an \( \sim_{\alpha} \)-equivalence class of formulas, then (12) holds.

(iii) \( \varphi[x := \tilde{x}] = \varphi \)

**Proof:** By induction. □

**22.5. Definition.** We define a functor \( \text{Form} = \text{Form}_{\alpha} : \text{Tm}_{op} \to \text{Set} \) as follows. For each \( \bar{x} \in \text{Ob Tm} \), \( \text{Form}(\bar{x}) \) is \( \{\varphi \in \text{Frm}/\sim_{\alpha} : \text{FV}(\varphi) \subseteq \bar{x}\} \). Given a morphism \( \bar{t} : \bar{x} \to \bar{y} \) and \( \varphi \in \text{Form}(\bar{y}) \), we set \( \text{Form}(\bar{t})(\varphi) = \varphi[y := \tilde{t}] \) which by Proposition 22.4 (i) is in \( \text{Form}(\bar{x}) \) as required. That this is a functor follows from Proposition 22.4 (ii)-(iii).

We now “force” \( \text{Form} \) to descend to a functor \( \text{Form} = \text{Form}_{\alpha} : \text{Tm}_{op} \to \text{Set} \). Namely, we define \( \text{Form}(\bar{A}) \) to be

\[
\left( \bigsqcup_{\bar{x} \in \text{Ob Tm}} \text{Form}(\bar{x}) \right)/\sim,
\]
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where \((\vec{x}, \varphi) \sim (\vec{y}, \psi)\) if and only if there exists a renaming \(r : \vec{x} \to \vec{y}\) with \(\text{Form}(r)(\varphi) = \varphi\) \(-\) i.e., if and only if \(\psi = \varphi[r := \vec{y}]\). The quotient maps \(\text{Form}(\vec{x}) \to \text{Form}(\text{tp}(\vec{x}))\) assemble in a unique (and obvious) way into a natural isomorphism from \(\text{Form}\) to a functor \(\text{Tm}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Set}\), and this latter functor takes renaming to identities, and hence factors uniquely through a functor \(\text{Form} : \text{Tm}^{\text{op}} \to \text{Set}\).

We denote the image of \(\varphi \in \text{Form}(\vec{x})\) in \(\text{Form}(\text{tp}(\vec{x}))\) by \([\varphi, \vec{x}]\). Note that for \([\vec{t}, \vec{x}] : \vec{A} \to \vec{B}\) and \([\varphi, \vec{y}] \in \text{Form}(\vec{B})\), we have that \(\text{Form}([\vec{t}, \vec{x}])((\varphi, \vec{y}))\) is given by \([\varphi[\vec{y} := \vec{t}], \vec{x}]\). For \(t \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \vec{B})\) and \(\varphi \in \text{Form}(\vec{B})\), we will also write \(t^* \varphi\) for \(\text{Form}(t)(\varphi)\).

22.6. Definition. We note that the operations &, ∨, → : Frm × Frm → Frm and \(\forall v, \exists v : \text{Frm} \to \text{Frm}\) are well-defined on \(\sim_{\alpha}\)-equivalence classes (the last two cases follow from Proposition 22.2 (iv)), and we use the same notation to denote the induced operations &, ∨, → : Frm/\(\sim_{\alpha}\) × Frm/\(\sim_{\alpha}\) → Frm/\(\sim_{\alpha}\), and so on. Similarly, we write \(\top, \bot\) for \([\top], [\bot] \in \text{Form}/\(\sim_{\alpha}\)\), and write FV for the induced map \(\text{Frm}/\(\sim_{\alpha}\) \to \mathcal{P}(\text{Var})\) (which is well-defined by Proposition 22.2 (i)).

Next, for each \(\vec{A} \in \text{Ob Tm}\), we have induced operations \(\land, \lor, \Rightarrow : \text{Form}(\vec{x}) \times \text{Form}(\vec{x}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{x})\), as well as operations \(\forall y, \exists y : \text{Form}(\vec{x}y) \to \text{Form}(\vec{x})\), and elements \(\top, \bot \in \text{Form}(\vec{x})\), and \(s =_B t \in \text{Form}(\vec{x})\), where \(\text{FV}(s), \text{FV}(t) \subseteq \vec{x}\).

22.7. Proposition. The operations \(\top, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow, \forall y, \exists y, s =_B t\) on the sets \(\text{Form}(\vec{x})\) are compatible with the substitution maps \([\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \text{Form}(\vec{t}) : \text{Form}(\vec{x}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{x})\) for \(t : \vec{x} \to \vec{x}\). Specifically, we mean

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \top[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \top \quad \text{and} \quad \bot[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \bot, \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad (\varphi \land \psi)[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \varphi[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] \land \psi[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] \quad \text{for} \quad \land \text{ any of } \land, \lor, \Rightarrow \text{ and } \varphi, \psi \in \text{Form}(\vec{x}), \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad (\forall y \varphi)[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \forall y(\varphi[\vec{x}y] := \vec{t}(w)) \quad \text{for} \quad \forall \text{ one of } \forall, \exists \text{ and } \varphi \in \text{Form}(\vec{x}y) \text{ and } w \in \text{Var}_{\text{tp}(y)}\{\vec{z}\}, \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad (s =_B t')[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = (s[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] =_B s'[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]) \quad \text{for any } s, s' \in \text{Tm}_B \text{ with } \text{FV}(s), \text{FV}(s') \subseteq \vec{x}.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof: The cases (i),(ii),(iv) are immediate from the definition of substitution.

Let us prove the case (iii). Let \(U = \text{FV}(\vec{t}) \cup \vec{x} \cup \vec{z} \cup \{y, w\}\) (the set of variables that occurred so far). Let \(\tilde{\varphi}\) be a representative of \(\varphi\) with \(\text{BV}(\tilde{\varphi}) \cap U = \emptyset\), so that the left hand side in (iii) is represented by

\[
(\forall y \tilde{\varphi})[\vec{x} := \vec{t}].
\] (13)

Let \(\Psi \sim_{\alpha} (\forall y \tilde{\varphi})\) be such that \(\text{BV}(\Psi) \cap U = \emptyset\), so in particular \(\Psi = \exists y' \psi\) for some \(\psi\), and some \(y' \in \text{Var}_{\text{tp}(y)} \setminus U\), and we have (by Proposition 22.2 (iv)) that (13) is alphabetically equivalent to

\[
(\exists y' \psi)[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \exists y'(\psi[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]).
\] (14)

We also have that the right-hand side in (iii) is represented by

\[
\Box w(\tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x}y] := \vec{t}(w)).
\] (15)

We need to show that (14) is alphabetically equivalent to (15), i.e., that

\[
\tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]^{y'} \sim_{\alpha} \tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x}y := \vec{t}(w)]^{w}
\] (16)

for some \(v \in \text{Var}_{\text{tp}(y)}\), distinct from all the variables in all the terms and formulas thus far considered.

Note that, for any such \(v\), we have \(\psi^{y'} \sim_{\alpha} \tilde{\varphi}^{y'}\) by the definition of \(\psi\). Hence, the left-hand side of (16), which is equal to \(\tilde{\varphi}^{y'}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]\) by Proposition 22.2 (viii), is alphabetically equivalent to \(\tilde{\varphi}^{y'}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}]\) by Proposition 22.2 (iv).

On the other hand, the right-hand side of (16) is equal to \(\tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x}y := \vec{t}(v)]\) by Proposition 22.4 (ii) since \(v \notin \vec{z} \cap \text{FV}(\vec{t})\). Hence, it remains to see that

\[
\tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \tilde{\varphi}[\vec{x}y := \vec{t}(v)].
\]
We have thus reduced the claim to the following lemma, which can be proven by induction:

Given any formula \( \omega \), a sequence \( \vec{x}(y) \) of distinct variables, a sequence \( \vec{t} \) of terms with \( \text{tp}(\vec{t}) = \text{tp}(\vec{x}) \), and a variable \( v \in \text{Var}_{\text{tp}(y)}(\vec{x} \cup \{ y \} \cup \text{FV}(\vec{t})) \), and assuming \( \text{BV}(\omega) \cap (\vec{x} \cup \{ y \}) = \emptyset \), we have

\[
\omega^y[\vec{x} := \vec{t}] = \omega[\vec{x}(y) := \vec{t}(v)].
\]

22.8. Definition. Because the operations \( \land, \lor, \Rightarrow : \text{Form}(\vec{x}) \times \text{Form}(\vec{z}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{x}) \) are compatible with substitutions (Proposition 22.7), and in particular with renamings \( \vec{y} \to \vec{x} \), they descend to give operations \( \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \times \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \) (where \( \vec{x} : \vec{A} \)), which we denote by the same symbols; these are given by \( [\varphi, \vec{x}] \square [\psi, \vec{x}]= [\varphi \square \psi, \vec{x}] \).

Similarly, we have induced operations \( \top : \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \times \langle B \rangle \to \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \langle B \rangle \) given by \( \square[\varphi, \vec{x}]= \square[\varphi, \vec{x}] \).

We also have an induced map \( =_B : \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \times \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \to \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \) taking \( [s, \vec{x}] \) and \( [t, \vec{x}] \) to \( s =_B t, \vec{x} \). We denote by \( \text{Eq}_B \) the object \( \pi_1^{B, B} =_B \pi_2^{B, B} \in \text{Form}(\langle B \rangle) \), and we note that we then have \( (s =_B t) = \langle s, t \rangle \) for any \( s, t : \vec{A} \to \langle B \rangle \).

Finally, we denote by \( \top \sqcup _\vec{x}, \bot \vec{x} \) the elements \( [\top, \vec{x}], [\bot, \vec{x}] \in \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \) (where \( \vec{x} : \vec{A} \)).

22.9. Proposition. The operations \( \top, \bot, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow : \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \times \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \) are compatible with the substitution maps \( t^* : \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{B}) \) for \( t : \vec{A} \to \vec{B} \). Specifically, we mean

(i) \( t^* \top = \top, t^* \bot = \bot \).

(ii) \( t^* (P \land Q) = t^*(P) \land t^*(Q) \) for \( \forall \) any of \( \land, \lor, \Rightarrow \) and \( P, Q \in \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \).

(iii) \( t^*(P) = \text{Eq}_B (t \times 1(\vec{C})) \) for \( \exists \) any of \( \forall, \exists \) and \( P \in \text{Form}(\vec{A} \langle \vec{C} \rangle) = \text{Form}(\vec{A}(\vec{C})) \).

(iv) \( t^*(s =_C s') = (s \cdot t =_C s' \cdot t) \) for any \( s, s' : \vec{A} \to \langle C \rangle \).

Proof: Immediate from Proposition 22.7.

22.10. Proposition. The family of sets \( \langle \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \rangle_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \) are freely generated by the operations \( \top, \bot, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow : \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \to \text{Form}(\vec{B}) \) for \( \vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}} \).

(i) For any family \( \langle S_{\vec{A}} \subseteq \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \rangle_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \) of subsets of this family which is closed under all of these operations, we have \( S_{\vec{A}} = \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \) for all \( \vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}} \).

(ii) We have “unique readability” as in Proposition 20.3 and Proposition 21.6 (ii); the map

\[
\bigcup_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \left( \text{Form}(\vec{A})^0 \sqcup \text{Form}(\vec{A})^0 \sqcup \text{Form}(\vec{A})^2 \sqcup \text{Form}(\vec{A})^2 \right) \sqcup
\bigcup_{\langle B \rangle \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \left( \text{Form}(\vec{A}(\langle B \rangle)) \sqcup \text{Form}(\vec{A}(\langle B \rangle)) \right) \sqcup \bigcup_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle)^2 \to \bigcup_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \text{Form}(\vec{A})
\]

induced from these operations is a bijection.

(iii) Given any family \( \langle X_{\vec{A}} \rangle_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \) of sets, together with operations \( \land, \lor, \Rightarrow : X_{\vec{A}} \times X_{\vec{A}} \to X_{\vec{A}} \) and elements \( \top, \bot \subseteq X_{\vec{A}} \) for each \( \vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}} \), operations \( \forall, \exists : X_{\vec{A}(\langle B \rangle)} \to X_{\vec{A}} \) for each \( \vec{A}, \langle B \rangle \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}} \), and operations \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \times \text{Hom}_{\text{Tm}}(\vec{A}, \langle B \rangle) \to X_{\vec{A}} \) for each \( \vec{A}, \langle B \rangle \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}} \), there is a unique family of maps \( \langle f_{\vec{A}} : \text{Form}(\vec{A}) \to X_{\vec{A}} \rangle_{\vec{A} \in \text{Ob}_{\text{Tm}}} \) preserving all of these operations.
Proof: The claims (i) and (iii) are proven as in Proposition 21.6.

The claim (ii) is also proven similarly. Surjectivity follows from (i), and injectivity follows from unique readability for formulas (Proposition 20.3) and the definitions of renaming and of alphabetical equivalence. □

22.11. Definition. We now define a set \( \text{Ded} = \text{Ded}_\sigma \) (the set of “deductions”). Each deduction has an object \( \vec{A} \) of \( \text{Tm}_\sigma \) associated with it, as well as two objects of \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\vec{A}) \) (its “premise” and “conclusion”). We write \( f : P \to Q \) to indicate that \( f \) is a deduction with premise \( P \) and conclusion \( Q \).

In fact, we will define the set of deductions as the initial structure (or free structure with no generators) for a certain algebraic signature, whose sorts are triples \( (\vec{A}, P, Q) \) with \( \vec{A}, P, \) and \( Q \) as above. Recall from Definition 20.1 that the set \( \text{Tm}_\sigma' \) of terms over a signature \( \sigma' \) was defined relative to a fixed infinite set \( \text{Varn} \) of variable names. In fact, the set thus constructed – or better, the \( \text{Ob} \sigma' \)-indexed family of sets – is precisely the free \( \sigma' \)-algebra on the (\( \text{Ob} \sigma' \)-indexed) set \( \text{Varn} = \text{Ob} \sigma' \times \text{Varn} \). If we instead take \( \text{Varn} = \emptyset \) – or, what amounts to the same thing – if we omit from the definition of \( \text{Tm}_\sigma' \), the reference to variables – we obtain the definition of the initial \( \sigma' \)-structure. This structure is characterized up to isomorphism by an obvious universal property – namely, the one obtained from Proposition 20.4 by eliminating the reference to variables.

It now remains to define the signature \( \sigma' \) for which the set of deductions is the initial \( \sigma' \)-structure. As we said above, we take \( \text{Ob} \sigma' \) to be the set of triples \( (\vec{A}, P, Q) \) with \( \vec{A} \in \text{Ob} \text{Tm}_\sigma \) and \( P, Q \in \text{Ob} \text{Form}_\sigma(\vec{A}) \).

The function symbols of \( \sigma' \) are given schematically below. Each figure indicates a set of function symbols, one for each of the possible values of the relevant parameters.

Each figure displays, above the line, the input sorts of the function symbol and below, the codomain sort, and also introduces a notation for the function symbol being defined.

We write \( \pi^{\vec{A}} \) as a shorthand for \( \left( \pi^{\vec{A}}_1, \ldots, \pi^{\vec{A}}_{\ell(\vec{A})-1} \right) = [\vec{x} \setminus x_{\ell(\vec{A})}, \vec{x}] : \vec{A} \to \vec{A} \setminus \{ A_{\ell(\vec{A})} \} \) in the figures for \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \).

Category and fibration structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
1_P : P & \to P \\
f : P & \to Q \\
g : Q & \to R \\
g \circ f & : P \to R \\
\pi^{\vec{A}} & : \vec{A} \to P \\
f \circ g & : Q \to R \\
g \circ f & : P \to R \\
\pi^{\vec{A}}_P & : P \to \top \\
\kappa^{\vec{A}} & : \top \to \vec{A} \\
f \circ g & : Q \to R \\
\kappa^{\vec{A}}_Q & : \bot \to Q \\
\epsilon^{\vec{A}} & : (P \Rightarrow Q) \wedge P \to Q \\
\overline{f} & : P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow \bot \\
\end{align*}
\]

Finite products and coproducts:

\[
\begin{align*}
!_P : P & \to \top \\
\pi^{\vec{A}}_{PQ} & : P \wedge Q \to P \\
\pi^{\vec{A}}_{PQ} & : P \wedge Q \to P \\
\kappa^{\vec{A}}_{PQ} & : P \to P \vee Q \\
\kappa^{\vec{A}}_{PQ} & : Q \to P \vee Q \\
\epsilon^{PQ} & : (P \Rightarrow Q) \wedge P \to Q \\
\overline{f} & : P \Rightarrow Q \Rightarrow \bot \\
\end{align*}
\]

Exponentials:

\[
\begin{align*}
f : P \wedge Q & \to R \\
\end{align*}
\]
Adjoins to pullback along projections:

\[ \varepsilon_P : (\pi^A)^* ? P \to P \]
\[ \eta_P : P \to (\pi^A)^* \exists P \]

Equality objects:

\[ r_B : \top_{(B)} \to \Delta^*_B \text{Eq}_B \]
\[ f : \top_{(B)} \to \Delta^*_B T \]
\[ \xi f : \text{Eq}_B \to T \]

22.12. Definition. We next want to define an equivalence relation \( \sim \subseteq \text{Ded} \times \text{Ded} \) on the set of deductions. These are chosen precisely in such a way that, for each \( \bar{A} \in \text{Ob} \text{Tm}_\sigma \), the set of deductions up to equivalence between objects in \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\bar{A}) \) form a category and that, moreover, this makes \( \text{Form}_\sigma \) a functor \( \text{Tm}_\sigma^{\text{op}} \to \text{Cat} \) whose associated fibration is an \( h^\text{eq} \)-fibration.

The equivalence relation \( \sim \) will be given by a certain set of equations over the language \( \sigma' \) defined in Definition 22.11, so that the resulting set of equivalence classes will be precisely the free algebra of the algebraic theory over \( \sigma' \) given by these equations.

More concretely, we define below a certain set of basic relations on \( \text{Ded} \) and then define \( \sim \subseteq \text{Ded} \times \text{Ded} \) to be the least equivalence relation which contains each of the basic relations, and which is closed under each of the operations of \( \sigma' \) (in the sense that if \( t_i \sim t'_i \) for each \( i \) and \( f \) is any operation symbol of \( \sigma' \), then \( ft_1 \ldots t_n \sim f't'_1 \ldots t'_n \)).

We now define the basic relations. Each figure below represents a set of basic relations, one (or more) for each possible value of the relevant parameters \( \bar{A}, B, P, Q, R, R', S, T, s, t, u, f, g, h \). Here \( \bar{A}, B, P, Q, R, S, T, t \) are as in Definition 22.11; \( R' \) is an additional object in \( \text{Form}(\bar{A}) \); \( s \) is a morphism with \( \text{cod}(s) = \text{dom}(t) \); \( u \) is a morphism with codomain \( \bar{A} \setminus A_t(\bar{A}) \); and finally, \( f, g, h \) are deductions whose premise and conclusion are specified above the horizontal line. Below the line are indicated one or more equations, each representing a basic relation. Note also that in the relations under “Exponentials”, we use the notation \( x \land y \) for \( (x \circ \pi_{PQ}, y \circ \pi'_{PQ}) \).

Category:

\[ f : P \to Q \]
\[ g : Q \to R \]
\[ h : R \to R' \]
\[ f \circ 1_P = f \]
\[ 1_Q \circ f = f \]
\[ (h \circ g) \circ f = h \circ (g \circ f) \]

Fibration:

\[ f : P \to Q \]
\[ g : Q \to R \]
\[ t^* f = f \]
\[ s^* t^* f = (ts)^* f \]

Finite products and coproducts:

\[ f : P \to \top_{\bar{A}} \]
\[ f = !_P \]
\[ f : \bot_{\bar{A}} \to A \]
\[ f = !_P \]

\[ \pi_{QR} \circ (f, g) = f \]
\[ \pi'_{QR} \circ (f, g) = g \]
\[ h : P \to Q \land R \]
\[ \langle \pi_{QR} \circ h, \pi'_{QR} \circ h \rangle = h \]
\[ f : P \to R \]
\[ g : Q \to R \]
\[ [f, g] \circ \kappa_{PQ} = f \]
\[ [f, g] \circ \kappa'_{PQ} = g \]
\[ h : P \lor Q \to R \]
\[ [h \circ \kappa_{PQ}, h \circ \kappa'_{PQ}] = h \]
Exponentials:

\[ f : P \land Q \to R \quad h : P \to (Q \Rightarrow R) \quad (\varepsilon_Q R \circ (f \sim \land Q) = f \quad (\varepsilon_Q R \circ (h \land Q) \sim \sim = h) \]

Ad joints to pullback along projections:

\[ f : (\pi^A)^* S \to P \quad h : S \to \forall P \quad (\varepsilon^P \circ (\pi^A)^*(\lambda f) = f \quad \lambda(\varepsilon^P \circ (\pi^A)^* h) = h \]

Equality objects:

\[ f : \top_{(B)} \to \Delta^*_B T \quad h : \text{Eq}_B \to T \quad (\Delta^*_B(\xi f) \circ r_B = f \quad \xi(\Delta^*_B h \circ r_B) = h) \]

Stability of the operations under pullbacks

\[ t^* \pi_{QR} = \pi_{(t^* Q)(t^* R)} \quad t^* \pi'_{QR} = \pi'_{(t^* Q)(t^* R)} \]
\[ t^* \kappa_{PQ} = \kappa_{(t^* P)(t^* Q)} \quad t^* \kappa'_{PQ} = \kappa'_{(t^* P)(t^* Q)} \]
\[ t^* \varepsilon_{QR} = \varepsilon_{(t^* Q)(t^* R)} \]
\[ (u \times 1_{(A_{(\xi A))})}^* \varepsilon^P = \varepsilon^P_{(u \times 1_{(A_{(\xi A))})^* P}} \quad (u \times 1_{(A_{(\xi A))})^* \eta^3_P = \eta^3_{(u \times 1_{(A_{(\xi A))})^* P}} \]

22.13. Proposition. The equivalence relation from Definition 22.12 respects premise and conclusion – i.e., if \( f : P \to Q \) and \( f \sim f' \), then \( f' : P \to Q \).

Proof: First, the claim is true for each of the basic relations. This is clear in most cases, but some thought is needed for the relation \( t^* \pi_{QR} = \pi_{(t^* Q)(t^* R)} \) and the other six relations which are displayed without a horizontal line. In order for \( t^* \pi_{QR} \) and \( \pi_{(t^* Q)(t^* R)} \) to have the same premise, we need \( t^* (Q \land R) = t^* Q \land t^* R \). This follows from Proposition 22.9. The other six cases also follow from Proposition 22.9, where in the last two we must also use that \( \pi^A(u \times 1_{(A_{(\xi A))}) = u \pi^A_{(A_{(\xi A))}^* \), where \( \tilde{B} = \text{dom} u \).

Next, taking the closure of the basic relations under the operations of \( \sigma' \) clearly preserves this property. Finally, taking the transitive, symmetric, reflexive closure also preserves this property. \( \square \)

22.14. Definition. Given \( \tilde{A} \in \text{Ob TM}_\sigma \) and \( P, Q \in \text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A}) \), we define \( \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A})}(P, Q) \) to be the set of equivalence classes of deductions \( P \to Q \) (where by Proposition 22.13, the domain and codomain of equivalence classes of deductions are well-defined). Given \( [f] \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A})}(P, Q) \) and \( [g] \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A})}(Q, R) \), we define their composite to be \( [g \circ f] \). Since \( \sim \) is defined to be closed under \((- \circ -)\), this is well-defined.

The “Category” relations from Definition 22.12 immediately imply that this makes \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A}) \) into the set of objects a category (which we again denote by \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A}) \)).

Given \( t : \tilde{A} \to \tilde{B} \) and \( [f] \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{B})}(P, Q) \), we define \( t^*[f] \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A})}(t^* P, t^* Q) \) to be \([t^* f]\). Again, this is well-defined since \( \sim \) is defined to be closed under \( t^* \).

By the “Fibration” relations, this makes \( t^* \) into a functor \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{B}) \to \text{Form}_\sigma(\tilde{A}) \).
We also have from the “Fibration” relations that $1^\star$ is the identity functor and that $t^\star s^\star = (s \cdot t)^\star$. Hence, we have upgraded Form, : $\mathbf{Tm}^{op} \to \mathbf{Set}$ to a functor $\mathbf{Tm}_o^{op} \to \mathbf{Cat}$, which we again denote by Form, (or Form).

We denote by $\mathbf{Pf}$ $\mathbf{Pf}_\downarrow = \mathbf{Pf}_o \downarrow$ the fibration associated to the functor Form, : $\mathbf{Tm}_o^{op} \to \mathbf{Cat}$. Explicitly, $\mathbf{Pf}$ has the set of objects $\bigsqcup_{\mathbf{A} \in \text{Ob} \mathbf{Tm}} \text{Form}(\mathbf{A})$, and the morphisms are given by $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Pf}}((\mathbf{A}, P), (\mathbf{B}, Q)) = \bigsqcup_{t: \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Form}(\mathbf{A})}(P, t^\star Q)$.

Composition is given by $(t, q) \cdot (s, p) = (t \cdot s, s^\star q \cdot p)$. The functor $\mathbf{Pf}$ takes $(\mathbf{A}, P)$ to $\mathbf{A}$ and $(t, p)$ to $t$.

As the fibration $\mathbf{Pf}$ is the one associated to a pseudo-functor, it has a canonical cleavage – namely, the specified cartesian lift of $t: \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{B}$ with codomain $Q$ is $(t, 1^\star t^\star Q)$ – and since our pseudo-functor is in fact a functor, this cleavage is even split (see [Hel19, §14.4]).

22.15. Proposition. The fibration $\mathbf{Pf}$ from Definition 22.14 is an $h^=\text{-fibration}$.

Proof: We must check all the conditions in the definition of an $h^=\text{-fibration}$.

The fibers are bicartesian closed.

It follows from the “Finite products and coproducts” relations of Definition 22.12 that $\top^\mathbf{A}$, $\bot^\mathbf{A}$ are terminal and initial objects of $\text{Form}(\mathbf{A})$, and that $P \land Q$ and $P \lor Q$ are the product and coproduct of $P$ and $Q$ with projections $\pi_{PQ}, \pi'_PQ$ and coprojections $\kappa_{PQ}, \kappa'_PQ$, respectively. The “Exponentials” relations imply that $P \Rightarrow Q$ is an exponential object of $P$ and $Q$ with evaluation morphism $\varepsilon_{PQ}$.

The necessary cocartesian morphisms and $\prod$-diagrams exist.

From the “Adjoint to pullback along projections” relations, we have that $\gamma^P$ is a universal arrow from $(\pi^\mathbf{A})^\star$ to $P$, and that $\zeta^P$ is a universal arrow from $P$ to $(\pi^\mathbf{A})^\star$, and hence that $(\pi^\mathbf{A})^\star$ has right and left adjoints, with object functions $\exists$ and $\forall$, respectively. It follows from Remark 9.13 that the morphisms $(\pi^\mathbf{A})^\star$ have the required cocartesian lifts and $\prod$-diagrams. Since the specified product projections in $\mathbf{Tm}_o$ are composites of the morphisms $\pi^\mathbf{A}$, and every product projection is isomorphic to a specified one, it follows from Propositions 23.2 and 23.3 below that the required cocartesian lifts and $\prod$-diagrams exist over every product projection.

Everything is stable.

The first five “Stability of the operations under pullbacks” relations imply that each of the functors $t^\star$ preserves (the specified, and hence all) products, coproducts, and exponentials.

We claim that the last two of these relations imply that (the specified and hence all) cocartesian morphisms and $\prod$-diagrams over the morphisms $\pi^\mathbf{A}$ are stable along every morphism. Again, once we show this, the same thing then follows for arbitrary product projections by Propositions 23.2 and 23.3.

More precisely, we claim that, for every $t: \mathbf{B} \to \mathbf{A} \setminus \{A_{t(\mathbf{A})}\}$, the cocartesian morphisms and $\prod$-diagrams over $\pi^\mathbf{A}$ satisfy the stability condition with respect to the pullback square

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbf{B} \times \langle A_{t(\mathbf{A})}\rangle & \xrightarrow{t \times 1_{\langle A\rangle}} & \mathbf{A} \\
\pi_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi^\mathbf{A} \\
\mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{t} & \mathbf{A} \setminus \{A_{t(\mathbf{A})}\}
\end{array}
$$

and hence are stable along $t$. 
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To prove the claim, let us put ourselves in the more general situation of a fibration \( \mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B} \) with a fixed split cleavage. Consider a pullback square

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A \\ h \\ C
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
f \\ \downarrow k \\ B \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
g \\ \downarrow \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
D
\end{array}
\]

(17)
in \( \mathcal{B} \), and suppose \( h^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^A \) and \( k^* : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^B \) have left (or right) adjoints, and that we have fixed such left adjoints \( \sum_h \dashv h \) and \( \sum_k \dashv k \) with units \( \eta^h \) and \( \eta^k \) (or right adjoints \( h \dashv \prod_h \) and \( k \dashv \prod_k \) with counits \( \varepsilon^h \) and \( \varepsilon^k \)).

Since the cleavage is split, the diagram of functors below to the left strictly commutes. Suppose further that \( \sum_h \) and \( \sum_k \) (or \( \prod_h \) and \( \prod_k \)) have been chosen so that the square below to the right commutes on objects (this is the case in our situation by Proposition 22.9).

Now, to see that the cocartesian morphisms (or \( \prod \)-diagrams) over \( k \) satisfy the stability condition with respect to the square (17), it suffices to see that this is true for some cocartesian morphism with domain \( P \) (or \( \prod \)-diagram based on \( P \)) for each \( P \in \mathcal{C}^B \), so we might as well take the cocartesian morphism (or \( \prod \)-diagram) associated to the fixed adjoint \( \sum_k \) (or \( \prod_k \)), namely the one shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
k^* \sum_k P \\
\eta^k_P \\
P
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
k^* \sum_k P
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\sum_k P \\
B
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
k
\rightarrow \\
D
\end{array}
\]

Again, to see that the stability condition holds for this particular cocartesian morphism (or \( \prod \)-diagram) it suffices to see that it holds with respect to some instance of the data involved in the stability condition (i.e., cartesian morphisms into \( P \) and \( \sum_k P \), and so on), so we might as well take the particular one shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
h^* g^* \sum_k P \\
f^* k^* \sum_k P \\
f^* \eta^k_P \\
f^* P
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
k^* \sum_k P
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\sum_k P \\
B
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
k \\
\rightarrow \\
D
\end{array}
\]

Hence we see that the equation \( f^* \eta^k_P = \eta^h_{f^* P} \) from “Stability of the operations under pullbacks” says precisely that the morphism \( \uparrow \cdot f^* \eta^k_P \) which is required by the stability condition to be cocartesian is
in fact the specified cocartesian morphism \( \eta^h_{f,P} \) (and similarly, \( f^* \varepsilon^h_{f,P} = \varepsilon^h_{f,P} \) is the condition that the diagram required to be a \( \Pi \)-diagram is in fact the specified \( \Pi \)-diagram).

**Equality objects**

Finally, the “Equality objects” relations ensure that the morphism \( ((\Delta(B))^\uparrow \cdot r^B : \top_B \rightarrow \text{Eq}_B \) over \( \Delta_B \) is cocartesian. Now, since \( \mathcal{Pf} \) has \( \Pi \)-diagrams over product projections, all cocartesian morphisms in \( \mathcal{Pf} \) are stable along product projections by Proposition 9.10. Hence, we also have cocartesian morphisms over \( 1_A \times \Delta(B) : A(B) \rightarrow \tilde{A}(B,B) \) with domain \( \top_{A(B)} \) for every \( A \). Since every (specified and hence every) diagonal morphism in \( \text{Tm} \) is isomorphic to a composite of such morphisms, it follows from Propositions 23.2 and 23.3 below that there is a cocartesian lift with domain \( \top_A \) for every diagonal morphism \( A \rightarrow A \times A \).

**22.16. Proposition.** The \( (\bigcup_{\tilde{A} \in \text{Ob} \text{Tm}} \text{Ob Form}(\tilde{A}) \times \text{Ob Form}(\tilde{A})) \)-indexed family of sets given by \( (\text{Hom}_{\text{Form}(\tilde{A})}(P,Q))_{\tilde{A},P,Q} \) is the (underlying family of sets of a) free \( \sigma' \)-structure (for \( \sigma' \) the signature introduced in Definition 22.11) subject to the relations from Definition 22.12, in the following sense:

Given any \( \sigma' \)-structure \( X \) with underlying sets \( (X_{PQ})_{\tilde{A},P,Q} \) satisfying all of the relations given in Definition 22.12 (these were defined as relations on the particular \( \sigma' \)-structure Ded, but of course they make sense for any \( \sigma' \)-structure), there is a unique morphism \( (\text{Hom}_{\text{Form}(\tilde{A})}(P,Q) \rightarrow X_{PQ})_{\tilde{A},P,Q} \) of \( \sigma' \)-structures.

**Proof:** This is more or less obvious. Since Ded is the initial \( \sigma' \)-algebra (i.e., set of \( \sigma' \)-terms with no variables), there is by Proposition 20.4 precisely one morphism of \( \sigma' \)-structures from Ded to \( X \), and hence there is at most one morphism from the quotient \( (\text{Hom}_{\text{Form}(\tilde{A})}(P,Q))_{\tilde{A},P,Q} \) of Ded to \( X \); and the assumption that \( X \) satisfies the relations of Definition 22.12 implies that the unique morphism from Ded to \( X \) does indeed factor through the quotient. \( \square \)

**23 Lemmas for the proof that \( \mathcal{Pf} \) is an \( h^- \)-fibration**

We now state and prove the Propositions 23.2 and 23.3 which were needed above in the proof that \( \mathcal{Pf}_\sigma \) is an \( h^- \)-fibration. For the rest of §23, let \( C \downarrow B \) be a fibration.

**23.1. Definition.** Let \( A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C \) be morphisms in \( \text{B} \). Suppose we are given \( \Pi \)-diagrams

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q \xrightarrow{q} R & & S \xrightarrow{t} T \\
\downarrow p & & \downarrow s \\
A \xrightarrow{f} B & & B \xrightarrow{g} C.
\end{array}
\]

We define a composite of these two \( \Pi \)-diagrams to be any diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
U \xrightarrow{v} T \\
\downarrow u & & \\
A \xrightarrow{gf} C
\end{array}
\]

with \( u \) over \( A \) and \( v \) over \( gf \), which arises in the following way. We choose a cartesian lift \( \uparrow: f^* \rightarrow S \)
of $f$, so that we obtain an induced morphism $f^* s : f^* S \to Q$

$$
\begin{array}{c}
f^* S \xrightarrow{t} T \\
\downarrow^{f^* s} \\
Q \xrightarrow{q} R \\
\downarrow^{p} \\
A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C,
\end{array}
$$

and then we set $u = p \cdot f^* s$ and $v = t\uparrow$.

**23.2. Proposition.** Any composite of cocartesian morphisms or $\prod$-diagrams in $\mathcal{C}$ is again a cocartesian morphism or $\prod$-diagram.

Moreover, given a cocartesian morphism (or $\prod$-diagram) over $g : B \to C$ which is stable along some morphism $h : D \to C$ for which there exists a pullback square

$$
\begin{array}{c}
D \\
\downarrow^j \\
B \xrightarrow{q} C \\
\downarrow^h \\
A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C,
\end{array}
$$

and given any cocartesian morphism (or $\prod$-diagram) over $f : A \to B$ which is stable along $k$, the composite of these cocartesian morphisms (or $\prod$-diagrams) is stable along $h$ as well.

**Proof:** We already know that cartesian (and hence, dually, cocartesian) morphisms are closed under composition (see [Hel19, Proposition 2.5]).

That $\prod$-diagrams are closed under composition follows from a straightforward but somewhat lengthy diagram chase. Suppose we have a composite of $\prod$-diagrams, as shown below, as well as some cocartesian lift $\uparrow:(gf)^* U \to U$ of $gf$ and a morphism $u : (gf)^* U \to P$.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
(gf)^* U \xrightarrow{t} U \\
\downarrow^{f^* S} \\
S \xrightarrow{t} T \\
\downarrow^{f^* s} \\
Q \xrightarrow{q} R \\
\downarrow^{p} \\
A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C.
\end{array}
$$

We obtain the requisite morphism $U \to T$ as follows. We first factor $\uparrow:(gf)^* U \to U$ as the composite $(gf)^* U \xrightarrow{\pi_2} g^* U \xrightarrow{\pi_1} U$ of two cartesian morphisms. The first $\prod$-diagram then induces a morphism $g^* U \to R$, and thence, the second $\prod$-diagram induces a morphism $U \to T$. It is then straightforward to see that this morphism has the desired property, and is the unique such morphism.

To see that the composite of stable cocartesian morphisms is stable, suppose we have pullback squares

$$
\begin{array}{c}
D \\
\downarrow^j \\
B \xrightarrow{g} C, \\
\downarrow^h \\
A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C,
\end{array}
$$
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and are considering the composite of cocartesian lifts \( P \xrightarrow{l} Q \xrightarrow{g} R \) of \( f \) and \( g \). We need to show that, given cartesian lifts \( \uparrow: l^*P \to P \) and \( \uparrow: h^*R \to R \) of \( l \) and \( h \), the induced morphism \( l^*P \to h^*R \) is cocartesian. We choose an additional cartesian lift \( k^*Q \to Q \) of \( k \). We then have, by the stability of \( p \) and \( q \), that the induced morphisms \( l^*P \to k^*Q \) and \( k^*Q \to h^*R \) are cartesian. But the induced morphism \( l^*P \to h^*R \) must be the composite of these, and hence cocartesian.

The proof that the composite of stable \( \Pi \)-diagrams is stable is similar. \( \square \)

23.3. Proposition. Let \( f: A \to B \) be a morphism in \( B \), and suppose \( f': A' \to B' \) is isomorphic to \( f \), in the sense that there exists a commutative square

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{i} & A' \\
\downarrow{f} & & \downarrow{f'} \\
B & \xrightarrow{j} & B'
\end{array}
\]

Let \( P \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{E}^A \) and let \( p: P' \to P \) be a cartesian lift of \( i^{-1} \) (\( p \) is then also an isomorphism by [Hel19, Proposition 10.2]).

**Claim:** If there exists a cocartesian morphism with domain \( P \) (or \( \Pi \)-diagram based on \( P \)) over \( f \), then there exists a cocartesian morphism with domain \( P' \) (or \( \Pi \)-diagram based on \( P' \)) over \( f' \).

Moreover, if the original cocartesian morphism (or \( \Pi \)-diagram) over \( f \) is stable along some morphism \( g: C \to B \), then the resulting one over \( f' \) is stable along the composite \( C \xrightarrow{j} B \xrightarrow{1} B' \).

**Proof:** Given a cocartesian lift \( q: P \to Q \) of \( f \), we can obtain a cocartesian lift of \( f' \) by composing \( qp \) with an isomorphic (hence cocartesian) lift of \( j \). To see that the result is stable, it suffices by Proposition 23.2 to see that cocartesian lifts of isomorphisms are stable along every possible morphism. In fact, using the stability of isomorphisms under pullbacks, the 2-of-3 property of cartesian morphisms [Hel19, Proposition 2.5], as well as [Hel19, Proposition 10.2] and its dual, one can see that the morphism required in the stability condition to be cocartesian will again be an isomorphism.

The proof for \( \Pi \)-diagrams is similar; we need only see that we can find a \( \Pi \)-diagram over any isomorphism and based on any object, and that these are always stable. In fact, given an isomorphism \( i: A \to A' \) and an object \( P \) over \( A \), we can take any isomorphism \( Q \to P \) (for example, \( 1^P \)), any isomorphism \( q: Q \to \bar{R} \) over \( f \), and the result

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q & \xrightarrow{q} & R \\
p\downarrow & & \downarrow \bar{f} \\
P & \xrightarrow{j} & \bar{B} \\
A & \xrightarrow{f} & B
\end{array}
\]

will be a \( \Pi \)-diagram. The proof that this is stable is similar to the one for cocartesian morphisms; in the same way, one can show that in the stability condition, the induced diagram which is required to be a \( \Pi \)-diagram again consists of two isomorphisms. \( \square \)

24 Freeness of the fibration

Our final task is to show that the \( h^- \)-fibration \( \mathcal{P}f_\sigma \) is free over \( \text{Tm}_\sigma \).

This will involve, first, showing that for any other \( h^- \)-fibration \( \mathcal{C} \) over \( \text{Tm} \), there is a morphism \( \mathcal{P}f_\sigma \to \mathcal{C} \) of \( h^- \)-fibrations over \( \text{Tm} \), and secondly, that any two such morphisms are connected by a unique natural isomorphism.

In both cases, this will involve a construction (or proof) involving the objects of \( \mathcal{P}f \) and then one
involving the morphisms, and these will both proceed by recursion/induction. In the case of morphisms, we note that it is only the morphisms in the fibers of $\mathcal{P}f$ (i.e., the “deductions”) that satisfy a recursion principle. To deal with a general morphism, we factor it as a morphism in the fibers and a cartesian morphism in the canonical cleavage. The latter morphisms can be handled by a recursion on the objects of $\mathcal{P}f$.

Hence, we begin with a lemma, showing that one can construct a morphism out of a (split cloven) fibration by separately specifying its action on the cleavage and on the fiber morphisms.

It is worth noting that, as will become more or less clear from the proof, the fibration $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma$ also satisfies a different universal property, which determines it up to isomorphism. Namely, given another $h\mathcal{E}$-fibration $\mathcal{C}$ over $\text{Thu}_\sigma$ in which “all of the choices” corresponding to the syntactic operations on formulas – i.e., finite products, coproducts, and exponentials in the fibers, and so on – have been, there is a unique morphism of $h\mathcal{E}$-fibrations $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ over $\sigma$ respecting all of these choices.

**24.1. Lemma.** Let $\mathcal{C}_1 \downarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{D}_1 \downarrow \mathcal{B}$ be fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\mathcal{C}$ admits a split cleavage, and fix one such, so that we have a subcategory $\mathcal{C}_1$ of $\mathcal{C}$ containing all the objects in $\mathcal{C}$ and all the morphisms in the cleavage. Let $\mathcal{C}_2$ be the union of all the fibers $\mathcal{C}_A$ for $A \in \text{Ob}\mathcal{B}$. Let $\Phi_1 : \mathcal{C}_1 \to \mathcal{D}$ and $\Phi_2 : \mathcal{C}_2 \to \mathcal{D}$ be functors over $\mathcal{B}$, in the sense that $\mathcal{D}\Phi_2 = \mathcal{C}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and suppose that $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$ agree on the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ (i.e., on the objects of $\mathcal{C}$). Suppose further that, for each $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$ and each $p : P \to Q$ in $\mathcal{C}_B$, the following square commutes.

Claim: There is a unique functor $\Phi : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ over $\mathcal{B}$ restricting to $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$. Moreover, if $\Phi_1$ takes each morphism to a cartesian morphism, then $\Phi$ is a morphism of fibrations over $\mathcal{B}$.

Proof: Let $p : P \to Q$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ over $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{B}$. Then $p$ factors as $(f^* Q)p$ for a unique $p : P \to f^* Q$ over $1_A$. Hence, if $p$ is not in $\mathcal{C}_1$ or $\mathcal{C}_2$, we are forced to take $\Phi p$ to be $(\Phi_1(f^* Q))(\Phi_2 p)$ (and if $p$ is in $\mathcal{C}_1$ or $\mathcal{C}_2$, we of course take $\Phi p$ to be $\Phi_1 p$ or $\Phi_2 p$). Note that the equation $\Phi p = (\Phi_1(f^* Q))(\Phi_2 p)$ still holds if $p$ in $\mathcal{C}_1$, since then $p = 1_{f^* Q}$, and it holds if $p$ is in $\mathcal{C}_2$, since then $f^* Q = 1_Q$.

It remains to see that $\Phi$, thus defined, is a functor. We know that $\Phi$ preserves identity morphisms since $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2$ do, so we need only see that it preserves composition.

Let $p : P \to Q$ and $q : Q \to R$ be morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ over $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to C$ in $\mathcal{B}$. We then have the following commutative diagram in $\mathcal{C}$ and its image under $\Phi$ in $\mathcal{D}$.

By definition, the two small triangles in the second diagram commute, as does the large triangle. By assumption, the rectangle also commutes. Hence $(\Phi q)(\Phi p) = (\Phi q p)$. \(\square\)
24.2. **Proposition.** Given an $h^\ast$-fibration $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\pi}{\text{Ob} \mathcal{Tm}}$, there exists a morphism of $h^\ast$-fibrations $M : \mathcal{Pf}_{\mathcal{Tm}} \to \mathcal{C}$ over $\mathcal{Tm}$.

We note that this will involve an essential use of the axiom of choice.

**Proof:** We will use Proposition 24.1 to construct $M$.

**First part: defining $M$ on objects**

To define $M$ on the objects of $\text{Ob Pf}$, we need, by Proposition 22.10 (iii) an $\text{Ob} \mathcal{Tm}$-indexed family of sets together with operations as listed there.

Let us (arbitrarily) choose, in $\mathcal{C}$, fiberwise binary products and coproducts, initial and terminal objects, and exponential objects (i.e., we choose for each pair of objects a product diagram, coproduct diagram, and exponential diagram based on them). Let us also fix cocartesian morphisms and prod-diagrams over the morphisms $\pi^{\ast}$, giving us functors $\sum_{\pi^{\ast}}$ and $\prod_{\pi^{\ast}}$ (which would be left and right adjoint to the functor $(\pi^{\ast})^\ast$, had we already chosen a cleavage). Finally, let us choose an equality object $\text{Eq}_B$ in $\mathcal{C}(\langle B \rangle \times \langle B \rangle)$ (i.e., a cocartesian morphisms over $\Delta_B : \langle B \rangle \to \langle B \rangle \times \langle B \rangle$ with domain a terminal object) for each $B \in \mathcal{Tm}$, and cartesian morphisms $\langle s, t \rangle^\ast \text{Eq}_B : \langle s, t \rangle^\ast \text{Eq}_B \to \text{Eq}_B$ for each pair of morphisms $s,t : \tilde{A} \to \langle B \rangle$ in $\text{Ob} \mathcal{Tm}$.

This clearly endows the family of sets $(\text{Ob} \mathcal{C})_{\tilde{A} \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{Tm}}$ with the operations listed in Proposition 22.10, and hence gives us maps $\text{Ob} \mathcal{Pf}^{\ast} \to \mathcal{C}$ for each $\tilde{A} \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{Tm}$.

**Second part: defining $M$ on the cleavage**

We have thus defined $M : \text{Ob Pf} \to \mathcal{C}$. We next define $M$ on the cartesian lifts constituting the canonical cleavage of $\mathcal{Pf}$.

Each such morphism has the form $\uparrow = t^\ast Q : t^\ast Q \to Q$ for some $t : \tilde{A} \to \tilde{B}$ in $\mathcal{Tm}$. We define $M(t^\ast Q)$ by induction on $Q$; i.e., we define by recursion a function taking each $Q \in \text{Ob Pf}$ to a function taking each $t : \tilde{A} \to \tilde{B}$ (where $Q \in \mathcal{Pf}^{\ast}B$) to a cartesian morphism $M(t^\ast Q) \to MQ$.

If $Q$ is $\top_B$ or $\bot_B$, then, by Proposition 22.9, $P$ is $\top_{\tilde{A}}$ or $\bot_{\tilde{A}}$, and $MP$ and $MQ$ are the terminal or initial objects of $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$. Then we let $M(t^\ast Q)$ be the unique cartesian morphism $MP \to MQ$.

If $Q$ is $s^\ast \text{Eq}_C$, for some $s : \tilde{B} \to \langle C, C \rangle$, so that $t^\ast Q = (ts)^\ast \text{Eq}_C$, then we have a solid diagram

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
M((ts)^\ast \text{Eq}_C) & \xrightarrow{(ts)^\ast(M\text{Eq}_C)} & M\text{Eq}_C \\
M(t^\ast Q) \downarrow & & \downarrow s^\ast(M\text{Eq}_C) \\
\tilde{A} \xrightarrow{t} \tilde{B} & \xrightarrow{s} & \langle C, C \rangle,
\end{array}
$$

where $(ts)^\ast(M\text{Eq}_C)$ and $s^\ast(M\text{Eq}_C)$ are the cartesian morphisms chosen in the definition of $M((ts)^\ast \text{Eq}_C)$ and $M(s^\ast \text{Eq}_C)$, and we let $M(t^\ast Q)$ be the unique morphism making the whole diagram commute. By [He19, Proposition 2.5], it is again cartesian.

Now suppose $Q$ is $Q' \land Q''$, so that $P = t^\ast Q' \land t^\ast Q''$. Now, $MP$ and $MQ$ have been defined as the chosen products $M(t^\ast Q') \land (t^\ast Q'')$ and $MQ' \land MQ''$. By induction, we have already defined the cartesian morphisms $M(t^\ast Q') : M(t^\ast Q') \to M(Q')$ and $M(t^\ast Q'') : M(t^\ast Q'') \to M(Q'')$. We now let $M(t^\ast Q)$ be the unique (necessarily cartesian) morphism over $t$, given by Proposition 25.2 below,
making the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
MP & \xrightarrow{M(t^\dagger Q)} & MQ \\
\downarrow M(t^\ast Q') & & \downarrow M(t^\dagger Q'') \\
M(t^\ast Q') & \xrightarrow{M(t^\dagger Q')} & MQ'
\end{array}
\]

commute, where the unlabeled arrows form the chosen product diagrams for MP and MQ. If \( P \) is \( Q' \lor Q'' \) or \( Q' \Rightarrow Q'' \), then \( M_P \) is defined similarly, but using Proposition 25.3 or Proposition 25.4. Similarly, if \( P \) is \( \forall Q \) or \( \exists Q \), then \( M_P \) is defined using Proposition 25.1 or 25.5.

**Third part: \( M \) is a functor on the cleavage**

Next, we must verify that, on the cartesian morphisms on which we have just defined \( M \), it preserves composition and identities. That it preserves identities is proven by induction: in each case \( M(t^\dagger Q) \) was defined to be the unique morphism satisfying some property, and the identity morphism always satisfies the property in question.

The proof that \( M \) preserves composites is similar. We consider a composite \((ts)^\ast R \xrightarrow{s^\dagger (t^\ast R)} t^\ast R \xrightarrow{t^\dagger R} R\) of morphisms in the cleavage over \( \bar{A} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \bar{B} \xrightarrow{\tau} \bar{C} \) in \( \text{Tm} \), and we prove by induction on \( R \) that \( M((ts)^\dagger R) = M(t^\dagger R)M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R)) \). The point is, again, that \( M((ts)^\dagger R) \) is defined to be the unique morphism satisfying some property, and the morphism \( M(t^\dagger R)M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R)) \) is always seen to satisfy this property. For example, if \( R = R' \land R'' \), then we have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
M(((ts)^\ast R) & M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R')) & M(t^\ast R) & M(t^\dagger R) \\
\downarrow M((ts)^\ast R') & \downarrow M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R')) & \downarrow M(t^\ast R') & \downarrow M(t^\dagger R') \\
M((ts)^\ast R') & M(t^\ast R') & M(t^\ast R') & M(t^\dagger R')
\end{array}
\]

Since, by induction,

\[
(M(t^\dagger R')(M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R'))) = M((ts)^\dagger R')
\]

and

\[
(M(t^\dagger R'')(M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R''))) = M((ts)^\dagger R''),
\]

we have by definition that \( M((ts)^\dagger R) \) is the unique morphism \( M((ts)^\ast R) \rightarrow MR \) making the diagram (with the object \( M(t^\ast R) \) and all incident arrows removed) commute. Obviously, \( M(t^\dagger R)M(s^\dagger (t^\ast R)) \) is the unique such morphism as desired.

**Fourth part: defining \( M \) on the fibers**

We next define \( M \) on morphisms in the fibers \( \text{Form}_\sigma(\bar{A}) \) – i.e., on the deductions. According to Proposition 22.16, to define such a function, we need to specify a \( \biguplus_{\bar{A} \in \text{Ob} \text{Form}(\bar{A})} \text{Ob} \text{Form}(\bar{A}) \times \text{Ob} \text{Form}(\bar{A}) \)-indexed family of sets, together with the operations given in Definition 22.11, satisfying the relations given in Definition 22.12.

For our family of sets, let us take \( \langle \text{Hom}_{\bar{A} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \bar{A}}(MP, MQ) \rangle \downarrow_{\bar{A} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \bar{A}} \) (of course, this choice is more or less forced on us since we are trying to extend \( M \) to a functor). The definitions of the operations listed in Definition 22.11 more or less suggest themselves.
For the “Category and fibration structure” operations, we use the category structure on $\mathcal{C}$ to define “$1_P$” and “$\circ$”, and given $f : MP \to MQ$ in $\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{A}$ and $t : \vec{B} \to \vec{A}$ we define $t^*f : M(t^*P) \to M(t^*Q)$ using the chosen cartesian morphisms $M(t^*P) : M(t^*P) \to MP$ and $M(t^*Q) : M(t^*Q) \to MQ$.

The “Finite products and coproducts” and “Exponentials” operations are defined using the chosen finite products and coproducts and exponentials in the fiber of $\mathcal{C}$.

The “Adjoint to pullback along projections” operations are defined using the chosen cocartesian morphisms and $\Pi$-diagrams, and the “Equality objects” operations are defined using the chosen Equality objects.

Now we must verify that these operations satisfy the relations in Definition 22.12. In fact, these almost all follow immediately from how we defined the operations. The two cases that require some thought are the final two equations under “Stability of the operations under pullbacks”; but these follow from a similar analysis to the one given in the proof of Proposition 22.15.

Having verified that the relations from Definition 22.12 are satisfied, we have by Proposition 22.16 a unique family of maps $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{A}}(P,Q) \to \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{A}}(MP,MQ)$ preserving all the operations from Definition 22.11. In particular, composition and identities are preserved, so this defines functors $\mathcal{P}^\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{C}^\mathcal{A}$ on the fibers. The way we defined the operations $t^*$ on the family of sets $(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}^\mathcal{A}}(MP,MQ))_{\vec{A},P,Q}$ ensure the final condition of Lemma 24.1 is satisfied, and so we have a morphism of fibrations $\mathcal{P}^\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{C}$ over $\mathcal{Tm}$.

Fifth part: $M$ is a morphism of $h^\mathcal{A}$-fibrations

Finally, we must verify that our morphism $\mathcal{P}^\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{C}$ of fibrations is a morphism of $h^\mathcal{A}$-fibrations. This will follow from the preservation of (some of) the operations from Definition 22.11.

Indeed, the preservation of the operations $1_P$, $1_P$, $\pi_{PQ}$, $\pi_{PQ}$, $\kappa_{PQ}$, $\kappa_{PQ}$, $\varepsilon_{PQ}$ from “Finite products and coproducts” and “Exponentials” operations shows that the specified – and hence all – finite products and coproducts and exponentials in the fibers are preserved. Similarly, the preservation of the operations $\varepsilon_{P}^\mathcal{A}$ and $\eta_{P}^\mathcal{A}$ imply that the specified – and hence all – cocartesian morphisms and $\Pi$-diagrams over the product projections $\pi_{\vec{A}}$ are preserved.

To see that $M$ preserves cocartesian morphisms and $\Pi$-diagrams over arbitrary product projections, we use – as in the proof of Proposition 22.15 – that every product projection in $\mathcal{Tm}$ is isomorphic to a composite of the morphisms $\pi_{\vec{A}}$. Now, it is clear that if two composable cocartesian morphisms are taken by $M$ to cocartesian morphisms, then so is their composite. Similarly, if two composable $\Pi$-diagrams are taken by $M$ to $\Pi$-diagrams, then so is their composite (Definition 23.1). Finally, any cocartesian morphism or $\Pi$-diagram which is isomorphic to one preserved by $M$ is preserved as well.

Finally, the preservation of the operation $\nu^{B}$ under “Equality objects” shows that the specified cocartesian morphisms over the diagonal morphisms $\Delta_{\{B\}}$ are preserved and hence, by a similar argument to that in the previous paragraph, that every cocartesian morphism over a diagonal morphism is preserved. Indeed, it is easy to see that if any cocartesian morphism $p$ is preserved by $M$, then so is any morphism which is cocartesian “by virtue” of $p$ being stable along some morphism. In particular, each cocartesian lift of $1_{\vec{A}} \times \Delta_{\{B\}}$ with domain $\nabla_{\vec{A}(B)}$ is preserved, and so we are done by the argument in the previous paragraph since every diagonal morphism in $\mathcal{Tm}$ is isomorphic to a composite of the morphisms $1_{\vec{A}} \times \Delta_{\{B\}}$.

24.3. Proposition. Let again $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{Tm}}$ be an $h^\mathcal{A}$-fibration over $\mathcal{Tm}$, and suppose now that we have two morphisms $M, M' : \mathcal{P}^\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{C}$ of $h^\mathcal{A}$-fibrations.

Claim: There is a unique natural isomorphism $M \to M'$ of morphisms of fibrations (which is then
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necessarily a natural isomorphism).

We will show, by induction on \( P \in \text{Ob Pf} \), that there is a unique morphism \( \alpha_P : MP \to M'P \) over \( \hat{A} \) (where \( P \in \text{Form}_* (\hat{A}) \)) which can be part of a natural transformation of morphisms of fibrations, and that \( \alpha_P \) is an isomorphism. More precisely, for each \( P \in \text{Ob Pf} \), we will define an isomorphism \( \alpha_P : MP \to M'P \) such that, if \( \beta : M \to M' \) is any natural transformation of morphisms of fibrations, then \( \beta_P = \alpha_P \).

We will then show that the \( \alpha_P \) do in fact constitute a natural transformation.

**First part: definition of \( \alpha_P \)**

We now define \( \alpha_P \) by recursion on \( P \).

According to Proposition 22.10, in order to define a function on the objects of \( \text{Ob Pf} \), we need to specify an \( \text{Ob Tm} \) indexed family of objects \((\hat{A})_{\hat{A} \in \text{Ob Pf}}\) together with the operations listed there.

For our family of sets, let us take \((\mathbb{P} \mathcal{MP}, \mathcal{M'P})_{\mathcal{A} \in \text{Ob Pf}}\) where \( \mathcal{P} \) denotes the subset of \( \text{Hom} \) consisting of isomorphisms.

We define operations \( \wedge, \vee, \) and so on, on this family of sets, by sending, for example, given isomorphisms \( MP \cong M'P \) and \( MQ \cong MQ' \) to the induced isomorphism \( M (P \wedge P') \cong M (Q \wedge Q') \) between the products, and similarly with the other operations.

We therefore get, by Proposition 22.10, an induced family \( \alpha : \text{Ob Pf} \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{P} \mathcal{MP}, \mathcal{M'P})_{\mathcal{A} \in \text{Ob Pf}} \) of maps preserving the operations. It follows by induction that \( \alpha_P : MP \to M'P \) for each \( P \).

**Second part: uniqueness of \( \alpha \)**

We next show that if \( \beta : M \to M' \) is any natural transformation over \( \text{Tm} \), then \( \alpha_P = \beta_P \) for every \( P \in \text{Ob Pf} \), by induction on \( P \).

If \( P \) is \( \top \) or \( \bot \), then \( MP \) and \( M'P \) are both terminal or initial, and there is a unique morphism \( MP \to M'P \).

Suppose \( P \) is \( s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c) \) for some \( s : \mathcal{A} \to \langle C, C \rangle \). Then we have the following commuting naturality squares for \( \beta \)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M(s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c)) & \xrightarrow{M(\top)} & M(\mathcal{Eq}(c)) & \xleftarrow{M'(\top)} & M'(\mathcal{Eq}(c)) \\
\beta s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c) & \downarrow & \beta \mathcal{Eq}(c) & \downarrow & \beta \mathcal{Eq}(c) \\
M'(s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c)) & \xrightarrow{M'(\top)} & M'(\mathcal{Eq}(c)) & \xleftarrow{M'(\top)} & \mathcal{T}(c) \\
\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{s} & \langle C, C \rangle & \xleftarrow{\Delta(c)} & \langle C, C \rangle
\end{array}
\]

We see, by cartesianness and cocartesianness, that there is a unique choice of \( \beta_{s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c)} \) and \( \beta s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c) \) making these diagrams commute; and these unique morphisms are precisely the definition of \( \alpha_{s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c)} \) and \( \alpha_{s^* \mathcal{Eq}(c)} \).

If \( P = Q \wedge Q' \), then by induction we have \( \beta_Q = \alpha_Q \) and \( \beta_{Q'} = \alpha_{Q'} \). We then have the commuting naturality squares for the morphisms \( \pi_{QQ'} \) and \( \pi'_{QQ'} \), and these imply that the morphism \( \beta_P \) must be the isomorphism of the products \( MP \cong M'P \) induced by the isomorphisms \( \beta_Q = \alpha_Q : MQ \to M'Q \) and \( \beta_{Q'} = \alpha_{Q'} : MQ' \to M'Q' \) - and this is precisely the definition of \( \alpha_P \). The same proof applies when \( P = Q \vee Q' \).

The argument when \( P = Q \Rightarrow Q' \) is similar. The naturality squares of \( \beta \) for \( \pi_{Q(Q \Rightarrow Q')}, \pi'_{Q(Q \Rightarrow Q')} \), and \( \varepsilon_{QQ'} \) imply that \( \beta_P \) is the isomorphism between exponential objects induced by the isomorphisms
We first show that \( \alpha \colon Q \xrightarrow{\sim} Q' \) and \( \beta_p = \alpha_p : Q \xrightarrow{\sim} Q' \) – which is the definition of \( \alpha_p \).

The arguments when \( P = \forall Q \) or \( P = \exists Q \) are also similar; we use the naturality squares for \( \varepsilon_Q^\forall \) and \( (\pi^-)^\forall (\forall Q) \) (where \( Q \in \mathcal{P} \overline{A} \)), or for \( \alpha_Q^\exists \), and conclude that \( \beta_p \) is the isomorphism \( M(\forall Q) \equiv M'(\forall Q) \) or \( M(\exists Q) \equiv M'(\exists Q) \) induced by the isomorphism \( \beta_q = \alpha_Q : MQ \xrightarrow{\sim} M'Q \).

Third part: naturality of \( \alpha \)

Next, we must check that the family \( \alpha = (\alpha_p)_{p \in \text{Ob(Pf)}} \) constitutes a natural transformation.

We first note that \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to the composite \( qp \) of morphisms in \( \text{Pf} \) whenever it is natural with respect to \( p \) and \( q \). Hence, since each morphism in \( \text{Pf} \) is a composite a morphism in the canonical cleavage of \( \mathcal{P} \), we need only check naturality for morphisms in these two classes.

**Cleavage morphisms**

We first show that \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to the morphisms \( t^*P : t^*P \to P \) in the cleavage by induction on \( P \), where \( t : A \to B \).

Suppose \( P \) is one of \( \top_B \) or \( \bot_B \). Then the naturality square for \( t^*P \) consists of two morphisms \( M(t^*P) \to M'(P) \) over \( t \), which are equal, since there is only one such morphism.

Next, suppose \( P \) is \( s^* \text{Eq}_C \) for some \( s : B \to (C, C) \). We then have the following diagram, where the rectangle on the right and the outer rectangle commute by the definitions of \( \alpha(t^*s)^* \text{Eq}_C \) and \( \alpha_s^* \text{Eq}_C \).

Hence, the rectangle on the left commutes by a diagram chase using [Hel19, Proposition 2.8].

Now suppose that \( P \) is \( Q \land R \). Consider the following diagram.

By Proposition 25.2, there is a unique morphism \( M(t^*Q \land t^*R) \to M'(Q \land R) \) making the diagram (with the objects \( M'(t^*Q \land t^*R) \) and \( M(Q \land R) \) and all arrows incident to them removed) commute.
By a diagram chase using the commutativity (which we know by induction) of the naturality squares of $\alpha$ for $\pi^3_{QR}$, $\pi^3_{QR}$, $t^*\pi^3_{QR}$, and $t^*\pi^3_{QR}$, as well as the definitions of $M(t^*(Q \land R))$ and $M'(t^*(Q \land R))$, we have that the two composite morphisms $M(t^*(Q \land R)) \to M'(Q \land R)$ in the diagram satisfy this condition, hence they must be equal, as desired.

The case in which $P$ is $Q \lor R$ is similar.

Next, suppose $P$ is $\exists Q$ for some $Q \in \text{Form}_\omega(\bar{B}(C))$ and some sort $C$. We then have the following diagram, in which we wish to show that the back face commutes.

![Diagram for existential case](image)

By induction, we know that the front face commutes; by the definitions of $\alpha_{\exists Q}$ and $\alpha_{t^*\exists Q} = \alpha_{\exists(t \times 1_{(C)})^*Q}$, we have that the sides commute; and by the definitions of $M(t^*(\exists Q))$ and $M'(t^*(\exists Q))$, we know that the top and bottom faces commute. Hence, by a diagram chase using the dual of [Hel19, Proposition 2.8], the back face commutes as desired.

The case in which $P$ is $Q \to R$ is handled in the same way as the case $Q \land R$ above. Specifically, in the diagram for that case, replace “$R$” with “$Q \Rightarrow R$”, and adjoin the square

![Diagram for implication case](image)

as well as the evaluation morphisms $M(\varepsilon_{QR})$, $M'(\varepsilon_{QR})$, $M(\varepsilon_{(t^*Q)(t^*R)})$, and $M'(\varepsilon_{(t^*Q)(t^*R)})$. We then have by Proposition 25.4 that there is a unique morphism $M(t^*(Q \Rightarrow R)) \to M'(Q \Rightarrow R)$ for which there exists a morphism $M(t^*(Q \land t^*(Q \Rightarrow R)) \to M'(Q \land Q \Rightarrow R)$ making the whole diagram commute. A diagram chase using the induction hypothesis and the definitions of $M(t^*(Q \Rightarrow R))$ and $M'(t^*(Q \Rightarrow R))$ then shows that both of the composite morphisms $M(t^*(Q \Rightarrow R)) \to M'(Q \Rightarrow R)$ make the diagram commute, and hence are equal as desired.

The final case in which $P$ is $\forall Q$ is handled similarly using 25.1.

**Fiber morphisms**

We next show, by induction, that $\alpha$ is natural with respect to the morphisms in the fibers.

We begin with the base cases of the induction.

Naturality with respect to $1_P, !_P, \iota_P$ is clear.

Naturality with respect to $\pi_{PQ}$, $\pi'_{PQ}$, $\kappa_{PQ}$, $\kappa'_{PQ}$ follows immediately from the definitions of $\alpha_{P,Q}$, $\alpha_{P \lor Q}$.

Next, consider naturality with respect to $\varepsilon_{QR}$. By definition, $\alpha_{P \Rightarrow Q}$ is the unique morphism for which
there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism \( p \) making the following diagram commute.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
MQ \\
\downarrow M\varepsilon_{PQ} \\
M((P \Rightarrow Q) \land P) \\
\downarrow M\pi_{(P \Rightarrow Q)P} \\
M(P \Rightarrow Q) \\
\downarrow M\alpha_P \Rightarrow \land \\
MP \\
\end{array}
\]  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_Q \\
\downarrow M'\varepsilon_{PQ} \\
M'((P \Rightarrow Q) \land P) \\
\downarrow M'\pi_{(P \Rightarrow Q)P} \\
M'(P \Rightarrow Q) \\
\downarrow M'\alpha_P \Rightarrow \land \\
M'P \\
\end{array}
\]

Since \( \alpha_{(P \Rightarrow Q) \land P} \) is by definition the unique morphism \( p \) making the above diagram (with the objects \( MQ \) and \( MQ' \) and all incident arrows removed) commute, it follows that \( p = \alpha_{(P \Rightarrow Q) \land P} \), and hence that we have the desired commutativity of the naturality square for \( \varepsilon_{PQ} \).

Let us next consider naturality with respect to \( \eta^\exists_P \) and \( \varepsilon^\forall_P \), and let us assume \( P \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{P}f^A_\land \). By definition, \( \alpha_{\exists P} \) is the unique morphism making the square on the bottom of the diagram below to the left commute. It then follows from a diagram chase using [Hel19, Proposition 2.8] and the already-proven naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect to \((\pi^A)\uparrow^\exists(\exists P)\) that the desired naturality square for \( \eta^\exists_P \) commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
M((\pi^A)\exists P) \\
\downarrow M\eta^\exists_P \\
M'((\pi^A)\exists P) \\
\downarrow M'\eta^\exists_P \\
M'(\exists P) \\
\downarrow M'\alpha_{\exists P} \\
M'P \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_{(\pi^A)\exists P} \\
\downarrow M'\varepsilon_{PQ} \\
M'((\pi^A)\forall P) \\
\downarrow M'\varepsilon_{PQ} \\
M'(\forall P) \\
\downarrow M'\alpha_{\forall P} \\
M'P \\
\end{array}
\]

Next, \( \alpha_{\forall P} \) is defined to be the unique morphism for which there exists a (necessarily unique) \( p \) making the above diagram to the right commute. Since \( \alpha_{(\pi^A)\forall P} \) is the unique morphism \( p \) making the top square in the diagram commute, it follows that \( p = \alpha_{(\pi^A)\forall P} \), and hence that we have the desired commuting naturality square for \( \varepsilon^\forall_P \).

The argument for naturality with respect to \( r^B \) is the same as the one for \( \eta^\exists_P \) just given.

**Inductive steps**

We now turn to the inductive steps for the naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect to fiber morphisms.

It is immediate that \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( g \circ f \) if it is natural with respect to \( f \) and \( g \).

Next, let \( t : \vec{A} \rightarrow \vec{B} \) and let \( f : P \rightarrow Q \) be a morphism in \( \mathcal{P}f^\vec{A} \), and suppose \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( f \). Then, in the following cube, the right face commutes by assumption, the front and back squares commute by the naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect to the cleavage, shown above, and the top and bottom squares commute by the functoriality of \( M \) and \( M' \). Hence, by a diagram chase using [Hel19,
Proposition 2.8, the left face commutes, so \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( t^*f \).

Next, suppose \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( f : P \to Q \) and \( g : P \to R \). We want to prove that it is also natural with respect to \( \langle f, g \rangle \). We have the following diagram, where the unlabeled morphisms are \( M \langle f, g \rangle \) and \( M' \langle f, g \rangle \). Naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect to \( \langle f, g \rangle \) then follows from the universal property of \( M'\langle Q \land R \rangle \) by a diagram chase, using the naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect \( f \) and \( g \), which we are assuming, and with respect \( \pi_{QR} \) and \( \pi'_{QR} \), which we showed above.

The proof of naturality with respect to \( [f, g] \) is the same.

Next, suppose that \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( f : P \to (\pi^\dagger)^*S \). We then have the following diagram.

Here, the left face commutes by assumption, the front and back faces commute by the functoriality of \( M \) and \( M' \), and the top and bottom faces by the naturality of \( \alpha \) with respect to cartesian morphisms, shown above. Hence, the right face commutes by the dual of [Hel19, Proposition 2.8], and so \( \alpha \) is natural with respect to \( \mu f \).
The proof that $\alpha$ is natural with respect to $\xi f$ is the same.

Next, suppose that $\alpha$ is natural with respect to $f : P \land Q \to R$. We want to show that the following square commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
MP \xrightarrow{M(f)} M(Q \Rightarrow R) \\
\downarrow \alpha_P \\
M'P \xrightarrow{M'(f)} M'(Q \Rightarrow R)
\end{array}
\]

By the universal property of $M'(Q \Rightarrow R)$, it suffices to see that the diagram commutes after applying $(-) \land M'(Q)$ and post-composing with $M' \varepsilon_{QR} : M'(Q \Rightarrow R) \land M'Q \to M'R$. We then have the following diagram, in which each of the sub-diagrams (using the naturality square of $\alpha$ for $\varepsilon_{QR}$, which we have already proved) – except possibly the square on the bottom left – commutes, and the outside of the diagram also commutes (by induction).

![Diagram](image)

We wish to show that the square on the bottom-left commutes after post-composing with $M' \varepsilon_{QR}$. It suffices to show this after pre-composing with the isomorphism $1 \land \alpha_Q : MP \land MQ \to MP \land M'Q$, and this now follows from a diagram chase.

Finally, suppose $\alpha$ is natural with respect to $f : (\pi^\tilde{\times})^* P \to S$. We want to show that the following square commutes.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
MP \xrightarrow{M(\mu_f)} M(\forall S) \\
\downarrow \alpha_P \\
M'P \xrightarrow{M'(\mu_f)} M'(\forall S)
\end{array}
\]

By the universal property of $M'(\forall S)$, it suffices to show this after applying $(\pi^\tilde{\times})^*$ and post-composing with $M' \varepsilon_{\forall S}^\tilde{\times} : M'(\forall S) \to S$. This follows from a diagram chase in the following diagram, since the square on the right commutes by the hypothesis and the outside naturality of $\alpha$ with respect $\varepsilon_{\forall S}^\tilde{\times}$, shown above.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
M((\pi^\tilde{\times})^* P) \xrightarrow{M(\mu_f)} M((\pi^\tilde{\times})^* \forall S) \xrightarrow{M\varepsilon_{\forall S}^\tilde{\times}} MS \\
\downarrow \alpha_{(\pi^\tilde{\times})^* P} \\
M'(\pi^\tilde{\times})^* P \xrightarrow{M'(\mu_f)} M'(\pi^\tilde{\times})^* \forall S) \xrightarrow{M'\varepsilon_{\forall S}^\tilde{\times}} M'S
\end{array}
\]

### 24.4. Theorem. $PF_\sigma$ is a free $h^=\text{-fibration over } Tm_\sigma$. □

*Proof: This is precisely the content of Propositions 24.2 and 24.3.* □
25 Lemmas for the proof of freeness

We now state and prove the Propositions 25.1-25.5 which were used in the proof that $\mathcal{P}f_\sigma$ is free.

The propositions are all very similar, and there is one for each of the operations of an $h^-$-fibration. In fact, the proofs are so similar that we only give the first one, leaving the remaining ones to the reader.

The statements all have the following form: given any one of the $h^-$-fibration operations – in each case, this is given by a diagram $D$ satisfying some universal property – and a cartesian morphism into each of the objects which are the “inputs” to the operation, we can apply the corresponding operation to the domains of these cartesian morphisms, thus obtaining a diagram $D'$. The claim is then that there is an induced cartesian morphism from the “output” object $P'$ of $D'$ to the “output” object $P$ of $D$. In each case, this is proven by choosing an arbitrary cartesian morphism $\uparrow$ into $P$, and then using the universal property of $D'$ to conclude that the domain of $\uparrow$ is isomorphic to $P'$.

Henceforth, let $\mathcal{C} \downarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a fibration.

25.1. Proposition. Suppose we are given – as shown in the solid diagram below – a pullback square in $\mathcal{B}$ with morphisms $f, g, h, k$, a $\prod$-diagram over $k$ based on $Q \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^C$ which is stable along $g$, a cartesian lift $P \to Q$ of $f$, and a $\prod$-diagram over $h$ based on $P$.

Claim: There is a unique morphism $q : \prod_h P \to \prod_k Q$ over $g$ for which there exists a (necessarily unique) morphism $r : \prod_h P \to \prod_k Q$ over $f$ making the whole diagram commute. Moreover, $q$ (and hence also $r$) is cartesian.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\prod_h P \to \prod_h P \\
\downarrow \ \\
\prod_k Q \to \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow \ \\
Q \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
P \to \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow \ \\
Q \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
A \to B \\
\downarrow f \ \\
C \to D \\
\end{array} \]

Proof: By the stability along $g$ of the $\prod$-diagram based on $Q$, we obtain a commutative solid diagram

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\prod_h P \to \prod_h P \\
\downarrow f \ \\
\prod_k Q \to g^* \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow \ \\
\prod_k Q \to \prod_k Q \\
\downarrow \ \\
Q \\
\end{array} \]

with $(s, t)$ a $\prod_h$-diagram. By the universal property of the $\prod$-diagrams based on $P$, there is a unique isomorphism $u : \prod_h P \to g^* \prod_k Q$ over $B$ for which there exists a morphism $v$ over $A$ as shown making the diagram commute (and which is hence an isomorphism). The claim follows. \qed
25.2. Proposition. Suppose we are given – as shown in the solid diagram below – a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}$, objects $P', Q' \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B$, a product diagram based on $P'$ and $Q'$ in $\mathcal{C}^B$ which is stable along $f$, cartesian lifts $p : P \to P'$ and $q : Q \to Q'$ of $f$, and a product diagram on $P$ and $Q$ in $\mathcal{C}^A$.

![Diagram](image)

**Claim:** There is a unique morphism $r$ making the diagram commute. Moreover, $r$ is cartesian. □

25.3. Proposition. The previous proposition holds with “product” replaced by “coproduct” (and with the direction of all morphisms lying over $A$ and $B$ reversed). □

25.4. Proposition. Suppose we are given – as shown in the solid diagram below – a morphism $f : A \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}$, objects $P', Q' \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}^B$, an exponential diagram in $\mathcal{C}^B$ based on $P'$ and $Q'$ which is stable along $f$, cartesian lifts $p : P \to P'$ and $q : Q \to Q'$ of $f$, and an exponential diagram in $\mathcal{C}^A$ based on $P$ and $Q$.

![Diagram](image)

**Claim:** There exists a unique $r$ such that there is a (by Proposition 25.2 necessarily unique, and cartesian) $s$ making the whole diagram commute. Moreover, $r$ is cartesian. □

25.5. Proposition. Suppose we are given – as shown in the solid diagram below – a pullback square in $\mathcal{C}$ with morphisms $f, g, h, k$, a cocartesian morphism over $k$ with domain $Q$ which is stable along $g$,
a cartesian lift $P \to Q$ of $f$, and a cocartesian morphism over $h$ with domain $P$.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
P & \rightarrow & \sum_h P \\
\downarrow_{p} & & \downarrow_{q} \\
Q & \rightarrow & \sum_k Q
\end{array}
\]

Claim: There is a unique morphism $q : \sum_h P \to \sum_k Q$ over $g$ making the whole diagram commute. Moreover, $q$ is cartesian. □
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