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Abstract

We prove a correspondence between $\kappa$-small fibrations in simplicial presheaf categories equipped with the injective or projective model structure (and left Bousfield localizations thereof) and relative $\kappa$-compact maps in their underlying quasi-categories for suitably large inaccessible cardinals $\kappa$. We thus obtain a transition result between weakly universal small fibrations in the injective Dugger-Rezk-style standard presentations of model toposes and object classifiers in Grothendieck $\infty$-toposes in the sense of Lurie.

1 Introduction

A Grothendieck $\infty$-topos $M$ is the left exact localization of a presheaf $(\infty, 1)$-category $\hat{C}$. Hence, it is presented by a model topos $\hat{M}$ of the form $L_T sPsh(C)$ for some small simplicial category $C$, that is a left exact left Bousfield localization of the simplicial category $sPsh(C)$ equipped with either the projective or the injective model structure. In the following we prove a correspondence between relative $\kappa$-compact maps in Grothendieck $\infty$-toposes $M$ and $\kappa$-small fibrations in their associated model topos $\hat{M}$. This is motivated by the interpretation of univalent Tarski universes defined in type theory as univalent fibrations universal for the class of $\kappa$-small fibrations, and their intended interpretation as “object classifiers” in Higher Topos Theory, i.e. classifying maps for relative $\kappa$-compact maps as developed in [14, Chapter 6]. Therefore, even though we prove an analogous (but slightly weaker result) result for the projective model structure and arbitrary localizations, the main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 3.16.** Let $C$ be a small simplicial category, $T$ a set of arrows in $sPsh(C)$ and $M$ be the left exact left Bousfield localization $L_T sPsh(C)_{inj}$. Let $\kappa$ be a sufficiently large inaccessible cardinal. Then a morphism $f \in Ho_\infty(M)$ is relative $\kappa$-compact if and only if there is a $\kappa$-small fibration $g \in sPsh(C)$ such that $g \simeq f$ in $Ho_\infty(M)$.

**Corollary 4.1.** Let $\hat{M} \cong L_T sPsh(C)_{inj}$ be a model topos, let $p$ be a fibration in $\hat{M}$. Let $\kappa$ be a sufficiently large inaccessible cardinal. Then $p$ is univalent and weakly universal for $\kappa$-small fibrations if and only if $p$ is a classifying map for relatively $\kappa$-compact maps in $Ho_\infty(\hat{M})$.

As a prerequisite for the proof we are giving, in Section 2 we show that up to DK-equivalence every simplicial category can be replaced by the localization of a well founded poset as already observed by Shulman in [20]. This allows us to replace simplicial presheaf categories over arbitrary small simplicial categories $C$ by simplicial presheaf categories over well founded posets $I$. In Section 3, we will use that such model categories come equipped with a theory of minimal fibrations that will allow us to present relative $\kappa$-compact maps in their underlying quasi-category by $\kappa$-small fibrations. Those can be pushed forward to $\kappa$-small fibrations in our original presheaf category over $C$ making use of Dugger’s ideas on universal homotopy theories in [6]. The move to the injective model structure then follows by Shulman’s recent observation ([21, 8]) that the cobar construction on presheaf categories takes projective fibrations to injective ones.

In Section 4 we explain the relevance of this result for the semantics of Homotopy Type Theory in Higher Topos Theory, as Theorem 3.16 is necessary to translate Tarski universes in the syntax to object classifiers in a higher topos (when using the common semantics via type theoretic model categories given in [19, 4]).
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2 Replacing simplicial categories with direct posets

In the following, simplicial categories - that is simplicially enriched categories - will be denoted by bold faced letters $\mathbf{C}$ and ordinary categories will be distinguished by blackboard letters $\mathbb{C}$. $\mathbf{S}$ denotes the (simplicial) category of simplicial sets. By a simplicial presheaf over $\mathbf{C}$ we mean a simplicially enriched presheaf $\mathbf{C}^{\Delta^\text{op}} \to \mathbf{S}$. Simplicial functors and simplicial natural transformations form a simplicial category $\mathbf{sPsh}(\mathbb{C})$ whose underlying ordinary category also will be denoted by $\mathbf{sPsh}(\mathbb{C})$.

Mike Shulman noted in [20, Lemma 0.2] that every quasi-category can be presented by the localization of an Eilenberg-Zilber Reedy category, proving the stronger condition of posetality only requires about as much work as the Eilenberg-Zilber Reedy condition itself.

Recall the following constructions and notation from [3]. A relative category is a pair $(\mathbb{C}, V)$ such that $\mathbb{C}$ is a category and $V$ is a subcategory of $\mathbb{C}$. A relative functor $F: (\mathbb{C}, V) \to (\mathbb{D}, W)$ is a functor $F: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{D}$ of categories such that $F[V] \subseteq W$. The relative functor $F$ is a relative inclusion if its underlying functor of categories is an inclusion and $V = W \cap \mathbb{C}$. The category of small relative categories and relative functors is denoted by $\mathbf{RelCat}$.

There are two canonical inclusions of the category $\mathbf{Cat}$ of small categories into $\mathbf{RelCat}$; for a category $\mathbb{C}$ and its discrete wide subcategory $\mathbb{C}_0$, we obtain the associated minimal relative category $\hat{\mathbb{C}} := (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}_0)$ and the associated maximal relative category $\bar{\mathbb{C}} := (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$

In [3, Section 5.3], Barwick and Kan introduce a combinatorial sub-divisonal operation $\xi: \mathbf{RelCat} \to \mathbf{RelCat}$ and an associated bisimplicial nerve construction $N_\xi: \mathbf{RelCat} \to \mathbf{sS}$ giving rise to the adjoint pair

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{sS} \\
\downarrow_{N_\xi} \quad \downarrow_{K_\xi} \\
\mathbf{RelCat}
\end{array}
\]

The left adjoint $K_\xi$ is given on representables by $K_\xi(\Delta[m, n]) = \xi([m] \times [n])$ and left Kan extension along the Yoneda embedding. The authors of [3] have shown that the category $\mathbf{RelCat}$ inherits a transferred model structure (RelCat, BK) from the Reedy model structure $(\mathbf{sS}, R_\mathbf{r})$ which turns the pair $(K_\xi, N_\xi)$ into a Quillen equivalence. By construction, the set $K_\xi(I_n)$ forms a set generating cofibrations for the model structure in question, where

\[
I_n := \{(\delta_n: \partial \Delta^n \hookrightarrow \Delta^n) \Box' (\delta_m: \partial \Delta^m \hookrightarrow \Delta^m) \mid n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}
\]

is the generating set of monomorphisms in $\mathbf{sS}$ given by the pushout-product $\Box'$ associated to the box product $\Box: \mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{S} \to \mathbf{sS}$ as presented in [11, Section 2].

A central notion of [3] is that of “Dwyer maps” in $\mathbf{RelCat}$. A relative functor $F: (\mathbb{C}, V) \to (\mathbb{D}, W)$ is a Dwyer inclusion if $F$ is a relative inclusion such that $\mathbb{C}$ is a sieve in $\mathbb{D}$ and such that the cosieve $\mathbb{ZC}$ generated by $\mathbb{C}$ in $\mathbb{D}$ comes equipped with a strong deformation retraction $\mathbb{ZC} \to \mathbb{C}$. The relative functor $F$ is a Dwyer map if it factors as an isomorphism followed by a Dwyer inclusion, see [3, Section 3.5] for more details.

A major insight of the authors was that the generating cofibrations

\[
K_\xi(\delta_m \Box' \delta_n): K_\xi(\Delta^m \Box \partial \Delta^n) \cup_{\partial \Delta^m \Box \partial \Delta^n} (\partial \Delta^m \Box \Delta^n) \to K_\xi(\Delta^m \Box \Delta^n)
\]

of the model category $(\mathbf{RelCat}, \mathbf{BK})$ are Dwyer maps of relative posets ([3, Proposition 9.5]). It follows that every cofibration in $(\mathbf{RelCat}, \mathbf{BK})$ is a Dwyer map as shown in [3, Theorem 6.1].

Proposition 2.1. The underlying category of a cofibrant object in $(\mathbf{RelCat}, \mathbf{BK})$ is a direct (i.e. well founded) poset.

\[1\]Shulman in fact argues for a presentation by inverse posets. But since localization commutes with taking opposite categories, this amounts to the same statement.
Proof. Since the empty relative category \( \emptyset \) is a relative direct poset, it suffices to show that for every cofibration \((P, V) \hookrightarrow (Q, W)\) where \((P, V)\) is a relative direct poset also \((Q, W)\) is a relative direct poset. We show this by “induction along the small object argument” as follows.

The generating cofibrations \(K_\ell(\delta_m \Box' \delta_n)\) are maps between finite relative posets and such are clearly direct. Both Dwyer maps and relative posets are closed under coproducts and under pushouts along Dwyer maps between relative posets by [3, Proposition 9.2], and it is easy to see that both constructions preserve well foundedness, too. Suppose we are given a transfinite composition of Dwyer maps \(A_\alpha \to A_\beta\) for \(\alpha < \beta \leq \lambda\) ordinals and \(A_\alpha\) relative inverse posets. Again by [3, Proposition 9.2], the colimit \(A_\lambda\) is a relative poset. Suppose \(a = (a_i \mid i < \omega)\) is a descending sequence of arrows in \(A_\lambda\) and let \(\alpha < \lambda\) such that \(a_0 \in A_\alpha\). Then the whole sequence \(a\) is contained in \(A_\alpha\), because the inclusion \(A_\alpha \hookrightarrow A_\lambda\) is a Dwyer map by [3, Proposition 9.3] and so \(A_\alpha \subseteq A_\lambda\) is a sieve (see [3, 3.5]). Therefore, the sequence \(a\) is finite.

In particular, every free cofibration \(\emptyset \hookrightarrow (P, V)\) – that is every transfinite composition of pushouts of generating cofibrations with domain \(\emptyset\) – yields a relative direct poset \((P, V)\). But every cofibration \(\emptyset \hookrightarrow (Q, W)\) is a retract of such, and hence every cofibrant object in \(\text{RelCat}\) is a relative direct poset.

Remark 2.2. The same proof shows that the cofibrant objects in the Thomason model structure on \(\text{Cat}\) are direct posets, using Thomason’s original observation that the cofibrant objects in the Thomason model structure are posetal in the first place.

Let \(F_\Delta : \text{Cat} \to \text{S-Cat}\) be the Bar construction obtained in the standard way by monad resolution of the free category functor \(F\) from reflexive Graphs to \(\text{Cat}\). Recall that \(F_\Delta\) is not the left adjoint to the “underlying category” functor, but, as often remarked in the literature, a cofibrant replacement of this left adjoint. Furthermore, for example from [7], recall the (standard) simplicial localization functor

\[L_\Delta : \text{RelCat} \to \text{S-Cat}\]

which takes a relative category \((C, V)\) to the simplicial category given in degree \(n < \omega\) by

\[L_\Delta(C, V)_n = F_\Delta(C)_n[F_\Delta(V)_n^{-1}]\]

The simplicial category \(L_\Delta(C, V)\) is in fact the enriched localization of \(F_\Delta(C)\) at \(F_\Delta(V)\) in the sense that, for every simplicial category \(D\) and \(\text{S-Cat}(F_\Delta(C), D)_{F_\Delta V \to \text{Iso}}\) the category of simplicial functors which map \(F_\Delta V\) to the core of \(D\), we obtain a natural isomorphism

\[\text{S-Cat}(F_\Delta(C), D)_{F_\Delta V \to \text{Iso}} \cong \text{S-Cat}(L_\Delta(C, V), D)\]

This universal property together with the corresponding observation that presheaves \(X : L_\Delta(C, V)^{\text{op}} \to \text{S}\) are exactly the presheaves \(F_\Delta(C)^{\text{op}} \to \text{S}\) which take maps in \(V\) to isomorphisms in \(\text{S}\), enables us to prove the following proposition in the same way as we would prove it for localizations in ordinary category theory.

Proposition 2.3. For \((C, V) \in \text{RelCat}\) and \(j : F_\Delta(C) \to L_\Delta(C, V)\) the associated localization functor, the induced restriction

\[j^* : \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V)) \to \text{sPsh}(F_\Delta(C))\]

is fully faithful.

Proof. See [23, Proposition 8.2.3].

Therefore, the map \(j : F_\Delta(C) \to L_\Delta(C, V)\) induces both a localization

\[(j_!, j^*) : \text{sPsh}(F_\Delta(C)) \to \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V))\]

and a colocalization

\[(j^*, j_*^) : \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V)) \to \text{sPsh}(F_\Delta(C))\]

between simplicial presheaf categories. Equipping both sides with the injective model structure, the pair \((j^*, j_*^)\) becomes a Quillen pair. Its derived adjoint pair on underlying quasi-categories is the fully faithful left Kan extension \(j^* : \mathcal{P}(N(C)[V^{-1}]) \to \mathcal{P}(N(C))\) for \(j : N(C) \to N(C)[V^{-1}]\) together with its right adjoint \(j_*\). It hence also gives rise to a colocalization of underlying quasi-categories. Hence, equipping both sides with the injective model structure, the pair \((j^*, j_*^)\) becomes a homotopy colocalization. Dually, equipping both sides with the projective model structure, the pair \((j^*, j_*^)\) becomes a homotopy localization.
\textbf{Remark 2.4.} If one chooses to work with any other homotopical localization of \( (C, V) \) such as the hammock localization \( L_H(C, V) \) an analogue of the functor \( j^* \) still exists and also induces a localization \( (j, j^*) \) and colocalization \( (j^*, j) \) on underlying quasi-categories.

\textbf{Lemma 2.5.} For \( (C, V) \in \text{RelCat} \), the functor \( j^*: \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V)) \to \text{sPsh}(C) \) induces a Quillen equivalence

\[ (j, j^*): L_{y[V]} \text{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}} \to \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V))_{\text{proj}}. \]

\textbf{Proof.} The \((\infty, 1)\)-categorical content of this statement seems to be folklore and was also used in [20, Lemma 0.1]. The Quillen pair

\[ (j, j^*): L_{y[V]} \text{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}} \to \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V))_{\text{proj}} \]

is a homotopy localization as noted above, and it takes every map in \( y[V] \) to a weak equivalence. By [10, Proposition 3.3.18.(1)], we hence obtain a homotopy localization

\[ (j, j^*): L_{y[V]} \text{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}} \to \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(C, V))_{\text{proj}}. \]

The fact that this Quillen pair is a Quillen equivalence can be seen on underlying quasi-categories, where it follows that the induced reflective localization is an equivalence by essentially the same computations we performed in the proof of Proposition 2.3. \(\square\)

Analogously, for the injective model structure one can show a dualized statement. The localization functor \( L_\Delta: \text{RelCat} \to \text{S-Cat} \) has a homotopy inverse, the “delocalization” or “flattening”

\[ \mathfrak{b}: \text{S-Cat} \to \text{RelCat}, \]

given by the Grothendieck construction of its input \( C^{op}: \Delta \to \text{Cat} \). This functor was introduced in [8, Theorem 2.5] and is analysed in detail in [2].

Now, given a simplicial category \( C \), consider its delocalization \( \mathfrak{b}(C) \in \text{RelCat} \). Cofibrantly replacing \( \mathfrak{b}(C) \) by some pair \( (P, V) \) in \text{RelCat} yields a direct relative poset \( (P, V) \) weakly equivalent - i.e. Rezk-equivalent in the language of [2] – to \( \mathfrak{b}(C) \). Hence, by [2, Theorem 1.8], the simplicial localization \( L_\Delta(P, V) \in \text{Cat}_\Delta \) is DK-equivalent to the original simplicial category \( C \), i.e. there is a zig-zag of DK-equivalences

\[ C \overset{f_1}{\longrightarrow} \cdots \overset{f_n}{\longrightarrow} L_\Delta(P, V). \]

By [14, Proposition A.3.3.8] or [8, Theorem 2.1] and the sequence of maps in \((*)\), we obtain a zig-zag of Quillen equivalences

\[ \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(P, V))_{\text{proj}} \overset{(f_n)}{\longrightarrow} \cdots \overset{(f_1)}{\longrightarrow} \text{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}}. \]

Further recall from [7, Proposition 2.6] that for every category \( C \) the canonical projection \( \varphi: F_\Delta C \to C \) is a DK-equivalence of simplicial categories. So, to summarize, we have seen the following.

\textbf{Proposition 2.6.} Let \( C \) be a simplicial category. Then there is a direct relative poset \( (P, V) \) together with a zig-zag of DK-equivalences

\[ C \overset{\cdots}{\longrightarrow} L_\Delta(P, V) \]

in \text{Cat}_\Delta which induces a zig-zag of Quillen pairs

\[ \text{sPsh}(P)_{\text{proj}} \overset{\varphi}{\longrightarrow} \text{sPsh}(F_\Delta P)_{\text{proj}} \overset{j}{\longrightarrow} \text{sPsh}(L_\Delta(P, V))_{\text{proj}} \overset{(f_n)}{\longrightarrow} \cdots \overset{(f_1)}{\longrightarrow} \text{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}} \]

such that \((j^*, j)\) is a homotopy localization and all other pairs are Quillen equivalences. \(\square\)
3 Comparing compactness in quasi-categories and model categories

We start by stating some facts about compactness in presheaf categories. Given a small category $\mathcal{C}$, we denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$|\mathcal{C}| := \sum_{C,C' \in \mathcal{C}} |\text{Hom}_\mathcal{C}(C,C')|.$$ 

Given a (set-valued) presheaf $X \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$, its cardinality is denoted by

$$|X| := \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |X(C)|.$$ 

Given a regular cardinal $\kappa > |\mathcal{C}|$, recall that a presheaf $X \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is $\kappa$-small if $|X| < \kappa$, that is if all its values $X(C)$ have cardinality smaller than $\kappa$. A map $f : X \to Y$ in $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is $\kappa$-small if all its pullbacks along maps $Z \to Y$ with $\kappa$-small domain $Z$ are $\kappa$-small presheaves.

Given a small simplicial category $\mathcal{C}$, we also denote the cardinality of $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$|\mathcal{C}| := \sum_{C,C' \in \mathcal{C}} |\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C,C')|$$

where the cardinality of the hom-spaces $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(C,C') \in \mathcal{S}$ is given by the cardinality of presheaves defined above. Accordingly, given a regular cardinal $\kappa > |\mathcal{C}|$, a simplicial presheaf $X \in s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ is $\kappa$-small if all its values $X(C)$ are $\kappa$-small. A simplicial natural transformation $f : X \to Y$ in $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ is $\kappa$-small if all its pullbacks along maps $Z \to Y$ with $\kappa$-small domain $Z$ are $\kappa$-small simplicial presheaves.

The category $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ is locally presentable, generated by the objects $yC \otimes \Delta^n$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \geq 0$ which we refer to in the following as "the generators". When an ordinary category $\mathcal{C}$ is considered as discrete simplicial category, we have an obvious isomorphism between $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ and the set-valued presheaf category $\mathcal{C} \times \hat{\Delta}^{op}$.

**Notation.** For two cardinals $\mu < \kappa$ recall the sharply larger relation from [1, Definition 2.12] and the special case "\(\ll\)" from [1, Example 2.13.(4)] and [14, Definition 5.4.2.8] (the notation is chosen to be coherent with Lurie’s definition in the quasi-categorical case used below). The relation $\mu \ll \kappa$ from [14, Definition 5.4.2.8] which holds if and only if for all cardinals $\kappa_0 < \kappa$ and $\mu_0 < \mu$ we have $\kappa_0 \ll \mu_0 < \kappa$.

The order "\(\ll\)" is chosen in such a way that whenever $\mu \ll \kappa$ holds, then $\mu < \kappa$ and $\mu$-accessibility of a quasi-category $\mathcal{C}$ implies $\kappa$-accessibility of $\mathcal{C}$ ([14, Proposition 5.4.2.11]). As noted in [14], the order is unbounded in the class of cardinals as for any cardinal $\mu$ we have $\mu \ll \sup(\tau^\mu | \tau < \mu)^+$. In particular, we always find a regular cardinal sharply larger than a given $\mu$. Furthermore, if $\mu$ is regular, then $\mu \ll \mu^+$, and whenever we have $\lambda < \mu$ and $\mu \ll \kappa$, then also $\mu \ll \lambda$. Thus, for any set $X$ of cardinals there is a regular cardinal $\mu$ such that $\kappa \ll \mu$ for all $\kappa \in X$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a small simplicial category and $\kappa \gg |\mathcal{C}|$ an infinite regular cardinal. Then

1. An object $X \in s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ is $\kappa$-compact if and only if it is $\kappa$-small.
2. A map $f \in s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ is relative $\kappa$-compact if and only if it is $\kappa$-small.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a small simplicial category. For part (a), recall that a presheaf $X$ is $\kappa$-compact if and only if it is the retract of a $\kappa$-small $|\mathcal{C}|$-directed colimit of $|\mathcal{C}|$-compact objects by [1, Remark 2.15]. But one can show that $\kappa \gg |\mathcal{C}|$ implies that all $|\mathcal{C}|$-compact objects are $\kappa$-small. Hence, every $\kappa$-compact presheaf $X$ is a subobject of a $\kappa$-small colimit of $\kappa$-small presheaves and hence $\kappa$-small. Vice versa, every $\kappa$-small presheaf is a $\kappa$-small colimit of the generators $yC \otimes \Delta^n$ for $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $n \geq 0$, and hence $\kappa$-compact. Part (b) follows directly from part (a).

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be small simplicial categories and let

$$F : s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C}) \rightleftarrows s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{D}) : G$$

be a simplicial adjoint pair. Let $\kappa \gg |\mathcal{C}| \cdot |\mathcal{D}|$ be regular (and inaccessible) and suppose $F$ takes representables to representables (preserves $\kappa$-small objects). Then $G$ preserves $\kappa$-small maps.
Proof. Let \( \theta : \text{sPsh}(C)(FX, Y) \to \text{sPsh}(D)(X, GY) \) be the natural isomorphism associated to the adjunction \( F \dashv G \). Let \( f : X \to Y \) be a \( \kappa \)-small map in \( \text{sPsh}(D) \) and \( g : yC \otimes \Delta^n \to GY \) be an element of \( GY \). We have to show that for every \( C' \in C \) and \( m \geq 0 \) the hom-set \( \text{sPsh}(C)(yC' \otimes \Delta^m, g^*GX) \) is \( \kappa \)-small, but we have an isomorphism of hom-spaces between \( [yC' \otimes \Delta^m, g^*GX]_{sPsh(C)} \) and the pullback
\[
[yC' \otimes \Delta^m, yC \otimes \Delta^n]_{sPsh(C)} \times_{[yC' \otimes \Delta^m, GY]} [yC' \otimes \Delta^m, GX]_{sPsh(C)}
\]
\[
\cong [(C', C) \times [yC', 1 \otimes \Delta^n]_{sPsh(C)}] \Delta^m \times [FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, Y]_{sPsh(D)} [FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, X]_{sPsh(D)}.
\]
This yields an isomorphism on hom-sets between \( \text{sPsh}(C)(yC' \otimes \Delta^m, g^*GX) \) and the pullback
\[
(C_m(C', C) \times sPsh(C)(yC' \otimes \Delta^m, 1 \otimes \Delta^n)) \times sPsh(D)(FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, Y) sPsh(D)(FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, X).
\]
The hom-set \( C_m(C', C) \) is \( \kappa \)-small by assumption and so is the entire left component of the pullback (1). If \( F \) preserves representables, the object \( FyC' \) is representable and hence \( sPsh(D)(FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, X) \) is \( \kappa \)-small, too. If \( F \) preserves \( \kappa \)-small objects, the object \( FyC' \) is \( \kappa \)-small and hence \( sPsh(D)(FyC' \otimes \Delta^m, X) \) is \( \kappa \)-small by inaccessibility of \( \kappa \). Either way, it follows that the hom-set \( sPsh(C)(yC' \otimes \Delta^m, g^*GX) \) is \( \kappa \)-small by regularity of \( \kappa \).

The aim of this section is to compare this ordinary notion of compactness in a simplicial presheaf category with the notion of compactness in its underlying quasi-category as defined in [14, Definition 5.3.4.5] and [14, Definition 6.1.6.4]. The validity of this comparison was addressed in a question posted in [15] by Shulman; for objects it is given in Proposition 3.5, for maps it is given in Theorem 3.11 for the projective case and in Theorem 3.16 for the injective case. A proof of the object-wise statement – that is Proposition 3.5 – was outlined by Lurie in the same post which in one direction coincides with our proof given in Proposition 3.5. Before we state the theorems, we make the following ad hoc construction and give one auxiliary folklore lemma.

Given a \( \lambda \)-accessible quasi-category \( C \) with generating set \( A \) and a regular cardinal \( \mu \geq \lambda \), define the full subcategory \( J^\mu \subseteq C \) recursively as follows. Let
\[
J^\mu_{0,0} := A
\]
and \( J^{\mu,0} \) be the full subcategory of \( C \) generated by \( J^\mu_{0,0} \). Whenever \( \beta < \mu \) is a limit ordinal, let
\[
J^\mu_{0,\beta} = \bigcup_{\alpha<\beta} J^\mu_{0,\alpha}
\]
and \( J^{\mu,\beta} \) be the full subcategory generated by \( J^\mu_{0,\beta} \). On successors, given \( J^{\mu,\alpha} \), let
\[
J^{\mu,\alpha+1}_{0} := \{ \text{colim}_F : I \to J^{\mu,\alpha}, I \in \text{QCat} \text{ is } \mu \text{-small and } \lambda \text{-filtered} \}
\]
(2)
so we choose a set of representatives \( V^\Delta_{\alpha\rho} \) for \( \mu \)-small simplicial sets) and \( J^{\mu,\alpha+1} \) be the corresponding full subcategory. Eventually, we define the full subcategory \( J^\mu \) of \( C \) to have the set of objects
\[
J^\mu := \bigcup_{\alpha<\mu} J^{\mu,\alpha}_{0}.
\]

The following lemma is noted in [14, Section 5.4.2] and a generalization of the corresponding 1-categorical statement that can be found in [1, Remark 2.15] for accessible categories.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( C \) and \( D \) be presentable quasi-categories.

1. Suppose \( C \) is \( \lambda \)-presentable. Then, for every regular \( \mu \gg \lambda \), the \( \mu \)-compact objects in \( C \) are, up to equivalence, exactly the retracts of objects in \( J^\mu \).

2. Let \( F : C \to D \) be an accessible functor. Then there is a cardinal \( \mu \) such that \( F \) preserves \( \kappa \)-compact objects for all regular \( \kappa \gg \mu \).

**Proof.** See [23, Lemma 8.3.4].

**Notation 3.4.** The following group of statements will in each case claim that a certain comparison holds for all \( \kappa \) "sufficiently large" or "large enough". That means in each case there is a cardinal \( \mu \) such that for all \( \kappa \gg \mu \) the given statement holds true. Since we are not interested in a precise formula for the lower bound \( \mu \), we generally will not make the cardinal \( \mu \) explicit. Instead, we note that we will have to impose the condition on \( \kappa \) to be "large enough" only finitely often and eventually take the corresponding supremum.
Proposition 3.5. Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be a combinatorial model category. Then for all sufficiently large regular cardinals \( \kappa \), an object \( C \in \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) is \( \kappa \)-compact if and only if there is a \( \kappa \)-compact \( D \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( C \simeq D \) in \( \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \).

Proof. As observed in [15], one direction can be shown directly for every combinatorial model category. Indeed, for \( \kappa \) large enough, \( \kappa \)-filtered colimits in \( \mathcal{M} \) are homotopy colimits and the \( \kappa \)-compact objects in \( \mathcal{M} \) are exactly the \( \kappa \)-compact objects in \( N(\mathcal{M}) \). The localization \( N(\mathcal{M}) \to \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) preserves \( \kappa \)-filtered colimits and hence is \( \kappa \)-accessible. The statement now follows from Lemma 3.3.

For the other direction, we note that by Dugger’s presentation theorem for combinatorial model categories [5, Theorem 1.1] it suffices to consider left Bousfield localizations of simplicial presheaf categories \( sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \). Indeed, given a combinatorial model category \( \mathcal{M} \) together with a category \( \mathcal{C} \), a set \( T \subset sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \) of arrows and a Quillen equivalence

\[
\mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(\mathcal{C}))_{proj} \xrightarrow{L} \mathcal{M},
\]

suppose we have shown the statement for \( \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(\mathcal{C}))_{proj} \) (or for \( \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(\mathcal{C}))_{inj} \) equivalently as both model structures have the same underlying category and equivalent underlying quasicategories). Then, as both categories \( \mathcal{M} \) and \( sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \) are presentable, we find \( \kappa \gg |\mathcal{C}| \) large enough such that the right adjoint \( R \) preserves \( \kappa \)-compact objects. Certainly \( LL \) and \( \mathcal{R} \mathcal{R} \) preserve \( \kappa \)-compactness in \( \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \), so given \( X \in \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) \( \kappa \)-compact, choose \( Y \in sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \) \( \kappa \)-small weakly equivalent to \( \mathcal{R} \mathcal{R} X \). Without loss of generality \( Y \) is cofibrant by [5, Proposition 2.3.(iii)] and so \( L(Y) \) is \( \kappa \)-compact in \( \mathcal{M} \) and presents \( X \) in \( \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \). Therefore, assume \( \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(\mathcal{C}))_{inj} \).

Furthermore, by Lemma 3.1 we can use the words “compact” and “small” interchangeably.

Now, if \( X \in \operatorname{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \) is \( \kappa \)-compact, we have seen in Lemma 3.3.(1) that there is a \( Y \in J^\kappa \) such that \( X \) is a homotopy retract of \( Y \). But the representatives for the colimits in the construction of \( (J^\kappa,\sim)(\alpha < \kappa) \) can be chosen to be homotopy colimits of strict diagrams \( F: I \to \mathcal{S} \) for \( \kappa \)-small categories \( I \) in \( \mathcal{M} \) by [14, Proposition 4.2.3.14] and [13, Proposition 1.3.4.25]. Hence, they can be computed according to the Bousfield-Kan formula

\[
\operatorname{hocolim}F = \coeq \left( \coprod_{i \to j} F(i) \otimes N(j/I)^{op} \xrightarrow{=} \coprod_i F(i) \otimes N(i/I)^{op} \right)
\]

because \( \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}_T sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \) is a simplicial model category. But this choice of homotopy colimit is \( \kappa \)-small whenever \( F \) and \( I \) are \( \kappa \)-small, and hence, by induction, every object contained in \( J^\kappa \) is in fact a \( \kappa \)-small object in \( sPsh(\mathcal{C}) \). Therefore, as \( X \) is homotopy equivalent to a subobject of \( Y \in J^\kappa \), it is homotopy equivalent to a \( \kappa \)-small presheaf. This proves the proposition.

In the following we generalize Proposition 3.5 to relative \( \kappa \)-compact maps. We begin with a special class of model categories.

Definition 3.6. Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be a model category such that all cofibrations are monomorphisms. Say \( \mathcal{M} \) has a theory of minimal fibrations if there is a pullback stable class \( \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{min}} \) of fibrations in \( \mathcal{M} \) – the class of minimal fibrations – such that the following hold.

1. Let \( p: X \to Y \) and \( q: X' \to Y \) be minimal fibrations. Then every homotopy equivalence between \( X \) and \( X' \) over \( Y \) is an isomorphism.

2. For every fibration \( p: X \to Y \) in \( \mathcal{M} \) there is an acyclic cofibration \( M \xrightarrow{\sim} X \) such that the restriction \( M \to Y \) is a minimal fibration.

Lemma 3.7. Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be a model category such that all cofibrations are monomorphisms. Suppose \( \mathcal{M} \) has a theory of minimal fibrations. Let \( T \) be a class of maps in \( \mathcal{M} \) such that the left Bousfield localization \( \mathcal{L}_T(\mathcal{M}) \) exists. Then the model category \( \mathcal{L}_T(\mathcal{M}) \) has a theory of minimal fibrations.

Proof. Given a model category \( \mathcal{M} \) and a class \( T \) of maps in \( \mathcal{M} \) as stated, simply define the class \( \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{min}} \) of minimal fibrations in \( \mathcal{L}_T\mathcal{M} \) to be the class of fibrations in \( \mathcal{L}_T\mathcal{M} \) which are minimal fibrations in \( \mathcal{M} \). Pullback stability of \( \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\text{min}} \) and Property (1) are immediate. For Property (2), let \( p: X \to Y \) be a fibration in \( \mathcal{L}_T \mathcal{M} \). By the assumption that \( \mathcal{M} \) has a theory of minimal fibrations, there is an acyclic cofibration \( M \xrightarrow{\sim} X \) in \( \mathcal{M} \) such that the restriction \( M \to Y \) is a minimal fibration in \( \mathcal{M} \). But \( M \to X \) is a weak equivalence from the fibration \( M \to Y \) to the fibration \( p: X \to Y \) over \( Y \). The latter is a fibration in \( \mathcal{L}_T \mathcal{M} \) and it hence follows by [10, Proposition 3.4.6] that \( M \to Y \) is a fibration in \( \mathcal{L}_T \mathcal{M} \), too.
Proposition 3.8. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a small category and $\mathcal{M}$ be a cofibrantly generated model structure on the presheaf category $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{C}}$ such that all cofibrations are monomorphisms. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ has a theory of minimal fibrations. Then for all sufficiently large regular cardinals $\kappa$, a morphism $f: C \to D$ in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is relative $\kappa$-compact if and only if there is a $\kappa$-small fibration $p \in \mathcal{M}$ between fibrant objects such that $p \simeq f$ in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. For one direction, let $p: X \to Y$ be a $\kappa$-small fibration between fibrant objects in $\mathcal{M}$. Given a map $g: A \to Y$ with $\kappa$-compact domain $A$ in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\text{aPsh}(\mathcal{C}))$, in order to show that the (strict) pullback of $X$ along $g$ is $\kappa$-compact in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$, by part (1) we can present $A$ by a $\kappa$-small object $A'$. Without loss of generality $A'$ is bifibrant by [5, Proposition 2.3.(iii)], so we obtain a map $g': A' \to Y$ presenting $g$. Also the pullback $(g')^*X$ is a homotopy pullback and it is $\kappa$-small by assumption. Hence, it is $\kappa$-compact in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ by part (1). This shows that $p$ is relative $\kappa$-compact in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

For the converse direction, assume that $f: C \to D$ is relative $\kappa$-compact in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ and $p: X \to Y$ is a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ such that $Y$ fibrant in $\mathcal{M}$ and $p \simeq f$ in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$. By Definition 3.6.(2) there is a subobject $M \subseteq X$ such that the restriction $m: M \to Y$ of $p$ is a minimal fibration. As $m$ and $p$ are homotopy equivalent over $Y$, the fibration $m$ is relative $\kappa$-compact in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$, too.

We want to show that $m$ is a $\kappa$-small fibration. Therefore, for $C \in \mathcal{C}$ let $g: yC \to Y$ be an element of $Y$, so that we have to show that the pullback $g^*M$ as depicted in the diagram

\[
g^*M \xrightarrow{g^*m} M \xrightarrow{g} Y.
\]

is a $\kappa$-small object in $\mathcal{C}$. By [5, Proposition 2.3.(iii)] there is a $\kappa$-small fibrant replacement $RC$ of the representable $yC$. Since the object $Y$ is fibrant, we obtain an extension $g': RC \to Y$ of $g$ along the acyclic cofibration $yC \hookrightarrow RC$ and hence a factorization of the following form.

\[
g^*M \xrightarrow{g^*m} (g')^*M \xrightarrow{m} M \xrightarrow{g} Y
\]

All three faces of the diagram are pullback squares, hence, in order to show that the object $g^*M$ is $\kappa$-small, it suffices to show that the object $(g')^*M$ is $\kappa$-small.

We know that $RC$ is also $\kappa$-compact in the underlying quasi-category $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ by part (1) and so is the map $(g')^*m$ by our assumption on the morphism $f$. The underlying quasi-category $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}/RC)$ is equivalent to the overcategory $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})/_{RC}$ by [23, Lemma 7.2.1], and is generated under (homotopy) colimits by the $\kappa$-small collection of maps with codomain $RC$ and representable domain by [6, Proposition 2.9]. Recall that the domain functor

\[
\text{dom}: \text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})/_{RC} \to \text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})
\]

both preserves and reflects colimits by [14, Proposition 1.2.13.8]. Therefore, by Lemma 3.3.(2) the functor $\text{dom}$ preserves $\kappa$-small objects. Dually, it is not hard to see that the functor $\text{dom}$ also reflects $\kappa$-compact objects. We obtain that the map $r^*m \in \text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})/_{RC}$ is a $\kappa$-compact object. By part (1) applied to the combinatorial model category $\mathcal{M}/RC$ (observing that the chosen $\kappa$ for $\mathcal{M}$ also works for $\mathcal{M}/RC$ since $RC$ is $\kappa$-small), we obtain a $\kappa$-small fibration $q: Z \to RC$ together with a homotopy equivalence $Z \simeq (g')^*M$ over $RC$. Again by [4, Theorem 2.14] there is a subobject $N \subseteq Z$ such that the restriction $n: N \to RC$ of $q: Z \to RC$ is a minimal fibration. Clearly $n$ is still $\kappa$-small. But the induced homotopy equivalence $N \simeq (g')^*M$ over $RC$ is a homotopy equivalence between minimal fibrations and hence turns out to be an isomorphism by [4, Proposition 2.16]. Therefore, $(g')^*M$ is $\kappa$-small. \qed
Corollary 3.9. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be an Eilenberg-Zilber Reedy category in the sense of [4, Section 2.1] and $\mathcal{M} = \mathbf{sPsh}(\mathbb{P})_{\text{inj}}$, the category of simplicial presheaves on $\mathbb{P}$ equipped with the injective model structure. Then for all sufficiently large regular cardinals $\kappa$, a morphism $f \in \text{Ho}_{\infty}(\mathcal{M})$ is relative $\kappa$-compact if and only if there is a $\kappa$-small fibration $p \in \mathcal{M}$ between fibrant objects such that $p \simeq f$ in $\text{Ho}_{\infty}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. The model category $\mathcal{M}$ supports a theory of minimal fibrations as shown in [4, 2.13-2.16], thus one direction follows immediately from Proposition 3.8. For the other direction we can proceed exactly as we did in the proof of Proposition 3.8.

3.1 The projective case

We now make use of the observations in Section 2 to generalize Corollary 3.9 to the category of simplicial presheaves over arbitrary small simplicial categories.

Therefore, we make use of the following adaption of [6, Proposition 5.10, Corollary 6.5], which in virtue of the simplicial enrichment of all involved categories and the available literature on the general theory of such in fact is easier to show than the original.

Lemma 3.10. Let $C$ be a small simplicial category, and $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}$ be simplicial model categories together with a simplicial Quillen equivalence $(L, R) : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}$. Let $T$ be a class of arrows in $\mathbf{sPsh}(C)$ and $(F, G) : \mathbf{L}_T(\mathbf{sPsh}(C))_{\text{proj}} \to \mathcal{M}$ a simplicial Quillen pair. Then there is a Quillen pair $(F', G') : \mathbf{L}_T(\mathbf{sPsh}(C))_{\text{proj}} \to \mathcal{N}$ such that the functors $L \circ F'$ and $F'$ are Quillen-homotopic in the sense of [6, Definition 5.9]. In other words, simplicial Quillen pairs with domain $\mathbf{L}_T(\mathbf{sPsh}(C))_{\text{proj}}$ can be lifted along Quillen equivalences up to homotopy.

Proof. Let $\lambda$ and $\rho$ denote cofibrant and fibrant replacements respectively and $L = \lambda^*$, $R = \rho^*$ denote their associated left and right derivations of functors. Let the composition

$$\lambda R(R)Fy : C \to \mathcal{N}$$

be denoted by $p$. Note that the left and right derivation $L$ and $R$ of simplicial functors may be chosen to be simplicial again by [18, Corollary 13.2.4], thus $p$ is a simplicial functor and we can consider the simplicially enriched left Kan extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathcal{N} \\
\downarrow & \swarrow & \\
s\mathbf{Psh}(C)
\end{array}$$

We claim that $F' := \text{Lan}_p \rho$ is the left Quillen functor we are looking for. First, let us construct the Quillen homotopies connecting $L \circ F'$ and $F$.

Recall that, as explained for instance in [12, 4.31], for every presheaf $X \in \mathbf{sPsh}(C)$ the object $\text{Lan}_p \rho(X)$ is the colimit of $p$ weighted by $X$, i.e.

$$F' = \ast \ast p.$$

The left Quillen functor $L : \mathcal{N} \to \mathcal{M}$ is a left adjoint and hence preserves weighted colimits, thus we have that $L \circ F' \cong \ast \ast Lp$. Further, from [16, Theorem 3.3] remember that the weighted colimit functor

$$\ast \ast : \mathbf{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}} \times ([C, \mathcal{M}]_{\text{inj}}) \to \mathcal{M}$$

is a left Quillen bifunctor. In particular, for cofibrant presheaves $X \in \mathbf{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}}$ the $X$-weighted colimit

$$X \ast \ast : ([C, \mathcal{M}]_{\text{inj}}) \to \mathcal{M}$$

is a left Quillen functor. But both $Lp \cong L(L)R(R)Fy$ and $Fy$ are cofibrant objects in $([C, \mathcal{M}]_{\text{inj}}$, the former because representables are projectively cofibrant and $F$ preserves cofibrant objects, and the latter because $L$ preserves cofibrant objects. Thus, if $p_{Fy} : Fy \to r(Fy)$ denotes an injective fibrant replacement of $Fy$, the counit $\varepsilon_{r(Fy)} : Lp \Rightarrow r(Fy)$ of the Quillen equivalence $(L, R)$ induces a span of natural weak equivalences between the cofibrant objects $Lp, r(Fy)$ and $Fy$. Thus, for cofibrant presheaves $X \in \mathbf{sPsh}(C)_{\text{proj}}$, we obtain a zig zag of natural weak equivalences between $X \ast Lp$ and $X \ast Fy$. But $\ast \ast Fy$ is just $F$ (by [12, 4.51]), thus we have constructed a span of Quillen homotopies between $L \circ F'$ and $F$. 


Second, the fact that \( F' : (sPsh(C))_{proj} \to \mathbb{N} \) is a left Quillen functor with right adjoint \( G'(N) = [p_\wedge, N]_\mathbb{N} \) was basically already shown above (following for instance, as it were, from [16, Theorem 3.3]).

We are left to show that, third, the Quillen pair

\[
(F', G') : sPsh(C)_{proj} \to \mathbb{N}
\]

descends to the localization at \( T \) whenever \( F \) does so. That is, we have to show that in this case every arrow \( f \in T \) is send to a weak equivalence in \( \mathbb{N} \). Without loss of generality all arrows \( f \in T \) have cofibrant domain and codomain. Then, given \( f \in T \), the arrow \( F(f) \) is a weak equivalence in \( M \), and so is \( LF'(f) \in M \) since \( F \) and \( LF' \) are Quillen-homotopic. Thus, \( \mathbb{R}(R)(LF'(f)) \) is a weak equivalence in \( \mathbb{N} \), but this arrow is weakly equivalent to \( F'(f) \) since \( (L, R) \) is a Quillen equivalence. This concludes the proof.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let \( C \) be a small simplicial category, \( T \subset sPsh(C) \) be a set of maps and \( M = \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \). Then for all sufficiently large inaccessible cardinals \( \kappa \), a morphism \( f \in Ho_\infty(M) \) is relative \( \kappa \)-compact if and only if there is a \( \kappa \)-small fibration \( p \in M \) between fibrant objects such that \( p \simeq f \) in \( Ho_\infty(M) \).

**Proof.** Let \( C \) be a small simplicial category and \( T \subset sPsh(C) \) a set of maps. Combining Lemma 2.5 and Proposition 2.6, we obtain a zig-zag of Quillen equivalences

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(P)_{proj}} \cong \mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(P)_{proj}} \cong \mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(F_{N}(\Delta P))_{proj}} \cong \mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(L\Delta(P,V))_{proj}} \cong \cdots \cong \mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(C)_{proj}}
\]

such that \( P \) is an Eilenberg-Zilber Reedy category. This yields a zig-zag of Quillen equivalences

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\varphi(V)|sPsh(P)_{proj}} \cong \cdots \cong \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj}
\]

where \( T \subset sPsh(P) \) is obtained from \( T \subset sPsh(C) \) by transferring \( T \) along the finitely many Quillen equivalences successively. We denote the union \( \varphi(V)|sPsh(P) \sqcup T \subset sPsh(P) \) short-handed by \( U \).

By Lemma 3.10 this chain of Quillen equivalences induces a single Quillen equivalence

\[
\mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \cong \mathcal{L}_U(sPsh(P))_{proj}
\]

The Bousfield localization \( \mathcal{L}_U(sPsh(P))_{proj} \) has a theory of minimal fibrations by Lemma 3.7. Now, let \( \kappa \gg |C|, |P| \) be inaccessible large enough such that Corollary 3.9 applies to \( P \) and large enough such that Proposition 3.8 applies to \( \mathcal{L}_U(sPsh(P))_{proj} \).

For one direction, let \( f \in Ho_\infty(M) \) be relative \( \kappa \)-compact. Since the pair (3) is a Quillen equivalence, the quasi-category \( Ho_\infty(M) \) is equivalent to the underlying quasi-category of \( \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \). Then, by Proposition 3.8, there is a \( \kappa \)-small fibration \( p : X \to Y \) between fibrant objects in \( \mathcal{L}_U(sPsh(P))_{proj} \) presenting \( f \) in \( Ho_\infty(M) \). By Lemma 3.3 (or its ordinary categorical analogon), we know that for \( \kappa \gg |C|, |P| \) the left adjoint \( F \) preserves \( \kappa \)-compact objects. Hence, since \( \kappa \gg |C|, |P| \) is inaccessible, by Lemma 3.2 the right Quillen functor \( G \) preserves \( \kappa \)-small maps. Thus, \( Gp : GX \to GY \) is a \( \kappa \)-small fibration between fibrant objects presenting \( f \) in \( Ho_\infty(M) \).

The proof of other direction is exactly as in Proposition 3.8.

**Corollary 3.12.** Let \( M \) be a combinatorial model category. Let \( \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \) be the presentation of \( M \) from Dugger’s representation theorem for combinatorial model categories in [5]. Then for all sufficiently large inaccessible cardinals \( \kappa \), a morphism \( f \in Ho_\infty(M) \) is relative \( \kappa \)-compact if and only if there is a \( \kappa \)-small fibration \( p \in \mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \) between fibrant objects such that \( p \simeq f \) in \( Ho_\infty(M) \).

**Remark 3.13.** The reason why in Corollary 3.12 we don’t obtain the comparison result for \( M \) itself is that there is no obvious reason why the Quillen equivalence

\[
\mathcal{L}_T(sPsh(C))_{proj} \cong \mathcal{L}_U(sPsh(P))_{proj} \cong \mathcal{L}_U(M)
\]
given by Dugger’s presentation theorem should preserve \(\kappa\)-small maps. While the right adjoint certainly does preserve such maps, the left adjoint does not seem to exhibit any properties with that respect.

### 3.2 The injective case

In this section we prove an analogous result for the injective model structure and get rid of the condition on fibrancy of the bases whenever the localization is left exact. We will make use of Shulman’s results [21] in two ways. Therefore, applied to the special case relevant for this paper, recall the forgetful functor

\[
U : \text{sPsh}(C) \to S^{\text{Ob}}(C)
\]

with right adjoint

\[
G : S^{\text{Ob}}(C) \to \text{sPsh}(C).
\]

The functor \(G\) takes objects \(W \in S^{\text{Ob}}(C)\) to the presheaf evaluating

\[
G(W)(C) := \prod_{C' \in C} W(C'[C', C]) \in S.
\]

The adjoint pair \((U, G)\) gives rise to a comonad on \(\text{sPsh}(C)\) with standard resolution

\[
C_n(G, UG, U-) : \text{sPsh}(C) \to \text{sPsh}(C)^\Delta^n.
\]

The associated cobar construction \(C(G, UG, U-) : \text{sPsh}(C) \to \text{sPsh}(C)\) is then defined as the pointwise totalization

\[
\text{Tot}(C_n(G, UG, U-)) = \int_{[n] \in \Delta} (C_n(G, UG, U-))^{\Delta^n}.
\]

A crucial observation of Shulman is that the cobar construction takes (acyclic) projective fibrations to pointwise weakly equivalent (acyclic) injective fibrations. More precisely, the natural coaugmentation \(\eta : \text{id} \Rightarrow C(G, UG, U-)\) is a pointwise weak equivalence, and the arrow \(C(G, UG, Up)\) is an (acyclic) injective fibration whenever \(p\) is a (acyclic) projective fibration. All this is covered in [21, Section 8] in much greater generality.

In fact, it is not hard to see that the cobar construction preserves \(\kappa\)-smallness (for \(\kappa\) large enough).

**Lemma 3.14.** Let \(C\) be a small simplicial category and \(f : X \to Y\) be a \(\kappa\)-small map in \(\text{sPsh}(C)\). Then \(C(G, UG, Up)\) is \(\kappa\)-small, too.

**Proof.** Clearly, the forgetful functor preserves \(\kappa\)-smallness. If the right adjoint \(G\) preserves \(\kappa\)-smallness, too, then for every \(\kappa\)-small map \(f : X \to Y\) in \(\text{sPsh}(C)\), the map \(C_n(G, UG, Up)\) of cosimplicial objects is levelwise \(\kappa\)-small. Thus we are only left to show that totalization preserves \(\kappa\)-smallness. All in all, this leaves us to show that the two functors \(G : S^{\text{Ob}}(C) \to \text{sPsh}(C)\) and

\[
\text{Tot}(C_n(G, UG, U-)) = \int_{[n] \in \Delta} (C_n(G, UG, U-))^{\Delta^n}
\]

preserve \(\kappa\)-smallness of maps. Both proofs consist of rather elementary checks with no suprises. \(\square\)

Therefore, we directly obtain an analogue of Theorem 3.11 for the injective model structure as follows.

**Proposition 3.15.** Let \(C\) be a small simplicial category, \(T \subset \text{sPsh}(C)\) be a set of maps and \(M = L_T(\text{sPsh}(C))\). Then for all sufficiently large inaccessible cardinals \(\kappa\), a morphism \(f \in \text{Ho}_{\infty}(M)\) is relative \(\kappa\)-compact if and only if there is a \(\kappa\)-small fibration \(p \in M\) between fibrant objects such that \(p \simeq f\) in \(\text{Ho}_{\infty}(M)\).

**Proof.** Let \(f\) be relative \(\kappa\)-compact in \(\text{Ho}_{\infty}(M)\). By Theorem 3.11 there is a fibration \(p : X \to Y\) between fibrant objects in \(L_T(\text{sPsh}(C))\) such that \(p \simeq f\) in the underlying quasi-category. Hence, by Lemma 3.14 and [21, Section 8] the map

\[
C(G, UG, Up) : C(G, UG, UX) \to C(G, UG, UY)
\]

is a \(\kappa\)-small injective fibration between injectively fibrant objects. But since the coaugmentations \(\eta_X\) and \(\eta_Y\) are pointwise weak equivalences, the objects \(C(G, UG, UX)\) and \(C(G, UG, UY)\) are \(T\)-local and thus fibrant in \(M\). Thus, the map \(C(G, UG, Up)\) is a fibration in \(M\).

The other direction follows immediately from Theorem 3.11 since every injective fibration is a projective fibration. \(\square\)
Note that if $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the fiber extension property for $\kappa$-small maps ([23, Definition 2.2.1]), we can get rid of the fibrancy condition on the bases of small maps. That is, in that case every $\kappa$-small fibration is weakly equivalent to a $\kappa$-small fibration with fibrant base. Since every left exact left Bousfield localization of $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})_{\text{inj}}$ is a type theoretic model topos by [21, Corollary 8.31, Theorem 10.5] and hence has univalent universes for $\kappa$-small fibrations, the class $S_\kappa$ satisfies the fiber extension property in every left exact left Bousfield localization of $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})_{\text{inj}}$. Therefore, we have

**Theorem 3.16.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a small simplicial category, $T \subset s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ be a set of maps such that the localization $\mathcal{M} := L_T(s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})_{\text{inj}})$ is left exact. Then for all sufficiently large inaccessible cardinals $\kappa$, a morphism $f \in \text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$ is relative $\kappa$-compact if and only if $f$ is a $\kappa$-small fibration.

### 4 The correspondence of weak Tarski universes and object classifiers

We conclude by commenting briefly on the relevance of these results for Homotopy Type Theory. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a presentable quasi-category and let $\mathcal{C}$ be a small simplicial category with a set $T$ of arrows in $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ such that the localization $\mathcal{M} := L_T(s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})_{\text{inj}})$ presents $\mathcal{M}$. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is a type theoretic model category as shown in [9, Section 7]. Shulman recently has shown in [21] (among other results) that this presentation $\mathcal{M}$ in fact is a type theoretic model topos, and hence exhibits an infinite sequence of univalent strict Tarski universes whenever $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\infty$-topos. In fact it is reasonable to assume that in this case the object classifiers in $\mathcal{M}$ at least yield univalent weak Tarski universes as claimed in the Introduction of [9]. Here, by “weak Tarski universe” we understand an inaccessible cardinal $\kappa$ together with a fibration that is weakly universal for the class of $\kappa$-small fibrations.

Weak universality of a fibration $p: E \rightarrow B$ for a class $S$ of fibrations in turn means that $p$ is univalent and that for all fibrations $q: X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{M}$ there is a map $w: X \rightarrow B$ such that $q$ is the homotopy pullback of $p$ along $w$. Clearly, every univalent strictly universal fibration is a weakly universal fibration for the same class of maps when ever the model category is right proper.

Then it is easy to see that a univalent weakly universal fibration for a pullback stable class $S$ of fibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ yields a classifying object for the class $\text{Ho}_\infty[\mathcal{M}]$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{M}$ and that, vice versa, every classifying object for a pullback stable class $T$ of morphisms in $\mathcal{M}$ yields a univalent weakly universal fibration for the class

$$\bar{T} := \{ f \in \mathcal{F}_\mathcal{M} \mid f \in \text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M}) \text{ is in } T\}$$

of maps in $\mathcal{M}$. There is one class of maps in each case which is relevant for the construction of strict Tarski universes in $\mathcal{M}$ on the one hand, and the construction of object classifiers in $\mathcal{M}$ on the other. That is, given a sufficiently large inaccessible cardinal $\kappa$, the class $S_\kappa$ of $\kappa$-small fibrations in $s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})$ and the class $T_\kappa$ of relative $\kappa$-compact maps in $\mathcal{M}$. In the former case, the common constructions of univalent universal fibrations $\pi_\kappa: U_\kappa \rightarrow U_\kappa$ use various functorial closure properties of $S_\kappa$ and the fact that an infinite sequence of inaccessible cardinals yields a cumulative hierarchy of universal fibrations in this way. In the latter case, [14, Theorem 6.1.6.8] characterizes $\infty$-toposes in terms of classifying objects $V_\kappa$ for $T_\kappa$ for all sufficiently large cardinals $\kappa$.

While the associated classifying map $\pi_\kappa: V_\kappa \rightarrow V_\kappa$ lifts to a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$ which is weakly universal for $T_\kappa$, and $U_\kappa$ descends to a classifying object for the class $\text{Ho}_\infty[S_\kappa]$, it is a priori unclear whether $S_\kappa = T_\kappa$ or $T_\kappa = \text{Ho}_\infty[S_\kappa]$ hold. In other words, without a comparison of smallness notions as considered in Section 3, it is not clear whether the categorical construction of (either weak or strict) universal $\kappa$-small fibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ – which models Tarski universes in the associated type theory – also models universes in the underlying quasi-category.

But Theorem 3.16 shows that both $S_\kappa = T_\kappa$ and $T_\kappa = \text{Ho}_\infty[S_\kappa]$ hold true. In other words, we have shown the following.

**Corollary 4.1.** Let $\mathcal{M} \cong L_T s\text{Psh}(\mathcal{C})_{\text{inj}}$ be a model topos, let $p$ be a fibration in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\kappa$ be a sufficiently large inaccessible cardinal. Then $p$ is univalent and weakly universal for $\kappa$-small fibrations if and only if $p$ is a classifying map for relatively $\kappa$-compact maps in $\text{Ho}_\infty(\mathcal{M})$.

**Remark.** Let us finish with a note on the existence of “sufficiently large” cardinals that has been the standing assumption along the way and that only has been addressed very briefly when introduced in Notation 3.4. It is interesting to remember that to be sufficiently large means to be contained
in the club of cardinals sharply larger than a specified cardinal associated to the small simplicial
category $C$ – or the $\infty$-Grothendieck topos $\mathcal{M}$ that is.\(^2\) Thus, if we start out with an $\infty$-topos
$\mathcal{M}$ and wish to show that its type theoretic presentation
$\mathcal{M} := \mathcal{L}_\ast \mathcal{P}sh(C)_{inj}$ exhibits a universal
fibration, we need an object classifier $U_\kappa$ in $\mathcal{M}$ classifying relative $\kappa$-compact maps for $\kappa$ in
the sharply large club associated to $\mathcal{M}$. The same holds if we want to show that a given cumulative
hierarchy of universal fibrations in $\mathcal{M}$ yields a corresponding hierarchy of object classifiers in $\mathcal{M}$.
Thus, it seems that the translation of the categorical structure together with a universe (or even a
cumulative infinite hierarchy of such) between Homotopy Type Theory and Higher Topos Theory
requires a Mahlo cardinal, rather than only an inaccessible (or an infinite sequence of such).
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