

# FAILURE OF THE ALGEBRAIC UNIVERSE OF TYPES WITH PRISM-BASED KAN COMPOSITION IN SIMPLICIAL SETS

CHRISTIAN SATTLER

**Extensional layer.** We will call  $\mathbf{SSet} = \text{Presheaf}(\Delta)$  the category of context. Given a context  $\Gamma$ , we will call  $\text{Presheaf}(\int \Gamma)$  the category of types over  $\Gamma$ , with a type  $A$  over  $\Gamma$  written  $\Gamma \vdash A$ . Under the equivalence  $\text{Presheaf}(\int \Gamma) \simeq \text{Presheaf}(\Delta)/\Gamma$ , such a type corresponds to a morphism  $\Gamma.A \rightarrow \Gamma$ , called the context extension of  $\Gamma$  with  $A$ .

Let  $V$  be the Hofmann-Streicher universe in simplicial sets, i.e.  $V_n$  is the set of (small) types over  $\Delta^n$  (with the presheaf structure given by precomposition of functors). Let  $\tilde{V}$  be its pointed variant, i.e.  $\tilde{V}_n$  is the set of (small) types  $\Delta^n \vdash A$  together with a point  $1 \rightarrow A$ . Viewing  $\tilde{V}$  as a type over  $V$ , it forms a classifier of (small) types. (The projection  $\tilde{V} \rightarrow V$  forms a weak classifier (in the sense of Cisinski) of all (small) maps in  $\mathbf{SSet}$ .)

**Homotopical layer.** We will now introduce the homotopical layer following the newer cubical model of Coquand et al. Given a context  $\Gamma$  and a type  $\Gamma \vdash A$ , we have a set of composition structures  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A)$  where we use all monomorphisms as cofibrations and  $\Delta^1$  as the interval (with evident endpoints). This gives a functor  $\text{Comp}: (\int \text{Type})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ . Observe that  $\text{Comp}$  is furthermore contravariantly functorial in  $\Gamma \vdash A$  as an arrow  $\Gamma.A \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathbf{SSet}$  (though this may not be used in this note).

Our goal for this note is to examine the algebraic universe  $U \in \text{Presheaf}(\Delta)$  of (small) types with composition. It is defined by letting  $U_n$  be the set of (small) types  $\Delta^n \vdash A$  together with a composition structure  $\text{Comp}(\Delta^n, A)$ . This gives an evident projection  $U \rightarrow V$ , inducing the classifier  $U \vdash \tilde{U}$  via pullback of  $V \vdash \tilde{V}$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be a context and  $\Gamma \vdash A$  a (small) type classified by a map  $\ulcorner A \urcorner: \Gamma \rightarrow V$ . Lifts

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & U \\
 & \nearrow & \downarrow \\
 \Gamma & \xrightarrow{\ulcorner A \urcorner} & V
 \end{array} \tag{0.1}$$

correspond to a coherent family of composition structures  $\text{Comp}(\Delta^n, \sigma^*A)$  for  $\sigma: \Delta^n \rightarrow \Gamma$ . We denote the set of such coherent families by  $\text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$ .

Functoriality of  $\text{Comp}: (\int \text{Type})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  induces a map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$ . For an algebraic universe, we would want lifts (0.1) to be in canonical bijection with composition structures on  $\Gamma \vdash A$ , so would want the map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  to be a bijection.

**A recursive description of compositions.** Here, we restrict to decidable simplicial sets. In our counterexamples, all simplicial sets will be decidable.

Let  $\text{CompProb}(\Gamma, A)$  and  $\text{CompProb}_\bullet(\Gamma, A)$  denote the category of composition problems and solved composition problems with right-hand side  $\Gamma.A \rightarrow A$ , respectively. Forgetting the solution yields a discrete Grothendieck fibration  $\text{CompProb}_\bullet(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{CompProb}(\Gamma, A)$ . The projection to the left-hand side gives a discrete Grothendieck fibration  $\text{CompProb}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \times I$  where

---

*Date:* 19 November 2017.

$I \rightarrow \mathbf{SSet}^{\rightarrow}$  is the generating category of cofibrations. We have a further discrete Grothendieck fibration  $I \rightarrow \Delta$  given by the codomain functor. Thus, all of the involved categories inherit an elegant Reedy category structure from  $\Delta$ .

An element of  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A)$  is a section  $F$  to the functor  $\text{CompProb}_{\bullet}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{CompProb}(\Gamma, A)$ . Such a section can be specified recursively as follows. Let  $X \in \text{CompProb}(\Gamma, A)$ .

If  $X$  is degenerate, there is a unique non-identity degeneracy  $d: X \rightarrow Y$  with  $Y$  non-degenerate. Since  $Y$  has lower degree than  $X$ , we already have the value  $F(Y)$ . We then let  $F(X)$  be the base change of  $F(Y)$  along  $d$ .

Otherwise, we consider the faces of  $X$ . Since they have lower degree, we already have their values under  $F$ . Letting  $U \hookrightarrow \Delta^n$  denote the left-hand side of  $X$ . The information from the faces of  $X$  specified the composition filler on the restriction on the boundary of  $\Delta^n$ , so it only remains to choose an  $n$ -simplex in  $A$  over the given  $n$ -simplex in  $\Gamma$  that has the boundary prescribed by the value of  $F$  on the faces of  $X$ .

It is easy to verify that this indeed yields a section  $F$  as required and that every section  $F$  arises in this way.

**Lemma 0.1.** *The map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  is not always injective.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Gamma =_{\text{def}} \Delta^1 \times \Delta^1$  and  $A =_{\text{def}} \text{Cosk}^1(\Gamma \cup \{a, b\})$  where  $a, b$  are two additional copies of the edge  $e: (1, 0) \rightarrow (1, 1)$ . The map  $A \rightarrow \Gamma$  is the unique extension of the identity on  $\Gamma$ . Viewing  $A$  as a type in context  $\Gamma$ , we have

$$A(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \{\bullet, a, b\} & \text{for } \sigma = e, \\ \{\bullet\} & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for  $\sigma: \Delta^n \rightarrow \Gamma$ . We define composition structures  $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Comp}(\Gamma, A)$  as follows. Since  $A(\sigma)$  is a singleton except for  $\sigma = e$ , we only need to specify these solutions over the edge  $e$ . We use the description of solutions to composition problems from before. So we only need to consider a 1-dimensional problem  $X \in \text{CompProb}(\text{Comp}, A)$  where the missing edge is over  $e$ . The solution to potentially missing vertices is given by recursion. If the lifting problem lifts to a lifting problem in  $\text{Comp}(\Delta^2, u^*A)$  where  $u: \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Gamma$  is the unique inclusion whose image includes  $e$ , we let the solution over  $e$  be the canonical element  $\bullet \in A(e)$ . Otherwise, we let the solution over  $e$  be  $a$  in case of  $\alpha$  and  $b$  in case of  $\beta$ .

We claim that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  pull back to the same element of  $\text{Comp}(\Delta^n, \sigma^*A)$  for any  $\sigma: \Delta^n \rightarrow \Gamma$ . This is clear when the edge  $e$  is not in the image of  $\sigma$ . Otherwise, there is  $\sigma': \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Delta^n$  such that  $\sigma = \sigma'u$ . Thus, it suffices to check that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  pull back to the same element of  $\text{Comp}(\Delta^2, u^*A)$ . But this is also clear by construction.

Thus, the distinct elements  $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Comp}(\Gamma, A)$  get sent to the same element of  $\text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  under the map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$ .  $\square$

We will now look at the dual question: is the map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  always surjective? Note that it suffices to examine the universal case of  $\Gamma = U$  and  $A = \text{El}$ , i.e.  $\Gamma.A = \tilde{U}$ .

For a particular  $\Gamma \vdash A$ , the answer is positive if for every the bottom map  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^n \rightarrow \Gamma$ , the category of factorizations of this map through a representable is connected. This suggests a way to build a counterexample.

**Lemma 0.2.** *The map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  is not always surjective.*

*Proof.* Let  $S$  and  $T$  be 3-simplices glued together along inclusions  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1 \rightarrow S$  and  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1 \rightarrow T$  to yield a simplicial set  $\Gamma$ . We name an edge  $e: (1, 0) \rightarrow (1, 1)$ .

In the presheaf category over  $\int \Gamma$ , obtain a type  $A$  by starting with the terminal object that is  $\{\bullet\}$  over any element of  $\Gamma$ , adding two edges  $s, t$  over  $e$ , and then taking the 1-coskeleton. Let  $A_S$  and  $A_T$  be the restriction of  $A$  to  $S$  and  $T$ , respectively.

Just like in Lemma 0.1, we build an element of  $\text{Comp}(S, A_S)$  by using the edge  $s$  in the solution whenever possible, but only if the lifting problem does not factor through a triangle of  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1$  (otherwise we use the canonical element  $\bullet$  over  $e$ ). We build an element of  $\text{Comp}(T, A_T)$  just like that, only using the edge  $t$  instead. It can then be verified that these composition structures give rise to a coherent family as required for an element of  $\text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$ .

There cannot be a preimage of this element in  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A)$ , for the composition problem with base the identity on  $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1$  and only an edge missing over  $e$  would have to be solved using both  $a$  and  $b$ , but  $a \neq b$ .  $\square$

Let us consider  $\text{Presheaf}(\mathbf{SSet})$  (with a larger universe of sets in the outer presheaf layer). We have a Hofmann-Streicher universe  $\text{Type}$  and  $\text{Comp}$  can be viewed as a presheaf on  $\int \text{Type}$ .

**Corollary 0.3.** *Comp is not continuous.*

*Proof.* Using the fact that presheaves are the free cocompletion of the base category,  $\text{Comp}$  is continuous precisely if the map  $\text{Comp}(\Gamma, A) \rightarrow \text{Comp}'(\Gamma, A)$  is an isomorphism for every element  $(\Gamma, A)$  of  $\text{Type}$ . But by Lemmata 0.1 and 0.2, it is neither a monomorphism nor an epimorphism.  $\square$

Unrelatedly, we can still say the following.

**Lemma 0.4.** *The map  $\tilde{U} \rightarrow U$ , i.e. the type  $U \vdash \text{El}$ , is a Kan fibration.*

*Proof.* So it suffices to solve lifting problems

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_i^n & \longrightarrow & \tilde{U} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ \Delta^n & \xrightarrow{\ulcorner A \urcorner} & U \end{array}$$

This pulls back to a lifting problem

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_i^n & \longrightarrow & A \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \downarrow \\ \Delta^n & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \Delta^n \end{array}$$

But  $\Delta^n \vdash A$  had composition, so  $A \rightarrow \Delta^n$  is a Kan fibration.  $\square$