

An Enriched Small Object Argument Over a Cofibrantly Generated Base

Jan Jurka

Abstract

The small object argument is a method for transfinitely constructing weak factorization systems originally motivated by homotopy theory. We establish a variant of the small object argument that is enriched over a cofibrantly generated weak factorization system. This enriched variant of the small object argument subsumes the ordinary small object argument for categories and also certain variants of the small object argument for 2-categories, (2,1)-categories, dg-categories and simplicially enriched categories. Along the way, we show that enriched functor categories can be enriched over the Day convolution monoidal product and in such a case become copowered.

1 Introduction

Quillen [Qui67] introduced a way of transfinitely constructing weak factorization systems, dubbed the *small object argument*. The original motivation for the argument comes from the theory of model categories, which is a categorical approach to homotopy theory. Moreover, later on various variants of the small object argument ([AR94, 1.37], [Gar09], [Rie14, 13.2.1]) became an important tool in category theory itself and also in other areas of mathematics such as model theory due to the connection between the argument and ubiquitous notions of injectivity and orthogonality.

Enriched category theory is part of category theory that deals with “categories” in which hom-sets are not necessarily simply sets anymore, but instead they are objects in some monoidal category (a base of enrichment). It is the purpose of this paper to find a variant of the small object argument in the context of enriched category theory. The enrichment will be over a cofibrantly generated weak factorization system. As special cases we obtain the classical 1-categorical small object argument for weak factorization systems, the 1-categorical small object argument for orthogonal factorization systems, and certain variants of the small object argument for 2-categories, (2,1)-categories, dg-categories and simplicially enriched categories.

The basic idea of the construction is as follows. Recall that a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is said to have the *left lifting property* with respect to a morphism $k: C \rightarrow D$, which we

The author acknowledges the support of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic under the grant 22-02964S.

denote $f \square k$, if for each commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{r} & C \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow k \\ B & \xrightarrow{s} & D \end{array}$$

there exists a diagonal $d: B \rightarrow C$ making the two triangles below commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{r} & C \\ f \downarrow & \nearrow d & \downarrow k \\ B & \xrightarrow{s} & D \end{array}$$

Given a \mathcal{V} -enriched category \mathcal{K} , there is an object $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ in \mathcal{V} (of “squares connecting f to k ”) for each pair of morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B, k: C \rightarrow D$ from the underlying category \mathcal{K}_0 , and this makes the category of morphisms in the underlying category of \mathcal{K} a \mathcal{V} -category with $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ serving as a hom-object. The object $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ can be viewed as a pullback of $\mathcal{K}(f, D), \mathcal{K}(A, k)$, which leads to an induced map $e_{f,k}: \mathcal{K}(B, C) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$. This map is an isomorphism if and only if f has the left lifting property with respect to k in the enriched sense (explicitly defined in [LW14], implicitly defined in [Day74]). Generalizing this, given a class \mathcal{J} of morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 , asking that each morphism from \mathcal{J} has an ordinary left lifting property with respect to $e_{f,k}$ encodes a form of an enriched left lifting property of f with respect to k that is relative to \mathcal{J} . Our variant of the small object argument then involves an enriched category \mathcal{K} , a base of enrichment \mathcal{V} , a class \mathcal{J} of morphisms in \mathcal{V} , and a class of morphisms \mathcal{I} in \mathcal{K}_0 . In order to perform the small object argument, we find suitable conditions on $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{J}$, and \mathcal{I} , and show that the small object argument can be performed under these conditions.

In the ordinary 1-categorical small object argument, one constructs the first morphism in the factorization by taking a (nested) transfinite composite of pushouts of morphisms from \mathcal{I} , and the second morphism in the factorization by using the universal property of a transfinite composite. In our enriched variant of the small object argument we replace pushouts by “copowered pushouts”, which are relative to each morphism in \mathcal{J} . As a consequence of that, in each step of the transfinite construction we use $|\mathcal{J}|$ -many different kinds of “pushouts” and this is done by cycling through \mathcal{J} .

On our way towards the small object argument we’ll have a brief detour into enriched functor categories: For \mathcal{V} -functors $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}, X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ we introduce an analogue $F * X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ of the Day convolution in which we use copowers in \mathcal{K} instead of the monoidal product in \mathcal{V} , and then we prove that this makes the underlying category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ of the \mathcal{V} -category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ of \mathcal{V} -functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ a copowered $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -category. The key aspect for our application is the associativity of the action $*$, which we then use to obtain a stability property of copowered pushouts that’s required for our variant of the small object argument.

The paper is organized in the following way: In the second section we recall some preliminaries, in the third section we prove the aforementioned property of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$, in the

fourth section we apply the results from the previous section to the enriched category of arrows, in the fifth section we define the needed notions such as enriched liftings, in the sixth section we prove the required stability properties, and in the seventh section we finally perform the small object argument.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank my doctoral advisor John Bourke for suggesting to me an interesting topic to investigate, for many fruitful discussions, for carefully reading drafts of the paper, and for many suggestions on how to improve presentation. I would also like to thank Simon Henry for a helpful discussion on the broad picture of enriched small object arguments, and Nathanael Arkor for telling me about locally graded categories.

2 Preliminaries

In this short section we recall some preliminary notions.

Definition 2.1. For a class \mathcal{J} of morphisms in a category, $\square\mathcal{J}$ denotes the class of all morphisms that have the left lifting property with respect to all morphisms from \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{J}^\square denotes the class of all morphisms that have the right lifting property with respect to all morphisms from \mathcal{J} . For the definition of \mathcal{J}^\square recall that a morphism k is said to have the *right lifting property* with respect to a morphism f if $f \square k$.

Definition 2.2. A *weak prefactorization system* $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ is a pair of classes of morphisms in a category such that $\mathcal{L}^\square = \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{L} = \square\mathcal{R}$.

Furthermore, a weak prefactorization system \mathcal{F} is called a *weak factorization system* if for each morphism f there exists a pair of morphisms $g \in \mathcal{L}$, $h \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $f = h \cdot g$.

Moreover, a weak factorization system \mathcal{F} is said to be *cofibrantly generated* if there exists a set \mathcal{J} of morphisms such that $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{J}^\square$.

Remark 2.3. If $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ is a weak prefactorization system, then it is well-known and easy to see that \mathcal{R} is stable under pullbacks, transfinite cocomposites, and isomorphisms, and dually \mathcal{L} is stable under pushouts, transfinite composites, and isomorphisms. In particular, both classes are stable under binary composites.

Remark 2.4. If a functor $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ between categories is left adjoint to a functor $G: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$, then the following equivalence holds for all morphisms f in \mathcal{C} , g in \mathcal{D} :

$$F(f) \square g \text{ if and only if } f \square G(g).$$

3 Copowers in Categories of \mathcal{V} -Functors

Throughout the paper we will assume that \mathcal{V} is a *cosmos*, i.e. a bicomplete symmetric monoidal closed category, and that \mathcal{K} is a \mathcal{V} -category. Furthermore, in this section we will assume that \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category admitting coends of the form (1). For objects V in \mathcal{V} and K in \mathcal{K} we will denote the copower by $V \odot K$. Recall that \mathcal{V} is

a copowered \mathcal{V} -category in which copowers $U \odot V$ are given by the monoidal product $U \otimes V$, and hence from now on we will use the copower notation instead of the monoidal notation.

Let \mathcal{A} be a small monoidal \mathcal{V} -category. The purpose of this section is to show that the underlying category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ of the \mathcal{V} -category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ of \mathcal{V} -functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is a copowered $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -category. In order to do that we will show the stronger statement that the \mathcal{V} -category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ is a left $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -actegory such that the action on a fixed object of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ always has a right adjoint. Given two \mathcal{V} -categories \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' we will denote by $\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{L}'$ their tensor product [Kel05, p. 12]. Given two \mathcal{V} -functors $F, G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, denote by $F \odot G$ the composite

$$\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{F \otimes G} \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\odot} \mathcal{V}$$

and by $m: \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the monoidal product on \mathcal{A} . Recall that the Day convolution $F * G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is defined [Day70, (3.1)] by:

$$(F * G)(x) := \int^{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot F(a)) \odot G(b),$$

and can be characterized [MMSS01, Definition 21.4] as the \mathcal{V} -functor part of the left Kan extension of $F \odot G$ along m . Furthermore, recall that the Day convolution is a monoidal product on the \mathcal{V} -category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$, which follows from [Day70, Theorem 3.3]. Given a \mathcal{V} -functor $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$, we define the \mathcal{V} -functor $F * X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ by:

$$(F * X)(x) := \int^{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot F(a)) \odot X(b), \quad (1)$$

and again $F * X$ can be equivalently characterized as the \mathcal{V} -functor part of the left Kan extension of

$$F \odot X: \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{F \otimes X} \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{K} \xrightarrow{\odot} \mathcal{K}$$

along m . Note that this is a notion analogous to the Day convolution where we now use copowers in \mathcal{K} instead of the monoidal product in \mathcal{V} .

Definition 3.1. Suppose that $(\mathcal{M}, *_{\mathcal{M}}, I)$ is a monoidal \mathcal{V} -category. A *left \mathcal{M} -actegory* is a \mathcal{V} -category \mathcal{L} equipped with a \mathcal{V} -functor $*$: $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ together with \mathcal{V} -natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{M, N, L}: M * (N * L) &\xrightarrow{\cong} (M *_{\mathcal{M}} N) * L, \\ \lambda_L: I * L &\xrightarrow{\cong} L \end{aligned}$$

satisfying coherence conditions [JK01, (1.1), (1.2), (1.3)].

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that \mathcal{V} is a cosmos and \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category admitting coends of the form (1). Then*

- (i) *the \mathcal{V} -category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ is a left $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -actegory such that the action on a fixed object of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ always has a right adjoint, and*
- (ii) *the category $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ is a copowered $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -category.*

Proof. In the proof we will omit the verification of coherence conditions, since it is not needed for the purposes of our small object argument. We begin by proving the first part of the theorem, the second part will then be a corollary of the first part.

Let $F, G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, $X: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ be \mathcal{V} -functors. The action on $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$ that we are looking for is $*$ from Definition (1). First we will show associativity of the action, i.e. that

$$(F * G) * X \cong F * (G * X). \quad (2)$$

We will decorate isomorphisms that follow from the Yoneda Lemma by \mathfrak{Y} . We have the following chain of isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} ((F * G) * X)(x) &= \int^{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot (F * G)(a)) \odot X(b) \\ &= \int^{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot \left(\int^{c, d \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(c, d), a) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d) \right) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\cong \int^{a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot ((\mathcal{A}(m(c, d), a) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d)) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\cong \int^{a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} \left(((\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), x) \odot \mathcal{A}(m(c, d), a)) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\stackrel{\mathfrak{Y}}{\cong} \int^{b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} \left((\mathcal{A}(m(m(c, d), b), x) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\cong \int^{b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} \left((\mathcal{A}(m(c, m(d, b)), x) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\stackrel{\mathfrak{Y}}{\cong} \int^{a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} \left(((\mathcal{A}(m(c, a), x) \odot \mathcal{A}(m(d, b), a)) \odot F(c)) \odot G(d) \right) \odot X(b) \\ &\cong \int^{a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(c, a), x) \odot F(c)) \odot \left((\mathcal{A}(m(d, b), a) \odot G(d)) \odot X(b) \right) \\ &\cong \int^{c, a \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(c, a), x) \odot F(c)) \odot \left(\int^{d, b \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(d, b), a) \odot G(d)) \odot X(b) \right) \\ &= \int^{c, a \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(c, a), x) \odot F(c)) \odot (G * X)(a) \\ &= (F * (G * X))(x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the eighth line in the chain above uses the symmetry of the monoidal product in \mathcal{V} .

Denote by i the unit object of \mathcal{A} . We will show that $\mathcal{A}(i, -): \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ is the unit of the action $*$. This can be done in an analogous way as showing associativity by using

the coend definition of the action $*$, however we will show it by using the Kan extension characterization of the action $*$:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}](\mathcal{A}(i, -) * X, Y) &\cong [\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}](\mathcal{A}(i, -) \odot X, Y \cdot m) \\
&\cong \int_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}(i, a) \odot X(b), Y(m(a, b))) \\
&\cong \int_{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{A}(i, a), \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(m(a, b)))) \\
&\stackrel{\cong}{\cong} \int_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(m(i, b))) \\
&\cong \int_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(b)) \\
&\cong [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}](X, Y),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus $\mathcal{A}(i, -) * X \cong X$ by the Yoneda Lemma. If $X, Y: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ are \mathcal{V} -functors, define

$$\langle X, Y \rangle := \int_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(X(a), Y(m(-, a))). \quad (3)$$

In order to finish the proof, we will show that $\langle X, - \rangle: [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}] \rightarrow [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ is a right adjoint to $- * X: [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}] \rightarrow [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}](F * X, Y) &= \int_{c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}((F * X)(c), Y(c)) \\
&\cong \int_{c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}\left(\int^{a, b \in \mathcal{A}} (\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), c) \odot F(a)) \odot X(b), Y(c)\right) \\
&\cong \int_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}\left(\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), c) \odot F(a), \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(c))\right) \\
&\cong \int_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}\left(F(a), \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), c), \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(c)))\right) \\
&\cong \int_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}\left(F(a), \int_{b, c \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{A}(m(a, b), c), \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(c)))\right) \\
&\stackrel{\cong}{\cong} \int_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}\left(F(a), \int_{b \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(X(b), Y(m(a, b)))\right) \\
&= \int_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{K}(F(a), \langle X, Y \rangle(a)) \\
&\cong [\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}](F, \langle X, Y \rangle).
\end{aligned}$$

By [JK01, 6. Appendix on tensored \mathcal{V} -categories], the second part of the theorem follows from the first part. We remark that copowers are given by the action $*$ from Definition (1) and the hom-object for $X, Y: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ is given by $\langle X, Y \rangle$ from Definition (3). \square

Remark 3.3. When $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, the enrichment of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ over $[\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{Set}]$ has been described by McDermott and Uustalu [MU22]. They describe the enrichment directly in [MU22, Definition 10] using the language of locally \mathcal{A} -graded categories, which are an elementary formulation of $[\mathcal{A}, \mathbf{Set}]$ -enriched categories due to Wood [Woo76, Theorem 1.6]. For our purposes, the case of general \mathcal{V} and the left $[\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}]$ -actegory structure are essential.

4 The Enriched Category of Arrows

We now specialise the results from the previous section to $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{2}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ is the free \mathcal{V} -category on the category with two objects $0, 1$ and a single non-identity morphism $0 \rightarrow 1$. Recall that this free \mathcal{V} -category has as hom-objects the initial object and the unit object if the corresponding hom-sets are the empty set and the singleton, respectively. Furthermore, $\mathbf{2}$ can be equipped with the cartesian monoidal product m , which is given on objects $x, y \in \mathbf{2}$ by the formula $m(x, y) := \min(x, y)$.

Then $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{V}]$ and $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$ are the \mathcal{V} -categories of morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 and in \mathcal{K}_0 , respectively. Hom-objects in $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$ are given by $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ from the following definition.

Definition 4.1. For each pair of morphisms $f: A \rightarrow B, k: C \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{K}_0 , define $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ to be the *object of squares connecting f to k* , i.e. the pullback-object in the following pullback square.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sq}(f, k) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \mathcal{K}(A, C) \\ p_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A, k) \\ \mathcal{K}(B, D) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f, D)} & \mathcal{K}(A, D) \end{array}$$

Note that since $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$ is a \mathcal{V} -category, we have the associated \mathcal{V}_0 -valued hom-functor $\text{Sq}(-, -): [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0^{\text{op}} \times [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$, and so in particular $\text{Sq}(-, k): [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ for a morphism k in \mathcal{K}_0 . We will make heavy use of this in what follows, and so now record its explicit description. If

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & K \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow f' \\ B & \xrightarrow{g'} & L \end{array}$$

is a commutative square, i.e. a morphism $(g, g'): f \rightarrow f'$ in $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0$, then there is a unique morphism $\text{Sq}((g, g'), k): \text{Sq}(f', k) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$ in \mathcal{V}_0 that makes the two top squares in the following diagram commute, since (p_1, p_2) is a pullback.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{K}(K, C) & \xleftarrow{p'_1} & \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{p'_2} & \mathcal{K}(L, D) \\ \mathcal{K}(g, C) \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Sq}((g, g'), k) & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(g', D) \\ \mathcal{K}(A, C) & \xleftarrow{p_1} & \text{Sq}(f, k) & \xrightarrow{p_2} & \mathcal{K}(B, D) \\ & \searrow \mathcal{K}(A, k) & & \swarrow \mathcal{K}(f, D) & \\ & & \mathcal{K}(A, D) & & \end{array}$$

Examples 4.2.

- (1) In the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, where \mathbf{Set} is the monoidal category of sets, we get that \mathcal{K} is a category. The elements of $\text{Sq}(f, k)$ are commutative squares in \mathcal{K} of the form:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A & \xrightarrow{r} & C \\
f \downarrow & & \downarrow k \\
B & \xrightarrow{s} & D
\end{array}$$

We will call each such square a *commutative (f, k) -square*.

- (2) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Cat}$, where \mathbf{Cat} is the monoidal category of categories in which the monoidal structure is given by the cartesian product. This means that \mathcal{K} is a 2-category. Then the objects of $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ are commutative (f, k) -squares, and the morphisms in $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ are pairs $\theta: r \Rightarrow r', \theta': s \Rightarrow s'$ of 2-cells such that $k * \theta = \theta' * f$.
- (3) If $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Grpd}$, where \mathbf{Grpd} is the monoidal category of groupoids in which the monoidal structure is given by the cartesian product, then that means that \mathcal{K} is a (2,1)-category. The objects of $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ are commutative (f, k) -squares, and the morphisms in $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ are pairs $\theta: r \Rightarrow r', \theta': s \Rightarrow s'$ of invertible 2-cells such that $k * \theta = \theta' * f$.
- (4) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Ch}$, where \mathbf{Ch} is the monoidal category of chain complexes of left R -modules over a ring R in which the monoidal structure is given by the tensor product of chain complexes. This means that \mathcal{K} is a dg-category and $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ is a chain complex

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+2}} \mathrm{Sq}(f, k)_{n+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} \mathrm{Sq}(f, k)_n \xrightarrow{\partial_n} \mathrm{Sq}(f, k)_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{n-1}} \cdots$$

whose n -th degree elements are pairs $(r, s) \in \mathcal{K}(A, C)_n \times \mathcal{K}(B, D)_n$ that satisfy $k \cdot r = s \cdot f \in \mathcal{K}(A, D)_n$. The equality $\partial_n(r, s) = (\partial_n(r), \partial_n(s))$ defines differentials on $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$.

- (5) In the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{SSet}$, where \mathbf{SSet} is the monoidal category of simplicial sets with monoidal structure given by the pointwise cartesian product, we get that \mathcal{K} is a simplicially enriched category and $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ is a simplicial set whose n -simplices are pairs $(r, t) \in \mathcal{K}(A, C)_n \times \mathcal{K}(B, D)_n$ such that $k \cdot r = t \cdot f \in \mathcal{K}(A, D)_n$. Face maps and degeneracy maps on $\mathrm{Sq}(f, k)$ are defined by $d_i(r, t) = (d_i(r), d_i(t))$ and $s_i(r, t) = (s_i(r), s_i(t))$, respectively.

In the remainder of this section we will assume that \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category admitting pushouts of the form $u \odot f$ from the following definition.

Definition 4.3. Suppose that u is a morphism in \mathcal{V}_0 and $f: A \rightarrow B$ is a morphism in \mathcal{K}_0 . Then $\nabla(u, f): u \odot f \rightarrow V \odot B$ is the induced morphism depicted in the following diagram, where (i_1, i_2) is a pushout of $U \odot f$ and $u \odot A$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
U \odot A & \xrightarrow{U \odot f} & U \odot B \\
\downarrow u \odot A & \nearrow i_2 & \downarrow u \odot B \\
& u \odot f & \\
& \nearrow i_1 & \searrow \nabla(u, f) \\
V \odot A & \xrightarrow{V \odot f} & V \odot B
\end{array}$$

Remark 4.4. Theorem 3.2 gives us that the category $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ of morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 is a copowered $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{V}]$ -category whose copower action $*$ is given by ∇ from Definition 4.3.

Remark 4.5. The existence of coends of the form (1) is equivalent to the existence of pushouts of the form $u \odot f$ from Definition 4.3, since for $\mathcal{A} = \mathbf{2}$ these coends are of the form (4). The fact that ∇ is the copower action $*$ follows from the formula

$$(u * f)(x) = \int^{a, b \in \mathbf{2}} (\mathbf{2}(m(a, b), x) \odot u(a)) \odot f(b). \quad (4)$$

Remark 4.6. Since \mathcal{V} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category, it makes sense to also consider $\text{Sq}(u, v)$ and $\nabla(u, v)$ for morphisms u, v in \mathcal{V}_0 .

Now from Equation (2) we obtain

$$\nabla(v, \nabla(u, f)) \cong \nabla(\nabla(v, u), f), \quad (5)$$

which will be useful for the purposes of our small object argument. Moreover, the hom-object $\langle f, k \rangle$ for $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$ as a $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{V}]$ -enriched category becomes $e_{f, k}$ from the following definition, which will later be used to express enriched lifting properties.

Definition 4.7. Suppose that $f: A \rightarrow B, k: C \rightarrow D$ are morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 . Then define $e_{f, k}: \mathcal{K}(B, C) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$ to be the induced morphism depicted below.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{K}(B, C) & & \mathcal{K}(f, C) & & \\
\downarrow \kappa(B, k) & \dashrightarrow e_{f, k} & \searrow & & \\
& \text{Sq}(f, k) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \mathcal{K}(A, C) & \\
& \downarrow p_2 & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A, k) & \\
& \mathcal{K}(B, D) & \xrightarrow{\kappa(f, D)} & \mathcal{K}(A, D) &
\end{array} \quad (6)$$

Remark 4.8. We will denote by $-^*$ the bijective correspondence assigning to each morphism $U \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A, B)$ in \mathcal{V}_0 a morphism $U \odot A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{K}_0 , and by $-_*$ its inverse.

Remark 4.9. The fact that $e_{f, k}$ is the hom-object $\langle f, k \rangle$ follows from the functor $\nabla(-, f): [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{V}]_0 \rightarrow [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0$ being left adjoint to the functor $e_{f, -}: [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0 \rightarrow [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{V}]_0$ and

the uniqueness of right adjoints. The adjunction is given as follows, in both cases given a commutative square on the left we obtain the commutative square on the right:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{v} & \mathcal{K}(B, C) \\ u \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{f,k} \\ V & \xrightarrow{w} & \text{Sq}(f, k) \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} u \odot f & \xrightarrow{(v^*, (p_1 \cdot w)^*)} & C \\ \nabla(u, f) \downarrow & & \downarrow k \\ V \odot B & \xrightarrow{(p_2 \cdot w)^*} & D \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u \odot f & \xrightarrow{g} & C \\ \nabla(u, f) \downarrow & & \downarrow k \\ V \odot B & \xrightarrow{h} & D \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{(g \cdot i_1)^*} & \mathcal{K}(B, C) \\ u \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{f,k} \\ V & \xrightarrow{((g \cdot i_2)^*, h_*)} & \text{Sq}(f, k) \end{array}$$

5 Enriched Lifting Properties

From now on in the paper we will assume that the cosmos \mathcal{V} is equipped with a weak prefactorization system $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ on \mathcal{V}_0 . The purpose of this section is to define basic notions needed for our small object argument: Enriched lifting properties, enriched weak factorization systems, and the notion of a class morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 being stable under corners.

Definition 5.1. Suppose that $f: A \rightarrow B$, $k: C \rightarrow D$ are morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 . Then we write $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ if $e_{f,k} \in \mathcal{R}$, where $e_{f,k}: \mathcal{K}(B, C) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$ is the induced morphism from Definition 4.7.

Furthermore, if $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$, then we say that f has the *left \mathcal{F} -lifting property* with respect to k , or equivalently that k has the *right \mathcal{F} -lifting property* with respect to f . Moreover, if \mathcal{S} is a class of morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 , then we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}} &:= \{k \in [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}] \mid \forall f \in \mathcal{S}: f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k\}, \\ \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} \mathcal{S} &:= \{f \in [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}] \mid \forall k \in \mathcal{S}: f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Examples 5.2.

(1) In the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathcal{F} = (\text{injective}, \text{surjective})$, we capture the ordinary (weak) lifting property, i.e. $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ iff $f \square k$. Note that \mathcal{F} is cofibrantly generated by $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1\}$.

If we instead choose the following $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow 1\}$ we capture the strong lifting property in which the diagonal is required to be unique because \mathcal{F} becomes (all functions, bijections).

- (2) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Cat}$, $\mathcal{F} = (\text{injective on objects, surjective equivalences})$. Then $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ iff $e_{f,k}$ is a surjective equivalence, which happens iff for each pair of 1-cells $r: A \rightarrow C$, $s: B \rightarrow D$ satisfying $k \cdot r = s \cdot f$ there exists a diagonal $d: B \rightarrow C$ such that $d \cdot f = r$, $k \cdot d = s$, and furthermore if $d, d': B \rightarrow C$ are 1-cells, and $\theta: d \cdot f \Rightarrow d' \cdot f$, $\theta': k \cdot d \Rightarrow k \cdot d'$ are 2-cells such that $k * \theta = \theta' * f$, then there exists a unique 2-cell $\varphi: d \Rightarrow d'$ such that $\varphi * f = \theta$ and $k * \varphi = \theta'$. Note that \mathcal{F} is cofibrantly generated by $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, w: \mathbf{2}' \rightarrow \mathbf{2}'\}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ is the discrete category with two objects, $\mathbf{2}$ is the category with two objects $0, 1$ and a single non-identity morphism $0 \rightarrow 1$, and $\mathbf{2}'$ is the two-object category with two objects $0, 1$ and two non-identity morphisms $0 \rightarrow 1$.

We remark that \mathcal{F} -liftings offer a lot of flexibility in specification: For example if we want to get rid of the uniqueness assumption on the 2-cell φ we can simply omit w from \mathcal{J} .

- (3) If $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Grpd}$, $\mathcal{F} = (\text{injective on objects, surjective equivalences})$, then the \mathcal{F} -lifting property is almost the same as in Example (2) with the only difference being that all the 2-cells are invertible. Note that \mathcal{F} is cofibrantly generated by \mathcal{J} that is almost the same as in Example (2) with the only difference being that to each non-invertible morphism in $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{2}'$ we add its inverse.
- (4) If $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Ch}$, then we can choose $\mathcal{J} = \{S^{n-1} \hookrightarrow D^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\mathcal{F} = (\square(\mathcal{J}^\square), \mathcal{J}^\square)$, in which case $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ iff $e_{f,k}$ is a surjective quasi-isomorphism. See [Hov99, Proposition 2.3.4, Proposition 2.3.5].
- (5) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{SSet}$ and let $\mathcal{J} = \{\partial \Delta^n \hookrightarrow \Delta^n \mid n \geq 0\}$, $\mathcal{F} = (\square(\mathcal{J}^\square), \mathcal{J}^\square)$. Then $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ iff $e_{f,k}$ is both a Kan fibration and a weak homotopy equivalence.
- (6) In this example we will show that the enriched lifting property in [LW14] can be obtained as an \mathcal{F} -lifting property. Consider $\mathcal{F} = (\text{all maps, isomorphisms})$, which is obviously a weak factorization system on \mathcal{V}_0 . Then $f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k$ iff $e_{f,k}$ is an isomorphism. Now we will show that under some assumptions on \mathcal{V}_0 we can cofibrantly generate the weak factorization system \mathcal{F} . Assume that λ is a regular cardinal and \mathcal{V}_0 is a locally λ -presentable category with a set \mathcal{V}_λ of λ -presentable objects that form a strong generator. Consider

$$\mathcal{J} = \{u_V: \emptyset \rightarrow V \mid V \in \mathcal{V}_\lambda\} \cup \{\nabla_V: V + V \rightarrow V \mid V \in \mathcal{V}_\lambda\},$$

where $\nabla_V = (\text{id}_V, \text{id}_V)$. Since \mathcal{V}_λ is a strong generator, a morphism v in \mathcal{V}_0 is an isomorphism iff $\mathcal{V}_0(V, v)$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{Set} for each $V \in \mathcal{V}_\lambda$. Now it suffices to notice that $u_V \square v$ iff $\mathcal{V}_0(V, v)$ is surjective, and $\nabla_V \square v$ iff $\mathcal{V}_0(V, v)$ is injective.

- (7) Suppose that \mathcal{R} is the class of split epimorphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 and \mathcal{L} is the class of retracts of binary coproduct injections in \mathcal{V}_0 . By [RT07, Proposition 2.6], $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ is

a weak factorization system. Then the \mathcal{F} -lifting property coincides with the \mathcal{V} -enriched lifting property in the sense of [Rie14, Definition 13.3.1]. Finally, we remark that all the previous examples were cofibrantly generated, whereas this example is not necessarily cofibrantly generated.

Definition 5.3. An *enriched weak \mathcal{F} -factorization system* on \mathcal{K} is a pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ of classes of morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 such that each morphism $h: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{K}_0 has a factorization $h = g \cdot f$ such that $f \in \mathcal{L}$, $g \in \mathcal{R}$, and furthermore $\mathcal{L} = \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} \mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}$.

Definition 5.4. We say that a class \mathcal{S} of morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 is *stable under corners* if whenever $u, v \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\nabla(u, v) \in \mathcal{S}$. (Recall Remark 4.6.)

In the remainder of this section we will assume that \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category admitting pushouts of the form $u \odot f$ from Definition 4.3.

Remark 5.5. The following equivalence holds:

$$u \square e_{f,k} \text{ if and only if } \nabla(u, f) \square k,$$

where u is a morphism in \mathcal{V}_0 and f, k are morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 . Indeed, this follows from Remark 2.4 and Remark 4.9.

Remark 5.6. From Remark 5.5 we immediately conclude that for all morphisms f, k in \mathcal{K}_0 the following equivalence holds:

$$\nabla(u, f) \square k \text{ holds for all } u \in \mathcal{L} \text{ if and only if } f \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square} k.$$

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that \mathcal{J} is a class of morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 , and that the following implication holds:*

$$\text{If } u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{J}, \text{ then } \nabla(u_1, u_2) \text{ is in } \square(\mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}).$$

Then $\square(\mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square})$ is stable under corners.

Proof. Suppose that $u_1 \in \square(\mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square})$, $u_2 \in \mathcal{J}$, $v \in \mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}$. By assumption we know that for each $u \in \mathcal{J}$: $\nabla(u, u_2) \square v$, which is equivalent to $u \square e_{u_2, v}$ by Remark 5.5. Since this holds for all $u \in \mathcal{J}$, we get that $u_1 \square e_{u_2, v}$, and thus $\nabla(u_1, u_2) \square v$.

Now suppose that $u_1 \in \square(\mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square})$, $u_2 \in \square(\mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square})$, $v \in \mathcal{J} \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}$. By the previous paragraph, we know that for each $u \in \mathcal{J}$: $\nabla(u_1, u) \square v$, which is equivalent to $u \square e_{u_1, v}$ by Remark 5.5. Since this holds for all $u \in \mathcal{J}$, we get that $u_2 \square e_{u_1, v}$, and thus $\nabla(u_1, u_2) \square v$. Note that we used the symmetry of the monoidal structure on \mathcal{V} . \square

Example 5.8. In a monoidal model category [Hov99, Definition 4.2.6], cofibrations and trivial cofibrations are stable under corners.

6 Stability Properties

Here we establish the stability properties that are required in order to conclude that our small object argument generates an enriched weak \mathcal{F} -factorization system. We will be considering pushouts and transfinite composites in \mathcal{K} as a \mathcal{V} -category: This means colimits in \mathcal{K}_0 that are sent by each representable functor $\mathcal{K}(-, K): \mathcal{K}_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ to a limit in \mathcal{V}_0 .

Proposition 6.1. *The class $\square^{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{I}$ is stable under pushouts in \mathcal{K} .*

Proof. Suppose that the following square is a pushout in \mathcal{K} .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{g} & K \\ f \downarrow & & \downarrow f' \\ B & \xrightarrow{g'} & L \end{array}$$

We will show that if $f \in \square^{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{I}$, then $f' \in \square^{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{I}$.

Let $k: C \rightarrow D$ be in \mathcal{I} . We have induced morphisms $e_{f,k}, e_{f',k}$ in the notation of Definition 4.7. By assumption, $e_{f,k} \in \mathcal{R}$. We want to show that $e_{f',k} \in \mathcal{R}$. Recalling Definition 4.1, there exists a morphism $\text{Sq}((g, g'), k): \text{Sq}(f, k') \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$ such that $p_1 \cdot \text{Sq}((g, g'), k) = \mathcal{K}(g, C) \cdot p'_1$ and $p_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((g, g'), k) = \mathcal{K}(g', D) \cdot p'_2$. Now we will show that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}(L, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g', C)} & \mathcal{K}(B, C) \\ e_{f',k} \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{f,k} \\ \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sq}((g, g'), k)} & \text{Sq}(f, k) \end{array}$$

is a pullback and this will finish the proof because \mathcal{R} is stable under pullbacks.

Consider the following rectangle.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{p'_2} & \mathcal{K}(L, D) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g', D)} & \mathcal{K}(B, D) \\ p'_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(f', D) & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(f, D) \\ \mathcal{K}(K, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(K, k)} & \mathcal{K}(K, D) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g, D)} & \mathcal{K}(A, D) \end{array}$$

The left square is a pullback by definition of $\text{Sq}(f', k)$. The right square is a pullback, since $\mathcal{K}(-, C): \mathcal{K}_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ preserves limits in \mathcal{K}^{op} . Thus, the rectangle is a pullback by the pasting law for pullbacks.

Now consider the following rectangle.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sq}((g, g'), k)} & \text{Sq}(f, k) & \xrightarrow{p_2} & \mathcal{K}(B, D) \\ p'_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(f, D) \\ \mathcal{K}(K, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g, C)} & \mathcal{K}(A, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(A, k)} & \mathcal{K}(A, D) \end{array}$$

The right square is a pullback by definition of $\text{Sq}(f, k)$, and the rectangle is a pullback, since $p_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((g, g'), k) = \mathcal{K}(g', D) \cdot p'_2$ and $\mathcal{K}(A, k) \cdot \mathcal{K}(g, C) = \mathcal{K}(g, D) \cdot \mathcal{K}(K, k)$. Hence, by using the pasting law, we get that the left square in the rectangle is a pullback too.

Finally, consider the following rectangle.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{K}(L, C) & \xrightarrow{e_{f',k}} & \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{p'_1} & \mathcal{K}(K, C) \\ \mathcal{K}(g', C) \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Sq}((g, g'), k) & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(g, C) \\ \mathcal{K}(B, C) & \xrightarrow{e_{f,k}} & \text{Sq}(f, k) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \mathcal{K}(A, C) \end{array}$$

The right square was shown above to be a pullback. Moreover, the rectangle is a pullback because by composing the horizontal sides we get the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}(L, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f', C)} & \mathcal{K}(K, C) \\ \mathcal{K}(g', C) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(g, C) \\ \mathcal{K}(B, C) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f, C)} & \mathcal{K}(A, C) \end{array}$$

and this square is a pullback, since $\mathcal{K}(-, C): \mathcal{K}_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ preserves limits in \mathcal{K}^{op} . Therefore, from the pasting law, we conclude that the left square in the rectangle is a pullback. \square

Proposition 6.2. *The class $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$ is stable under transfinite compositions in \mathcal{K} .*

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha > 0$ is an ordinal. We will show that if $f_{\beta, \beta+1}: A_\beta \rightarrow A_{\beta+1}$, $\beta < \alpha$, are morphisms from \mathcal{K}_0 that belong to $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$ and for each limit ordinal $\gamma < \alpha$ the induced morphism $i_\gamma: \text{colim}_{\delta < \gamma} A_\delta \rightarrow A_\gamma$ is an isomorphism, then their transfinite composition $f_{0, \alpha}: A_0 \rightarrow A_\alpha := \text{colim}_{\beta < \alpha} A_\beta$ also belongs to $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$.

The proof is by transfinite induction.

Base Case: If $\alpha = 1$, then the statement clearly holds: $f_{0,1} \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$ implies that $f_{0,1} \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$.

Successor Step: Suppose that $\alpha = \epsilon + 1$ and that the result holds for all non-zero ordinals less than α . By inductive hypothesis we know that $f_{0, \epsilon}: A_0 \rightarrow A_\epsilon$ belongs to $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$. Let $k: C \rightarrow D$ be in \mathcal{I} . To simplify notation, denote $A := A_0$, $A' := A_\epsilon$, $B := A_\alpha$, $f := f_{0, \epsilon}$, $f' := f_{\epsilon, \epsilon+1}$. Note that $f_{0, \alpha} = f' \cdot f$. We have induced morphisms $e_{f,k}, e_{f',k}, e_{f' \cdot f, k}$ from Definition 4.7 whose respective pullback projections will be denoted p_i, p'_i, p''_i , where $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We know that $e_{f,k} \in \mathcal{R}$, $e_{f',k} \in \mathcal{R}$, and we want to show that $e_{f' \cdot f, k} \in \mathcal{R}$. Recalling Definition 4.1, we have a morphism $\text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k): \text{Sq}(f', k) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f' \cdot f, k)$ such that $p''_1 \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) = \mathcal{K}(f, C) \cdot p'_1$ and $p''_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) = p'_2$, and also a morphism $\text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k): \text{Sq}(f' \cdot f, k) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f, k)$ such that $p_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k) = \mathcal{K}(f', D) \cdot p''_2$ and $p_1 \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k) = p''_1$. Now note that

$$p''_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot e_{f',k} = p'_2 \cdot e_{f',k} = \mathcal{K}(B, k) = p''_2 \cdot e_{f' \cdot f, k}$$

and

$$p_1'' \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot e_{f',k} = \mathcal{K}(f, C) \cdot p_1' \cdot e_{f',k} = \mathcal{K}(f, C) \cdot \mathcal{K}(f', C) = \mathcal{K}(f' \cdot f, C) = p_1'' \cdot e_{f' \cdot f, k}.$$

Therefore $e_{f' \cdot f, k} = \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot e_{f',k}$, since (p_1'', p_2'') is a pullback. We will show that $\text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \in \mathcal{R}$ and this will finish the proof of the successor step, since \mathcal{R} is stable under compositions. In order to do that, we will show that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{p_1'} & \mathcal{K}(A', C) \\ \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{f,k} \\ \text{Sq}(f' \cdot f, k) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k)} & \text{Sq}(f, k) \end{array}$$

is a pullback and this will imply $\text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \in \mathcal{R}$, since \mathcal{R} is stable under pullbacks. Let $r: U \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A', C)$, $s: U \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f' \cdot f, k)$ be two morphisms such that the following equality holds $e_{f,k} \cdot r = \text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k) \cdot s$. Note that

$$\mathcal{K}(f', D) \cdot p_2'' \cdot s = p_2 \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k) \cdot s = p_2 \cdot e_{f,k} \cdot r = \mathcal{K}(A', k) \cdot r.$$

Hence, there exists a unique morphism $u: U \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f', k)$ such that the two triangles below commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & & \\ \text{---} u \text{---} \searrow & r \searrow & \\ \text{Sq}(f', k) & \xrightarrow{p_1'} & \mathcal{K}(A', C) \\ p_2'' \cdot s \searrow & p_2' \downarrow & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A', k) \\ \mathcal{K}(B, D) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f', D)} & \mathcal{K}(A', D) \end{array}$$

Note that

$$p_1'' \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot u = \mathcal{K}(f, C) \cdot p_1' \cdot u = \mathcal{K}(f, C) \cdot r = p_1 \cdot e_{f,k} \cdot r = p_1 \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_A, f'), k) \cdot s = p_1'' \cdot s$$

and

$$p_2'' \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot u = p_2' \cdot u = p_2'' \cdot s.$$

Therefore $\text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot u = s$, since (p_1'', p_2'') is a pullback. On the other hand, suppose that a morphism $u': U \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f', k)$ satisfies $\text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot u' = s$ and $p_1' \cdot u' = r$. Then $p_2' \cdot u' = p_2'' \cdot \text{Sq}((f, \text{id}_B), k) \cdot u' = p_2'' \cdot s$, and thus $u' = u$ by the uniqueness of u .

Limit Step: Suppose that $\alpha > 0$ is a limit ordinal such that the result holds for all non-zero ordinals less than α . Let $k: C \rightarrow D$ be in \mathcal{I} . We know that for each $\beta < \alpha$ the induced morphism $e_{f_{\beta, \beta+1}, k}$ from the following diagram belongs to \mathcal{R} .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, C) & & & & \\
\swarrow \text{---} e_{f_{\beta, \beta+1}, k} \text{---} & \searrow \mathcal{K}(f_{\beta, \beta+1}, C) & & & \\
& & \text{Sq}(f_{\beta, \beta+1}, k) & \xrightarrow{p_1^{\beta, \beta+1}} & \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta}, C) \\
\swarrow \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, k) & & \downarrow p_2^{\beta, \beta+1} & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A', k) \\
& & \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, D) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f_{\beta, \beta+1}, D)} & \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta}, D)
\end{array}$$

Let $(f_{\beta, \alpha}: A_{\beta} \rightarrow A_{\alpha})_{\beta < \alpha}$ be a colimit of the diagram $\{f_{\beta, \beta+1}: A_{\beta} \rightarrow A_{\beta+1} \mid \beta < \alpha\}$. For simplicity, we will write the diagram as follows.

$$A_0 \xrightarrow{f_{0,1}} A_1 \xrightarrow{f_{1,2}} A_2 \xrightarrow{f_{2,3}} A_3 \xrightarrow{f_{3,4}} \dots$$

Then $((f_{\beta, \alpha}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}): f_{\beta, \alpha} \rightarrow \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}})_{\beta < \alpha}$ is a colimit of the following diagram in $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$, since it is a colimit in each component.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
A_0 & \xrightarrow{f_{0,1}} & A_1 & \xrightarrow{f_{1,2}} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{f_{2,3}} & A_3 \xrightarrow{f_{3,4}} \dots \\
f_{0,\alpha} \downarrow & & f_{1,\alpha} \downarrow & & f_{2,\alpha} \downarrow & & f_{3,\alpha} \downarrow \\
A_{\alpha} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}} & A_{\alpha} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}} & A_{\alpha} & \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}} & A_{\alpha} \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}} \dots
\end{array}$$

Recall from Definition 4.1 that $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$ is a \mathcal{V} -category with $\text{Sq}(g, h)$ being the hom-object for each pair $g, h \in [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]$. Thus,

$$(\text{Sq}((f_{\beta, \alpha}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k): \text{Sq}(\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}, k) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{\beta, \alpha}, k))_{\beta < \alpha}$$

is a limit of the diagram

$$\text{Sq}(f_{0,\alpha}, k) \xleftarrow{\text{Sq}((f_{0,1}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k)} \text{Sq}(f_{1,\alpha}, k) \xleftarrow{\text{Sq}((f_{1,2}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k)} \text{Sq}(f_{2,\alpha}, k) \xleftarrow{\text{Sq}((f_{2,3}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k)} \dots$$

in \mathcal{V}_0 because $\text{Sq}(-, k): [\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ preserves limits in $[\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{K}]_0^{\text{op}}$. Also, note that there exists an isomorphism $\iota: \mathcal{K}(A_{\omega}, C) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(\text{id}_{A_{\omega}}, k)$ that makes the following diagram commute because the second component is uniquely determined by the first component via composition with k .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, C) & & \\
& \swarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, C)} & \downarrow \iota & \searrow \mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, k) & \\
\mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, C) & \xleftarrow{p_1} & \text{Sq}(\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}, k) & \xrightarrow{p_2} & \mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, D)
\end{array}$$

Thus, the transfinite cocomposition $\text{Sq}((f_{0,\alpha}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k): \text{Sq}(\text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}, k) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{0,\alpha}, k)$ is isomorphic to a morphism $\text{Sq}((f_{0,\alpha}, \text{id}_{A_{\alpha}}), k) \cdot \iota: \mathcal{K}(A_{\alpha}, C) \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{0,\alpha}, k)$, and this morphism

is the induced map $e_{f_0,\alpha,k}$ in the following diagram by the uniqueness of the induced map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, C) & & \\
\begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, k) \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f_{0,\alpha}, C)} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, D) \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \mathcal{K}(A_0, C) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A_0, k) \\ \mathcal{K}(A_0, D) \end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \text{Sq}(f_{0,\alpha}, k) \\ \downarrow p_2^{0,\alpha} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1^{0,\alpha}} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_0, D) \end{array} & \\
& & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f_{0,\alpha}, D)} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_0, D) \end{array} &
\end{array}$$

Indeed,

$$p_1^{0,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((f_{0,\alpha}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot \iota = \mathcal{K}(f_{0,\alpha}, C) \cdot p_1 \cdot \iota = \mathcal{K}(f_{0,\alpha}, C) \cdot \text{id}_{\mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, C)} = \mathcal{K}(f_{0,\alpha}, C)$$

and

$$p_2^{0,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((f_{0,\alpha}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot \iota = \text{id}_{A_\alpha} \cdot p_2 \cdot \iota = p_2 \cdot \iota = \mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, k).$$

Therefore, $\text{Sq}((f_{0,\alpha}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot \iota = e_{f_{0,\alpha},k}$. In order to finish the proof we need to show that $e_{f_{0,\alpha},k}$ belongs to \mathcal{R} . To achieve that, recall that \mathcal{R} is stable under transfinite cocompositions and isomorphisms, and thus it suffices to show that for each $\beta < \alpha$ the morphism $\text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k)$ belongs to \mathcal{R} . Let $\beta < \alpha$. We will show that the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Sq}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, k) & \xrightarrow{p_1^{\beta+1,\alpha}} & \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, C) \\
\text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{f_{\beta,\beta+1},k} \\
\text{Sq}(f_{\beta,\alpha}, k) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sq}((\text{id}_{A_\beta}, f_{\beta+1,\alpha}), k)} & \text{Sq}(f_{\beta,\beta+1}, k)
\end{array}$$

is a pullback and this will imply that $\text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k)$ belongs to \mathcal{R} because \mathcal{R} is stable under pullbacks. Let $r_\beta: U_\beta \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, C)$, $s_\beta: U_\beta \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{\beta,\alpha}, k)$ be morphisms such that $e_{f_{\beta,\beta+1},k} \cdot r_\beta = \text{Sq}((\text{id}_{A_\beta}, f_{\beta+1,\alpha}), k) \cdot s_\beta$. Note that

$$\mathcal{K}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, D) \cdot p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot s_\beta = p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_{A_\beta}, f_{\beta+1,\alpha}), k) \cdot s_\beta = p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot e_{f_{\beta,\beta+1},k} \cdot r_\beta = \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, k) \cdot r_\beta,$$

and therefore there exists a unique morphism $u_\beta: U_\beta \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, k)$ making the two triangles below commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
U_\beta & & \\
\begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot s_\beta \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{r_\beta} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_\alpha, D) \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, C) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, k) \\ \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, D) \end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \text{Sq}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, k) \\ \downarrow p_2^{\beta+1,\alpha} \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1^{\beta+1,\alpha}} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, D) \end{array} & \\
& & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, D)} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \mathcal{K}(A_{\beta+1}, D) \end{array} &
\end{array}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot u_\beta &= \mathcal{K}(f_{\beta,\beta+1}, C) \cdot p_1^{\beta+1,\alpha} \cdot u_\beta \\
&= \mathcal{K}(f_{\beta,\beta+1}, C) \cdot r_\beta \\
&= p_1^{\beta,\beta+1} \cdot e_{f_{\beta,\beta+1}, k} \cdot r_\beta \\
&= p_1^{\beta,\beta+1} \cdot \text{Sq}((\text{id}_{A_\beta}, f_{\beta+1,\alpha}), k) \cdot s_\beta \\
&= p_1^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot s_\beta
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot u_\beta = p_2^{\beta+1,\alpha} \cdot u_\beta = p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot s_\beta.$$

Therefore we obtain $\text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot u_\beta = s_\beta$, since $(p_1^{\beta,\alpha}, p_2^{\beta,\alpha})$ is a pullback. Now suppose that $u'_\beta: U_\beta \rightarrow \text{Sq}(f_{\beta+1,\alpha}, k)$ is a morphism such that $p_1^{\beta+1,\alpha} \cdot u'_\beta = r_\beta$ and also $\text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot u'_\beta = s_\beta$. Then

$$p_2^{\beta+1,\alpha} \cdot u'_\beta = p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot \text{Sq}((f_{\beta,\beta+1}, \text{id}_{A_\alpha}), k) \cdot u'_\beta = p_2^{\beta,\alpha} \cdot s_\beta,$$

and thus $u'_\beta = u_\beta$ by the uniqueness of u_β . \square

In the remainder of this section we will assume that \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category admitting pushouts of the form $u \odot f$ from Definition 4.3.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that \mathcal{L} is stable under corners. Moreover, suppose that we have $u: U \rightarrow V$ in \mathcal{L} and $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{K}_0 such that $f \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$. Then $\nabla(u, f) \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. In order to show that $\nabla(u, f) \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$ it suffices to show that $\nabla(v, \nabla(u, f)) \in \square\mathcal{I}$ for each $v \in \mathcal{L}$, see Remark 5.6. From Equation (5) we know that $\nabla(v, \nabla(u, f))$ is isomorphic to $\nabla(\nabla(v, u), f)$. Note that $\nabla(v, u)$ is in \mathcal{L} , since \mathcal{L} is stable under corners.

Furthermore, f is in $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$. Hence, recalling Remark 5.6, we obtain $\nabla(\nabla(v, u), f) \in \square\mathcal{I}$, and thus $\nabla(v, \nabla(u, f)) \in \square\mathcal{I}$. \square

Corollary 6.4. *Suppose that \mathcal{L} is stable under corners. Moreover, suppose that we have a span*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
u \odot f & \xrightarrow{(g,h)} & K \\
\nabla(u,f) \downarrow & & \\
V \odot B & &
\end{array}$$

in \mathcal{K}_0 , where $u: U \rightarrow V$ is in \mathcal{L} , $f: A \rightarrow B$, $g: V \odot A \rightarrow K$, and $h: U \odot B \rightarrow K$ are morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 , and that the following square is a pushout in \mathcal{K} .


$$\begin{array}{ccc}
u \odot f & \xrightarrow{(g,h)} & K \\
\nabla(u,f) \downarrow & & \downarrow f' \\
V \odot B & \xrightarrow{g'} & L
\end{array}$$

If $f \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$, then $f' \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$.


Proof. From Proposition 6.3 we get that $\nabla(u, f) \in \overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$. Now it suffices to recall that $\overset{\mathcal{F}}{\square}\mathcal{I}$ is stable under pushouts, see Proposition 6.1. \square

Definition 6.5. We call the pushout from Corollary 6.4 a *copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to u* .

Remark 6.6. Note that all of the information concerning the span from Corollary 6.4 is encoded in the following diagram



whose colimit is the copowered pushout as displayed below.




We will use this rephrasing in the proof of the small object argument. Moreover, the rephrasing, together with the bijective correspondence from Remark 4.8, is also useful for understanding Examples 6.7.

Examples 6.7. In the following examples we will describe the part of the universal property of a copowered pushout that takes place in \mathcal{K}_0 . In each example we assume that $\mathcal{F} = (\square(\mathcal{J}^\square), \mathcal{J}^\square)$.

(1) In the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1\}$, a copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to u is the same as a pushout of f, g . Note that h is the empty map.


Moreover, in the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow 1\}$, a copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to v takes as input the following diagram in \mathbf{Set}



in which $h \cdot f = h' \cdot f = g$ and returns a function $c: K \rightarrow L$ such that $c \cdot h = c \cdot h'$ with the following universal property: For each function $d: K \rightarrow D$ satisfying $d \cdot h = d \cdot h'$ there exists a unique function $p: L \rightarrow D$ such that $p \cdot c = d$. Note that c is the coequalizer of h and h' .


(2) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Cat}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, w: \mathbf{2}' \rightarrow \mathbf{2}\}$.

- (a) A copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to u is the same as a pushout of f, g .
- (b) A copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to v takes as input cells in \mathcal{K} depicted in the diagram below



in which $h \cdot f = g$, $\tilde{h} \cdot f = \tilde{g}$, and returns a cocone $j, \tilde{j}: B \rightarrow L$, $\delta: j \Rightarrow \tilde{j}$, $i: K \rightarrow L$ such that $j \cdot f = i \cdot g$, $\tilde{j} \cdot f = i \cdot \tilde{g}$, $j = i \cdot h$, $\tilde{j} = i \cdot \tilde{h}$, and $\delta * f = i * \gamma$ with the following universal property: For each other such compatible cocone $r: K \rightarrow D$, $s, \tilde{s}: B \rightarrow D$, $\epsilon: s \Rightarrow \tilde{s}$ there exists a unique 1-cell $p: L \rightarrow D$ such that $p * \delta = \epsilon$ and $p \cdot i = r$.

- (c) A copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to w takes as input cells in \mathcal{K} depicted in the diagram below



in which $h \cdot f = g$, $\tilde{h} \cdot f = g$, $\tau * f = \gamma$, $\tau' * f = \gamma$, and returns a 1-cell $c: K \rightarrow L$ such that $c * \tau = c * \tau'$ with the following universal property: For any 1-cell $d: K \rightarrow D$ satisfying $d * \tau = d * \tau'$ there exists a unique 1-cell $p: L \rightarrow D$ such that $p \cdot c = d$. Note that c is the coequifier of τ and τ' .

- (3) If $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Grpd}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, w: \mathbf{2}' \rightarrow \mathbf{2}\}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{2}'$ have the same meaning as in Example 5.2.(3), then copowered pushouts are almost the same as in Example (2) with the only difference being that all the 2-cells are invertible.
- (4) In the case $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Ch}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u_n: S^{n-1} \hookrightarrow D^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, a copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to u_n takes as input an n -chain $g \in \mathcal{K}(A, K)_n$, a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{K}_0 , and an $(n-1)$ -cycle $h \in \mathcal{K}(B, K)_{n-1}$ such that $h \cdot f = \partial_n(g)$, and it returns a morphism $f': K \rightarrow L$ in \mathcal{K}_0 and an n -chain $g' \in \mathcal{K}(B, L)_n$ such that $f' \cdot h = \partial_n(g')$ and $f' \cdot g = g' \cdot f \in \mathcal{K}(A, K)_n$ with the following universal property: For each other

such compatible pair consisting of a morphism $r: K \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{K}_0 and an n -chain $s \in \mathcal{K}(B, D)_n$ there exists a unique morphism $p: L \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{K}_0 such that $p \cdot f' = r$ and $p \cdot g' = s$.

- (5) Suppose that $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{SSet}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{u_n: \partial\Delta^n \hookrightarrow \Delta^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. A copowered pushout of f, g, h relative to u_n takes as input an n -simplex $g \in \mathcal{K}(A, K)_n$, a morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{K}_0 , and $(n-1)$ -simplices $h_0, h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathcal{K}(B, K)_{n-1}$ such that $h_i \cdot f = d_i(g)$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, and it returns a morphism $f': K \rightarrow L$ in \mathcal{K}_0 and an n -simplex $g' \in \mathcal{K}(B, L)_n$ such that $f' \cdot g = g' \cdot f \in \mathcal{K}(A, K)_n$ and $f' \cdot h_i = d_i(g')$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ with the following universal property: For each other such compatible pair consisting of a morphism $r: K \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{K}_0 and an n -simplex $s \in \mathcal{K}(B, D)_n$ there exists a unique morphism $p: L \rightarrow D$ in \mathcal{K}_0 such that $p \cdot f' = r$ and $p \cdot g' = s$.

7 Enriched Small Object Argument

We will prove our small object argument in the special case when \mathcal{F} is a cofibrantly generated weak factorization system.

Definition 7.1. Suppose that λ is a regular cardinal. An object K of \mathcal{K} is said to be λ -presentable in the enriched sense [Kel82, 2.1] if the functor $\mathcal{K}(K, -): \mathcal{K}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_0$ preserves λ -directed colimits in \mathcal{K} . Moreover, an object K of \mathcal{K} is said to be presentable in the enriched sense if there exists a regular cardinal μ such that K is μ -presentable.

Theorem 7.2. Suppose that \mathcal{V} is a cosmos, \mathcal{K} is a copowered \mathcal{V} -category that has pushouts and transfinite composites, \mathcal{I} is a set of morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 , \mathcal{J} is a set of morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 , $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ is a weak factorization system on \mathcal{V}_0 that's cofibrantly generated by \mathcal{J} , and

- (i) the domains and codomains of morphisms in \mathcal{I} are presentable in the enriched sense.
- (ii) the domains and codomains of morphisms in \mathcal{J} are presentable (in the unenriched sense), and
- (iii) \mathcal{L} is stable under corners.

Then for each morphism $f: K \rightarrow L$ in \mathcal{K}_0 there exists a factorization $f = m \cdot e$ such that e and m are morphisms in \mathcal{K}_0 satisfying $e \in \square^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{I}^{\square})$ and $m \in \mathcal{I}^{\square}$.

Proof. Let λ be a regular cardinal such that the cardinality of \mathcal{J} is less than λ , the domains and codomains of morphisms in \mathcal{I} are λ -presentable in the enriched sense, and the domains and codomains of morphisms in \mathcal{J} are λ -presentable. Such a regular cardinal exists because of assumptions (i) and (ii), and the assumption that \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} are sets.

We will transfinitely define a diagram $D: \lambda \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_0$ such that $D0 = K$, the morphism $D(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1)$ is a transfinite composition of copowered pushouts of morphisms in \mathcal{I} for each ordinal $\alpha < \lambda$, and $D\alpha := \text{colim}_{\zeta < \alpha} D\zeta$ for each limit ordinal $\alpha < \lambda$. Then we will define e to be the injection $\iota_0: D0 \rightarrow \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha$. Furthermore, we are going to construct a cocone $(\varphi_\alpha: D\alpha \rightarrow L)_{\alpha < \lambda}$ in \mathcal{K}_0 , and then we can define the morphism $m: \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha \rightarrow L$ to be the induced morphism obtained from the universal property of the colimit.

Base Case: Define $D0 := K$ and $\varphi_0 := f$.

Limit Step: Suppose that α is a limit ordinal such that we've already performed the construction for all $\zeta < \alpha$. Then define $D\alpha := \text{colim}_{\zeta < \alpha} D\zeta$ and let $\varphi_\alpha: D\alpha \rightarrow L$ be the induced morphism induced by the cocone $(\varphi_\zeta: D\zeta \rightarrow L)_{\zeta < \alpha}$.

Successor Step: Suppose that $\alpha < \lambda$ is an ordinal such that we've already performed the construction for each $\zeta \leq \alpha$. Well-order the set \mathcal{J} , i.e. $\mathcal{J} = \{u_{\alpha'}: U_{\alpha'} \rightarrow V_{\alpha'} \mid \alpha' < \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}\}$, where $\alpha_{\mathcal{J}}$ is an ordinal. Let $F: \mathbf{Ord} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ord}$ be the ordinal function defined via transfinite induction as follows: $F(0) := 0$, if F is defined on γ , then

$$F(\gamma + 1) := \begin{cases} F(\gamma) + 1 & \text{if } F(\gamma) + 1 \neq \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}, \\ 0 & \text{if } F(\gamma) + 1 = \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}, \end{cases}$$

and finally if γ is a limit ordinal, then

$$F(\gamma) := \begin{cases} \sup_{\delta < \gamma} F(\delta) & \text{if } \gamma \neq \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \gamma = \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}. \end{cases}$$

Briefly, we can think of F as being defined via the modulo operator in the following way $F := - \bmod \alpha_{\mathcal{J}}$. Consider the set J_α of all triples (g, v, w) of morphisms such that $g \in \mathcal{I}$ and that make the following square commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_{F(\alpha)} & \xrightarrow{w} & \mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g, D\alpha) \\ u_{F(\alpha)} \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{g, \varphi_\alpha} \\ V_{F(\alpha)} & \xrightarrow{v} & \text{Sq}(g, \varphi_\alpha) \end{array} \quad (7)$$

Now we are going to use transfinite composition again. Well-order the set J_α , i.e. $J_\alpha = \{(g_\gamma, v_\gamma, w_\gamma) \mid \gamma < \gamma_\alpha\}$, where γ_α is an ordinal. Define $D_0(\alpha + 1) := D\alpha$ and $\varphi_{\alpha+1,0} := \varphi_\alpha$. If $\beta \leq \gamma_\alpha$ is a limit ordinal such that we've already performed the construction for all the ordinals less than β , then define $D_\beta(\alpha + 1) := \text{colim}_{\delta < \beta} D_\delta(\alpha + 1)$ and define $\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}: D_\beta(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow L$ to be the morphism that's induced by the cocone $(\varphi_{\alpha+1,\delta}: D_\delta(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow L)_{\delta < \beta}$. Finally, suppose that $\beta < \gamma_\alpha$ is an ordinal such that we've already performed the construction for all the ordinals less or equal to β . Denote by π_1, π_2 the projections in the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, D\alpha) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g_\beta, D\alpha)} & \mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, D\alpha) \\
\downarrow \mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha) & \dashrightarrow e_{g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha} \dashrightarrow \text{Sq}(g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha) \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha) \\
\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, L) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g_\beta, L)} & \mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, L)
\end{array} \quad (8)$$

Denote by $f'_{0,\beta}: D\alpha \rightarrow D_\beta(\alpha + 1)$ the morphism coming from the construction in the previous steps. Define $D_{\beta+1}(\alpha + 1)$ to be the colimit object of the following diagram in \mathcal{K} . (Recall Remark 4.8 for the meaning of $-^*$.)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & V_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi_1 \cdot v_\beta)^*} & \\
& \nearrow u_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & & \searrow V_{F(\alpha)} \odot g_\beta & \\
U_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & & & & V_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta & \xrightarrow{\quad} & D_\beta(\alpha + 1) \\
& \searrow U_{F(\alpha)} \odot g_\beta & & \nearrow u_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta & & \nearrow (\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_\beta)^* & \\
& & U_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta & & & &
\end{array} \quad (9)$$

Denote by $h'_\beta: V_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta \rightarrow D_{\beta+1}(\alpha + 1)$, $f'_{\beta,\beta+1}: D_\beta(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow D_{\beta+1}(\alpha + 1)$ the colimit injections. Furthermore, define $\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}: D_{\beta+1}(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow L$ to be the morphism induced by the following cocone.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & V_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & \xrightarrow{(\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi_1 \cdot v_\beta)^*} & \\
& \nearrow u_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & & \searrow V_{F(\alpha)} \odot g_\beta & \\
U_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{dom } g_\beta & & & & V_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta & \xrightarrow{(\pi_2 \cdot v_\beta)^*} & L & \xleftarrow{\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}} & D_\beta(\alpha + 1) \\
& \searrow U_{F(\alpha)} \odot g_\beta & & \nearrow u_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta & & \nearrow (\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_\beta)^* & & &
\end{array}$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, \varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi_1 \cdot v_\beta = \mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha) \cdot \pi_1 \cdot v_\beta \stackrel{(8)}{=} \mathcal{K}(g_\beta, L) \cdot \pi_2 \cdot v_\beta,$$

where the first equality follows from construction of $\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}$. By applying $-^*$ we obtain

$$\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta} \cdot (\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi_1 \cdot v_\beta)^* = (\pi_2 \cdot v_\beta)^* \cdot (V_{F(\alpha)} \odot g_\beta).$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, \varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_\beta = \mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha) \cdot w_\beta \stackrel{(8)}{=} \pi_2 \cdot e_{g_\beta, \varphi_\alpha} \cdot w_\beta \stackrel{(7)}{=} \pi_2 \cdot v_\beta \cdot u_{F(\alpha)},$$

and by applying $-^*$ we get

$$\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta} \cdot (\mathcal{K}(\text{cod } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_\beta)^* = (\pi_2 \cdot v_\beta)^* \cdot (u_{F(\alpha)} \odot \text{cod } g_\beta).$$

The “inner” transfinite construction is finished. Define $D(\alpha \rightarrow \alpha + 1)$ to be the transfinite composition of all the morphisms $f'_{\delta,\delta+1}$, where $\delta < \gamma_\alpha$. We also define the morphism $\varphi_{\alpha+1}: D(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow L$ to be the morphism that is induced by the cocone $(\varphi_{\alpha+1,\beta}: D_\beta(\alpha + 1) \rightarrow L)_{\beta < \gamma_\alpha}$.

Now that we’ve finished the construction let us show that $m \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{F}\square}$. Suppose that $g: X \rightarrow Y$ is in \mathcal{I} . We want to verify that $e_{g,m} \in \mathcal{J}^\square$, where $e_{g,m}$ is the induced morphism below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}(Y, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha)} & \mathcal{K}(X, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) \\ \text{---} \xrightarrow{e_{g,m}} \text{---} & \searrow \text{---} & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(X,m) \\ \mathcal{K}(Y,m) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sq}(g,m)} & \mathcal{K}(X,m) \\ \downarrow p_2 & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(X,m) \\ \mathcal{K}(Y,L) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g,L)} & \mathcal{K}(X,L) \end{array} \quad (10)$$

Suppose that we have a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_{\alpha'} & \xrightarrow{w} & \mathcal{K}(Y, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) \\ u_{\alpha'} \downarrow & & \downarrow e_{g,m} \\ V_{\alpha'} & \xrightarrow{v} & \text{Sq}(g,m) \end{array} \quad (11)$$

in which $u_{\alpha'} \in \mathcal{J}$. Since the cocone $(\mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\beta): \mathcal{K}(X, D\beta) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha))_{\beta < \lambda}$ is a λ -directed colimit (by the λ -presentability of X in the enriched sense) and $V_{\alpha'}$ is λ -presentable there exists $\xi < \lambda$ and a morphism $v'': V_{\alpha'} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(X, D\xi)$ such that

$$p_1 \cdot v = \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot v''. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, since Y is λ -presentable in the enriched sense and $U_{\alpha'}$ is λ -presentable, there exists $\xi' < \lambda$ and a morphism $w': U_{\alpha'} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(Y, D\xi')$ such that $w = \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_{\xi'}) \cdot w'$. By using $\min\{\xi, \xi'\} \rightarrow \max\{\xi, \xi'\}$ we can assume that $\xi' = \xi$, and thus

$$w = \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_\xi) \cdot w'. \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, since $\text{card } \mathcal{J} < \lambda$, there exists an ordinal ξ'' such that $\lambda > \xi'' \geq \xi$ and $F(\xi'') = \alpha'$, and thus we can assume that $F(\xi) = \alpha'$. Using the fact that $\text{Sq}(g, \varphi_\xi)$ is a pullback we get a unique morphism v' making the two triangles in the following diagram commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
V_{\alpha'} & \xrightarrow{v''} & \mathcal{K}(X, D\xi) \\
\downarrow p_2 \cdot v & \searrow v' & \downarrow \pi_1' \\
\text{Sq}(g, \varphi_\xi) & \xrightarrow{\pi_1'} & \mathcal{K}(X, D\xi) \\
\downarrow \pi_2' & & \downarrow \mathcal{K}(X, \varphi_\xi) \\
\mathcal{K}(Y, L) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{K}(g, L)} & \mathcal{K}(X, L)
\end{array} \tag{14}$$

Indeed,

$$\mathcal{K}(g, L) \cdot p_2 \cdot v \stackrel{(10)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, m) \cdot p_1 \cdot v \stackrel{(12)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, m) \cdot \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot v'' = \mathcal{K}(X, \varphi_\xi) \cdot v'',$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of m . Now we will show that the triple (g, v', w') belongs to J_ξ . Indeed, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot \pi_1' \cdot v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} &\stackrel{(14)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot v'' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(12)}{=} p_1 \cdot v \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(11)}{=} p_1 \cdot e_{g, m} \cdot w \\
&\stackrel{(10)}{=} \mathcal{K}(g, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) \cdot w \\
&\stackrel{(13)}{=} \mathcal{K}(g, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) \cdot \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_\xi) \cdot w' \\
&= \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot \mathcal{K}(g, D\xi) \cdot w' \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot \pi_1' \cdot e_{g, \varphi_\xi} \cdot w'.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists $\tilde{\xi}$ such that $\lambda > \tilde{\xi} \geq \xi$, $F(\tilde{\xi}) = \alpha'$,

$$\mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot \pi_1' \cdot v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} = \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot \pi_1' \cdot e_{g, \varphi_\xi} \cdot w', \tag{15}$$

and morphisms $v''_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot v''$, $w'_{\tilde{\xi}} = \mathcal{K}(Y, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot w'$, and $v'_{\tilde{\xi}}$ satisfying the analogues of (12), (13), and (14) for $\tilde{\xi}$, respectively. Thus we obtain the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi'_{1,\tilde{\xi}} \cdot v'_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot u_{F(\tilde{\xi})} &\stackrel{(14)}{=} v''_{\tilde{\xi}} \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&= \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot v'' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(14)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(15)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot e_{g,\varphi_{\xi}} \cdot w' \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot \mathcal{K}(g, D\xi) \cdot w' \\
&= \mathcal{K}(g, D\tilde{\xi}) \cdot \mathcal{K}(Y, D(\xi \rightarrow \tilde{\xi})) \cdot w' \\
&= \mathcal{K}(g, D\tilde{\xi}) \cdot w'_{\tilde{\xi}} \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} \pi'_{1,\tilde{\xi}} \cdot e_{g,\varphi_{\tilde{\xi}}} \cdot w'_{\tilde{\xi}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we can replace the previous ξ by $\tilde{\xi}$ (while still denoting it ξ) and we obtain $\pi'_1 \cdot v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} = \pi'_1 \cdot e_{g,\varphi_{\xi}} \cdot w'$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi'_2 \cdot v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} &\stackrel{(14)}{=} p_2 \cdot v \cdot u_{F(\xi)} \\
&\stackrel{(11)}{=} p_2 \cdot e_{g,m} \cdot w \\
&\stackrel{(10)}{=} \mathcal{K}(Y, m) \cdot w \\
&\stackrel{(13)}{=} \mathcal{K}(Y, m) \cdot \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_{\xi}) \cdot w' \\
&= \mathcal{K}(Y, \varphi_{\xi}) \cdot w' \\
&\stackrel{(6)}{=} \pi'_2 \cdot e_{g,\varphi_{\xi}} \cdot w'.
\end{aligned}$$

Since (π'_1, π'_2) is a pullback, this gives us $v' \cdot u_{F(\xi)} = e_{g,\varphi_{\xi}} \cdot w'$. Hence there exists $\beta < \gamma_{\xi}$ such that $(g, v', w') = (g_{\beta}, v_{\beta}, w_{\beta})$. Let $\iota'_{\beta+1}: D_{\beta+1}(\xi+1) \rightarrow D(\xi+1)$ denote the colimit injection. Then we get a composite

$$V_{\alpha'} \odot Y \xrightarrow{h'_{\beta}} D_{\beta+1}(\xi+1) \xrightarrow{\iota'_{\beta+1}} D(\xi+1) \xrightarrow{\iota_{\xi+1}} \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha$$

whose adjoint $(\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_{\beta})_*: V_{\alpha'} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(Y, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha)$ is the diagonal that we are looking for. Indeed, note that

$$\mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_{\xi+1}) \cdot \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota'_{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{K}(Y, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_{\beta} = \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta}) \cdot w_{\beta} = \mathcal{K}(Y, \iota_{\xi}) \cdot w_{\beta} \stackrel{(13)}{=} w.$$

Hence by applying $-^*$ we get

$$\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_{\beta} \cdot (u_{\alpha'} \odot Y) \stackrel{(9)}{=} \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot f'_{\beta,\beta+1} \cdot (\mathcal{K}(Y, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_{\beta})^* = \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta} \cdot (\mathcal{K}(Y, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot w_{\beta})^* = w^*,$$

and by applying $-_*$ we finally obtain $(\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* \cdot u_{\alpha'} = w$. Furthermore, note that

$$\mathcal{K}(X, \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta} \cdot f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta = \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_0) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta = \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta.$$

Thus by applying $-_*$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta \cdot (V_{\alpha'} \odot g) &\stackrel{(9)}{=} \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot f'_{\beta,\beta+1} \cdot (\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta)^* \\ &= \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_\beta \cdot (\mathcal{K}(\text{dom } g_\beta, f'_{0,\beta}) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta)^* \\ &= \iota_\xi \cdot (\pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta)^*, \end{aligned}$$

and by applying $-_*$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 \cdot e_{g,m} \cdot (\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* &\stackrel{(10)}{=} \mathcal{K}(g, \text{colim}_{\alpha < \lambda} D\alpha) \cdot (\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* \\ &= \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot \pi'_1 \cdot v_\beta \\ &\stackrel{(14)}{=} \mathcal{K}(X, \iota_\xi) \cdot v'' \\ &\stackrel{(12)}{=} p_1 \cdot v. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$m \cdot \iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta = \varphi_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta = \varphi_{\xi+1,\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta = (\pi'_2 \cdot v_\beta)^* \stackrel{(14)}{=} (p_2 \cdot v)^*,$$

where the penultimate equality follows from the definition of $\varphi_{\xi+1,\beta+1}$. Thus by applying $-_*$ we get

$$p_2 \cdot e_{g,m} \cdot (\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* \stackrel{(10)}{=} \mathcal{K}(Y, m) \cdot (\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* = p_2 \cdot v.$$

Since (p_1, p_2) is a pullback, we finally obtain $e_{g,m} \cdot (\iota_{\xi+1} \cdot \iota'_{\beta+1} \cdot h'_\beta)_* = v$. Thus, the proof of $m \in \mathcal{I}^{\square}$ is finished.

Finally, note that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \square^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{I}^{\square})$ and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq (\square^{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{I})^{\square}$. In fact, this holds for any binary relation and \square is a binary relation. Therefore, we conclude that $e \in \square^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{I}^{\square})$, which follows from the stability properties in the previous section and the fact that $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \square^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{I}^{\square})$. \square

Remark 7.3. From Theorem 7.2 we obtain an enriched weak \mathcal{F} -factorization system $(\square^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{I}^{\square}), \mathcal{I}^{\square})$.

Remark 7.4. By inspecting the construction in the proof of Theorem 7.2 we see that instead of assuming the existence of all pushouts in \mathcal{K} it suffices to assume that \mathcal{K} has the following special types of pushouts in order to conclude that Theorem 7.2 holds:

- (i) pushouts of the form $u \odot g$ from Definition 4.3, where $u \in \mathcal{J}$, $g \in \mathcal{I}$, and
- (ii) pushouts of morphisms of the form $\nabla(u, g)$, where $u \in \mathcal{J}$, $g \in \mathcal{I}$.

Examples 7.5. In all of the following examples (see Examples 5.2.(1)-(6) for the corresponding \mathcal{F} -lifting properties) Theorem 7.2 holds. In examples (1)-(5), \mathcal{V} is indeed a cosmos, and in example (6) it is assumed to be. In all examples we will assume that $\mathcal{F} = (\square(\mathcal{J}^\square), \mathcal{J}^\square)$.

- (1) $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Set}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1\}$. Note that \emptyset and 1 are finitely presentable as objects of \mathbf{Set} and \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than \aleph_0 . The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners follows from $\nabla(u, u) = u$ and Lemma 5.7.

If we instead choose $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow 1\}$, then all the assumptions are again satisfied, since 2 is finitely presentable in \mathbf{Set} and \mathcal{J} still has cardinality less than \aleph_0 . The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners follows from the fact that \mathcal{L} is the class of all functions, since \mathcal{R} is the class of all bijections.

- (2) $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Cat}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, w: \mathbf{2}' \rightarrow \mathbf{2}\}$. Note that $\emptyset, 1, 2, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}'$ are finitely presentable as objects of \mathbf{Cat} , \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than \aleph_0 , and \mathcal{L} is stable under corners. The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners follows from [Rez96, Theorem 5.1].

- (3) $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Grpd}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{u: \emptyset \rightarrow 1, v: 2 \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, w: \mathbf{2}' \rightarrow \mathbf{2}\}$, where $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{2}'$ have the same meaning as in Example 5.2.(3). Note that $\emptyset, 1, 2, \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2}'$ are finitely presentable as objects of \mathbf{Grpd} , \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than \aleph_0 , and \mathcal{L} is stable under corners. The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners can be shown completely analogously as in Example (2).

The small object argument for (2,1)-categories that we obtain in this way differs from the the small object argument for (2,1)-categories in [Kan21, Section 5], since the \mathcal{F} -lifting property that we are considering has a 2-dimensional aspect that's not present in the aforementioned paper. Even if we remove the previously mentioned 2-dimensional aspect by omitting v and w from \mathcal{J} , then the arguments are still different, since the one in the aforementioned paper has homotopical aspects that are not present in our argument.

- (4) $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{Ch}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{S^{n-1} \hookrightarrow D^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, S^{n-1} and D^n are finitely presentable (and hence \aleph_1 -presentable) as objects of \mathbf{Ch} , and \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than \aleph_1 . The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners follows from [Hov99, Proposition 4.2.13].

- (5) $\mathcal{V} = \mathbf{SSet}$, $\mathcal{J} = \{\partial\Delta^n \hookrightarrow \Delta^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. Note that for each $n \geq 0$, $\partial\Delta^n$ and Δ^n are finitely presentable (and hence \aleph_1 -presentable) as objects of \mathbf{SSet} , and \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than \aleph_1 . The stability of \mathcal{L} under corners follows from [Hov99, Proposition 4.2.8].

- (6) \mathcal{V}_0 is a locally λ -presentable category with a set \mathcal{V}_λ of λ -presentable objects that form a strong generator, where λ is a regular cardinal. Consider

$$\mathcal{J} = \{u_V: \emptyset \rightarrow V \mid V \in \mathcal{V}_\lambda\} \cup \{\nabla_V: V + V \rightarrow V \mid V \in \mathcal{V}_\lambda\}.$$

Let μ be a regular cardinal greater than $\max\{\lambda, |\mathcal{J}|\}$. Then all the domains and codomains of morphisms in \mathcal{J} are μ -presentable and \mathcal{J} has cardinality less than μ . The stability under corners follows from the fact that \mathcal{L} is the class of all morphisms in \mathcal{V}_0 .

References

- [AR94] Jiří Adámek and Jiří Rosický. *Locally presentable and accessible categories*, volume 189 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994. [doi:10.1017/CB09780511600579](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511600579).
- [Day70] Brian Day. On closed categories of functors. In *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar, IV*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 137, pages 1–38. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1970.
- [Day74] Brian Day. On adjoint-functor factorisation. In *Category Seminar (Proc. Sem., Sydney, 1972/1973)*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 420, pages 1–19. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1974.
- [Gar09] Richard Garner. Understanding the small object argument. *Appl. Categ. Structures*, 17(3):247–285, 2009. [doi:10.1007/s10485-008-9137-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10485-008-9137-4).
- [Hov99] Mark Hovey. *Model categories*, volume 63 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [JK01] G. Janelidze and G. M. Kelly. A note on actions of a monoidal category. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 9:61–91, 2001.
- [Kan21] Kristóf Kanalas. The (2,1)-category of small coherent categories, 2021. [arXiv:2104.13239](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.13239).
- [Kel82] G. M. Kelly. Structures defined by finite limits in the enriched context. I. *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle*, 23(1):3–42, 1982. Third Colloquium on Categories, Part VI (Amiens, 1980).
- [Kel05] G. M. Kelly. Basic concepts of enriched category theory. *Repr. Theory Appl. Categ.*, (10):vi+137, 2005. Reprint of the 1982 original [Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge; MR0651714].
- [LW14] Rory B. B. Lucyshyn-Wright. Enriched factorization systems. *Theory Appl. Categ.*, 29:No. 18, 475–495, 2014.
- [MMSS01] M. A. Mandell, J. P. May, S. Schwede, and B. Shipley. Model categories of diagram spectra. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 82(2):441–512, 2001. [doi:10.1112/S0024611501012692](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0024611501012692).

- [MU22] Dylan McDermott and Tarmo Uustalu. Flexibly graded monads and graded algebras. In *Mathematics of program construction*, volume 13544 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 102–128. Springer, Cham, [2022] ©2022. [doi:10.1007/978-3-031-16912-0_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16912-0_4).
- [Qui67] Daniel G. Quillen. *Homotopical algebra*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 43. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1967.
- [Rez96] Charles Rezk. A model category for categories, 1996. https://ncatlab.org/nlab/files/Rezk_ModelCategoryForCategories.pdf. Accessed: 11-16-2023.
- [Rie14] Emily Riehl. *Categorical homotopy theory*, volume 24 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014. [doi:10.1017/CB09781107261457](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09781107261457).
- [RT07] Jiří Rosický and Walter Tholen. Factorization, fibration and torsion. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.*, 2(2):295–314, 2007.
- [Woo76] Richard James Wood. Indical methods for relative categories. Ph.D. thesis. Dalhousie University, 1976. <https://dalspace.library.dal.ca//handle/10222/55465>.

JAN JURKA
 Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
 Masaryk University,
 Kotlářská 2, 611 37 Brno,
 Czech Republic
Email address: jurka@math.muni.cz