

A Type-Theoretic Definition of Lax (∞, ∞) -Limits

Thomas Jan Mikhail

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*

Abstract

We introduce and study a purely syntactic notion of lax cones and (∞, ∞) -limits on finite computads in \mathbf{CaTT} , a type theory for (∞, ∞) -categories due to Finster and Mimram. Conveniently, finite computads are precisely the contexts in \mathbf{CaTT} . We define a cone over a context to be a context, which is obtained by induction over the list of variables of the underlying context. In the case where the underlying context is globular we give an explicit description of the cone and conjecture that an analogous description continues to hold also for general contexts. We use the cone to control the types of the term constructors for the universal cone. The implementation of the universal property follows a similar line of ideas. Starting with a cone as a context, a set of context extension rules produce a context with the shape of a transfer between cones, i.e. a higher morphism between cones. As in the case of cones, we use this context as a template to control the types of the term constructor required for universal property.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	A Brief Introduction to \mathbf{CaTT}	6
2.1	The Rules	7
2.2	Operations and Identities	11
3	The Universal Cone	13
3.1	Cones as Context	15
3.2	Existence of Cones	16
3.3	The Universal Cone	21
4	The Universal Property	23
4.1	Gray Operations	23
4.2	Higher Transfers between Cones	26
4.3	Composing with Cones	27
4.4	Composing with Cones and the Universal Property	28

*Email: thomasjan.mikhail@uab.cat

4.5	The Universal Property	32
4.6	Free Variables and Admissibility of Cut	33

5 (∞, n) -Categories 35

1 Introduction

With the advent of higher category theory, the 21st century is casting new light on abstract homotopy theory. By now the theory of $(\infty, 1)$ -categories has matured into a full fledged theory thanks to the pioneering work of André Joyal and Jacob Lurie among others, providing us with a language native to ∞ -groupoids.

Working with $(\infty, 1)$ -categories one quickly runs into $(\infty, 2)$ -categories, with the prototypical example of $(\infty, 2)$ -category being that of all $(\infty, 1)$ -categories. On the other hand, (∞, n) -categories appear naturally in the study of bordisms motivating the necessity for (∞, n) -categories for arbitrary n . With these considerations in mind it thus becomes natural to consider the most general such structures namely (∞, ∞) -categories in which the existence of non-invertible morphisms is permitted in every dimension.

A number of different proposals for models for higher categories have been made. Approaches include Rezk’s complete Segal Θ_n -spaces [14] and Barwick’s n -fold complete Segal spaces [2], as well as Verity’s n -complicial sets (see Barwick–Schommer-Pries [3] for a more extensive list and again Barwick–Schommer-Pries [3] and Loubaton [12] for the equivalence of the aforementioned examples). While non-algebraic models such as those mentioned have been the most successful so far, it is an important challenge to provide also a purely algebraic notion, as envisioned by Grothendieck. As an algebraic system, one may ask for a type-theoretic approach, which is the path taken in this work.

In his manuscript Pursuing Stacks, Grothendieck himself already spelled out an algebraic definition of ∞ -groupoids in terms of globular sets (see Maltsiniotis [13]). This was then taken up by Maltsiniotis, who generalized this definition to (∞, ∞) -categories [13]. Brunerie [8] developed a type-theoretic version of the definition of ∞ -groupoids with the aim of showing that the types in Homotopy Type Theory possess this structure. Building upon this and filling in the remaining slot, Finster and Mimram constructed a type-theoretic definition of (∞, ∞) -categories called **CaTT** [11], and together with Benjamin proved that its models are precisely the Grothendieck–Maltsiniotis (∞, ∞) -categories [4].

With the definition in place, it is now our task to develop theory for it. One of the most basic categorical construction is that of limits. In higher dimensional categories there is an increased level of complexity, as the higher-dimensional cells comprising cones may be noninvertible. In 2-dimensional categories, for example, we may consider lax or oplax limits, depending on the orientation of the 2-cells involved, or pseudo limits if the 2-cells are invertible. Many fundamental concepts in 2-category theory arise as lax (co)limits. The Grothendieck construction corresponding to a pseudofunctor, for example, can be described as the oplax colimit of the given pseudofunctor. Furthermore, given a monad as a lax functor $1 \rightarrow \text{Cat}$, the Eilenberg–Moore category and the Kleisli category are computed by the lax limit and lax colimit of the lax functor respectively.

The same ideas are expected to continue to hold as we increase the dimension of categories all the way up to (∞, ∞) -categories. The Grothendieck construction, for example, is again computed by the lax colimit in the setting of (∞, ∞) -categories, which motivates the study of lax limits in the setting of (∞, ∞) -categories (see Loubaton [12] for a definition of lax (co)limits and the Grothendieck construction for (∞, ∞) -categories in the setting of complicial sets). In this paper we propose a definition for lax (∞, ∞) -limits in the type theory **CaTT** of Finster and Mimram [11].

CaTT is a dependent type theory with two type constructors. The first, functioning as the base case, introduces the type **Ob** which one may think of as the type of objects. The second one takes two terms $s, t : A$ as input and produces the type $s \rightarrow_A t$ which is understood as the type of morphisms from $s \rightarrow_A t$. Starting with the terms of **Ob** and applying the second type constructor iteratively, one can access the type of all higher dimensional morphisms. In addition to the type constructors, **CaTT** also contains two term constructors. The first term constructor is responsible for the existence of all (∞, ∞) -categorical operations. These include all binary operations. We denote the binary operation of two d -dimensional cells α, β along a k -dimensional cell by $\alpha \underset{k}{*} \beta$. For example, horizontal composition of two 2-dimensional cells α, β is denoted by $\alpha \underset{0}{*} \beta$. The second term constructor is responsible for all coherences, interpolating between the different ways of composing cells. These include the unit, the associator, the unit laws and so on. Given a term $t : A$, the unit of that term is denoted by $1_t : t \rightarrow t$. Inductively we obtain the terms $1_t^{n+1} : 1_t^n \rightarrow 1_t^n$, where we have defined $1_t^1 \equiv 1_t$.

In **CaTT**, diagrams can conveniently be encoded by contexts and we will use these words interchangeably. A context is a list of variables $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n$, such that the type A_i can be constructed using the variables of $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_{i-1} : A_{i-1}$. Contexts are finite computads, thanks to a result by Benjamin, Markakis and Sarti [7]. This limitation is brought upon us by the finiteness of type theory's contexts. It may be possible to translate and extend these ideas to other frameworks, such as that of Dean, Finster, Markakis, Reutter and Vicary [10], in which one is liberated from this restriction.

We define the cone over a context Γ to be another context K . As a low dimensional example, consider the cone over $\Gamma \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y$, given by

$$\begin{array}{c}
 c \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \searrow p_x & & \\
 & \Rightarrow p_f & \\
 \swarrow p_y & & \downarrow f \\
 & x & \\
 & \downarrow & \\
 & y &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \quad
 K \equiv \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, p_x : c \rightarrow x, p_y : c \rightarrow y, p_f : p_y \rightarrow p_x \underset{0}{*} f$$

The definition of cones is based on the observation that the types of the projections exhibit a certain pattern. Take, for example, the variable $f : x \rightarrow y$. First of all, the source of p_f is built out of the projections associated to the target of f , namely p_y . Second, the target of p_f is built out of the projections associated to the source of f , namely p_x as well as f itself. Finally, the variable f appears in a certain linear way. We collect all these properties into a set of conditions and use these to spell out the following definition.

Definition 1.1 (Cones). *The derivable judgments $K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c)$ are generated by the*

rules

$$\begin{array}{c}
\hline
c : \mathbf{Ob} \quad \mathbf{cone} \quad (\emptyset, c) \\
\hline
\frac{\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi \quad \mathbf{cone} \quad (\Gamma, c) \quad \Gamma, x : X, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi \vdash s \rightarrow_A t}{\Gamma, x : X, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi, p_x : s \rightarrow_A t \quad \mathbf{cone} \quad ((\Gamma, x : X), c)} \quad (+ \text{ side conditions})
\end{array}$$

If $K \mathbf{cone} (\Gamma, c)$ is derivable we say that K is a cone over Γ with apex c .

The rules exploit the inductive definition of contexts. For the empty context the cone is simply an apex. This is the first rule. In the second rule we begin with a cone K over a diagram Γ as well as a context extension $\Gamma, x : X$. The side conditions ensure that the type $s \rightarrow_A t$ is of the appropriate form so as to be the type of a projection corresponding to the appended variable $x : X$. Given this, the rule extends the original cone over Γ to a cone over $\Gamma, x : X$.


The definition of the cone involves a choice of orientation for the higher cells. The orientation chosen has the benefit of exhibiting a certain uniformity. All other choices can be obtained by making suitable adjustments to the rules. In addition to that, reversing the orientation of all 1-dimensional cells turns the definition into one for colimits.

If Γ is a globular diagram, meaning that all terms involved are variables, we show that there exists a context K such that K is the cone over Γ . In particular we construct a cone over a globular diagram Γ with an explicit description of the type of the projection of a variable $(x : A) \in \Gamma$:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
c \rightarrow x, & \text{if } \dim(x) = 0 \\
p_{\tau(x)} \rightarrow p_{\sigma(x)} \underset{d-1}{\overset{d}{*}} \left(\underset{d-2}{\overset{d}{*}} \left(\underset{0}{\overset{d}{*}} x \right) \right), & \text{if } \dim(x) > 0.
\end{array} \tag{1}$$

where $d = \dim(x)$. We then examine two classes of examples of two dimensional non-globular diagrams, the first one containing sequences of composable 1-dimensional morphisms and the second a sequence of composable 2-dimensional morphisms. Considering both examples in the strict case we show that there exists a cone with a similar description to that in the globular case. The argument relies on the fact that, given a term in the diagram $t : A$, the projections associated to the free variables of t may be composed in a way to obtain a certain term p_t the type of which is described by a formula analogous to equation 1. Restricting ourselves to the strict case does not spoil the argument, as the coherences are absorbed by the terms p_t . Motivated by these examples we conjecture the existence of such terms for all $t : A$ in a diagram. Using these we construct a cone with an explicit description for arbitrary diagrams.

Given a cone K over a diagram Γ , we can build the universal cone with the help of term-constructor rules, which produce a term for the apex and for each projection. As a collection these terms organize themselves into a context morphism $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone} : K$. Diagrammatically we may depict this as



Implementing the universal property amounts to asking the functor of (∞, ∞) -categories given by postcomposition with the universal cone, schematically depicted by

$$\mathbf{cone}_* : \{\text{terms of } c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma\} \longrightarrow \{\text{cones over } \Gamma \text{ with apex } c\} \quad (2)$$

to an equivalence. Here, the domain is the (∞, ∞) -category of terms of the type $c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma$ and the codomain is given by the (∞, ∞) -category of cones over Γ with apex c . We refer to the n -dimensional cells of the codomain as $(n+1)$ -transforms.¹ We define an equivalence of (∞, ∞) -categories to be a functor which is (essentially) surjective on all higher hom- (∞, ∞) -categories. To ensure that the functor in equation 2 is an equivalence we first spell out a set of rules which, in a manner similar to those generating cones, produce out of a given context a new context of the shape of a higher transform between cones on that context. As in the case of the universal cone, we use this context as a template, to control the types of the terms we need to build with term constructor rules. In its first application, given a arbitrary cone over a given diagram, our constructions will produce a cone morphism (i.e. a modification) from the given cone to the universal cone.

Outline of paper: We begin in Section 2 with a short recap of the rules making up the type theory **CaTT**. In Subsection 2.2 we take the time to make explicit how the standard binary operations and identities are extracted from the general rules.

In Section 3 we discuss all the constructions related to the universal cone. After motivating the definition we introduce the rule generating the cone over a given diagram in Subsection 3.1. In Subsection 3.2 we discuss the existence of cones over globular as well as arbitrary contexts. Subsection 3.3 introduces the rules for the universal cone.

Section 4 contains all constructions related to the universal property. As a warm-up we begin in Subsection 4.1 with a set of rules which, given an arbitrary diagram Γ generate contexts which have the shape of the Gray tensor product of Γ with the interval. In fact the same rules also produce Gray tensor products with the n -globe for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^>$. We give an existence proof for the case $n = 1$. In Subsection 4.2 we then give a slight modification of the previous rules so as to give higher transforms between cones. The last ingredient we need is the ability to postcompose with a cone, as in equation 2. This is the subject of Subsections 4.3 and 4.4. Finally, putting everything together we give in Subsection 4.5 a rule which generates all the required terms for the universal cone to satisfy the universal property. Subsection 4.6 covers some technical loose ends, ensuring that the new rules do not interfere with those of **CaTT** and that the new rules do not spoil the admissibility of the cut rule.

¹More generally, an n -dimensional cell in a functor category is called an n -transform, this terminology being coined by Crans [9].

We conclude with Section 5, in which we briefly remark on (∞, n) -categories and in particular the case of $(\infty, 1)$ -categories.

Acknowledgments: I am deeply indebted to Joachim Kock for his constant support and guidance. My gratitude extends also to Michael Shulman who first suggested looking into **CaTT** and the conversations with whom have been a major boost to my project. Many more have given me their time and feedback as I was developing the ideas for this project. These include Thibaut Benjamin, Simon Henry, Felix Loubaton, Samuel Mimram and Chaitanya Leena Subramaniam. Benjamin in particular has made a number of helpful suggestions. This work has been funded by the grant FI-DGR 2020 of the Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca of Catalunya, Spain. I also acknowledge support from grant PID2020-116481GB-I00 (AEI/FEDER, UE) of Spain, grant 10.46540/3103-00099B from the Independent Research Fund Denmark, and the Danish National Research Foundation through the Copenhagen Centre for Geometry and Topology (DNRF151)

2 A Brief Introduction to CaTT

The type theory **CaTT**, developed by Mimram and Finster [11] describes a single (∞, ∞) -category. Its models are precisely the (∞, ∞) -categories in the sense of Grothendieck and Maltsev, as shown by Benjamin, Finster and Mimram [4]. The type theory **CaTT** has two type constructors

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Ob}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t}$$

Here \mathbf{Ob} is the type of all objects, while $s \rightarrow_A t$ may be thought of as a directed hom-type, containing all morphisms from s to t . Starting with \mathbf{Ob} , the second rule allows us to iteratively build all higher hom-types. To reduce clutter we will often omit the subscript A in $s \rightarrow_A t$.

In a (weak) higher category there are two types of cells one needs to produce as part of the axioms, the operations and the coherences. Operations are non-invertible and include precisely all the compositions while the coherences are invertible and include cells such as the units, the associators and the interchange laws. As an example, consider the horizontal composition of two 2-dimensional cells (left) and the associator (right):

(3)

The collection of solid arrows form the pasting diagram. These are the diagrams which may be composed via the operations. The remaining arrows, stylized with a dashed body, are built using the data of the underlying pasting diagram. In each case we are ultimately

constructing a 2-dimensional cell $s \rightarrow t$. In the case of the horizontal composition $\text{op} : f_1 \cdot f_2 \rightarrow g_1 \cdot g_2$, the source only makes use of variables f_1 and f_2 which define a sub-pasting-diagram called the source and denoted by $\partial^-\Gamma$. Similarly, the target of op only makes use of g_1 and g_2 which define a sub-pasting-diagram called the target diagram and denoted by $\partial^+\Gamma$. In the case of the associator $\text{coh} : (f \cdot g) \cdot h \rightarrow f \cdot (g \cdot h)$, both the source and the target make use of the whole diagram defined by f, g and h . These observations are the defining features of operations and coherences respectively.

In the type theory **CaTT** the underlying pasting diagram is encoded as a context Γ . A judgment of the form $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}$ asserts that Γ as a diagram has the shape of a pasting diagram. **CaTT** contains two rules (OP) and (COH), producing the operations and coherences respectively. Each of these two rules is accompanied by a side condition referencing the free variables of the terms involved, which expresses precisely the intuition explained in the previous paragraph. The rules read

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t}{\Gamma \vdash \text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t} : s \rightarrow_A t} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{FV}(s : A) = \text{FV}(\partial^-\Gamma) \\ \text{FV}(t : A) = \text{FV}(\partial^+\Gamma) \end{array}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t}{\Gamma \vdash \text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t} : s \rightarrow_A t} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{FV}(s : A) = \text{FV}(\Gamma) \\ \text{FV}(t : A) = \text{FV}(\Gamma) \end{array}$$

It is now just a matter of building in a cut into the rules to make the cut rule admissible. Intuitively we may think of this as allowing us to compose arbitrary terms, not just the variables of the given pasting diagram. In the next section we will give the full list of all rules with all the required details.

2.1 The Rules

Definition 2.1 (CaTT Rules). *CaTT is defined by the rules:*

Rules for types:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{0b}} \text{ (0b)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t} \text{ (}\rightarrow\text{)}$$

Rules for terms:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \quad (x : A) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : A} \text{ (VAR)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \partial^-\Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \partial^+\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]} \text{ (OP)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{FV}(\partial^-\Gamma) = \text{FV}(s : A) \\ \text{FV}(\partial^+\Gamma) = \text{FV}(t : A) \end{array}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]} \text{ (COH)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{FV}(\Gamma) = \text{FV}(t : A) \\ \text{FV}(\Gamma) = \text{FV}(s : A) \end{array}$$

Rules for contexts:

$$\frac{}{\emptyset \vdash} \text{ (EC)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash} \text{ (CE)}$$

Rules for substitutions:

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash}{\Delta \vdash \langle \rangle : \emptyset} \text{ (ES)} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash \quad \Delta \vdash t : A[\gamma]}{\Delta \vdash \langle \gamma, t \rangle : (\Gamma, x : A)} \text{ (SE)}$$

Rules for ps-contexts:

$$\frac{}{x : \mathbf{0b} \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : \mathbf{0b}} \text{ (PSS)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : A}{\Gamma, y : A, f : x \rightarrow_A y \vdash_{\text{ps}} f : x \rightarrow_A y} \text{ (PSE)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} f : x \rightarrow_A y}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} y : A} \text{ (PSD)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : \mathbf{0b}}{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}} \text{ (PS)}$$

Given a context morphism $\Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma$ and a variable $x \in \text{FV}(\Gamma)$ we may denote by γ_x the term in γ corresponding to x .

To make sense of the rules we need to define the free variables on all the constructors, substitution on the constructors, the dimension of contexts and finally the source and the target of a ps-context.

Definition 2.2 (Free Variables). *The set of free variables are inductively defined as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(\mathbf{0b}) &:= \emptyset & \text{FV}(\emptyset) &:= \emptyset \\ \text{FV}(s \rightarrow_A t) &:= \text{FV}(s) \cup \text{FV}(t) \cup \text{FV}(A) & \text{FV}(\Gamma, x : A) &:= \text{FV}(\Gamma) \cup \{x\} \\ \text{FV}(x) &:= \{x\} & \text{FV}(\langle \rangle) &:= \emptyset \\ \text{FV}(\text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(\gamma) & \text{FV}(\langle \gamma, t \rangle) &:= \text{FV}(\gamma) \cup \text{FV}(t) \\ \text{FV}(\text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

As a shorthand we also write $\text{FV}(t : A) = \text{FV}(t) \cup \text{FV}(A)$ for a term t of type A . Moreover, if a context Γ is of the form Γ', Γ'' , then we define $\text{FV}(\Gamma'') = \text{FV}(\Gamma) \setminus \text{FV}(\Gamma')$. The cardinality of $\text{FV}(\Gamma'')$ will be denoted by $|\Gamma''|$.

For technical reasons it is convenient to make substitution an admissible rule rather than an explicit one. This requires defining substitution on the constructors and building in just enough substitution into the term constructors.

Definition 2.3 (Substitution). *For the operation of substitution, we define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Ob}[\gamma] &::= \mathbf{Ob} & \langle \rangle \circ \gamma &::= \langle \rangle \\ (s \xrightarrow{A} t)[\gamma] &::= s[\gamma] \xrightarrow{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma] & \langle \theta, t \rangle \circ \gamma &::= \langle \theta \circ \gamma, t[\gamma] \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_i[\gamma] &::= \gamma_i \\ \mathbf{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma][\delta] &::= \mathbf{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma \circ \delta] \\ \mathbf{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma][\delta] &::= \mathbf{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma \circ \delta] \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if $(x_i : A_i) \in \Gamma$ and $\Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma$, then we define $A_i[\gamma] ::= A_i[\gamma^{i-1}]$.

The rules also rely on the definition of the source and target of a ps-context. This definition makes use of the dimension of contexts which we define first.

Definition 2.4 (Dimension). *The dimension of a type is defined inductively by:*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\mathbf{Ob}) &::= 0 \\ \dim(s \rightarrow_A t) &::= \dim(A) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, given a context $\Gamma ::= (x_i : A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ we define $\dim(\Gamma) ::= \max_i \{\dim(A_i)\}$ and given a term $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ we define $\dim(t) ::= \dim(A)$.

Given a term $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ with $\dim(t) > 0$, then A is necessarily the result of an application of $(\rightarrow \mathcal{I})$, and we write $A ::= \sigma(t) \rightarrow_{\partial A} \tau(t)$.

Definition 2.5 (Context Source and Target). *Let $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}}$ be a ps-context and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number. We define k -source by $\partial_k^-(x : \mathbf{Ob}) ::= x : \mathbf{Ob}$ and*

$$\partial_k^-(\Gamma, y : A, f : x \rightarrow y) ::= \begin{cases} \partial_k^-(\Gamma) & \text{if } k \leq \dim(A) \\ \partial_k^-(\Gamma), y : A, f : x \rightarrow y & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

and the k -th target by $\partial_k^+(x : \mathbf{Ob}) ::= x : \mathbf{Ob}$ and

$$\partial_k^+(\Gamma, y : A, f : x \rightarrow y) ::= \begin{cases} \partial_k^+(\Gamma) & \text{if } k < \dim(A) \\ \text{drop}(\partial_k^+(\Gamma)), y : A & \text{if } k = \dim(A) \\ \partial_k^+(\Gamma), y : A, f : x \rightarrow y & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Here $\text{drop}(\Gamma)$ is given by Γ with the last element removed. If $\dim(\Gamma) > 0$, then the source and target of Γ are defined to be $\partial^- \Gamma ::= \partial_{\dim(\Gamma)-1}^- \Gamma$ and $\partial^+ \Gamma ::= \partial_{\dim(\Gamma)-1}^+ \Gamma$.

If we forget the rules (OP) and (COH) along with all the required rules (such as those for the ps-contexts and their boundaries), we are left with a type theory called **GSet**, which has been studied by Benjamin, Finster and Mimram in [4]. The models of this type theory are precisely globular sets. A term, type or context in **CaTT** is said to be globular, if it is derivable in the subtype theory **GSet**. This amounts to saying that all of the terms appearing in its construction are variables. Similarly a term, type or context is said to be categorical if it is constructed purely using the rules of **CaTT**.

Lemma 2.6. *The following two statements hold in CaTT*

(i) *Given a judgment $\Gamma \vdash A$ we have*

$$x_i \in \text{FV}(A) \implies \dim(A_i) < \dim(A)$$

(ii) *Given a judgment $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ we have*

$$x_i \in \text{FV}(t) \implies \dim(x_i) \leq \dim(t)$$

Proof. We prove all three statements simultaneously. The proof is obtained by performing a mutual induction on the rules for types and terms. We start with the rules for producing types.

(Ob) Consider the type $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{Ob}$. Since $\text{FV}(\mathbf{Ob}) = \emptyset$ there is nothing to check and the statement is vacuously true.

(\rightarrow) Consider the type $\Gamma \vdash s \xrightarrow{A} t$. By definition $\text{FV}(s \xrightarrow{A} t) = \text{FV}(s) \cup \text{FV}(t) \cup \text{FV}(A)$. So let $x_i \in \text{FV}(s \xrightarrow{A} t)$. If $x_i \in \text{FV}(s)$ or $x_i \in \text{FV}(t)$, then by the inductive hypothesis $\dim(x_i) \leq \dim(s)$ or $\dim(x_i) \leq \dim(t)$. Thus $\dim(A_i) = \dim(x_i) < \dim(s \xrightarrow{A} t)$. Otherwise, if $x_i \in \text{FV}(A)$ then $\dim(A_i) < \dim(A)$ by the inductive hypothesis and $\dim(A_i) < \dim(A) < \dim(s \xrightarrow{A} t)$.

Next we go through the rules for terms.

(VAR) Consider the term $\Gamma \vdash x : A$ where $(x : A) \in \text{FV}(\Gamma)$. By definition $\text{FV}(x) = \{x\}$. So $x_i \in \text{FV}(x)$ implies that $A_i \equiv A$ and $x_i \equiv x : A$ by which we trivially have $\dim(A_i) \leq \dim(A)$ or $\dim(x_i) \leq \dim(x)$.

(OP) Consider the term $\Delta \vdash \text{op}_{\Gamma, t \xrightarrow{A} s}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \xrightarrow{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]$. First of all, $\dim(\partial^- \Gamma) \leq \dim(A)$. This follows from $\text{FV}(\partial^- \Gamma) = \text{FV}(s : A)$ and an application of the inductive hypothesis.

Now let $y_j \in \text{FV}(\text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma]) = \text{FV}(\gamma)$. By the definition of $\text{FV}(\gamma)$ this means $y_j \in \text{FV}(\gamma_i)$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Putting everything together we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(y_j) &\stackrel{\text{i.h.}}{\leq} \dim(\gamma_i) = \dim(x_i) \leq \dim(\Gamma) = \dim(\partial^- \Gamma) + 1 \leq \dim(A) + 1 \\ &= \dim(s \xrightarrow{A} t) = \dim(s[\gamma] \xrightarrow{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]) = \dim(\text{op}_{\Gamma, s \xrightarrow{A} t}[\gamma]). \end{aligned}$$

(COH) Consider the term $\Delta \vdash \text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \xrightarrow{A} t}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \xrightarrow{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]$. Let $y_j \in \text{FV}(\text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma])$. Then, since by definition $\text{FV}(\text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow t}[\gamma]) = \text{FV}(\gamma)$, there exists an $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $y_j \in \text{FV}(\gamma_i)$. So by the inductive hypothesis for terms we already know that $\dim(y_j) \leq \dim(\gamma_i) = \dim(x_i)$. Consider now the corresponding variable $x_i \in \text{FV}(\Gamma)$. Since, $\text{FV}(\Gamma) = \text{FV}(s \rightarrow t)$, it follows that $x_i \in \text{FV}(s \rightarrow t)$ so that $\dim(A_i) < \dim(s \rightarrow t)$ by the inductive hypothesis. Putting everything together we have

$$\dim(y_j) \leq \dim(x_i) = \dim(A_i) < \dim(s \xrightarrow{A} t) = \dim(s[\gamma] \xrightarrow{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]) = \dim(\text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \xrightarrow{A} t}[\gamma]).$$

We see that in this case we even get a strict inequality, as one may have expected intuitively. \square

2.2 Operations and Identities

In a higher category, there are various ways of composing higher dimensional cells. Here we make explicit the d canonical binary compositions with which d -dimensional cells may be composed. The i -th binary composition is defined by having an $(i - 1)$ -dimensional locus of composition.

For 2-dimensional cells we have vertical and horizontal composition. The relevant diagram for vertical composition is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & f & \\ & \downarrow \alpha & \\ x & \xrightarrow{g} & y \\ & \downarrow \beta & \\ & h & \end{array}$$

As a ps-context it can be obtained by the derivation tree

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{x : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : \mathbf{Ob}}{\text{(PSS)}}}{x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y \vdash_{\text{ps}} f : x \rightarrow y}{\text{(PSE)}}}{x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \vdash_{\text{ps}} \alpha : f \rightarrow g}{\text{(PSE)}}}{x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \vdash_{\text{ps}} g : x \rightarrow y}{\text{(PSD)}}}{x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g, h : x \rightarrow y, \beta : g \rightarrow h \vdash_{\text{ps}} \beta : g \rightarrow h}{\text{(PSE)}}$$

and we define the context in the last judgment to be $O_1^2(\alpha, \beta)$, that is we set

$$O_1^2(\alpha, \beta) := x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g, h : x \rightarrow y, \beta : g \rightarrow h.$$

The source and boundary ps-contexts are given by

$$\partial^- O_1^2(\alpha, \beta) \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y \equiv: D^1(f)$$

$$\partial^+ O_1^2(\alpha, \beta) \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, h : x \rightarrow y \equiv: D^1(h).$$

With these we may apply the (OP) rule and obtain the vertical composition

$$\frac{O_1^2(\alpha, \beta) \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad D^1(f) \vdash f : x \rightarrow z \quad D^1(h) \vdash h : x \rightarrow z \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : O_1^2(\alpha, \beta)}{\Delta \vdash \gamma_{\alpha} \stackrel{2}{\ast} \gamma_{\beta} : \gamma_f \rightarrow \gamma_h} \text{(OP)}$$

where we have defined $\gamma_{\alpha} \stackrel{2}{\ast} \gamma_{\beta} := \text{op}_{O_1^2(\alpha, \beta)}[\gamma]$. In particular we get the composite $\alpha \stackrel{2}{\ast} \beta : f \rightarrow h$ using the identity context morphism.

Similarly we can build horizontal composition by considering the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & f & & g & \\ & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & \\ x & \xrightarrow{\quad} & y & \xrightarrow{\quad} & z \\ & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & \\ & f' & & g' & \end{array}$$

As a ps-context it is given by

$$O_0^2(\alpha, \beta) := x : \mathbf{0b}, y : \mathbf{0b}, f : x \rightarrow y, f' : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow f', \\ z : \mathbf{0b}, g : y \rightarrow z, g' : y \rightarrow z, \beta : g \rightarrow g'$$

in which we may construct the horizontal composite $\alpha \overset{2}{\ast}_0 \beta : f \overset{1}{\ast}_0 g \rightarrow f' \overset{1}{\ast}_0 g'$, where $\overset{1}{\ast}_0$ denotes the composition of 1-cells.

We now construct all binary composites more systematically. The d -dimensional globe as a context can be defined using the rules for ps-context. First of all, by (PSS) we have $x : \mathbf{0b} \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : \mathbf{0b}$ and we define $D^0(x : \mathbf{0b}) := x : \mathbf{0b}$. By construction, the judgment $D^0(x : \mathbf{0b}) \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : \mathbf{0b}$ is derivable and $\dim(x) = 0$. Applying inductively the rule (PSE) we get

$$\frac{D^d(x : A) \vdash_{\text{ps}} x : A}{D^d(x : A), y : A, f : x \rightarrow_A y \vdash_{\text{ps}} f : x \rightarrow_A y}$$

and we define $D^{d+1}(f : x \rightarrow y) := D^d(x : A), y : A, f : x \rightarrow_A y$. Given a d -dimensional globe $D^d(x : A)$, by an inductive argument one can show that $\dim(x) = d$ as well as $\text{FV}(D^d(x : A)) = \text{FV}(x : A)$. Often we will suppress the type and simply write $D^d(x)$ instead of $D^d(x : A)$.

Next we define a collection of ps-contexts, the gluings of which will give us the binary compositions. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be some natural number. Applying (PSD) and then (PSE) again to $D^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y) \vdash_{\text{ps}} f : x \rightarrow_A y$ we get a context

$$\overbrace{O_n^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y, g : y \rightarrow_A z) := D^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y), z : A, g : y \rightarrow z \vdash_{\text{ps}} g : y \rightarrow_A z}$$

Again for brevity we may also write $O_n^{n+1}(f, g)$. These contexts will allow us to define sequential composition (or vertical composition in the 2-dimensional case). As a sequence of rules this judgment is represented by (PSS)(PSE) $^{d+1}$ (PSD)(PSE).

For the contexts of the remaining compositions we take the ps-context which as a sequence of rules is given by (PSS)(PSE) d (PSD) $^{d-n}$ (PSE) $^{d-n}$. The judgment obtained is of the form

$$\overbrace{O_n^d(\alpha : X, \beta : Y) := D^d(\alpha : X), \Delta, \beta : Y \vdash_{\text{ps}} \beta : Y}$$

where $d > n$, Δ is a string of variables containing the target of β and variables thereof.

Now, a calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^- O_n^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y, g : y \rightarrow_A z) &\equiv D^n(x : A) \\ \partial^+ O_n^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y, g : y \rightarrow_A z) &\equiv D^n(z : A) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^- O_n^{d+1}(\phi : \alpha \rightarrow_X \alpha', \psi : \beta \rightarrow_Y \beta') &\equiv O_n^d(\alpha : X, \beta : Y) \\ \partial^+ O_n^{d+1}(\phi : \alpha \rightarrow_X \alpha', \psi : \beta \rightarrow_Y \beta') &\equiv O_n^d(\alpha' : X, \beta' : Y) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We use these ps-context to construct all binary operations $\overset{d}{*}$. By equation (4) and with the abbreviation $O_n^{n+1}(f, g)$ for $O_n^{n+1}(f : x \rightarrow_A y, g : y \rightarrow_A z)$ we have

$$\frac{O_n^{n+1}(f, g) \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad D^n(x : A) \vdash x : A \quad D^n(z : A) \vdash z : A \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : O_n^{n+1}(f, g)}{\Delta \vdash \gamma_f \overset{n+1}{*}_n \gamma_g : \gamma_x \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} \gamma_z} \text{ (OP)}$$

where we have defined $\gamma_f \overset{n+1}{*}_n \gamma_g := \text{op}_{O_n^{n+1}(f, g)}[\gamma]$.

The remaining binary compositions are built by induction. To start consider the ps-context $O_n^{d+1}(\phi : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha', \psi : \beta \rightarrow \beta')$. By the inductive hypothesis, the terms $O_n^d(\alpha, \beta) \vdash \alpha \overset{d}{*}_n \beta : T$ and $O_n^d(\alpha', \beta') \vdash \alpha' \overset{d}{*}_n \beta' : T$ are derivable and parallel. This allows us to apply the (OP) rule in the following way:

$$\frac{O_n^{d+1}(\phi, \psi) \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad O_n^d(\alpha, \beta) \vdash \alpha \overset{d}{*}_n \beta : T \quad O_n^d(\alpha', \beta') \vdash \alpha' \overset{d}{*}_n \beta' : T \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : O_n^{d+1}(\phi, \psi)}{\Delta \vdash \phi \overset{d+1}{*}_n \psi : \alpha \overset{d}{*}_n \beta \rightarrow \alpha' \overset{d}{*}_n \beta'} \text{ (OP)}$$

where we have used equation (5) and where we have defined $\phi \overset{d+1}{*}_n \psi \equiv \text{op}_{O_n^{d+1}(\phi, \psi)}[\gamma]$.

A context morphisms $\Delta \vdash \gamma : O_n^d(\phi, \psi)$ contains the same information as two d -dimensional terms $\Delta \vdash u : s \rightarrow t$ and $\Delta \vdash v : s' \rightarrow t'$ such that $\text{cod}^{d-n}(u) \equiv \text{dom}^{d-n}(v)$. Thus, for any two such terms we may derive their composite $u \overset{d}{*}_n v$, which will also use the notation $u \cdot v$ when $d = n + 1$.

Consider the globe context $D^d(x : A)$ defined in the previous section. Given any term $\Delta \vdash t : T$, define $1_t^0 := t$. Applying the (COH) rule inductively then produces all higher identities

$$\frac{D^d(x : A) \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad D^d(x : A) \vdash 1_x^n \rightarrow 1_x^n \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : D^d(x : A)}{\Delta \vdash 1_{\gamma_x}^{n+1} : 1_{\gamma_x}^n \rightarrow 1_{\gamma_x}^n} \text{ (COH)}$$

where we have defined $1_{\gamma_x}^{n+1} := \text{coh}_{D^d(x:A)}[\gamma]$. In the case of $n = 1$ we also write 1_{γ_x} for $1_{\gamma_x}^1$. Since a term $\Delta \vdash t : T$ contains the same information as a context morphism $\Delta \vdash \hat{t} : D^d(x : A)$ with $\hat{t}_x \equiv t$, we can construct the identity $1_t^{n+1} : 1_t^n \rightarrow 1_t^n$ for any d -dimensional term $\Delta \vdash t : T$.

3 The Universal Cone

In 1-category theory, thanks to the free-forgetful adjunction between directed graphs and 1-categories, limits of functors can be equivalently described as limits over diagrams. When considering (∞, ∞) -categories, the appropriate notion encapsulating the generating data of free structures is that of computads. By a result of Benjamin, Markakis and Sarti [7], the contexts of **CaTT** are precisely finite computads. We exploit this fact to build a theory of limits over finite computads in **CaTT** in which the role of the diagram is played by the contexts. Note that the restriction to finite computads is a limitations of type theory, in which contexts are necessarily finite. In principle, the same ideas could be used to define arbitrary limits in a framework without this limitation (e.g. in that of computads as in the work of Dean, Finster, Markakis, Reutter and Vicary [10]).

The constituent cells of the cones and the corresponding limit notions we consider here are oriented. As a result, when building cones there are number of choices we can make with respect to the orientation of the terms involved, namely one for each dimension. As an example, in the 2-dimensional case we have four options. The first choice fixes the orientation of the 1-cells leading to the notion of limits and colimits respectively. The second choice fixes the orientation of the 2-cells, which are referred to as the lax and oplax versions of the corresponding (co)limit notion. In our case, for the purposes of this section we will be working with a choice of orientation with which the construction acquires a convenient uniformity. All other choices can be obtained by changing the roles of the terms s and t in the definition appropriately. Alternatively, all other choices can be obtained by taking opposites, which are studied by Benjamin and Markakis in [5] for (∞, ∞) -categories in the related framework of computads of Dean et al [10]. Since CaTT.

To motivate the following proposition, let us begin with an example and build a cone over a 2-globe. The context of a 2-globe is given by

$$\Gamma \equiv x : \mathbf{0b}, y : \mathbf{0b}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \quad \begin{array}{c} x \\ f \left(\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \Downarrow \end{array} \right) g \\ y \end{array}$$

and a cone over this diagram is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} C \\ \searrow p_x \\ x \\ \swarrow p_g \\ y \\ \nearrow p_y \end{array} & \xrightarrow{p_\alpha} & \begin{array}{c} C \\ \searrow p_x \\ x \\ \swarrow p_f \\ y \\ \nearrow p_y \end{array} \end{array}$$

which as a context has the form

$$\begin{aligned} C(\Gamma) &\equiv x : \mathbf{0b}, y : \mathbf{0b}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \\ c &: \mathbf{0b}, p_x : c \rightarrow x, p_y : c \rightarrow y, \\ p_f &: p_y \rightarrow p_x \overset{1}{\circ} f, p_g : p_y \rightarrow p_x \overset{1}{\circ} g, \\ p_\alpha &: p_g \rightarrow p_f \overset{2}{\circ} \left(1_{p_x} \overset{2}{\circ} \alpha \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since we are working with a weak category, the construction of cones involves choices, as there are many ways of gluing a given diagram. The choices we made are for the sake of convenience because they fit into a pattern revealing certain features we will eventually rely on in our definition.

We can already see these features in the cone as a context in this simple example. The cone is generated by “formally adding” an apex and then freely adding a unique “projection” to each variable in Γ . Moreover, the types of each projection all have common features, which become more apparent if we increases the dimension and the complexity of the diagrams.

Take, for example, $p_\alpha : p_g \rightarrow p_f \frac{2}{1} \left(1_{p_x} \frac{2}{0} \alpha \right)$. We see, first of all, that the source of p_α involves only the projections associated to the target of α , namely g . Note that the projections associated to the dependencies of g , namely p_x and p_y are themselves dependencies of p_g and thus appear in the construction of p_g and its type. On the other hand, the target of p_α involves only projections associated to the source of α , namely f . The target of p_α also involves the variable α itself. Moreover, α appears in a certain linear way which we now make this precise.

Definition 3.1. *Let $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ be a term and let $x \in \text{FV}(t)$ be a variable such that $\dim(x) = \dim(t)$. We define the relation $x \propto t$ by inducting over the term t as follows.*

(VAR) $\Gamma \vdash x : A$ where $(x : A) \in \Gamma$

In this case $x \propto x$.

(OP) $\Delta \vdash \text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow A} t[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]$

In this case $x \propto \text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow A} t[\gamma]$ if there exists a unique $x_i \in \text{FV}(\Gamma)$ such that $x \propto \gamma_i$.

(COH) $\Delta \vdash \text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow A} t[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]$

This case is similar to that of (OP).

If $x \propto t$ we say x is linear in t .

3.1 Cones as Context

Motivated by the previous section we can now spell out a set of rules which build cones over a diagram. Notably we do not restrict ourselves to any particular way of gluing. All legitimate ways of gluing cells to obtain higher projections are permitted and lead to distinct but valid cones.

The idea is to induct over the underlying context, adding precisely one higher projection for each such new variable. For the sake of readability and reusability, let us introduce a shorthand for the side conditions that will appear in the rules. Given a term $K \vdash t : A$, a variable $(x : X) \in K$ and a sublist of variables P of K , we let $\delta\text{Cond}(t : A, x : X, P)$ stand for

- $t : A$ is categorical
- $\text{FV}(t : A) = \text{FV}(x : X) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{p \in \text{FV}(P) \\ y \in \text{FV}(\delta(x) : \partial X) \\ y \propto \tau(p)}} \text{FV}(p : T_p)$
- $x \propto t$

where δ stands for σ or τ . We will also denote by $\delta\text{CCond}(t : A, x : X, P)$ the same set of conditions except for the linearity condition. In the following rules, the set P will be such that it contains precisely the projections. These conditions therefore ensure that the term t is built using the appropriate projections, as dictated by the conjecture in the previous section.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction over the length of Γ . As part of the inductive process we also show that for a given variables $(x : A) \in \Gamma$, the free variables of the corresponding projections are given by

$$\text{FV}(p_x : T_x) = \bigcup_{\substack{p_{x_i} \in \text{FV}(\Pi) \\ y \in \text{FV}(x : A) \\ y \propto \tau(p_{x_i})}} \text{FV}(p_{x_i} : T_{x_i}). \quad (6)$$

In addition to that we have $c \in \text{FV}(p_x : T_x)$ and x is the unique variable in Γ such that $x \propto \tau(p_x)$.

If $\Gamma \equiv \emptyset$, then the rules directly give us $c : \mathbf{Ob}$ as a cone over \emptyset with apex c . Assume now that we have built the cone for the context Γ , that is, we have a derivation of $C(\Gamma)$ $\text{cone}(\Gamma, c)$ as described in the statement. Assume moreover that we now extend the context Γ to $\Gamma, x : A$. If $\dim(x) = 0$, then $c \rightarrow x$ is derivable and satisfies the condition of the rule (KE). Thus, applying (KE) we can extend the context by $p_x : c \rightarrow x$, giving us a cone over $\Gamma, x : A$. Moreover, $p_x : c \rightarrow x$ satisfies equation 6.

Assume now that $d := \dim(x) > 0$ and define the terms

$$t^{d+1}(x) := x : A, \quad t^n(x) := 1_{p_{\sigma^n(x)} \ d \atop * \ n}^{n-1} t^{n+1}(x) : T_n(x) \quad (7)$$

for $1 \leq n \leq d$ and where T is the appropriate type. The term $t^n(x)$, which is of the form

$$t^n(x) := 1_{p_{\sigma^n(x)} \ d \atop * \ n}^{n-1} \left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n+1}(x)} \ d-n-1 \atop * \ n-1}^n \cdots \left(1_{p_{\sigma^d(x)} \ 0 \atop * \ x}^{d-1} \right) \right).$$

approximates $\tau(p_x)$ as n decreases. We claim that for all $1 \leq n \leq d+1$ we have

- (i) $t^n(x) : T_n(x)$ derivable
- (ii) $\sigma^m(t^n(x)) \equiv t^{n-m}(\sigma^m(x))$ for all $0 \leq m < n$
- (iii) $\tau(t^n(x)) \equiv t^{n-1}(\tau(x))$ if $2 \leq n$
- (iv) $\text{FV}(t^n(x) : T_n(x)) = \text{FV}(x : A) \cup \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^n(x)} : T_{\sigma^n(x)})$ if $n < d+1$
- (v) $x \propto t^n(x)$

For the statements all the statements we now perform a nested induction on n starting with $n = d+1$ all the way down to $n = 1$. We start with (i) and (ii), which we prove simultaneously. For $n = d+1$ we have $t^{d+1}(x) \equiv x : A$ which is derivable so that (i) holds. Now since $\sigma^m(x)$ is of dimension $\dim(x) - m$ we also have $t^{d+1-m}(\sigma^m(x)) \equiv \sigma^m(x)$ which proves (ii). Assume now that the statements hold for some $1 < n$. For (i) we compute

$$\sigma^{n-1}(t^n(x)) \equiv t^1(\sigma^{n-1}(x)) \equiv \tau(p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)}) \equiv \tau^{n-1} \left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)}}^{n-2} \right) \quad (8)$$

Here the first and second identities hold by the inductive hypothesis. Notice that in order to define $t^{n-1}(x)$ starting with $t^n(x)$ we also made use of $p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)}$. But $\sigma^{n-1}(x)$ is a variable which necessarily appears before x , so that the context currently at hand already

contains the corresponds projection, allowing us to form this term. From equation 8 we conclude that the two terms in

$$t^{n-1}(x) \equiv 1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-2} t^n(x) : T_{n-1}(x)$$

are composable, rendering the composite derivable. Regarding (ii), for all $0 \leq m < n-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^m(t^{n-1}(x)) &\equiv \sigma^m\left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-2} t^n(x)\right) \\ &\equiv \sigma^m\left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-2}\right) \overset{d-m}{*} \sigma^m(t^n(x)) \\ &\equiv 1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-m-2} \overset{d-m}{*} t^{n-m}(\sigma^m(x)) \\ &\equiv t^{n-m-1}(\sigma^m(x)) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we used the fact that (ii) holds for $t^n(x)$.

Now, for (iii), an argument similar to that for the base case of (ii) shows that (iii) holds which applies since $n = d+1 \geq 2$. Now, assuming $n-1 \geq 2$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(t^{n-1}(x)) &\equiv \tau\left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-2} t^n(x)\right) \\ &\equiv \tau\left(1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n+1}^{n-2}\right) \overset{d-1}{*} \tau(t^n(x)) \\ &\equiv 1_{p_{\sigma^{n-1}(x)} d-n-1}^{n-3} \overset{d-1}{*} t^{n-1}(\tau(x)) \\ &\equiv 1_{p_{\sigma^{n-2}(\tau(x)) d-n-1}^{n-3}} \overset{d-1}{*} t^{n-1}(\tau(x)) \\ &\equiv t^{n-2}(\tau(x)) \end{aligned}$$

For (iv) we have $\text{FV}(t^d(x)) = \text{FV}(1_{p_{\sigma^d(x)} 0}^{d-1} x) = \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^d(x)} : T_{\sigma^d(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(x : A)$. For the inductive step,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(t^n(x) : T_n(x)) &= \text{FV}\left(1_{p_{\sigma^n(x)} d-n}^{n-1} t^{n+1}(x) : T_n(x)\right) \\ &= \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^n(x)} : T_{\sigma^n(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(t^{n+1}(x) : T_n(x)) \\ &= \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^n(x)} : T_{\sigma^n(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^{n+1}(x)} : T_{\sigma^{n+1}(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(x : A) \\ &= \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^n(x)} : T_{\sigma^n(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(x : A) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\text{FV}(p_{\sigma^{n+1}(x)} : T_{\sigma^{n+1}(x)}) \subset \text{FV}(p_{\sigma^n(x)} : T_{\sigma^n(x)})$.

As for (v), by definition $t^{d+1}(x) \equiv x : A$, and indeed, x is linear in x by definition. Now assume that $x \propto t^n(x)$ for some $1 \leq n$ and we ask if x is linear in $t^{n+1}(x) \equiv 1_{p_{\sigma^n(x)} d-n}^{n-1} t^{n+1}(x) : T_{n-1}(x)$, which is the case, as it only appears in $t^{n+1}(x)$.

Using the properties (ii) and (iii), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(t^1(x)) &\equiv \tau\left(p_{\sigma(x)} \overset{d}{*} t^2\right) \equiv \tau(t^2(x)) \equiv t^1(\tau(x)) \equiv \tau(p_{\tau(x)}) \\ \sigma(t^1(x)) &\equiv \sigma\left(p_{\sigma(x)} \overset{d}{*} t^2\right) \equiv \sigma(p_{\sigma(x)}) \equiv p_{\sigma^2(x)} \equiv p_{\sigma\tau(x)} \equiv \sigma(p_{\tau(x)}) \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude $t^1(x) \parallel p_{\tau(x)}$. This allows us to derive the judgment $p_{\tau(x)} \rightarrow t^1(x)$. Now, by the inductive hypothesis

$$\text{FV}(p_{\tau(x)} : T_{\tau(x)}) = \text{FV}(c : \mathbf{0b}) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{p_{x_i} \in \text{FV}(\Pi) \\ y \in \text{FV}(\tau(x) : T_{\tau(x)}) \\ y \propto \tau(p_{x_i})}} \text{FV}(p_{x_i} : T_{x_i}).$$

On the other hand, using (iv) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(t^1(x) : T_1(x)) &= \text{FV}(x : A) \cup \text{FV}(p_{\sigma(x)} : T_{\sigma(x)}) \\ &= \text{FV}(x : A) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{p_{x_i} \in \text{FV}(\Pi) \\ y \in \text{FV}(\sigma(x) : T_{\sigma(x)}) \\ y \propto \tau(p_{x_i})}} \text{FV}(p_{x_i} : T_{x_i}) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $p_{\tau(x)} \rightarrow t^1(x)$ satisfies the conditions of (KE) allowing us to produce the cone $C(\Gamma, x : A) \equiv \Gamma, x : A, c : \mathbf{0b}, \Pi, p_x : p_{\tau(x)} \rightarrow t^1(x)$.

To complete the induction we need to show that equation 6 still holds for all variables in Γ . On top of that we need to show that $x : A$ satisfies equation 6 as well as the two properties stated right after. We start with the latter.


A quick inductive argument shows that $c \in \text{FV}(p_x : T_x)$. Also, by (iv)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(p_x : T_x) &= \text{FV}(p_{\tau(x)} : T_{\tau(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(t^1(x) : T_1(x)) \\ &= \text{FV}(p_{\tau(x)} : T_{\tau(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(p_{\sigma(x)} : T_{\sigma(x)}) \cup \text{FV}(x : A). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma(x) \propto \tau(p_{\sigma(x)})$ and $\tau(x) \propto \tau(p_{\tau(x)})$, we know that $\dim(p_{\sigma(x)}) = \dim(p_{\tau(x)}) = \dim(x)$. Moreover, by lemma 2.6 there are the the only variables of dimension $\dim(x)$. Thus x is the unique variable of Γ such that $x \propto \tau(p_x)$. This fact guarantees that p_x satisfies equation 6 and that all the projections in Π continue to satisfy the same equation in the extended cone over $\Gamma, x : A$. \square

It is possible to give algorithmic constructions for the cones also for more complicated diagrams in the strict world. We will also suppress the labels of the binary operations in the interest of making the equations more readable and the global form more evident.

Example 3.5. Consider for example a diagram of the form




Then, in the strict case, the projection corresponding to the variable α can be taken to be of the type:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{g_m} \cdot (p_{g_{m-1}} * 1_{g_m}) \cdot (p_{g_{m-2}} * 1_{g_{m-1} \cdot g_m}) \cdots (p_{g_1} * 1_{g_2 \cdots g_m}) \\
& \quad \downarrow \\
& p_{f_n} \cdot (p_{f_{n-1}} * 1_{f_n}) \cdot (p_{f_{n-2}} * 1_{f_{n-1} \cdot f_n}) \cdots (p_{f_1} * 1_{f_2 \cdots f_n}) \cdot (1_{p_x} * \alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

By defining the terms $p_{f_1 \cdots f_n}$ and $p_{g_1 \cdots g_m}$ appropriately we can rewrite this as

$$p_{g_1 \cdots g_m} \rightarrow p_{f_1 \cdots f_n} \cdot (1_{p_x} * \alpha).$$

Example 3.6. Consider the diagram



For this diagram, again in the strict case, the projection corresponding to the variable ϕ can be taken to be of the type:

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{\beta_m} \cdot (p_{\beta_{m-1}} * 1_{1_{p_x} * \beta_m}) \cdot (p_{\beta_{m-2}} * 1_{1_{p_x} * (\beta_{m-1} \cdot \beta_m)}) \cdots (p_{\beta_1} * 1_{1_{p_x} * (\beta_2 \cdots \beta_m)}) \\
& \quad \downarrow \\
& p_{\alpha_n} \cdot (p_{\alpha_{n-1}} * 1_{1_{p_x} * \alpha_n}) \cdot (p_{\alpha_{n-2}} * 1_{1_{p_x} * (\alpha_{n-1} \cdot \alpha_n)}) \cdots (p_{\alpha_1} * 1_{1_{p_x} * (\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_n)}) \cdot (1_{p_f} * (1_{1_{p_x}} * \phi))
\end{aligned}$$

Again, by defining $p_{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n}$ and $p_{\beta_1 \cdots \beta_m}$ appropriately we can rewrite this as

$$p_{\beta_1 \cdots \beta_m} \rightarrow p_{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n} \cdot (1_{p_f} * (1_{1_{p_x}} * \phi)).$$

Returning to the weak higher categorical world, for low dimensional cases it is possible to construct a term p_t also for the case where t is a coherence. The examples suggest that, given a term $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ in a context, it is possible to glue the projections corresponding to the variables of $t : A$ appropriately and build a term p_t , the type of which is of a type analogous to that in Theorem 3.4. Based on this we formulate the conjecture.

Conjecture 3.7. *Let K be a cone over a diagram Γ with apex c . Given a term $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ of dimension d , there exists a term $K \vdash p_t : T_t$ such that T_t is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
c & \rightarrow t & \text{if } \dim(t) = 0 \\
p_{\tau(t)} & \rightarrow p_{\sigma(t)} \underset{d-1}{*} \left(1_{p_{\sigma^2(t)}} \underset{d-2}{*} \left(1_{p_{\sigma^3(t)}} \underset{d-3}{*} \cdots \left(1_{p_{\sigma^d(t)}} \underset{0}{*} t \right) \right) \right), & \text{if } \dim(t) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, writing $K \equiv \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$, we have

$$\text{FV}(p_t : T_t) = \bigcup_{\substack{p_{x_i} \in \text{FV}(\Pi) \\ y \in \text{FV}(t : A) \\ y \propto \tau(p_{x_i})}} \text{FV}(p_{x_i} : T_{x_i}).$$

Assuming the conjecture we can now prove the existence of cones as contexts for all diagrams.

Theorem 3.8. *Given a context Γ there exists a context $\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$ such that the judgment $\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi \text{ cone } \Gamma$ is derivable.*

Proof. This relies on the same ideas as those presented in the proof of Theorem 3.4. \square

3.3 The Universal Cone

The rules of Definition (3.2) allow us to generate cones as contexts for a given diagram. We now want to use this to build the universal cone. Given a diagram Γ and a cone K over it as a context K , the universal cone is given by a collection of terms that can be assembled into a context morphism $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone} : K$.

Example 3.9. Consider for example the context $\Gamma \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y$. The cone and universal cone can be depicted pictorially as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \text{lim}_{\Gamma} \\ \swarrow \text{up}_x \\ x \\ \xrightarrow{\text{up}_f} \\ y \\ \searrow \text{up}_y \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} c \\ \swarrow p_x \\ x \\ \xrightarrow{p_f} \\ y \\ \searrow p_y \end{array}
 \end{array} \tag{9}$$

As a context morphism we have

$$\Gamma \vdash \left(\begin{array}{c} x \\ y \\ f \\ \text{lim}_{\Gamma} \\ \text{up}_x \\ \text{up}_y \\ \text{up}_f \end{array} \right) : \left(\begin{array}{c} x : \mathbf{Ob} \\ y : \mathbf{Ob} \\ f : x \rightarrow y \\ c : \mathbf{Ob} \\ p_x : c \rightarrow x \\ p_y : c \rightarrow y \\ p_f : p_y \rightarrow p_x \cdot f \end{array} \right)$$

It is important to note that we explicitly build in new terms only for the cone apex and the projections in the context morphism. The cells in the context morphism corresponding to the underlying diagram are given by variables. Intuitively we think of this as allowing us to build a cone on diagrams of shape Γ . By substitution we can then instantiate this to get a cone on any specific diagram.

Unfortunately, we cannot simply spell out a rule which builds such a context morphism in one go. Due to the nature of type theory, any context morphism must be built step by step, otherwise there would be no way of accessing the terms it consists of. We are therefore forced to build the terms of the universal cone one by one with help of term constructor rules. Crucially, however, the higher cells of the universal cone depend on those of lower dimension, as dictated by the underlying diagram Γ . As a result, when

constructing a given term in the universal cone, we need to have kept track of all terms of the universal cone corresponding to the dependencies of the term at hand. We tackle this by collecting all terms at each step into a context morphism, which step by step approximates the context morphism $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone} : K$.

Definition 3.10 (Universal Cone). *We define the judgment $\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \kappa : \Theta$ inductively by the rules*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash}{\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \mathbf{id}_{\Gamma} : \Gamma}$$

$$\frac{(\Theta, x : X, \Theta') \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \kappa : \Theta}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone}_{\Gamma, x} : X[\kappa] \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \langle \kappa, \mathbf{ucone}_{\Gamma, x} \rangle : (\Theta, x : X)}$$

The term $\mathbf{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}$ also depends on the cone $\Theta, x : X, \Theta'$ which should therefore also appear as a subscript in the term constructor. We suppress this for the sake of readability.

As in Example 3.9, we will also write $\mathbf{lim}_{\Gamma} \equiv \mathbf{ucone}_{\Gamma, c}$ where $c : \mathbf{Ob}$ is the variable such that $K \equiv \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$. When no confusion can arise we will also write $\mathbf{ux} \equiv \mathbf{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}$, again as in the example.

Lemma 3.11. *Given a judgment $\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \kappa : \Theta$ we have*

$$\Gamma \vdash, \quad \Theta \vdash, \quad \Gamma \vdash \kappa : \Theta.$$

Moreover, the context $\Gamma \vdash \kappa : \Theta$ is of the form $\Gamma \vdash \langle \mathbf{id}_{\Gamma}, \mathbf{lim}_{\Gamma}, \mathbf{up}_1, \dots, \mathbf{up}_m \rangle : (\Gamma, p_1 : T_1, \dots, p_m : T_m)$ for some $1 \leq m \leq |\Gamma|$.

Proof. By induction. □

The process terminates once we have derived the judgment $\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \kappa : K$ where K is some cone over Γ , producing a context morphism as in Example 3.9. In the same way that K factorizes as $\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$, we have a corresponding factorization $\kappa \equiv \langle \mathbf{id}_{\Gamma}, \mathbf{lim}_{\Gamma}, \overline{\mathbf{up}} \rangle$. Here we use the notation $\overline{\mathbf{up}}$ to emphasize that we have a string of terms of the form \mathbf{up} .

Definition 3.12. *If K is a cone over Γ , given a derivable judgment $\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\mathbf{uni}} \kappa : K$ we say $\Gamma \vdash \kappa : K$, or simply κ , is a universal cone over Γ of shape K .*

Remark 3.13. A cone morphism contains the same information as a cone on a cone on the underlying diagram. With minor modifications it is possible to make use of the rules of Definition (3.2) to generate the cells of the universal cone morphism from an arbitrary cone to the universal cone. Instead of this we will pursue another path in which cone morphisms are given by modifications. In fact, these modifications can be obtained as part of a set of rules which generates not only modifications but also all higher transfors in a uniform way.

4 The Universal Property

4.1 Gray Operations

In this section we spell out a set of rules which generate the cells of the Gray tensor product of a diagram with a d -globe. Following Loubaton [12] we refer to these constructions as Gray operations. We think of these as shapes for natural transformations and all higher transfors. The natural transformation is between two diagrams represented as contexts, one of which is the copy of the other. Note that at this stage we are only interested in generating the shape as a context. In the next section we will modify the rules so as to produce higher transfors between cones (thought of as natural transformations) and use this later to define the higher coherences of the universal cone as a context morphism.

The starting point is a diagram Γ given to us as a context. We then proceed in two steps: first each variable $x \in \text{FV}(\Gamma)$ is duplicated and second for each such variable x and its duplicate x' we append a new cell relating x and x' in a specified way. Let us showcase this with an example.

Example 4.1. Consider the diagram $\Gamma \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g$. Duplication yields:

$$\Gamma, \Gamma' := x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y, g : x \rightarrow y, \alpha : f \rightarrow g, \\ x' : \mathbf{Ob}, y' : \mathbf{Ob}, f' : x' \rightarrow y', g' : x' \rightarrow y', \alpha' : f' \rightarrow g'.$$

Next for each variable in Γ and its corresponding duplicate we add a cell as follows:

$$\Gamma, \Gamma', p_x : x \rightarrow x', p_y : y \rightarrow y', \\ p_f : f \cdot p_y \rightarrow p_x \cdot f', p_g : g \cdot p_y \rightarrow p_x \cdot g', \\ p_\alpha : (\alpha * 1_{p_y}) \cdot p_g \rightarrow p_f \cdot (1_{p_x} * \alpha').$$

For later use we may also denote this context by Γ, Γ', P . Pictorially we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{ccc} x & \xrightarrow{p_x} & x' \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \Downarrow \end{array} \right) \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \nearrow \\ \nearrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \\ f & & g' \\ y & \xrightarrow{p_y} & y' \end{array} & \xRightarrow{p_\alpha} & \begin{array}{ccc} x & \xrightarrow{p_x} & x' \\ \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \\ \nearrow \\ \nearrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \\ f & & g' \\ y & \xrightarrow{p_y} & y' \end{array} \end{array}$$

Example 4.2. Continuing Example 4.1, let us now examine modifications. For this we begin with Γ, Γ', P and extend this context by adding the appropriate new variables. As for natural transformations we begin by duplicating certain cells. The cells we duplicate


turn out to be precisely the variables in P . Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma, \Gamma', p_x : x \rightarrow' x, p_y : y \rightarrow' y', \\
& p_f : f \cdot p_y \rightarrow p_x \cdot f', p_g : g \cdot p_y \rightarrow p_x \cdot g', \\
& p_\alpha : (\alpha * 1_{p_y}) \cdot p_g \rightarrow p_f \cdot (1_{p_x} \cdot \alpha'), \\
& p'_x : x \rightarrow x', p'_y : y \rightarrow y', \\
& p'_f : f \cdot p'_y \rightarrow p'_x \cdot f', p'_g : g \cdot p'_y \rightarrow p'_x \cdot g', \\
& p'_\alpha : (\alpha * 1_{p'_y}) \cdot p'_g \rightarrow p'_f \cdot (1_{p'_x} \cdot \alpha').
\end{aligned}$$

As a short hand, let us denote this context by Γ, Γ', P, P' where P' contains all the duplicates of P . Again, as for the natural transformation we now need to build in cells relating the variables in P with their duplicates, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Gamma, \Gamma', P, P', m_x : p_x \rightarrow p'_x, m_y : p_y \rightarrow p'_y \\
& m_f : p_f \cdot (m_x * 1_{f'}) \rightarrow (1_f * m_y) \cdot p'_f \\
& m_g : p_g \cdot (m_x * 1_{g'}) \rightarrow (1_g * m_y) \cdot p'_g \\
& m_\alpha : (p_\alpha * 1_{m_x * 1_{g'}}) \cdot (m_f * 1_{1_{p'_x} * \alpha'}) \rightarrow (1_{\alpha * 1_{p_y}} * m_g) \cdot (1_{1_f * m_y} * p'_\alpha).
\end{aligned}$$

which we may also abbreviate as $\Gamma, \Gamma', P, P', M$. Diagrammatically the cell m_α can be visualized as follows:



We now formalize this procedure in terms of type-theoretic rules producing a context of the form as in Examples 4.1 and 4.2. The inductive generation of the Gray operation is slightly different from the process displayed in the examples. Assuming we have already built such an operation for a certain underlying diagram, for each new variable extending the underlying diagram we step by step append the complete set of variables, giving us a Gray operation over the extended underlying diagram.

To keep track of the structure of these contexts we will use a semicolon instead of a comma to separate the constituent parts. The context of example 4.1 will be denoted by $\Gamma; \Gamma'; P; P'; M$. By convention all semicolons will always be made visible and the variables within a part, say P will always be separated by a comma. In the following rules we will also refer to the cardinality of these parts. Recall that given a list of variables M we let $|M|$ be its cardinality. We are now ready for the rules, generating contexts encoding transfors.

Definition 4.3 (Gray Operation). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^>$, the judgments $M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ gray } \Gamma$ and $M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1$ are generated by the judgments*

$$\frac{}{\emptyset; \dots; \emptyset \text{ gray } \emptyset}$$

$$\frac{M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ gray } M_1 \quad M_1 \vdash X}{M_1, x : X; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1, x : X}$$

$$\frac{M_1; \dots; M_{2i-1}, x : X; M_{2i}; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1 \quad M_1, \dots, M_{2i-1}, x : X, M_{2i}, x' : X, M_{2i+1} \vdash s \rightarrow_A t}{M_1; \dots; M_{2i-1}, x : X; M_{2i}, x' : X; M_{2i+1}, p_x : s \rightarrow_A t; M_{2i+2}; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1} \begin{array}{l} 1 \leq i \leq n \\ |M_{2i-1}| = |M_{2i}| \\ \tau\text{Cond}(s : A, x : X, M_{2i+1}) \\ \sigma\text{Cond}(t : A, x' : X, M_{2i+1}) \end{array}$$

$$\frac{M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1}{M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ gray } M_1} \quad |M_1| = |M_{2n+1}|$$

The following lemma affirms that we are indeed generating a context.

Lemma 4.4. *The rules*

$$\frac{M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ gray } M_1}{M_1, \dots, M_{2n+1} \vdash} \quad \frac{M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ pgray } M_1}{M_1, \dots, M_{2n+1} \vdash}$$

are admissible.

Proof. By induction. □

If $M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ gray } M_1$ is derivable, then we say the context M_1, \dots, M_{2n+1} is the Gray tensor product of M_1 with an n -globe.

As for cones we can formulate an existence proof for the Gray tensor product with 1-globes. Unsurprisingly the pattern that emerges simply generalizes that of cones.

If $\Gamma; c : \mathbf{Ob}; M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c)$ is derivable we say that $\Gamma; c : \mathbf{Ob}; M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1}$ is a conical $(n + 1)$ -transform over Γ .

The lists of variables generated by the above rules are contexts, as the following lemma affirms.

Lemma 4.8. *The rule*

$$\frac{\Gamma; c : \mathbf{Ob}; M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1} \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c)}{\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, M_1, \dots, M_{2n+1} \vdash}$$

is admissible.

Proof. By induction. □

Lemma 4.9. *Given a judgment $\Gamma; c : \mathbf{Ob}; M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1}$ we have $|\Gamma| = |M_i|$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 2n + 1$. Moreover $K := \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, M_1$ is a cone over Γ with apex c .*

In some cases we may write $M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c)$ instead of the full $\Gamma; c : \mathbf{Ob}; M_1; \dots; M_{2n+1}$. In such situation we will write $n_M \in \mathbb{N}^>$ instead of n , to make clear which natural number we are referring to.

4.3 Composing with Cones

Let Γ be a diagram and assume we are given a universal cone $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone} : K$. Given a morphism $c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma$ we can compose this with \mathbf{ucone} and form a cone with apex c . More generally, given any cell in the (∞, ∞) -category of morphisms $c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma$, by composition we get a term in the (∞, ∞) -category of cones over Γ with apex c . Schematically there exists a functor of (∞, ∞) -categories

$$\mathbf{ucone}_* : \{\text{terms of } c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma\} \longrightarrow \{\text{cones } K \text{ over } \Gamma \text{ with apex } c\}.$$

The cone \mathbf{ucone} is a limiting cone if this functor is an equivalence.

Spelling out this universal property requires us to be able to refer to the image of this functor. We encode this again by a context morphism.

Let Γ be a context and let $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{ucone} : K$ be a context morphism encoding a universal cone obtained from the rules of Definition 3.10. The cone will be of the form $K \equiv \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$ where Π contains all the projection variables. The context morphism can then be split accordingly and we denote by \overline{up} the list of terms in \mathbf{ucone} corresponding to Π . Now, given a context $\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma$, applying \mathbf{ucone}_* to f gives a context morphism schematically denoted by

$$\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma \vdash \langle \mathbf{id}_\Gamma, c, f * \overline{up} \rangle : K.$$

Here $f * \overline{up}$ stands for a list of terms of the same length as $\Gamma \equiv (x_i : A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, the i -th term of which is given by composing up_{x_i} with f appropriately.


More generally, let M be a conical n -transform over Γ . If $\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, D^n(c, \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma, \phi)$ is a context extending Γ where $D^n(c, c', \phi)$ is a

$$D^n(c, \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma, \phi) := f : c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma, g : c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma, \alpha : f \rightarrow g, \beta : f \rightarrow g, \dots, \phi : A_\phi$$

has the shape of an n -dimensional globe between \mathbf{lim}_Γ and some variable $c : \mathbf{Ob}$ with maximal cell ϕ , we would like to obtain a context morphism of the form

$$\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, D^n(c, \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma, \phi) \vdash \langle \mathbf{id}_\Gamma, c, f * \overline{up}, g * \overline{up}, \dots, \phi * \overline{up} \rangle : M.$$

Up to a manageable dimension we can depict this pictorially as



In the above diagram, composing the universal cone with f and g respectively gives two cones. Composing with ϕ produces a modification between these two cones.

To obtain such a context morphism, we use the same trick as before and work with an arbitrary cone in the form of a context instead of the universal cone. This allows us to control which projections contribute in which terms by fixing the free variables. In a bit more detail, assume we are given a judgment $K \text{ cone } \Gamma$, that is K is a cone over Γ . It will necessarily be of the form $K \equiv \Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi$, where Π contains all the projection variables. Then, what we are looking for a context morphism which schematically is of the form

$$K, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, D^n(c', c) \vdash \langle \mathbf{id}_\Gamma, c, f * \mathbf{id}_\Pi, g * \mathbf{id}_\Pi, \dots, \phi * \mathbf{id}_\Pi \rangle : M$$

where \mathbf{id}_Π denotes the variables $\text{FV}(\Pi)$ as a sequence of terms with the induced order. In the next subsection we give a set of rules which produce such context morphisms.

4.4 Composing with Cones and the Universal Property

Let $\Gamma \vdash \kappa : K$ be a universal cone over a diagram Γ . As explained in subsection 4.3, the idea is to build into CaTT the required terms to make the functor, described here informally

$$\text{ucone}_* : \{\text{terms of } c \rightarrow \mathbf{lim}_\Gamma\} \longrightarrow \{\text{cones } K \text{ over } \Gamma \text{ with apex } c\}$$

into an equivalence of (∞, ∞) -categories. Switching momentarily to non type-theoretic notation, we define a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ of (∞, ∞) -categories is said to be an equivalence if the maps

- (i) $F : \mathcal{C}_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0$;
- (ii) $F_{x,y} : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(Fx, Fy)$ $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$;
- (iii) $F_{f,g} : \text{Hom}_{\text{Hom}(x,y)}(f, g) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{Hom}(Fx, Fy)}(Ff, Fg)$ for all $f, g \in \text{Hom}(x, y)$;
- (iv) and so on.

are surjective.

By surjectivity we mean, essential surjectivity, i.e. surjectivity up to equivalence. By equivalence we mean coinductive equivalence. Coinductive equivalences have been studied by Benjamin and Markakis [6] in the related framework of computads due to Dean et al. [10]. Note that every coherence is a coinductive equivalence.

Given a term $\Gamma \vdash u : s \rightarrow t$ in CaTT , we can ensure this is an equivalence by introducing a new judgment $\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow t$ which obeys the rules

$$\frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow t}{\Gamma \vdash u : s \rightarrow t} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow t}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inv}(u) : t \rightarrow s}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow t}{\Gamma \vDash \text{eta}(u) : 1_s \rightarrow u \cdot \text{inv}(u)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow t}{\Gamma \vDash \text{eps}(u) : u \cdot \text{inv}(u) \rightarrow 1_t}$$

We say that an n -transfor is invertible, if all of its components are invertible.

Returning to ucone_* , on objects we must require the following: given a universal cone over $\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma} \kappa : K$ over Γ , where $K \equiv (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, \Pi)$, there exists a term $um : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma}$ and an invertible modification \overline{um} between the cone K and the universal cone composed with um . Working again with our example $\Gamma \equiv x : \mathbf{Ob}, y : \mathbf{Ob}, f : x \rightarrow y$, pictorially we have:

(10)

If $M \equiv (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ is a modification of cones, that is $M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c)$, then the whole data of diagram 10 can be organized into the context morphism

$$K \vdash \langle \text{id}_{\Gamma}, c, \text{id}_{\Pi}, um * \overline{up}, \overline{um} \rangle : (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, M_1, M_2, M_3).$$

For the level of morphisms, we are first given two maps $f, g : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma}$ with which we obtain two cones $f * \overline{up}$ and $g * \overline{up}$ with apex c by composition. Then, given any modification between these two cones, namely a list of variables denoted by the shorthand notation $\overline{m} : f * \overline{up} \rightarrow g * \overline{up}$, there should exist a cell $uq : f \rightarrow g$, which when composed with the universal cone yields an modification $uq * \overline{up}$ equivalent to \overline{m} . Using again a shorthand notation we denote this invertible map by $\overline{uq} : \overline{m} \rightarrow uq * \overline{up}$. As a context

morphism this is given by

$$\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma}, g : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma}, \bar{m} : f * \bar{u}p \rightarrow g * \bar{u}p \vdash \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{id}_{\Gamma} \\ c \\ f * \bar{u}p \\ g * \bar{u}p \\ \bar{m} \\ uq * \bar{u}p \\ \bar{u}q \end{array} \right) : \left(\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ c : \mathbf{Ob} \\ M_1 \\ M_2 \\ M_3 \\ M_4 \\ M_5 \end{array} \right) \quad (11)$$

where $M \equiv (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, M_1, \dots, M_5)$ encodes a perturbation between modifications of cones. To obtain such a context morphism, we will work with an arbitrary cone in the form of a context K over Γ (instead of the universal cone) where we can control the variables, and subsequently substitute a universal cone into the construction. As an example, the context morphism in equation 11 is obtained as the composite of the two context morphisms

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ c : \mathbf{Ob} \\ f : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma} \\ g : c \rightarrow \lim_{\Gamma} \\ \bar{m} : f * \bar{u}p \rightarrow g * \bar{u}p \end{array} \right) \vdash \left(\begin{array}{c} \kappa \\ c \\ f * \bar{u}p \\ g * \bar{u}p \\ \bar{m} \\ uq \\ \bar{u}q \end{array} \right) : \left(\begin{array}{c} K \\ c' : \mathbf{Ob} \\ f' : c' \rightarrow c \\ g' : c' \rightarrow c \\ \Delta \\ \alpha' : f' \rightarrow g' \\ \Delta' \end{array} \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} K \\ c' : \mathbf{Ob} \\ f' : c' \rightarrow c \\ g' : c' \rightarrow c \\ \Delta \\ \alpha' : f' \rightarrow g' \\ \Delta' \end{array} \right) \vdash \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{id}_{\Gamma} \\ c' \\ f' * \text{id}_{\Pi} \\ g' * \text{id}_{\Pi} \\ \text{id}_{\Delta} \\ \alpha' * \text{id}_{\Pi} \\ \text{id}_{\Delta'} \end{array} \right) : \left(\begin{array}{c} \Gamma \\ c : \mathbf{Ob} \\ M_1 \\ M_2 \\ M_3 \\ M_4 \\ M_5 \end{array} \right) \quad (13)$$

The order in which the variables appear in the context $K, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f' : c' \rightarrow c, g' : c' \rightarrow c, \Delta, \alpha' : f' \rightarrow g', \Delta'$ guarantees that we can later associate the correct free variables to the terms uq and $\bar{u}q$.

The context morphisms are built inductively by moving step by step through all the variables of M . Even though it is possible to do without, let us introduce a new judgment, which we will use as a convenient device to keep track of the process while keeping the notation more compact.

Definition 4.10. *Let $\Gamma \vdash$ be a context. We define the judgment $\Delta \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A$ by the rules*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash A}{\Gamma, x : A \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A \quad \Delta \vdash B}{\Delta, y : B \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A.}$$

If $\Delta \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A$ is derivable, we say Δ is an extension of Γ .

Lemma 4.11. *Given the judgement $\Delta \vdash_{\Gamma} x : A$, then the following judgments are derivable:*

$$\Gamma \vdash, \quad \Delta \vdash, \quad \Delta \vdash x : A.$$

Moreover, $\Delta \equiv \Gamma, x : A, \Delta'$ for some list of variables Δ' .

Proof. By induction. □

We now spell out a set of rules which generate context morphism of the form of equation (13). The first context morphism of equation 12, on the other hand, is what will be generated by the rules for the universal property in the next subsection.

Definition 4.12 (Rules for Postcomposition with a Cone). *The derivable judgements $W \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{star}} w : M$ are generated by the rules*

$$\frac{K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c)}{K, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, D^n(c, c', \alpha) \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} \langle \text{id}_{\Gamma}, c' \rangle : (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob})}$$

$$\frac{K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c) \quad W \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} w : \Theta \quad M \vdash_{\Theta} x : X \quad \Theta \vdash u : X[w]}{W \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} \langle w, u \rangle : (\Theta, x : X)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \dim(\alpha) = n_M \\ x \in \text{FV}(M_j), j \in \{1, \dots, 2n_M - 2, 2n_M\} \\ \text{Star}(\Gamma, K, M, x, u : X[w], \alpha : A) \end{array}$$

$$\frac{K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c) \quad W \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} w : \Theta \quad M \vdash_{\Theta} x : X}{W, x' : X[w] \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} \langle w, x' \rangle : (\Theta, x : X)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \dim(\alpha) = n_M \\ x \in \text{FV}(M_j), j \in \{2n_M - 1, 2n_M + 1\} \end{array}$$

$$\frac{W, \alpha : A, x : X, W' \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} w : \Theta}{W, x : X, \alpha : A, W' \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} w : \Theta} \quad \alpha \notin \text{FV}(X) \qquad \frac{W, \alpha : A, x : X, W' \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{pstar}} w : \Theta}{W, \alpha : A, x : X, W' \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{star}} w : \Theta} \quad \alpha \in \text{FV}(X)$$

where, with the notation $\Gamma \equiv (x_i : A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq l}$ and $K \equiv (\Gamma, c : \mathbf{Ob}, (p_i : T_{x_i})_{1 \leq i \leq l})$, as well as $M_j \equiv (x_{j,i} : T_{j,i})_{1 \leq i \leq l}$, the shorthand $\text{Star}(\Gamma, K, M, x_{j,i}, u : X, \alpha : T_{\alpha})$ stands for

$$\text{FV}(u : X) = \text{FV}(\alpha : T_{\alpha}) \cup \text{FV}(p_i : T_i)$$

$$\text{FV}(u : X) = \begin{cases} \text{FV}(\sigma^{n-j}(\alpha) : \partial T_{\alpha}) \cup \text{FV}(p_i : T_{x_i}), & i \text{ odd} \\ \text{FV}(\tau^{n-j}(\alpha) : \partial T_{\alpha}) \cup \text{FV}(p_i : T_{x_i}), & i \text{ even} \end{cases}$$

The following lemma affirms that we are indeed building a context morphism with the above rules.

Lemma 4.13. *Given a judgment $W \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{star}} w : \Theta$ we also have*

$$W \vdash, \quad \Theta \vdash, \quad W \vdash w : \Theta.$$

Proof. By induction. □

4.5 The Universal Property

We are now ready to formulate the universal property.

Definition 4.14 (Universal Property). *The rule for the universal property of limits in CaTT is given by*

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Lambda, \alpha : T_\alpha, \Delta \vdash_{K,\Theta} x : X \\ M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Lambda, \alpha : T_\alpha, \Delta \vdash_{K;\alpha}^{\text{star}} w : M \quad \Omega \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \theta : (K, \Theta) \end{array}}{\begin{array}{cccc} J_1 & J_2 & J_3 & J_4 \end{array}} \quad \dim(\alpha) = n_M$$

where the derivable judgments J_1, \dots, J_4 together with additional side conditions are given by:

$$\begin{array}{lll} J_1 : & \Omega, x' : X[\theta] \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \langle \theta, x' \rangle : (\Omega, x : X) & x \in \text{FV}(\Lambda) \\ J_2 : & \Omega \vdash \text{uni}_{\Gamma,x} : X[\theta] & x \in \{\alpha\} \\ J_3 : & \Omega \vDash \text{uni}_{\Gamma,x} : X[\theta] & x \in \text{FV}(\Delta) \\ J_4 : & \Omega \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \langle \theta, \text{uni}_{\Gamma,x} \rangle : (\Theta, x : X) & x \in \{\alpha\} \cup \text{FV}(\Delta) \end{array}$$

The terms $\text{uni}_{\Gamma,x}$ also depend on M and K as well as the context used in the **star** judgment, which should therefor also appear in the term constructor as subscripts. This, however would make the notation unweildly, because of which we suppress these dependencies.

Example 4.15. Consider the empty diagram $\emptyset \vdash$. Applying the rules for cones we can derive the judgment $(c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ cone } (\emptyset, c)$, that is, a cone over the empty diagram is just a 0-cell, the apex. A universal cone over \emptyset of shape $c : \mathbf{Ob}$ is then given by a context morphism $\emptyset \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \text{lim}_{\emptyset} \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob})$. Let us write \top instead of lim_{\emptyset} .

Regarding the universal property, a conical 2-transfor over \emptyset is given by $c : \mathbf{Ob}$, that is $(\emptyset; c : \mathbf{Ob}; \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset) \text{ ctrf } (\emptyset, c)$. The **star** judgement required by the rule must be of the form $c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, \alpha : c' \rightarrow c \vdash \langle c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob})$. The only judgment of the form $\vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}}$ available is $\emptyset \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob})$. Putting everything together, the first application of the rules gives

$$\frac{\begin{array}{l} (c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ cone } (\emptyset, c) \quad c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}} c' : \mathbf{Ob} \\ (c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ ctrf } (\emptyset, c) \quad c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}, f:c' \rightarrow c}^{\text{star}} \langle c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}) \end{array}}{c' : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top, c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob})}$$

and the second and final application gives

$$\frac{
\begin{array}{l}
(c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ cone } (\emptyset, c) \quad c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}, c':\mathbf{Ob}} f : c' \rightarrow c \\
(c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ ctrf } (\emptyset, c) \quad c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}, f:c' \rightarrow c}^{\text{star}} \langle c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}) \quad c' : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top, c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob})
\end{array}
}{
c' : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top, c', \text{uni}_{\emptyset, f} \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c)
}$$

Pictorially we have

$$\top \xleftarrow{\text{uni}_{\emptyset, f}} c'$$

Example 4.16. Consider again the diagram $\emptyset \vdash$. This time we consider $(c : \mathbf{Ob})$ as a 3-transfor over \emptyset . Application of the rule then gives

$$\frac{
\begin{array}{l}
(c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ cone } (\emptyset, c) \\
(c : \mathbf{Ob}) \text{ ctrf } (\emptyset, c) \\
c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c, g : c' \rightarrow c, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}} c' : \mathbf{Ob} \\
c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f : c' \rightarrow c, g : c' \rightarrow c, \alpha : f \rightarrow g \vdash_{c:\mathbf{Ob}; \alpha}^{\text{star}} \langle c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}) \\
c' : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob})
\end{array}
}{
c' : \mathbf{Ob} \vdash_{\emptyset}^{\text{uni}} \langle \top, c' \rangle : (c : \mathbf{Ob}, c' : \mathbf{Ob})
}$$

Three more applications give

$$c' : \mathbf{Ob}, f' : c' \rightarrow \top, g' : c' \rightarrow \top \vdash \left\langle \begin{array}{c} \top \\ c' \\ f' \\ g' \\ \text{uni}_{\emptyset, \alpha} \end{array} \right\rangle : \left(\begin{array}{c} c : \mathbf{Ob} \\ c' : \mathbf{Ob} \\ f : c' \rightarrow c \\ g : c' \rightarrow c \\ \alpha : f \rightarrow g \end{array} \right)$$

Pictorially we have

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{ccc}
& f' & \\
\top & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \\
& \Downarrow \text{uni}_{\emptyset, \alpha} c' & \\
& \xrightarrow{\quad} & \\
& g' &
\end{array}
\end{array}$$

4.6 Free Variables and Admissibility of Cut

For the type theory to function properly we need to make sure the cut rule is admissible, i.e., we can perform substitution. To ensure the admissibility of the cut rule we do the usual trick: introduce just enough cut into the remaining rules. In our case, it suffices to do this for all the rules introducing new terms. For the universal cone, the rules take the form

$$\frac{
(\Theta, x : X, \Theta') \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \kappa : \Theta \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma
}{
\Delta \vdash \text{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma] : X[\kappa \circ \gamma]
}$$

$$\frac{
(\Theta, x : X, \Theta') \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \kappa : \Theta
}{
\Gamma \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \langle \kappa, \text{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}[\text{id}_{\Gamma}] \rangle : (\Theta, x : X)
}$$

For the universal property we make similar modifications. The rule for J_1 remains unchanged. For J_2 we add in a cut and modify the rule accordingly

$$\frac{K \text{ cone } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Lambda, \alpha : T_\alpha, \Delta \vdash_{K, \Theta} x : X \quad \dim(\alpha) = n_M}{M \text{ ctrf } (\Gamma, c) \quad \Lambda, \alpha : T_\alpha, \Delta \vdash_{K, \alpha}^{\text{star}} w : M \quad \Omega \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \theta : (K, \Theta) \quad \Phi \vdash \omega : \Omega} \quad x \in \{\alpha\}$$

$$\Phi \vdash \text{uni}_{\Omega, x}[\omega] : X[\theta \circ \omega]$$

As for J_3 and J_4 the premise of the rules stay the same but the conclusion becomes

$$J_3 : \quad \Omega \vDash \text{uni}_{\Gamma, x}[\text{id}_\Gamma] : X[\theta] \quad x \in \text{FV}(\Delta)$$

$$J_4 : \quad \Omega \vdash_{\Gamma}^{\text{uni}} \langle \theta, \text{uni}_{\Gamma, x}[\text{id}_\Gamma] \rangle : (\Theta, x : X) \quad x \in \{\alpha\} \cup \text{FV}(\Delta)$$

Finally, we add a cut to the rule producing the coinductive inverses:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow_A t \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash u[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vDash u : s \rightarrow_A t \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{inv}(u)[\gamma] : t[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} s[\gamma]}$$

To make substitution admissible we then make the following definition.

Definition 4.17. *Substitution on term constructors is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma][\delta] &\equiv \text{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma \circ \delta], & \text{inv}(u)[\gamma] &\equiv \text{inv}(u[\gamma]) \\ \text{uni}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma][\delta] &\equiv \text{uni}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma \circ \delta], & \text{eta}(u)[\gamma] &\equiv \text{eta}(u[\gamma]) \\ & & \text{eps}(u)[\gamma] &\equiv \text{eps}(u[\gamma]). \end{aligned}$$

With this at hand one can prove

Lemma 4.18. *The following rules are admissible in CaTT*

$$(i) \text{ For types: } \frac{\Gamma \vdash A \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash A[\gamma]} \quad \text{and} \quad A[\gamma][\delta] \equiv A[\gamma \circ \delta] \quad \text{for all } \Phi \vdash \delta : \Delta.$$

$$(ii) \text{ For terms: } \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash t[\gamma] : A[\gamma]} \quad \text{and} \quad t[\gamma][\delta] \equiv t[\gamma \circ \delta] \quad \text{for all } \Phi \vdash \delta : \Delta.$$

$$(iii) \text{ For contexts: } \frac{\Gamma \vdash \theta : \Theta \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \theta \circ \gamma : \Theta} \quad \text{and} \quad (\theta \circ \gamma) \circ \delta \equiv \theta \circ (\gamma \circ \delta) \quad \text{for all } \Phi \vdash \delta : \Delta.$$

Next we define the free variables and the depth of the new term constructors.

Definition 4.19. *The free variables of the term constructors are defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FV}(\text{ucone}_{\Gamma, x}[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(\gamma) & \text{FV}(\text{inv}(\mathbf{u})[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(u[\gamma]) \\ \text{FV}(\text{uni}_{\Gamma, x}[\omega]) &:= \text{FV}(\omega) & \text{FV}(\text{eta}(u)[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(u[\gamma]) \\ & & \text{FV}(\text{eps}(u)[\gamma]) &:= \text{FV}(u[\gamma]) \end{aligned}$$

5 (∞, n) -Categories

Discarding the (OP) rule and making the coherence rule freely available without any side conditions yields a type-theoretic definition of ∞ -groupoids (see Finster–Mimram [11]). This definition of ∞ -groupoids is closely related to that of Brunerie [8], which served as the direct inspiration in the development of **CaTT**. With this in mind, we can modify **CaTT** in a way which interpolates between these two extremes, providing us with a candidate for a type-theoretic definition of (∞, n) -categories we call **nCaTT**. We only present the term constructor rules here, as all other rules remain the same as in Definition (2.1).

Definition 5.1. *In addition to all the rules in Definition 2.1 except for (OP) and (COH), **nCaTT** is defined by the rules:*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \partial^- \Gamma \vdash s : A \quad \partial^+ \Gamma \vdash t : A \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{op}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]} \text{ (OP)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{FV}(\partial^- \Gamma) = \text{FV}(s : A) \\ \text{FV}(\partial^+ \Gamma) = \text{FV}(t : A) \\ \dim(A) < n \end{array}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash_{\text{ps}} \quad \Gamma \vdash s \rightarrow_A t \quad \Delta \vdash \gamma : \Gamma}{\Delta \vdash \text{coh}_{\Gamma, s \rightarrow_A t}[\gamma] : s[\gamma] \rightarrow_{A[\gamma]} t[\gamma]} \text{ (nCOH)} \quad \begin{array}{l} \dim(A) \geq n \text{ or} \\ \text{FV}(\Gamma) = \text{FV}(t : A) \\ \text{FV}(\Gamma) = \text{FV}(s : A) \end{array}$$

In the special case of $(\infty, 1)$ -categories, all morphisms of dimension greater than 1 are already invertible. As a result, in the definition of $(\infty, 1)$ -limits, there is no need for addition rules ensuring the invertibility of certain cells. That is, we replace J_2 and J_3 with the $\Omega \vdash \text{uni}_{\Gamma, x} : X[\theta]$ for $x \in \text{FV}(\Delta) \cup \alpha$. Again thanks to the invertibility of all morphisms above dimension 1, the resulting theory describes an $(\infty, 1)$ -category with (ordinary) finite limits.

References

- [1] Dimitri Ara and Georges Maltsiniotis. *Joint et tranches pour les ∞ -catégories strictes*. Société Mathématique de France, 2020.
- [2] Clark Barwick. *(∞, n) -Cat as a closed model category*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2005.
- [3] Clark Barwick and Christopher Schommer-Pries. On the unicity of the theory of higher categories. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 34(4):1011–1058, 2021.
- [4] Thibaut Benjamin, Eric Finster, and Samuel Mimram. Globular weak ω -categories as models of a type theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04475*, 2021.
- [5] Thibaut Benjamin and Ioannis Markakis. Duality for weak ω -categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01611*, 2024.
- [6] Thibaut Benjamin and Ioannis Markakis. Invertible cells in ω -categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12127*, 2024.

- [7] Thibaut Benjamin, Ioannis Markakis, and Chiara Sarti. Catt contexts are finite computads. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00398*, 2024.
- [8] Guillaume Brunerie. On the homotopy groups of spheres in homotopy type theory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.05916*, 2016.
- [9] Sjoerd E Crans. Localizations of transfors. *K-theory*, 28(1):39–105, 2003.
- [10] Christopher J Dean, Eric Finster, Ioannis Markakis, David Reutter, and Jamie Vicary. Computads for weak ω -categories as an inductive type. *Advances in Mathematics*, 450:109739, 2024.
- [11] Eric Finster and Samuel Mimram. A type-theoretical definition of weak ω -categories. In *2017 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–12. IEEE, 2017.
- [12] Félix Loubaton. Theory and models of (∞, ω) -categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.11931*, 2023.
- [13] Georges Maltsiniotis. Grothendieck ∞ -groupoids, and still another definition of ∞ -categories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1009.2331*, 2010.
- [14] Charles Rezk. A cartesian presentation of weak n -categories. *Geometry & Topology*, 14(1):521–571, 2010.