# Homotopy type theory: a new connection between logic, category theory and topology

André Joyal

UQÀM

Category Theory Seminar, CUNY, October 26, 2018

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Classical connections between logic, algebra and topology

- Boolean algebras
- Heyting algebras
- Cylindric algebras
- Categorical doctrines
- Cartesian closed categories and  $\lambda$ -calculus
- Autonomous categories and linear logic

Topos theoretic connections:

- Frames and locales
- Elementary toposes and intuitionistic set theory

▲ロト ▲帰 ト ▲ ヨ ト ▲ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ・ の Q ()

- Grothendieck toposes and geometric logic
- Realisability toposes

## Axiomatic Homotopy Theory

J.H.C. Whitehead (1950):

The ultimate aim of algebraic homotopy is to construct a purely algebraic theory, which is equivalent to homotopy theory in the same sort of way that analytic is equivalent to pure projective geometry.

Traditional axiomatic systems in homotopy theory:

- Triangulated categories [Verdier 1963];
- Homotopical algebra [Quillen 1967];
- Derivators [Grothendieck 1984]

New axiomatic systems:

- Higher toposes [Rezk, Lurie, ....];
- Homotopy type theory [Voevodsky, Awodey & Warren,....];
- Cubical type theory [Coquand & collaborators].

## Voevodsky's Univalent Foundation Program

Voevodsky's univalence principle is to type theory what the induction principle is to Peano arithmetic.

A **univalent type theory** (UTT) is obtained by adding the univalence principle to Martin-Löf type theory (MLTT).

The goal of Voevodsky's Univalent Foundation Program is to

- give constructive mathematics a new foundation;
- apply type theory to homotopy theory;
- develop proof assistants based in UTT.

But many basic questions remain to be solved.

## Goals of my talk

To describe the connection between type theory, category theory and topology by using the notion of **tribe**.

#### Theorem

(Gambino & Garner, Shulman) The syntaxic category of type theory is a tribe.

The notion of tribe is a gateway to type theory:

We may work backward

*Tribe*  $\Rightarrow$  *Type Theory* 

## EVERY MATHEMATICIAN IS USING TYPE THEORY WITHOUT BEING AWARE OF IT

## Overview

- 1. What is a tribe?
- 2. What is type theory ?
- 3. What is univalence?
- 4. What is descent?
- 5. What is an elementary higher topos ?

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで

6. Applications

## Carrable maps

Recall that a map  $p: X \to B$  in a category C is said to be **carrable** if the fiber product of p with any map  $f: A \to B$  exists,



The projection  $\pi_1$  is called the **base change** of *p* along *f*.

## The notion of clan

## Definition

A **clan** is a category C with terminal object 1 and equipped with a class F of carrable maps called **fibrations** satisfying the following conditions:

- every isomorphism is a fibration;
- the composite of two fibrations is a fibration;
- the base change of a fibration along any map is a fibration;
- the unique map  $X \to 1$  is a fibration for every object  $X \in C$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

#### Definition

A homomorphism of clans  $F:\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}'$  is a functor which preserves

- fibrations and base changes of fibrations;
- terminal objects.

## Anodyne maps

#### Definition

A map  $u : A \to B$  in a clan C is said to be is **anodyne** if it has the left lifting property with respect to every fibration  $f : X \twoheadrightarrow Y$ .

This means that every commutative square



has a diagonal filler  $d: B \rightarrow X$  (du = a and fd = b).



### Definition

#### A clan ${\mathcal E}$ is a ${\boldsymbol{tribe}}$ if

- the base change of an anodyne map along a fibration is anodyne;
- ► every map f : A → B admits a factorization f = pu with u anodyne and p a fibration:



## Definition

A homomorphism of tribes  $F : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}'$  is a homomorphism of clans which takes anodyne maps to anodyne maps.

## The tribe of Kan complexes

A map of simplicial sets  $f : X \to Y$  is said to be a **Kan fibration** if every commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Lambda^{k}[n] \xrightarrow{h} X \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow^{f} \\
\Delta[n] \xrightarrow{y} Y
\end{array}$$

has a diagonal filler  $h': \Delta[n] \to Y$ .

A simplicial set X is said to be a **Kan complex** if the map  $X \to 1$  is a Kan fibration.

## The tribe of Kan complexes

#### Theorem

The category of Kan complexes **Kan** has the structure of a tribe, where a fibration is a Kan fibration.

Remark: a map between Kan complexes  $u : A \rightarrow B$  is anodyne iff it is a strong deformation retract.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Types and elements

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a tribe.

We shall say that an object  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  is a **type** and write

 $\vdash A$  : Type

We shall say that a map  $a: 1 \rightarrow A$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  is an **element** of type A and write

 $\vdash a : A$ 

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Remark: an element *a* : *A* is often called a **term** of type *A*.

## Elementary extension of a tribe

Let  $\mathcal E$  be a tribe.

Then for every object  $A \in \mathcal{E}$  we have a new tribe  $\mathcal{E}(A)$ .

By construction,  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  is the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{E}/A$  whose objects are fibrations  $p: X \twoheadrightarrow A$ .

A map  $f : (X, p) \to (Y, q)$  in  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  is a *fibration* if the map  $f : X \to Y$  is a fibration in  $\mathcal{E}$ .



## A fibration is a family of objects.

If  $p: E \to A$  is a fibration, then the object (E, p) of the tribe  $\mathcal{E}(A)$  is called a **dependant type in context** A.

A type theorist will write

$$x: A \vdash E(x): Type \tag{1}$$

where E(x) denotes the **fiber** of  $p : E \to A$  at a variable element x : A.



The fibration  $p: E \to A$  is defining a *family* (E(x) | x : A) of objects of  $\mathcal{E}$  indexed by elements of A.

## Sections of a fibration

A section  $s : A \to E$  of a fibration  $p : E \to A$  has a value s(x) : E(x) for every element x : A.



A type theorist will write:

$$x: A \vdash s(x): E(x) \tag{2}$$

The section  $s : A \to E$  is defining a *family of elements* s(x) : E(x) indexed by the elements x : A.

### Elementary extension

The functor

 $e: \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}(A)$ 

defined by putting  $e(X) = (A \times X, \pi_1)$  for every object  $X \in \mathcal{E}$  is a homomorphism of tribes.

In type theory, the functor  $e : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}(A)$  is defined by *context extension*:

A map between two types  $f : A \rightarrow B$  is an element f(x) : B indexed by a variable element x : A.

$$x: A \vdash f(x): B \tag{3}$$

## Change of parameters

If  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is a map in a tribe  $\mathcal{E}$ , then the base change functor

$$f^{\star}: \mathcal{E}(B) \to \mathcal{E}(A)$$

is a homomorphism of tribes.

In type theory, the functor  $f^*$  corresponds to the operation of substitution: y := f(x)

$y: B \vdash E(y): Type$	$y: B \vdash s(y): E(y)$
$\overline{x: A \vdash E(f(x)): Type}$	$\overline{x:A\vdash s(f(x)):E(f(x))}$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## $\Sigma$ -formation rule

If A is an object in a tribe  $\mathcal{E}$ , then the functor  $e_A : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}(A)$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_A : \mathcal{E}(A) \to \mathcal{E}$  defined by putting  $\Sigma_A(E, p) = E$ .

$$\frac{x: A \vdash E(x): Type}{\vdash \sum_{x:A} E(x): Type}$$

More generally if  $f : A \to B$  is a fibration, then the base change functor  $f^* : \mathcal{E}(B) \to \mathcal{E}(A)$  has a left adjoint  $\Sigma_f : \mathcal{E}(A) \to \mathcal{E}(B)$ .

$$\frac{x: A \vdash E(x): Type}{y: B \vdash \sum_{x:A(y)} E(x): Type}$$

## Internal products

A tribe  $\mathcal{E}$  has **internal products** if for every fibration  $f : A \to B$ the base change functor  $f^* : \mathcal{E}(B) \to \mathcal{E}(A)$  has a right adjoint

$$\Pi_f:\mathcal{E}(A)\to\mathcal{E}(B)$$

and if

• the functor  $\Pi_f$  takes anodyne maps to anodyne maps;

the Beck-Chevalley condition holds:



The tribe of Kan complexes Kan has internal products.

## Internal products

If  $\mathcal E$  has internal products, then the functor  $e:\mathcal E\to\mathcal E(A)$  has a right adjoint

 $\Pi_A:\mathcal{E}(A)\to\mathcal{E}$ 

for every object  $A \in \mathcal{E}$ . In type theoretic notation:

 $\frac{x: A \vdash E(x): Type}{\vdash \prod_{x:A} E(x): Type}$ 

The object of maps  $A \rightarrow B$  between two objects  $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$  is defined by putting

$$[A,B] := \prod_{x:A} B$$

An element f : [A, B] is a map  $f : A \rightarrow B$ .

## Path object

Let A be an object in a tribe  $\mathcal{E}$ .

A **path object** for A is obtained by factoring the diagonal  $\Delta : A \rightarrow A \times A$  as an anodyne map  $r : A \rightarrow PA$  followed by a fibration  $(s, t) : PA \rightarrow A \times A$ ,



A **homotopy**  $h: f \rightsquigarrow g$  between two maps  $f, g: A \rightarrow B$  is a map  $h: A \rightarrow PB$  such that sh = f and th = g.

The homotopy relation  $f \sim g$  is a congruence on the arrows of  $\mathcal{E}$ .

## The homotopy category

Let  ${\mathcal E}$  be a tribe

The **homotopy category** of  $\mathcal{E}$  is the quotient of  $\mathcal{E}$  by the homotopy relation  $\sim$ .

$$\mathit{ho}(\mathcal{E}):=\mathcal{E}/\sim$$

A map  $f : X \to Y$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  is called a **homotopy equivalence** if it is invertible in  $ho(\mathcal{E})$ .

Every anodyne map is a homotopy equivalence.

An object X is **contractible** if the map  $X \rightarrow 1$  is a homotopy equivalence.

## Identity type

In Martin-Löf type theory, there is a type constructor which associates to every type A a dependant type

$$x: A, y: A \vdash Id_A(x, y) : Type$$

called the **identity type** of A.

An element  $p : Id_A(x, y)$  is regarded as a **proof** that  $x =_A y$ .

There is a reflexivity term

$$x:A \vdash r(x): Id_A(x,x)$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

which proves that  $x =_A x$ .

The identity type is a path object

Let us put

$$Id_A = \sum_{x:A} \sum_{y:A} Id_A(x,y)$$

We obtain a factorisation of the diagonal  $\Delta: A \to A imes A$ 



(Awodey & Warren ) The factorisation  $\Delta = (s, t)r$  a path object for A. A proof  $p : Id_A(x, y)$  is a homotopy  $p : x \rightsquigarrow y$ .

## Tribes are fibration categories

A Brown fibration category is a clan  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a class  $\mathcal{W}$  of equivalences such that:

- the base change of an equivalence along a fibration is an equivalence;
- every map  $f : A \rightarrow B$  admits a factorization f = pw with w an equivalence and p a fibration;
- W satisfies 6-for-2:



#### Theorem

(Shulman, J.) Every tribe is a Brown fibration category.

## HOTT in action

Let  $\ensuremath{\mathcal{E}}$  be a tribe with internal products.

Definition (Voevodsky) If A is an object of  $\mathcal{E}$  we can put

$$lsCont(A) := \sum_{y:A} \prod_{x:A} Id_A(x,y)$$

An element p : IsCont(A) is a **proof** that A is contractible This may be compared with

$$IsSingleton(A) := (\exists y \in A)(\forall x \in A) \ x = y$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

(the Curry-Howard correspondance).

## The object IsEquiv(f)

Let  $f : A \to B$  be a map in a tribe  $\mathcal{E}$  (with internal products). The *homotopy fiber* of f at y : B is defined by putting

$$Fib(f)(y) := \sum_{x:A} Id_B(f(x), y)$$

#### Theorem

(Voevodsky) A map  $f : A \to B$  is a homotopy equivalence if and only if the object

$$lsEquiv(f) := \prod_{y:B} lsCont(Fib(f)(y))$$

has an element p : IsEquiv(f).

Let A and B be two objects in a tribe (with internal products). Definition (Voevodsky) Let us put

$$Eq(A,B) := \sum_{f:[A,B]} IsEquiv(f)$$

An element w : Eq(A, B) is a homotopy equivalence  $w : A \simeq B$ .



For every fibration  $p: E \rightarrow A$  let us put

$$Eq_{A\times A}(E) = \sum_{x:A} \sum_{y:A} Eq(E(x), E(y))$$

We then have a factorisation



where u(x) : Eq(E(x), E(x)) represents the identity map  $E(x) \rightarrow E(x)$  for every x : A.

## Connection

#### Definition

A (pseudo) connection on a fibration  $p : E \to A$  is a map  $\gamma : Id_A \to Eq_{A \times A}(E)$  such that the following square commutes

$$A \xrightarrow{u} Eq_{A \times A}(E)$$

$$r \bigvee \gamma \swarrow (p_1, p_2)$$

$$Id_A \xrightarrow{(s,t)} A \times A$$

The map  $\gamma(x, y) : Id_A(x, y) \to Eq(E(x), E(y))$  takes a path  $p : x \rightsquigarrow y$  to an equivalence  $\gamma(p) : E(x) \simeq E(y)$ .

#### Theorem

(Voevodsky) Every fibration  $p : E \to A$  admits a connection  $\gamma : Id_A \to Eq_{A \times A}(E)$  and  $\gamma$  is homotopy unique.

#### Definition

(Voevodsky) We say that a fibration  $E \to A$  is **univalent** if the connection  $\gamma : A \to Eq_{A \times A}(E)$  is a homotopy equivalence.

This means that the map

$$\gamma(x,y): Id_A(x,y) \to Eq(E(x),E(y))$$

is a homotopy equivalence for every x, y : A.

A fibration  $E \to A$  is univalent if and only if the unit map  $u: A \to Eq_{A \times A}(E)$  is a homotopy equivalence.

## Small fibrations

Let  $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$  be a tribe.

We say that sub-class  $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  is a class of **small fibrations** if the following conditions hold:

- every isomorphism is a small fibration;
- the base change of a small fibration along any map is small;
- If w : (X, p) → (Y, p) is a homotopy equivalence in E(A), then the fibration p : X → A is small if and only if the fibration q : Y → A is small;
- ► Etc ....

In the tribe of Kan complexes **Kan**, there is a notion of  $\kappa$ -small fibration for every strongly inaccessible cardinal  $\kappa$ .

## Semi-universal fibration

We say that a small fibration  $q : \mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{U}$  is **semi-universal** if for every small fibration  $p : E \to A$  there exists a homotopy pullback square:



(homotopy pullback square: the induced map  $E \to A \times_{\mathbb{U}} \mathbb{E}$  is a homotopy equivalence)

(Voevodsky) If the fibration  $q: \mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{U}$  is univalent, then the classifying pair  $(\phi, \phi')$  is homotopy unique.

Martin-Löf type theory (MLTT) has semi-universal fibrations, but they are not univalent.

We shall say that a small fibration  $q : \mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{U}$  is **universal** if it is semi-universal and univalent. The object  $(\mathbb{U}, q)$  is said to be a *universe*.

#### Theorem

(Voevodsky) The tribe of Kan complexes Kan has a universal  $\kappa$ -small fibration  $\mathbb{E}_{\kappa} \to \mathbb{U}_{\kappa}$  for every strongly inaccessible cardinal  $\kappa$ .

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

## Univalent type theory

## Definition

We shall say that the **univalence principle** holds in a tribe if for every fibration  $p: E \to A$  there exists a univalent fibration  $p': E' \to A'$  together with a homotopy pullback square



#### Definition

We shall say that a type theory T is **univalent** the univalence principle holds in T.

For example, Cubical Type Theory (CTT) (Thierry Coquand and collaborators) is univalent.

## Homotopy colimits in a tribe

The notion of homotopy colimit is defined in type theory with the notion of **inductive type**.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

References: *Inductive types in homotopy type theory* [Awodey-Gambino-Sojakova].

We shall use the notion of homotopy pushout informally.

## Homotopy pushouts

Recall that a commutative square of simplicial sets



is said to be be **homotopy pushout**, or **homotopy cocartesian** if the map  $B \sqcup_A E' \to F$  in the commutative diagram



is a homotopy equivalence, where  $v = wv' : A \to E' \to E$  is a factorisation of v as a cofibration v' followed by homotopy equivalence w.

#### Descent

A cube  $C : [1]^3 \to \mathcal{E}$ , when viewed from above, becomes a square  $C' : [1]^2 \to \mathcal{E}^{[1]}$  in the arrow category of  $\mathcal{E}$ .



An edge of C' is a square in  $\mathcal{E}$ .

#### Theorem

[Rezk] (Descent for pushouts) Suppose that the square  $C' : [1]^2 \rightarrow \Delta \mathbf{Set}^{[1]}$  is homotopy cocartesian. If the squares  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  of C' are homotopy cartesian, then so are the squares  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$ .

#### Univalence $\Rightarrow$ Descent

The proof is left as an exercise to the reader. Hint: we can suppose that the maps f, g, h and k are Kan fibrations; we then use the following diagram



where  $Q : \mathbb{E} \to \mathbb{U}$  is a univalent Kan fibration, and where  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are classifying f and g respectively.

## Model topos

#### Definition

[Rezk] A combinatorial model category  $\mathcal{E}$  is said to be a **model topos** if it is Quillen equivalent to a left exact Bousfield localisation of a model category  $[C, \Delta Set]$  equipped with the projective model structure.

#### Theorem

[Rezk] A combinatorial model category  $\mathcal{E}$  is a model topos if and only if the following two conditions hold:

The base change functor f<sup>\*</sup>: E/B → E/A preserves homotopy colimits for every map between fibrant objects f : A → B;

• The descent principle holds (for cubes).

## Grothendieck topos

#### Definition

A category  $\mathcal{E}$  is said to be a **topos** if it is equivalent to a left exact localisation of a presheaf category [C, Set]

#### Theorem

A locally presentable category  $\mathcal{E}$  is a topos if and only if the following two conditions hold:

The base change functor f<sup>\*</sup> : E/B → E/A preserves colimits for every map f : A → B;

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

► The presheaf Sub : E<sup>op</sup> → Set takes pushout squares to pullback squares.

## Grothendieck topos versus $\infty$ -topos

Grothendieck topos	$\infty$ -topos
monomorphisms	$\kappa$ -small maps
$t:1 ightarrow \Omega$	$\mathbb{E}_{\kappa} \to \mathbb{U}_{\kappa}$

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

From type theory to higher toposes



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- syntaxic category [Gambino & Garner]
- localisation [Kapulkin & Szumilo]
- ▶ elementary ∞-topos [Lurie, Shulman]

## What is an elementary $\infty$ -topos ?

Tentative answer:

## Definition

A tribe  ${\mathcal E}$  is an **elementary infinity-topos** if

- *E* has internal products;
- *E* has inductive types;
- *E* is univalent.

An elementary infinity-topos can also be defined to be a quasi-category satisfying certain conditions. See: *A theory of elementary higher toposes* [Nima Rasekh].

## Applications of type theory

- The Blakers-Massey Theorem
- The Generalised Blakers-Massey Theorem
- Goodwillie's Calculus
- Weiss's Calculus

A new proof of the Blakers-Massey theorem was found in type theory by [Finster-Licata-Lumsdaine].

The new proof was reformulated in the language of model categories by Charles Rezk.

Ref: A mechanization of the Blakers-Massey connectivity theorem in Homotopy Type Theory [Favonia-Finster-Licata-Lumsdaine]

## The Blakers-Massey theorem

Recall that a simplical set X is said to be (-1)-connected if it is non-empty.

If  $n \ge 0$ , X is said to be *n*-connected if it is connected and  $\pi_k(X, x) = 0$  for every  $1 \le k \le n$  and  $x \in X$ .

#### Definition

We shall say that a map of simplicial set  $f : X \to Y$  is *n*-connected if its homotopy fibers are *n*-connected.

Warning: the notion *n*-connected map defined above is often said to be (n + 1)-connected in the literature.

## The Blakers-Massey theorem

#### Theorem

(Blakers-Massey) Suppose that we have a homotopy pushout square of simplicial sets



in which f is m-connected and g is n-connected. Then the canonical map  $(f,g) : A \to B \times^h_D C$  to the homotopy pullback is (m + n)-connected.

## The Freudenthal suspension theorem

The BM theorem implies the Freudenthal suspension theorem:

If X is a pointed *n*-connected space, then the canonical map  $X \to \Omega \Sigma X$  is 2*n*-connected.

Proof: If CX is the (reduced) cone on X, then we have a pushout square



Moreover,

 $\Omega\Sigma X\simeq CX\times_{\Sigma X}CX$ 

Hence the map  $X \rightarrow \Omega \Sigma X$  is 2*n*-connected by the BM theorem.

## The generalised Blakers-Massey theorem

The class of *n*-connected maps is replaced by the left class  $\mathcal{L}$  of a modality.

Ref: Modalities in homotopy type theory [Rijke-Shulman-Spitter].

By definition, a **modality** in an  $\infty$ -topos  $\mathcal{E}$  is a homotopy factorisation system  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$  in which the left class  $\mathcal{L}$  is closed under base changes.

For example,  $\mathcal{L}$  can be the class of effective epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  is the class of monomorphisms.

More generally,  $\mathcal{L}$  can be the class of *n*-connected maps in  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  the class of *n*-truncated maps.

## The generalised Blakers-Massey Theorem

Recall that the **pushout product**  $f \Box g$  of two maps  $f : A' \to A$ and  $g : B' \to B$  in an  $\infty$ -topos  $\mathcal{E}$  is the map

$$f \Box g : (A' \times B) \sqcup_{A' \times B'} (A \times B') \to A \times B$$

obtained from the commutative square

$$\begin{array}{c} A' \times B' \xrightarrow{f \times B'} A \times B' \\ A' \times g \\ A' \times B \xrightarrow{f \times B} A \times B \end{array}$$

## The generalised Blakers-Massey Theorem

Recall that the diagonal of a map  $f:A \to B$  in an  $\infty$ -topos  $\mathcal E$  is the map

$$\Delta(f): A \to A \times_B A$$

#### Theorem

(GBM theorem)  $[{\rm ABFJ}]$  Let  $(\mathcal{L},\mathcal{R})$  be a modality in an  $\infty\text{-topos}$   $\mathcal E$  and let



be a pushout square in  $\mathcal{E}$ . If  $\Delta(f) \Box \Delta(g) \in \mathcal{L}$ , then the canonical map  $(f,g) : Z \to X \times_W Y$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Ref: *The Generalised Blakers-Massey Theorem* [Anel-Biedermann-Finster-Joyal]

Remarks

- if f is m-connected, then  $\Delta(f)$  is (m-1) connected;
- If f is m-connected and g is n-connected, then f□g is (m + n + 2) connected.

Thus, if f is m-connected and g is n-connected, then  $\Delta(f)\Box\Delta(g)$  is (m + n) connected.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Therefore:  $GBMT \Rightarrow BMT$ .

The proof of the GBMT depends on the following descent lemma.

#### Lemma

[ABFJ] Let  $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$  be a modality in an  $\infty$ -topos  $\mathcal{E}$  and let



be a pushout square in  $\mathcal{E}^{[1]}$ . If the square  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are  $\mathcal{L}$ -cartesian, then so are the squares  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$ .

## Goodwillie's Calculus

Let S be the quasicategory of spaces and let  $S_{\bullet}$  be the quasicategory of *pointed* spaces.

A functor  $F : S_{\bullet} \to S$  is said to be a *homotopy functor* if it preserves directed colimits.

Recall that Goodwillie's Calculus associates to a homotopy functor  $F : S_{\bullet} \rightarrow S$  a tower of approximations by *n*-excisive functors:

$$P_0(F) \longleftarrow P_1(F) \longleftarrow P_2(F) \longleftarrow (5)$$

The first approximation  $P_0(F)$  is the constant functor with value F(0).

## Postnikov's tower

There is an analogy between the Goodwillie tower of a functor F and the Postnikov tower of a space X

$$S_0(X) \longleftarrow S_1(X) \longleftarrow S_2(X) \longleftarrow$$
 (6)

The first approximation  $S_0(X)$  is the set  $\pi_0(X)$  of connected components of X.

The classical Blakers-Massey theorem is a powerfull tool for studying the Postnikov tower.

Biedermann's question: Is there a Blakers-Massey theorem for Goodwillie's Calculus?

## Goodwillie's topos

A homotopy functor  $F : S_{\bullet} \to S$  is entirely determined by its restriction to the sub-quasicategory of *finite pointed* spaces  $Fin_{\bullet} \subset S_{\bullet}$ .

It follows that the quasi-category of homotopy functors  $S_{\bullet} \to S$  is equivalent to the quasi-category  $[\textit{Fin}_{\bullet},S]$  of all functors  $\textit{Fin}_{\bullet} \to S$ .

The functor  $P_n : [Fin_{\bullet}, S] \rightarrow [Fin_{\bullet}, S]$  is a left exact reflection by a theorem of Goodwillie.

(Biedermann, Rezk) The quasicategory  $[Fin_{\bullet}, S]$  is an  $\infty$ -topos, since it is a presheaf category. Hence the quasi-category  $[Fin_{\bullet}, S]_{(n)}$  of *n*-excisive functors is an  $\infty$ -topos.

## P-equivalences

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an  $\infty$ -topos and  $P: \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$  a left exact reflection.

A map  $f : X \to Y$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  is said to be a *P*-equivalence if the map  $P(f) : P(X) \to P(Y)$  is an equivalence.

A map  $f : X \to Y$  is said to be a *P*-local if the naturality square



is cartesian.

This defines a modality  $(\mathcal{L}_P, \mathcal{R}_P)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_P$  is the class of *P*-equivalences and  $\mathcal{R}_P$  is the class of *P*-local maps.

The modality  $(\mathcal{L}_P, \mathcal{R}_P)$  is said to be *left exact*.

## The analogy

spaces	homotopy functors
Postnikov tower	Goodwillie Tower
<i>n</i> -connected maps	$P_n$ -equivalences
<i>n</i> -truncated maps	P <sub>n</sub> -local maps
BM theorem	BM theorem for GC

## BM theorem for Goodwillie calculus

#### Theorem

[ABFJ] Consider a homotopy pushout square of homotopy functors:



If f is a  $P_m$ -equivalence and g is a  $P_n$ -equivalence, then the induced map  $(f,g): Z \to G \times^h_K H$  is a  $P_{m+n+1}$ -equivalence.

Ref: Goodwillie's calculus of homotopy functors and higher topos theory [Anel-Biedermann-Finster-Joyal]

## Some applications

A homotopy functor F is said to be *n*-homogenous if  $P_n(F) = F$ and  $P_{n-1}F = P_0F$ . The space  $P_0(F) = F(0)$  is the base of F.

#### Theorem

(Goodwillie) The category of n-homogenous homotopy functors over a fixed base is stable for  $n \ge 1$ .

A homotopy functor F is said to be *n*-reduced if  $P_n(F) = 0$ .

#### Theorem

(Arone-Dwyer-Lesh) If a homotopy functor F is n-reduced and (2n - 1)-excisive, then it is infinitely deloopable.

#### Theorem

(Goodwillie) If  $n \ge 1$  and F is a n-excisive functor with base A := F(0), then the map  $F \to P_{n-1}F$  is a principal G-fibration, where G is a n-homogenous functor over A.

Vladimir Voevodsky was a visionary.

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Vladimir Voevodsky was a visionary.

I hope his dream of univalent foundation will be realised in a near future!

Thank you for your attention!

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>