

On the Cubical Model of Homotopy Type Theory
— *work in progress* —

Steve Awodey
Carnegie Mellon University

Deutsche Mathematiker-Vereinigung
Hamburg, September 2015

Why Cubical HoTT?

- ▶ Basic MLTT has a **constructive character** that makes it well-suited for use in computational proof assistants: strong normalization of terms, decidability of type-checking, decidability of judgemental equality, canonicity, etc.
- ▶ But when we add new **axioms** like Univalence and HITs, this constructive character is spoiled. Instances of UA cannot always be eliminated, and new primitive terms of higher Id-type need not reduce to normal forms.
- ▶ A “**normalization up to homotopy**” algorithm could partially restore the constructive character of the system.
- ▶ But, as recently shown by **Coquand** et al., a system with additional cubical structure seems to allow for such extensions while still retaining a constructive character.
- ▶ This could lead to a proof of normalization up to homotopy for the **original** system via an interpretation. Moreover, it could also serve on its own as the basis of a new generation of proof assistants based on **cubical HoTT**.

Cubical HoTT: Recent work

Why cubical?

- ▶ Some success was had by Licata-Harper (2011) and Shulman (2013) in verifying the homotopy canonicity conjecture at **low dimensions**, using methods based on **groupoids**.
- ▶ In recent and current work, Coquand and collaborators have devised an approach based on a **constructive** interpretation of HoTT in (different versions of) **cubical sets**, which are a form of ∞ -**groupoids**.
- ▶ Cubical sets are a **combinatorial** model of homotopy theory, introduced by Kan and still used in algebraic topology. Like the more familiar simplicial sets, they provide a more **algebraic** setting to study the homotopy theory of spaces.
- ▶ Voevodsky's original model of UA used classical **simplicial** sets and is **not constructive**. Known models of HITs are also based on **classical methods** from the theory of ∞ -toposes.

Cubical HoTT: Recent success

Cubes rule!

- ▶ The cubical model suggests enriching the type theory itself with some additional **cubical operations** and **equations** which are present in the model, and which allow calculations that are otherwise available only “up-to-homotopy”. This makes the system **more computational**.
- ▶ Coquand et al. have programmed a **proof checker** for such a **cubical type theory**, in which all terms — including those involving UA and some HITs — compute to normal forms.
- ▶ Brunerie and Licata (LICS 2015) have a variant system of **cubical HoTT** in which e.g. the proof that $\mathbf{T}^2 \simeq \mathbf{S}^1 \times \mathbf{S}^1$ is short and sweet (in contrast to the original “heroic” proof in plain HoTT first given by Sojakova in 2013).
- ▶ The cubical setting seems to be **better suited to HoTT** than the simplicial one (or the globular one). It may also be of some use in **homotopy theory** (cf. recent work by Jardine, Grandis, Williamson, and others).

Variations on cubical sets

The category of **cubical sets** is the functor category

$$\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}}$$

of **presheaves** on the category \mathbb{C} of cubes.

There are various different flavors of cubical sets in the literature, based on different categories \mathbb{C} of cubes:

- ▶ \mathbb{C}_m = the free **monoidal** category on an **interval** $1 \rightarrow I \leftarrow 1$,
- ▶ \mathbb{C}_{mc} = the free monoidal category on an **interval with connections** \wedge and \vee .
- ▶ \mathbb{C}_s = the free **symmetric monoidal** category on an interval.
- ▶ \mathbb{C}_c = the free **cartesian** category on an interval.
- ▶ \mathbb{C}_d = the free cartesian category on a **distributive lattice**.

The more structure one puts into the index category of cubes, the more “algebraic” the resulting model of type theory will be.

Cartesian cubes

Like the simplicial category Δ , each of these cube categories can be presented by generating face and degeneracy maps (plus others). But the **cartesian** cube category also has a simple description in terms of its Lawvere dual:

Definition

The **cartesian cube category** $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}_c$ is the opposite of the category \mathbb{B} of finite, strictly **bipointed sets**,

$$\mathbb{C} =_{\text{def}} \mathbb{B}^{\text{op}} .$$

Write the bipointed sets:

$$[n] = \{0, x_1, \dots, x_n, 1\}$$

So \mathbb{C} has the objects: $[0], [1], \dots, [n], \dots$, which we regard dually as the basic **n-cubes**.

Cartesian cubes

\mathbb{C} is the free finite-product category on the **bipointed object**:

$$[0] \rightarrow [1] \leftarrow [0],$$

which is then the universal cartesian interval.

The basic cubes are then just the finite powers of $[1]$,

$$[n] = [1] \times \dots \times [1].$$

The maps are those that can be composed from the \times -structure and the basic points $0, 1 : [0] \rightrightarrows [1]$.

They can also be represented syntactically as the terms of a very simple **algebraic theory**.

Cartesian cubical sets

Definition

The category **cSet** of (cartesian) **cubical sets** is the **presheaves** on \mathbb{C} . It is thus equal to the **covariant** functors on \mathbb{B} ,

$$\mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{C}^{\text{op}}} = \mathbf{Set}^{\mathbb{B}}.$$

The **cubes** in **cSet** are the *representable functors*:

$$I^n = \text{hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(-, [n]).$$

The **interval** object $I = \text{hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(-, [1])$ generates all the other cubes, which are closed under finite products and satisfy:

$$I^n \times I^m \cong I^{n+m}.$$

Cartesian cubical sets

The interval $1 + 1 \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$ in \mathbf{cSet} is **universal**, in the following sense.

Theorem (A. 2015)

*The category \mathbf{cSet} of cubical sets is the **classifying topos** for strictly bipointed objects $(X, a, b, a \neq b)$.*

- ▶ This allows us to relate \mathbf{cSet} to other logical and homotopical models in toposes.
- ▶ Other models of type theory, such as \mathbf{Top} and \mathbf{sSet} , have a **canonical comparison** with \mathbf{cSet} .
- ▶ Since \mathbb{C} is a **test category** in the sense of Grothendieck, \mathbf{cSet} has “the same” homotopy theory as classical spaces.
- ▶ Moreover, the geometric realization $\mathbf{cSet} \rightarrow \mathbf{Top}$ preserves finite products.

Path spaces in cubical sets

The interval $1 + 1 \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$ endows each cubical set A with a **canonical path object**,

$$A^{\mathbf{I}} \rightarrow A^{1+1} \cong A \times A.$$

The object $A^{\mathbf{I}}$ has the special property,

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{\mathbf{I}} &\cong \text{hom}(\mathbf{I}^n, A^{\mathbf{I}}) \cong \text{hom}(\mathbf{I}^n \times \mathbf{I}, A) \\ &\cong \text{hom}(\mathbf{I}^{n+1}, A) \cong A_{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

So an n -cube of **paths** in A is an $n + 1$ -cube in A .

This **combinatorial specification** makes this path object very well-behaved. For example, it has not only a **left** adjoint (“cylinder”) but also a **right** adjoint,

$$X \times \mathbf{I} \dashv Y^{\mathbf{I}} \dashv Z_{\mathbf{I}}.$$

Path spaces in cubical sets

Lemma

The interval I in \mathbf{cSet} satisfies the “domain equation”

$$I^I \cong I + 1.$$

Something similar happens in the object classifier and in the Schanuel topos. We can use this to calculate the right adjoint Z_I .

Corollary

For the “amazing right adjoint” Z_I , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_I(n) &\cong \text{Hom}(I^n, Z_I) \cong \text{Hom}(I^n)^I, Z \\ &\cong \text{Hom}((I^I)^n, Z) \cong \text{Hom}((I+1)^n, Z) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}(I^n + C_{n-1}^n I^{n-1} + \cdots + C_1^n I + 1, Z) \\ &\cong Z_n \times Z_{n-1}^{C_{n-1}^n} \times \cdots \times Z_1^{C_1^n} \times Z_0, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_k^n = \binom{n}{k}$ is the usual binomial coefficient.

Path spaces as identity types

We will use the canonical pathobject A^I to interpret the **Id-type**,

$$\text{Id}_A = A^I.$$

This implies some new type-theoretic **equations** and **conditions**, such as:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Id}_{\text{Id}_A} &= (A^I)^I \cong A^{I \times I}, \\ \text{Id}_{A+B} &= (A+B)^I \cong A^I + B^I = \text{Id}_A + \text{Id}_B,\end{aligned}$$

and generally, the Id-type of a colimit is a colimit of Id-types.

The interpretation is thus **not** expected to be **conservative** — indeed, one hopes to determine some new **cubical laws** that may be soundly added to the original theory

Path spaces as identity types

In order to use $A^{\mathbb{I}}$ as the Id-type, we are led to ask:

When does $A^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow A \times A$ satisfy the rules for Id-types?

Theorem (A. 2015)

The path space $A^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow A \times A$ satisfies the rules for Id-types if

- 1. The object A is a Kan complex.*
- 2. The dependent types $B \rightarrow A$ are Kan fibrations.*

The notions of **Kan complex** and **Kan fibration** are determined by the usual **box-filling conditions**.

Proof.

1. Reduce Id-elim to **transport** and **contraction**.
2. Transport follows from path-lifting, i.e. 1-box filling.
3. Contraction follows from 1-box filling for $A^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow A \times A$.
4. 1-box filling in $A^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow A \times A$ is 2-box filling in A .



Path spaces and identity types

The last step of the foregoing is a special case of the following:

Lemma

The following are equivalent for a cubical set A .

1. $(n + 1)$ -box filling in A ,
2. n -box filling in $A^{\mathbb{I}} \rightarrow A \times A$,
3. 1-box filling in $A^{\mathbb{I}^n} \rightarrow A^{\partial\mathbb{I}^n}$.

This can be used to prove a **converse** of the foregoing theorem: the box-filling conditions for cubical sets follow from the Id-rules together with Σ -types.

Cubical Lumsdaine

We can use the foregoing lemma to derive a **cubical version** of “Lumsdaine’s Theorem” (aka “Lumsdaine-van den Berg-Garner”):

Theorem (A. 2015)

Every type A in $MLTT$ gives rise to a **cubical** ∞ -groupoid (a cubical set satisfying the box-filling conditions).

We first need to determine the **cubical nerve of a type A** , i.e. a cubical set $N(A)$:

$$N(A)_0 \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} N(A)_1 \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \leftleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} N(A)_2 \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \leftleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \leftleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \dots$$

with:

$$N(A)_n \cong \text{“}n\text{-cubes in } A\text{”}$$

Cubical nerve of a type

A **pre-cubical** structure on a type A arises as follows:

Consider the **type-theoretic path object**:

$$P(X) = \sum_{x,y:X} \text{Id}_X(x,y).$$

We have the usual (reflexive) **globular** maps:

$$A \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} P(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} PP(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \dots$$

Since P also acts on maps by the “map on paths” operation, there are also the successive **images** of these maps under P :

$$A \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} P(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} PP(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \dots$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \\ \leftarrow \end{array} \end{array}$$

Cubical nerve of a type

Rearranging, we find the usual cubical **structure**:

$$A \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} P(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} PP(A) \begin{array}{c} \leftarrow \\ \rightleftarrows \\ \rightarrow \end{array} \dots$$

But we would need P to be **strictly functorial** for the cubical identities to hold!

Instead, we need a more elaborate dependent indexing of the successive steps to make the cubical identities hold. This is still **not** a **cartesian** cubical set (it lacks diagonals!), but only a **monoidal** one.

In **cubical** type theory we expect to have a **cartesian** cubical nerve.

Cubical nerve of a category

A similar example is the **cubical nerve** $N(\mathbb{A})$ of a category \mathbb{A} .
As a “pathobject” we can take the arrow category:

$$P(\mathbb{A}) = \mathbb{A}^{\rightarrow}$$

which is **strictly functorial**.

$N(\mathbb{A})_n$ is then the set of **commutative n -cubes** in \mathbb{A} , i.e.

$$\mathbf{Cat}(\mathbb{2}^n, \mathbb{A}),$$

where $\mathbb{2} = (\cdot \rightarrow \cdot)$ is the single-arrow category.

We also have the usual “realization \dashv nerve” adjunction,

$$\mathbf{cSet} \longleftarrow \mathbf{Cat},$$

given by Kan extension along $\mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$, the cartesian classifying map of the interval $\mathbb{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{2} \leftarrow \mathbb{1}$ in \mathbf{Cat} .

Cubical nerve of a category

Theorem (A. 2015)

The **cartesian** nerve functor $N : \mathbf{Cat} \longrightarrow \mathbf{cSet}$ is full and faithful.

- ▶ This uses the diagonals in an essential way and **fails** for the **monoidal** version of cubical sets.
- ▶ As in **sSets**, the categories \mathbb{A} with a Kan nerve $N(\mathbb{A})$ are exactly the **groupoids**.
- ▶ **Cubical analogues** of the **orientals**, the **homotopy coherent nerve**, and the notions of **quasicategory** and ∞ -**topos** have not yet been studied.
- ▶ We expect the (cubical nerve of) the category of types in cubical homotopy type theory to be a cubical ∞ -topos.