

1-Types vs Groupoids

Niels van der Weide Dan Frumin Herman Geuvers

Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

June 18, 2018

Motivation

A higher inductive type is given by constructors, equations, ...

Inductive $\mathbb{Z} :=$

| **Z** : \mathbb{Z}

| **S** : $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

| **P** : $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

Motivation

A higher inductive type is given by constructors, equations, ...

Inductive $\mathbb{Z} :=$

| $Z : \mathbb{Z}$

| $S : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

| $P : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$

| $PS : \prod(x : \mathbb{Z}), S(P\ x) = x$

| $SP : \prod(x : \mathbb{Z}), P(S\ x) = x$

Motivation

A higher inductive type is given by constructors, equations, ...

Inductive $\mathbb{Z} :=$

| $Z : \mathbb{Z}$
| $S : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$
| $P : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$
| $PS : \prod(x : \mathbb{Z}), S(P\ x) = x$
| $SP : \prod(x : \mathbb{Z}), P(S\ x) = x$
| $coh : \prod(x : \mathbb{Z}), PS(S\ x) = ap\ S\ (SP\ x)$

This type will be discussed in Pinyo's talk.

More examples:

- ▶ Type Theory in Type Theory (Kaposi, Altenkirch)
- ▶ Partiality (Altenkirch, Danielsson, Kraus)
- ▶ Finite Sets in HoTT (Fruhin, Geuvers, Gondelman, Van der Weide)

Motivation

Dybjer and Moenclaey give a semantics of HITs in the groupoid model of type theory.

A groupoid G consists of

- ▶ A set G (*objects*)
- ▶ For each x, y in G a set $G \times y$ (*hom sets*)
- ▶ For each x in G an element $e_x : G \times x$ (*identity*)
- ▶ For each x, y in G an *inverse* map

$$(\cdot)^{-1} : G \times y \rightarrow G \times x$$

- ▶ For all x, y, z in G a *composition*

$$\cdot : G \times z \times G \times y \rightarrow G \times x$$

such that \cdot is associative, e is a neutral element for \cdot , and inv are inverses for \cdot .

Motivation

In addition, we have 1-types.

A *set* is a type for which equality is proof irrelevant. All inhabitants of $x = y$ are equal.

A *1-type* is a type for which every $x = y$ is a set.

Questions

1-types and groupoids are related.

- ▶ What's the precise relation between 1-types and groupoids?
- ▶ Can we use this to give a semantics of HITs in 1-types?

We look into the first item.

Path Groupoid

We can map 1-types to groupoids.

Given a 1-type A , define the *path groupoid* $P A$ on A :

- ▶ Objects are inhabitants of A
- ▶ The hom set is $x = y$ (this is a set, because A is a 1-type)
- ▶ Identity: equality is reflexive
- ▶ Inverse: equality is symmetric
- ▶ Composition: equality is transitive

The laws hold by path induction.

Groupoid Quotient

Given a groupoid G , we define the *groupoid quotient* of G as the following HIT:

Inductive $\mathit{gquot} G :=$

| $\mathit{gcl} : G \rightarrow \mathit{gquot} G$

| $\mathit{gcleq} : \prod(x, y : A), G \times y \rightarrow \mathit{gcl} x = \mathit{gcl} y$

| $\mathit{ge} : \prod(x : A), \mathit{gcleq} x (e x) = \mathbf{refl}$

| $\mathit{ginv} : \prod(x, y : A), \prod_{g : G \times y} \mathit{gcleq} y x (g^{-1}) = (\mathit{gcleq} x y g)^{-1}$

| $\mathit{gconcat} : \prod(x, y, z : A), \prod(g_1 : G \times y), \prod(g_2 : G \times z),$
 $\mathit{gcleq} x z (g_1 \cdot g_2) = \mathit{gcleq} x y g_1 @ \mathit{gcleq} y z g_2$

| $\mathit{gtrunc} : \prod(x, y : \mathit{gquot} A G), \prod(p, q : x = y), \prod(r, s : p = q), r = s$

Note the similarities to the Rezk completion (Ahrens, Kapulkin, Shulman).

Groupoid Quotient

Equality in the groupoid quotient of G is described by G .

Proposition

For every $x, y : A$ the types $\text{gcl } x = \text{gcl } y$ and $G \times x \times y$ are equivalent.

Proposition

For all 1-types A , we have $A \simeq \text{gquot } A (P \ A)$.

Bicategories

A bicategory is like a category, but it also has arrows between arrows.

Proposition

- ▶ *We have a bicategory of groupoids with functors and natural transformation.*
- ▶ *We have a bicategory of 1-types with functions and equality*

See the talk by Ahrens and Maggesi.

Main Conjecture

Conjecture

We have an biadjoint biequivalence $\mathbf{g} \dashv \vdash P$.

What does this amount to?

- ▶ We need to make adjoint equivalences $\mathbf{g}(P A) \rightarrow A$ and $G \rightarrow P(\mathbf{g} G)$
- ▶ and many, many, many coherencies

See the talk by Ahrens and Maggesi

What we did/will do

We formalized

- ▶ The propositions ($\text{gcl } x = \text{gcl } y$ and $G \times y$ are equivalent, $A \simeq \text{gquot } A (P A)$)
- ▶ Some notions in bicategory theory (bicategories, lax functors, transformations, ...)

Still remaining:

- ▶ Formalize the notions of biadjoints and biequivalences
- ▶ Prove the conjecture

See <https://github.com/nmvdw/groupoids>