## Eliminating Higher Truncations via Constancy

Paolo Capriotti joint work with Nicolai Kraus

> Functional Programming Lab University of Nottingham

TYPES, 13th May 2014

#### Truncation levels

Types in HoTT are organised in a hierarchy

▶ level -1 (propositions): types with trivial equality

$$isprop(A) :\equiv \Pi(x, y : A). \ x =_A y$$

level 0 (sets): types whose equality is a proposition

$$isset(A) :\equiv \Pi(x, y : A). isprop(x =_A y)$$

► ...

► level n (n-types): types whose equality is in level n - 1 islevel<sub>n</sub>(X) :≡ Π(x, y : A). islevel<sub>n-1</sub>(x =<sub>A</sub> y)

## Truncations in HoTT

Given any type A, the *n*-truncation of A gives us:

- ▶ an *n*-type  $||A||_n$
- ▶ a "projection" function  $[-] : A \rightarrow ||A||_n$
- a universal property/eliminator: given any n-type B and a function f : A → B, we can factor f through [-]



and the factorisation is unique up to homotopy

Eliminating to higher types

What if *B* is not an *n*-type?



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

The eliminator doesn't help us.

#### Eliminating to a set

Let's focus on the -1 truncation (denoted  $\|-\|$ ). Consider this diagram again:



If  $\overline{f}$  does exist, then we have, for any x, y : A:

$$f(x) = \overline{f}[x] = \overline{f}[y] = f(y)$$

so f is "constant".

## Constancy

We define:

$$const_0(f) :\equiv \Pi(x, y : A). f(x) =_B f(y)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

So  $const_0(f)$  is a *necessary* condition for  $f : A \to B$  to factor through ||A||.

If B is a set,  $const_0(f)$  is also *sufficient*.

## Factoring 0-constant functions

Define a 0-truncated higher inductive type P given by:

•  $h: A \to P$ 

$$\ \ \square(x,y:A). \ h(x) =_P h(y)$$

isset(P)

Clearly f factors through h by construction, so we only need to show that P is a proposition.

For that, we assume  $x_0 : A$ , and show that

$$\Pi(p: P). [x_0] =_P p$$

using the eliminator of P.

This proves  $A \rightarrow \operatorname{contr}(P)$ , from which it easily follows that P is a proposition.

Notions of higher constancy

What if B is not a set?

Given:

- ► A 1-type B
- $f: A \rightarrow B$
- ► A 0-constancy proof: c<sub>1</sub> : const<sub>0</sub>(f)

in order for f to factor through ||A|| we need the following extra condition:

$$c_2$$
:  $\Pi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : A)$ .  $c_1(x_1, x_2) \cdot c_1(x_2, x_3) = c_1(x_1, x_3)$ 

In general, if *B* is an *n*-type, we need a tower of conditions  $c_1, \ldots, c_{n+1}$  involving higher paths.

Can we express this tower uniformly in n?

# Constancy conditions as maps of simplices

- A function  $f : A \rightarrow B$  maps points of A to *points* of B
- A term like c1 maps pairs of points of A to paths in B
- A term like c<sub>2</sub> maps triples of points of A to triangles in B
  ...

In general, the *n*-th condition  $c_n$  should give a mapping from  $A^{n+1}$  to a type Eq<sub>n</sub>(B) of *n*-simplices in B, compatible with the previous conditions.

# Constancy as a semi-simplicial map

We can give Eq(B) the structure of a (Reedy fibrant) *semi-simplicial* type.

The tower of conditions  $c_1, \ldots, c_n$  then becomes a map of semi-simplicial types:



# Conclusion

- we give an elimination property of truncations that can be applied to all types
- the formulation and the proof of this result are carried out externally
- for fixed values of n and m, the eliminator of the m-truncation into n-types can be expressed internally and used e.g. in formalised proofs

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