Homotopy Type Theory

Sets and logic

3.1 Sets and n-types

Definition 3.1.1. A type A is a **set** if for all $x, y : A$ and all $p, q : x = y$, we have $p = q$.

More precisely, the proposition $\mathsf{isSet}(A)$ is defined to be the type

$$\mathsf{isSet}(A) :\equiv \prod_{(x,y:A)} \prod_{(p,q:x=y)} (p = q).$$

Example 3.1.2. The type $\mathbf{1}$ is a set. For any $x, y : \mathbf{1}$ the type $(x = y)$ is equivalent to $\mathbf{1}$. Since any two elements of $\mathbf{1}$ are equal, this implies that any two elements of $x = y$ are equal.

Example 3.1.3. The type $\mathbf{0}$ is a set, for given any $x, y : \mathbf{0}$ we may deduce anything we like, by the induction principle of $\mathbf{0}$.

Example 3.1.4. The type $\mathbb{N}$ of natural numbers is also a set. Since all equality types $x =_{\mathbb{N}} y$ are equivalent to either $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{0}$, and any two inhabitants of $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{0}$ are equal.

Most of the type forming operations we have considered so far also preserve sets.

Example 3.1.5. If A and B are sets, then so is $A \times B$. For given $x, y : A \times B$ and $p, q : x = y$, then we have $p = \mathsf{pair}^=(\mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_1}(p), \mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_2}(p))$ and $q = \mathsf{pair}^=(\mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_1}(q), \mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_2}(q))$. But $\mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_1}(p) = \mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_1}(q)$ since A is a set, and $\mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_2}(p) = \mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{pr}_2}(q)$ since B is a set; hence $p = q$.
Similarly, if A is a set and $B : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is such that each $B(x)$ is a set, then $\sum_{(x:A)} B(x)$ is a set.

Example 3.1.6. If A is *any* type and $B : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is such that each $B(x)$ is a set, then the type $\prod_{(x:A)} B(x)$ is a set. For suppose $f, g : \prod_{(x:A)} B(x)$ and $p, q : f = g$. By function extensionality, we have

$$p = \mathsf{funext}(x \mapsto \mathsf{happly}(p,x)) \quad \text{and} \quad q = \mathsf{funext}(x \mapsto \mathsf{happly}(q,x)).$$

But for any $x : A$, we have

$$\mathsf{happly}(p,x) : f(x) = g(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{happly}(q,x) : f(x) = g(x),$$

so since $B(x)$ is a set we have $\mathsf{happly}(p,x) = \mathsf{happly}(q,x)$. Now using function extensionality again, the dependent functions $(x \mapsto \mathsf{happly}(p,x))$ and $(x \mapsto \mathsf{happly}(q,x))$ are equal, and hence (applying $\mathsf{ap}_{\mathsf{funext}}$) so are p and q.

Definition 3.1.7. A type A is a **1-type** if for all $x, y : A$ and $p, q : x = y$ and $r, s : p = q$, we have $r = s$.

Lemma 3.1.8. *If A is a set (that is, $\mathsf{isSet}(A)$ is inhabited), then A is a 1-type.*

3.2 Propositions as types?

Remark 3.2.1. (Statement) If for all $x : X$ there exists an $a : A(x)$ such that $P(x,a)$, then there exists a function $g : \prod_{(x:A)} A(x)$ such that for all $x : X$ we have $P(x, g(x))$".
This looks like the classical *axiom of choice*, is always true under this reading.

Remark 3.2.2. The classical *law of double negation* and *law of excluded middle* are incompatible with the univalence axiom.

Theorem 3.2.3. *It is not the case that for all $A : \mathcal{U}$ we have $\neg(\neg A) \to A$.*

Remark 3.2.4. For any A, $\neg\neg\neg A \to \neg A$ for any A.

Corollary 3.2.5. *It is not the case that for all $A : \mathcal{U}$ we have $A + (\neg A)$.*

3.3 Mere propositions

Definition 3.3.1. A type P is a **mere proposition** if for all $x, y : P$ we have $x = y$.

Specifically, for any $P : \mathcal{U}$, the type $\mathsf{isProp}(P)$ is defined to be

$$\mathsf{isProp}(P) :\equiv \prod_{x,y:P} (x = y).$$

Lemma 3.3.2. *If P is a mere proposition and $x_0 : P$, then $P \simeq \mathbf{1}$.*

Lemma 3.3.3. *If P and Q are mere propositions such that $P \to Q$ and $Q \to P$, then $P \simeq Q$.*

Lemma 3.3.4. *Every mere proposition is a set.*

Lemma 3.3.5. *For any type A, the types $\mathsf{isProp}(A)$ and $\mathsf{isSet}(A)$ are mere propositions.*

3.4 Classical vs. intuitionistic logic

With the notion of mere proposition in hand, we can now give the proper formulation of the **law of excluded middle** in homotopy type theory:

$$\mathsf{LEM} :\equiv \prod_{A:\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathsf{isProp}(A) \to (A + \neg A) \right). \tag{3.4.1}$$

Similarly, the **law of double negation** is

$$\prod_{A:\mathcal{U}} \left(\mathsf{isProp}(A) \to (\neg\neg A \to A) \right). \tag{3.4.2}$$

Definition 3.4.3.

(i). A type A is called **decidable** if $A + \neg A$.

(ii). Similarly, a type family $B : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is **decidable** if $\prod_{(a:A)} (B(a) + \neg B(a))$.

(iii). In particular, A has **decidable equality** if $\prod_{(a,b:A)} ((a = b) + \neg(a = b))$.

3.5 Subsets and propositional resizing

Lemma 3.5.1. *Suppose $P : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is a type family such that $P(x)$ is a mere proposition for all $x : A$. If $u, v : \sum_{(x:A)} P(x)$ are such that $\mathsf{pr}_1(u) = \mathsf{pr}_1(v)$, then $u = v$.*

For instance, recall that

$$(A \simeq B) :\equiv \sum_{f:A \to B} \mathsf{isequiv}(f),$$

where each type $\mathsf{isequiv}(f)$ was supposed to be a mere proposition. It follows that if two equivalences have equal underlying functions, then they are equal as equivalences.
If $P : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is a family of mere propositions (i.e. each $P(x)$ is a mere proposition), we may write

$$\{ x : A \mid P(x) \} \tag{3.5.2}$$

as an alternative notation for $\sum_{(x:A)} P(x)$. We may define the "subuniverses" of sets and of mere propositions in a universe $\mathcal{U}$:

$$\mathsf{Set}_\mathcal{U} :\equiv \{ A : \mathcal{U} \mid \mathsf{isSet}(A) \},$$
$$\mathsf{Prop}_\mathcal{U} :\equiv \{ A : \mathcal{U} \mid \mathsf{isProp}(A) \}.$$

An element of $\mathsf{Set}_\mathcal{U}$ is a type $A : \mathcal{U}$ together with evidence $s : \mathsf{isSet}(A)$, and similarly for $\mathsf{Prop}_\mathcal{U}$.

Axiom 3.5.3 (Propositional resizing). *The map $\mathsf{Prop}_{\mathcal{U}_i} \to \mathsf{Prop}_{\mathcal{U}_{i+1}}$ is an equivalence.*

With propositional resizing, we can define the power set to be

$$\mathcal{P}(A) :\equiv (A \to \Omega),$$

which is then independent of $\mathcal{U}$.

3.6 The logic of mere propositions

Example 3.6.1. If A and B are mere propositions, so is $A \times B$. This is easy to show using the characterization of paths in products, just like Example 3.1.5 but simpler. Thus, the connective "and" preserves mere propositions.

Example 3.6.2. If A is any type and $B : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is such that for all $x : A$, the type $B(x)$ is a mere proposition, then $\prod_{(x:A)} B(x)$ is a mere proposition. The proof is just like Example 3.1.6 but simpler: given $f, g : \prod_{(x:A)} B(x)$, for any $x : A$ we have $f(x) = g(x)$ since $B(x)$ is a mere proposition. But then by function extensionality, we have $f = g$.
In particular, if B is a mere proposition, then so is $A \to B$ regardless of what A is. In even more particular, since $\mathbf{0}$ is a mere proposition, so is $\neg A \equiv (A \to \mathbf{0})$. Thus, the connectives "implies" and "not" preserve mere propositions, as does the quantifier "for all".

3.7 Propositional truncation

The *propositional truncation*, also called the (-1)-*truncation*, *bracket type*, or *squash type*, is an additional type former which "squashes" or "truncates" a type down to a mere proposition, forgetting all information contained in inhabitants of that type other than their existence.

More precisely, for any type A, there is a type $\|A\|$. It has two constructors:

- For any $a : A$ we have $|a| : \|A\|$.
- For any $x, y : \|A\|$, we have $x = y$.

The recursion principle of $\|A\|$ says that:

- If B is a mere proposition and we have $f : A \to B$, then there is an induced $g : \|A\| \to B$ such that $g(|a|) \equiv f(a)$ for all $a : A$.

Definition 3.7.1. We define **traditional logical notation** using truncation as follows, where P and Q denote mere propositions (or families thereof):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\top &:\equiv \mathbf{1} \\
\bot &:\equiv \mathbf{0} \\
P \wedge Q &:\equiv P \times Q \\
P \Rightarrow Q &:\equiv P \to Q \\
P \Leftrightarrow Q &:\equiv P = Q \\
\neg P &:\equiv P \to \mathbf{0} \\
P \vee Q &:\equiv \|P + Q\| \\
\forall (x : A). P(x) &:\equiv \prod_{x:A} P(x) \\
\exists (x : A). P(x) &:\equiv \left\| \sum_{x:A} P(x) \right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

The notations $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are also used in homotopy theory for the smash product and the wedge of pointed spaces.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{ x : A \mid P(x) \} \cap \{ x : A \mid Q(x) \} &:\equiv \{ x : A \mid P(x) \wedge Q(x) \}, \\
\{ x : A \mid P(x) \} \cup \{ x : A \mid Q(x) \} &:\equiv \{ x : A \mid P(x) \vee Q(x) \}, \\
A \setminus \{ x : A \mid P(x) \} &:\equiv \{ x : A \mid \neg P(x) \}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Of course, in the absence of LEM, the latter are not "complements" in the usual sense: we may not have $B \cup (A \setminus B) = A$ for every subset B of A.

3.8 The axiom of choice

$$ A : X \to \mathcal{U} \qquad \text{and} \qquad P : \prod_{x:X} A(x) \to \mathcal{U}, $$

and moreover that

- X is a set,
- $A(x)$ is a set for all $x : X$, and
- $P(x, a)$ is a mere proposition for all $x : X$ and $a : A(x)$.

The **axiom of choice** AC asserts that under these assumptions,

$$ \left(\prod_{x:X} \left\| \sum_{a:A(x)} P(x,a) \right\| \right) \to \left\| \sum_{(g:\prod_{(x:X)} A(x))} \prod_{(x:X)} P(x, g(x)) \right\|. \tag{3.8.1} $$

Of course, this is a direct translation of (3.2.1) where we read "there exists $x : A$ such that $B(x)$" as $\left\| \sum_{(x:A)} B(x) \right\|$, so we could have written the statement in the familiar logical notation as

$$ \left(\forall (x : X). \exists (a : A(x)). P(x,a) \right) \Rightarrow \left(\exists (g : \prod_{(x:X)} A(x)). \forall (x : X). P(x, g(x)) \right). $$

Lemma 3.8.2. *The axiom of choice* (3.8.1) *is equivalent to the statement that for any set X and any $Y : X \to \mathcal{U}$ such that each $Y(x)$ is a set, we have*

$$ \left(\prod_{x:X} \left\| Y(x) \right\| \right) \to \left\| \prod_{x:X} Y(x) \right\|. \tag{3.8.3} $$

Remark 3.8.4. The right side of (3.8.3) always implies the left. Since both are mere propositions, by Lemma 3.3.3 the axiom of choice is also equivalent to asking for an equivalence

$$ \left(\prod_{x:X} \left\| Y(x) \right\| \right) \simeq \left\| \prod_{x:X} Y(x) \right\| $$

Lemma 3.8.5. *There exists a type X and a family $Y : X \to \mathcal{U}$ such that each $Y(x)$ is a set, but such that* (3.8.3) *is false.*

3.9 The principle of unique choice

Lemma 3.9.1. *If P is a mere proposition, then $P \simeq \|P\|$.*

Corollary 3.9.2 (The principle of unique choice). *Suppose a type family $P : A \to \mathcal{U}$ such that*

(i). *For each x, the type $P(x)$ is a mere proposition, and*

(ii). *For each x we have $\|P(x)\|$.*

Then we have $\prod_{(x:A)} P(x)$.

3.11 Contractibility

Definition 3.11.1. A type A is **contractible**, or a **singleton**, if there is $a : A$, called the **center of contraction**, such that $a = x$ for all $x : A$. We denote the specified path $a = x$ by contr_x.

In other words, the type $\mathrm{isContr}(A)$ is defined to be

$$ \mathrm{isContr}(A) :\equiv \sum_{(a:A)} \prod_{(x:A)} (a = x). $$

Lemma 3.11.2. *For a type A, the following are logically equivalent.*

(i). *A is contractible in the sense of Definition 3.11.1.*

(ii). *A is a mere proposition, and there is a point $a : A$.*

(iii). *A is equivalent to $\mathbf{1}$.*

Lemma 3.11.3. *For any type A, the type $\mathrm{isContr}(A)$ is a mere proposition.*

Corollary 3.11.4. *If A is contractible, then so is $\mathrm{isContr}(A)$.*

Lemma 3.11.5. *If $P : A \to \mathcal{U}$ is a type family such that each $P(a)$ is contractible, then $\prod_{(x:A)} P(x)$ is contractible.*

Of course, if A is equivalent to B and A is contractible, then so is B. More generally, it suffices for B to be a *retract* of A. By definition, a **retraction** is a function $r : A \to B$ such that there exists a function $s : B \to A$, called its **section**, and a homotopy $\epsilon : \prod_{(y:B)}(r(s(y)) = y)$; then we say that B is a **retract** of A.

Lemma 3.11.6. *If B is a retract of A, and A is contractible, then so is B.*

Lemma 3.11.7. *For any A and any $a : A$, the type $\sum_{(x:A)} (a = x)$ is contractible.*

Lemma 3.11.8. *Let $P : A \to \mathcal{U}$ be a type family.*

(i). *If each $P(x)$ is contractible, then $\sum_{(x:A)} P(x)$ is equivalent to A.*

(ii). *If A is contractible with center a, then $\sum_{(x:A)} P(x)$ is equivalent to $P(a)$.*

Lemma 3.11.9. *A type A is a mere proposition if and only if for all $x, y : A$, the type $x =_A y$ is contractible.*