

From Hedberg's Theorem to Truncation Elimination and Two-Level Type Theory

Types and Topology
Martín Escardó's 60th birthday

Nicolai Kraus

University of Nottingham

18 Dec 2025

Thank you, Martín!

How I met Martín:

- 2011: I started a PhD with Thorsten in Nottingham
Topic: “Higher Dimensional Type Theory”
Difficulty (for me): Not much work *in* HoTT

Thank you, Martín!

How I met Martín:

- 2011: I started a PhD with Thorsten in Nottingham
Topic: “Higher Dimensional Type Theory”
Difficulty (for me): Not much work *in* HoTT
- 2012: Martín wrote to me about my blog post *A direct proof of Hedberg’s theorem*
(hard to overstate how encouraging that was!)

Thank you, Martín!

How I met Martín:

- 2011: I started a PhD with Thorsten in Nottingham
Topic: “Higher Dimensional Type Theory”
Difficulty (for me): Not much work *in* HoTT
- 2012: Martín wrote to me about my blog post *A direct proof of Hedberg’s theorem*
(hard to overstate how encouraging that was!)
- Then: Martín shared his research questions with me,
we had several visits, wrote two papers together,
Martín wrote many (!) reference letters for me
– thank you (again), Martín!

Thank you, Martín!

How I met Martín:

- 2011: I started a PhD with Thorsten in Nottingham
Topic: “Higher Dimensional Type Theory”
Difficulty (for me): Not much work *in* HoTT
- 2012: Martín wrote to me about my blog post *A direct proof of Hedberg’s theorem*
(hard to overstate how encouraging that was!)
- Then: Martín shared his research questions with me,
we had several visits, wrote two papers together,
Martín wrote many (!) reference letters for me
– thank you (again), Martín!
- Disclaimer: All/most research in this talk is over 10 years old.

One of Martín's questions (from 2012)

Given $f : A \rightarrow B$ that is constant, i.e.

$\text{wconst}_f := \prod_{a_1, a_2 : A} f(a_1) = f(a_2)$, does it factor through $\|A\|$?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow & & \nearrow \\ \|A\| & & \end{array}$$

One of Martín's questions (from 2012)

Given $f : A \rightarrow B$ that is constant, i.e.

$\text{wconst}_f := \prod_{a_1, a_2 : A} f(a_1) = f(a_2)$, does it factor through $\|A\|$?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow & & \nearrow \\ \|A\| & & \end{array}$$

Not in general, but it works for endofunctions ($f : A \rightarrow A$) because $\text{fix } f := \sum(a : A). f a = a$ is a proposition.

One of Martín's questions (from 2012)

Given $f : A \rightarrow B$ that is constant, i.e.
 $\text{wconst}_f := \prod_{a_1, a_2 : A} f(a_1) = f(a_2)$, does
it factor through $\|A\|$?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ \|A\| & & \end{array}$$

Not in general, but it works for endofunctions ($f : A \rightarrow A$)
because $\text{fix } f := \sum(a : A). f a = a$ is a proposition.

 Martin Escardo
@MartinEscardo@mathstodon.xyz

@nilesjohnson

A long time ago, I posed a problem to @Nicolai_Kraus when he was a PhD student (not of mine).

He solved it in the evening, and then he emailed me saying something like "And I also formalized it in Agda, so that when I wake up in the morning it will still be true".

Feb 28, 2024, 10:32 PM · 🌐 · Web

2 boosts · 0 quotes · 11 favorites

(I had an ugly path algebra proof.)

One of Martín's questions (from 2012)

Given $f : A \rightarrow B$ that is constant, i.e.
 $\text{wconst}_f := \prod_{a_1, a_2 : A} f(a_1) = f(a_2)$, does
it factor through $\|A\|$?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ \|A\| & & \end{array}$$

Not in general, but it works for endofunctions ($f : A \rightarrow A$)
because $\text{fix } f := \sum(a : A). f a = a$ is a proposition.

 Martin Escardo
@MartinEscardo@mathstodon.xyz

@nilesjohnson

A long time ago, I posed a problem to @Nicolai_Kraus when he was a PhD student (not of mine).

He solved it in the evening, and then he emailed me saying something like "And I also formalized it in Agda, so that when I wake up in the morning it will still be true".

Feb 28, 2024, 10:32 PM ·  · Web

2 boosts · 0 quotes · 11 favorites

(I had an ugly path algebra proof.)

Christian Sattler, some years later: Assume $(a_0, p_0) : \text{fix } f$. Then $\text{fix } f \simeq \sum(a : A). f a_0 = a$, which is contractible. 

Another case that works (Martín, 2012)

Theorem. If B is a set, then the canonical map

$$(\|A\| \rightarrow B) \longrightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f$$

is an equivalence.

This is simple and (now) contained in most/all libraries.

Another case that works (Martín, 2012)

Theorem. If B is a set, then the canonical map

$$(\|A\| \rightarrow B) \rightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f$$

is an equivalence.

This is simple and (now) contained in most/all libraries.

Unnecessarily complicated argument (not the original):

Lemma 1. Assume that B is a set and $a : A$. Then,

$$B \rightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f$$

is an equivalence. □

Lemma 2. If X implies that $Y \xrightarrow{e} Z$ is an equivalence, then

$$(X \rightarrow Y) \xrightarrow{eo} (X \rightarrow Z)$$
 is an equivalence. □

Proof of the theorem: In Lemma 1, weaken the assumption to $\|A\|$. Apply Lemma 2 with $X := \|A\|$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (\|A\| \rightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f) \\ \simeq (\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f). \end{aligned}$$

Generalizations (2014)

Theorem. If B is a set, then the canonical map

$$(\|A\| \rightarrow B) \longrightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \text{wconst}_f$$

is an equivalence.

Goal: Weaken the assumption on B .

Theorem. If B is a 1-type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to the following data:

$$f : A \rightarrow B$$

$$c : \text{wconst}_f \equiv \prod_{a_1, a_2 : A} f(a_1) = f(a_2)$$

$$d : \text{coh}_{f,c} \equiv \prod_{a_1 a_2 a_3 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c(a_2, a_3) = c(a_1, a_3).$$

Proof. Show that $a_0 : A$ implies that

$$B \rightarrow \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$$

is an equivalence, then same as above.

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into
 $\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$
by adding and removing contractible components:

B

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into
 $\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$
by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into
 $\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$
by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1,a_2:A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $\mathfrak{a}_o : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$$

$$\Sigma(c_2 : f(\mathfrak{a}_o) = f_1) . \Sigma(d_3 : c(\mathfrak{a}_o, \mathfrak{a}_o) \cdot c_1(\mathfrak{a}_o) = c_2) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $\mathfrak{a}_o : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$$

$$\Sigma(c_2 : f(\mathfrak{a}_o) = f_1) . \Sigma(d_3 : c(\mathfrak{a}_o, \mathfrak{a}_o) \cdot c_1(\mathfrak{a}_o) = c_2) .$$

$$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c}) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $\mathbf{a}_o : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$$

$$\Sigma(c_2 : f(\mathbf{a}_o) = f_1) . \Sigma(d_3 : c(\mathbf{a}_o, \mathbf{a}_o) \cdot c_1(\mathbf{a}_o) = c_2) .$$

$$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c}) .$$

$$\Sigma(d_2 : \prod_{a:A} c(\mathbf{a}_o, a) \cdot c_1(a) = c_2) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$$

$$\Sigma(c_2 : f(a_0) = f_1) . \cancel{\Sigma(d_3 : c(a_0, a_0) \cdot c_1(a_0) = c_2)} .$$

$$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c}) .$$

$$\Sigma(d_2 : \prod_{a:A} c(a_0, a) \cdot c_1(a) = c_2) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$$

$$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$$

$$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \cancel{\Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1))} .$$

$$\Sigma(c_2 : f(a_0) = f_1) . \cancel{\Sigma(d_3 : c(a_0, a_0) \cdot c_1(a_0) = c_2)} .$$

$$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c}) .$$

$$\Sigma(d_2 : \prod_{a:A} c(a_0, a) \cdot c_1(a) = c_2) .$$

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

$\Sigma(f_1 : B)$.

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1)$.

$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1))$.

$\Sigma(c_2 : f(a_0) = f_1) . \Sigma(d_3 : c(a_0, a_0) \cdot c_1(a_0) = c_2)$.

$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c})$.

~~$\Sigma(d_2 : \prod_{a:A} c(a_0, a) \cdot c_1(a) = c_2)$.~~

1

Proof of $A \longrightarrow B \simeq \Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

Assume $a_0 : A$. We transform B into

$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \text{coh}_{f,c}$

by adding and removing contractible components:

~~$\Sigma(f_1 : B) .$~~

~~$\Sigma(f : A \rightarrow B) . \Sigma(c_1 : \prod_{a:A} f(a) = f_1) .$~~

~~$\Sigma(c : \text{wconst}_f) . \Sigma(d_1 : \prod_{a_1 a_2 : A} c(a_1, a_2) \cdot c_1(a_2) = c_1(a_1)) .$~~

~~$\Sigma(c_2 : f(a_0) = f_1) . \Sigma(d_3 : c(a_0, a_0) \cdot c_1(a_0) = c_2) .$~~

$\Sigma(d : \text{coh}_{f,c}) .$

~~$\Sigma(d_2 : \prod_{a:A} c(a_0, a) \cdot c_1(a) = c_2) .$~~

1

General case

- This “expanding and contracting” strategy is so fri
that it can be done at any level, with minimalistic
assumptions on the type theory – it only needs
1, Σ , Π , Id with function extensionality, $\|-\|$.



General case

- This “expanding and contracting” strategy is so fri
that it can be done at any level, with minimalistic
assumptions on the type theory – it only needs
 $\mathbf{1}, \Sigma, \Pi, \text{Id}$ with function extensionality, $\|-\|$.
- Main result: In a type theory with Shulman’s Reedy
 ω^{op} -limits (a.k.a. infinite Σ -types), the type $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is
equivalent to the type of *coherently constant* functions
 $A \rightarrow B$.
(cf. Lurie, HTT 6.2.3.4)



General case

- This “expanding and contracting” strategy is so fri that it can be done at any level, with minimalistic assumptions on the type theory – it only needs $\mathbf{1}, \Sigma, \Pi, \text{Id}$ with function extensionality, $\|-\|$.
- Main result: In a type theory with Shulman’s Reedy ω^{op} -limits (a.k.a. infinite Σ -types), the type $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to the type of *coherently constant* functions $A \rightarrow B$. (cf. Lurie, HTT 6.2.3.4)
- Main result for HoTT: Fix $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If B is an n -type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to constant functions $A \rightarrow B$ with n levels of coherence.



Coherent constancy

A coherently constant function $A \rightarrow B$ is a map between the semisimplicial diagrams $\text{cosk}_0(\text{const } A)$ and $\text{const } B$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \dots & & \dots \\ & & \Sigma(b_1, b_2, b_3 : B) . \\ & & \Sigma(p_{12} : b_1 = b_2) . \\ & & \Sigma(p_{23} : b_2 = b_3) . \\ & & \Sigma(p_{13} : b_1 = b_3) . \\ & & p_{12} \cdot p_{23} = p_{13} \\ A \times A \times A & \xrightarrow{\text{coh}_{f,c}} & \Sigma(b_1, b_2 : B) . b_1 = b_2 \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ A \times A & \xrightarrow{c : \text{wconst}_f} & \Sigma(b_1, b_2 : B) . b_1 = b_2 \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \end{array}$$

Two-Level Type Theory

Main result for HoTT: Fix $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If B is an n -type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to constant functions $A \rightarrow B$ with n levels of coherence.

- For every *externally fixed* n , this is a theorem in HoTT. Internalising seems to require us to define semisimplicial types — one of the big open problems of HoTT.

Two-Level Type Theory

Main result for HoTT: Fix $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If B is an n -type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to constant functions $A \rightarrow B$ with n levels of coherence.

- For every *externally fixed* n , this is a theorem in HoTT. Internalising seems to require us to define semisimplicial types — one of the big open problems of HoTT.
- In other words: We can write a program $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Agda}$, but not a direct Agda formalisation. To remedy this, we could use Voevodsky's HTS – but that's not HoTT!

Two-Level Type Theory

Main result for HoTT: Fix $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If B is an n -type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to constant functions $A \rightarrow B$ with n levels of coherence.

- For every *externally fixed* n , this is a theorem in HoTT. Internalising seems to require us to define semisimplicial types — one of the big open problems of HoTT.
- In other words: We can write a program $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Agda}$, but not a direct Agda formalisation. To remedy this, we could use Voevodsky's HTS – but that's not HoTT!
- What convinced me: Capriotti's argument(*) that 2LTT (two-level type theory) is conservative over HoTT (2016), which means we can extract HoTT proofs.
(*) Improved by Kovács (2022), Bocquet (2025)

Two-Level Type Theory

Main result for HoTT: Fix $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If B is an n -type, then $\|A\| \rightarrow B$ is equivalent to constant functions $A \rightarrow B$ with n levels of coherence.

- For every *externally fixed* n , this is a theorem in HoTT. Internalising seems to require us to define semisimplicial types — one of the big open problems of HoTT.
- In other words: We can write a program $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \text{Agda}$, but not a direct Agda formalisation. To remedy this, we could use Voevodsky's HTS – but that's not HoTT!
- What convinced me: Capriotti's argument(*) that 2LTT (two-level type theory) is conservative over HoTT (2016), which means we can extract HoTT proofs.

(*) Improved by Kovács (2022), Bocquet (2025)