# Towards a type theory for directed homotopy theory

Paige Randall North

Ohio State University

10 July 2018

#### Outline

Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

## Outline

#### Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

To formalize theorems about:

Higher category theory

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory
  - Concurrent processes

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory
  - Concurrent processes
  - Rewriting

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

To formalize theorems about:

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory
  - Concurrent processes
  - Rewriting

#### Criteria

 Directed paths are introduced as terms of a type former, hom, to be added to Martin-Löf type theory

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

To formalize theorems about:

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory
  - Concurrent processes
  - Rewriting

#### Criteria

- Directed paths are introduced as terms of a type former, hom, to be added to Martin-Löf type theory
- Transport along terms of hom

#### Goal

To develop a directed type theory.

To formalize theorems about:

- Higher category theory
- Directed homotopy theory
  - Concurrent processes
  - Rewriting

#### Criteria

- Directed paths are introduced as terms of a type former, hom, to be added to Martin-Löf type theory
- Transport along terms of hom
- Independence of hom and Id

#### Syntactically

Martin-Löf's identity type is symmetric/undirected since for any type T, and terms a, b : T, there is a function

$$i: \operatorname{Id}_T(a, b) \to \operatorname{Id}_T(b, a)$$

so that any path  $p : Id_T(a, b)$  can be inverted to obtain a path  $ip : Id_T(b, a)$ .

#### Syntactically

Martin-Löf's identity type is symmetric/undirected since for any type T, and terms a, b : T, there is a function

$$i: \operatorname{Id}_T(a, b) \to \operatorname{Id}_T(b, a)$$

so that any path  $p : Id_T(a, b)$  can be inverted to obtain a path  $ip : Id_T(b, a)$ .

Can think of these terms as undirected paths

#### Syntactically

Martin-Löf's identity type is symmetric/undirected since for any type T, and terms a, b : T, there is a function

$$i : \operatorname{Id}_{\mathcal{T}}(a, b) \to \operatorname{Id}_{\mathcal{T}}(b, a)$$

so that any path p :  $Id_T(a, b)$  can be *inverted* to obtain a path ip :  $Id_T(b, a)$ .

- Can think of these terms as undirected paths
- Can we design a type former of *directed* paths that resembles Id but without its inversion operation *i*?

#### Theorem

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{C}}$  cartesian closed category. A functorial reflexive relation

$$1_{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{r} \textit{Id} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_0 \times \epsilon_1} 1_{\mathcal{C}} \times 1_{\mathcal{C}}$$

models identity types if and only if the mapping path space factorization

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{f} X \times_Y Id(Y) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_1} Y$$

generates a weak factorization system on C where all red (resp. blue) maps are in the left (resp. right) class.

#### Theorem

 $\ensuremath{\mathcal{C}}$  cartesian closed category. A functorial reflexive relation

$$1_{\mathcal{C}} \xrightarrow{r} \textit{Id} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_0 \times \epsilon_1} 1_{\mathcal{C}} \times 1_{\mathcal{C}}$$

#### models identity types if and only if it is

- 1. transitive,
- 2. homotopical,
- 3. symmetric.







## Outline

#### Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

## Directed spaces

#### Rough definition

A space together with a subset of its paths that are marked as 'directed'

## Directed spaces

#### Rough definition

A space together with a subset of its paths that are marked as 'directed'



## Directed spaces

#### Rough definition

A space together with a subset of its paths that are marked as 'directed'







- A, B are two processes
- *m*, *n* are two memory locations
- which can be locked (L) or unlocked (U) by each process



- ► A, B are two processes
- *m*, *n* are two memory locations
- which can be locked (L) or unlocked (U) by each process



- A, B are two processes
- *m*, *n* are two memory locations
- which can be locked (L) or unlocked (U) by each process



- ► A, B are two processes
- *m*, *n* are two memory locations
- which can be locked (L) or unlocked (U) by each process

Concurrent processes can be represented by directed spaces.



- ► A, B are two processes
- *m*, *n* are two memory locations
- which can be locked (L) or unlocked (U) by each process

#### Fundamental questions:

- ▶ Which states are safe? (Predicate *S*(*x*) on *X*<sup>op</sup>.)
- ▶ Which states are reachable? (Predicate *R*(*x*) on *X*.)

## Outline

Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

Rules for hom: core and op

 $\frac{T}{T^{\text{core}}} \text{Type}$ 

 $\frac{T}{T^{\text{op}}} \text{Type}$ 

 $\frac{T \text{ TYPE} \quad t: T^{\text{core}}}{it: T}$ 

 $\frac{T \text{ TYPE } t: T^{\text{core}}}{i^{\text{op}}t: T^{\text{op}}}$ 

Rules for hom: formation

 $\frac{T \text{ type } s: T^{\text{op}} t: T}{\hom_{T}(s, t) \text{ type }}$ 

## Rules for hom: formation

# $\frac{T \text{ type } s: T^{\text{op}} t: T}{\hom_{T}(s, t) \text{ type }}$



## Rules for hom: introduction

 $\frac{\textit{T type } t:\textit{T}^{\text{core}}}{1_t: \hom_{\textit{T}}(\textit{i}^{\text{op}}t,\textit{i}t) \text{ type}}$ 

## Rules for hom: introduction

 $\frac{\textit{T type } t:\textit{T}^{\text{core}}}{1_t: \hom_{\textit{T}}(\textit{i}^{\text{op}}t,\textit{i}t) \text{ type}}$ 



Rules for hom: right elimination and computation

$$\frac{T \text{ type } s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ type }}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_s)}$$
$$\frac{s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_R(d, f): D(f)}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_R(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s): D(1_s)}$$

Rules for hom: right elimination and computation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \text{type} & s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) & \text{type} \\ & s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_s) \\ \hline \\ \hline s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_R(d, f): D(f) \\ & s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_R(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s): D(1_s) \end{array}$$

Id elimination and computation

\_

$$\frac{T \text{ type}}{s: T, t: T, f: \mathsf{Id}_T(s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ type } s: T \vdash d(s): D(r_s)}{s: T, t: T, f: \mathsf{Id}_T(s, t) \vdash j(d, f): D(f)}$$
$$s: T \vdash j(d, r_s) \equiv d(s): D(r_s)$$

## Rules for hom: left elimination and computation

$$\frac{T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_{T}(s, it) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE}}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_{s})}$$

$$\frac{s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_{T}(s, it) \vdash e_{L}(d, f): D(f)}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_{L}(d, 1_{s}) \equiv d(s): D(1_{s})}$$

## Rules for hom: left elimination and computation

$$\frac{T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_T(s, it) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE}}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_s)}$$
$$\frac{s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_T(s, it) \vdash e_L(d, f): D(f)}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_L(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s): D(1_s)}$$

Id elimination and computation

$$\label{eq:states} \begin{array}{c} T \quad \text{type} \\ \\ \frac{s:T,t:T,f:\mathsf{Id}_T(s,t) \vdash D(f) \quad \text{type} \quad s:T \vdash d(s):D(r_s)}{s:T,t:T,f:\mathsf{Id}_T(s,t) \vdash j(d,f):D(f)} \\ \\ s:T \vdash j(d,r_s) \equiv d(s):D(r_s) \end{array}$$

## Syntactic results

• Transport: for a dependent type  $t : T \vdash S(t)$ :

$$\begin{array}{l} t: \mathit{T}^{\mathsf{core}}, t': \mathit{T}, f: \mathsf{hom}_{\mathit{T}}(\mathit{i}^{\mathsf{op}}t, t'), s: \mathit{S}(\mathit{i}t) \\ \vdash \mathsf{transport}_{\mathsf{R}}(s, f): \mathit{S}(t') \end{array}$$

## Syntactic results

• Transport: for a dependent type  $t : T \vdash S(t)$ :

$$t: T^{core}, t': T, f: \hom_{T}(i^{op}t, t'), s: S(it) \\ \vdash \operatorname{transport}_{\mathsf{R}}(s, f): S(t')$$

• Composition: for a type T:

$$r: T^{op}, s: T^{core}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(r, is), g: \hom_{T}(i^{op}s, t) \\ \vdash \operatorname{comp}_{R}(f, g): \hom_{T}(r, t)$$

#### Syntactic results

• Transport: for a dependent type  $t : T \vdash S(t)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} t : \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{core}}, t' : \mathcal{T}, f : \mathsf{hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(i^{\mathsf{op}}t, t'), s : \mathcal{S}(it) \\ & \vdash \mathsf{transport}_{\mathsf{R}}(s, f) : \mathcal{S}(t') \end{aligned}$$

• Composition: for a type T:

$$r: T^{op}, s: T^{core}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(r, is), g: \hom_{T}(i^{op}s, t) \\ \vdash \operatorname{comp}_{R}(f, g): \hom_{T}(r, t)$$

• With  $\Sigma$  types, we can define

$$Reachable(T) := \Sigma_{x:T} \hom_T(i, x)$$

$$Safe(T) := \Sigma_{x:T^{op}} \hom_T(x, f)$$

for any type T with terms  $i : T^{op}, f : T$ .

## Outline

Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

## The interpretation

- Use the framework of comprehension categories
- Dependent types are represented by functors  $T : \Gamma \rightarrow Cat$ .
- Dependent terms are represented by natural transformations



where  $*: \Gamma \rightarrow Cat$  is the functor which takes everything to the one-object category.

• Context extension is represented by the Grothendieck construction which takes each functor  $T: \Gamma \to Cat$  to the Grothendieck opfibration

$$\pi_{\Gamma}: \int_{\Gamma} T \to \Gamma.$$

Interpreting core and op in the empty context



For any category T,

- $T^{\text{core}} := \operatorname{ob}(T)$
- $T^{op} := T^{op}$
- *i* : *T*<sup>core</sup> → *T* and *i*<sup>op</sup> : *T*<sup>core</sup> → *T*<sup>op</sup> are the identity on objects.

## Interpreting hom formation and introduction

$$\frac{T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{op}} t: T}{\hom_{T}(s, t) \text{ TYPE}} \qquad \frac{T \text{ TYPE } t: T^{\text{core}}}{1_{t}: \hom_{T}(i^{\text{op}}t, it) \text{ TYPE}}$$
For any category  $T$ ,

Take the functor

hom : 
$$T^{op} \times T \rightarrow Set \hookrightarrow Cat$$
.

Take the natural transformation

$$T^{\text{core}} \underbrace{ \underbrace{ \downarrow }_{hom \circ (i^{op} \times i)}^{*} Cat}_{hom \circ (i^{op} \times i)}$$

where each component  $1_t : * \rightarrow hom(t, t)$  picks out the identity morphism of t.

$$\frac{T \text{ type } s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ type }}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_{s})}$$
$$\frac{s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_{R}(d, f): D(f)}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_{R}(d, 1_{s}) \equiv d(s): D(1_{s})}$$

$$T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE}$$
$$s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_{s})$$

$$s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_{T}(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_{R}(d, f): D(f)$$
$$s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_{R}(d, 1_{s}) \equiv d(s): D(1_{s})$$



$$T \text{ TYPE} \quad s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE} \\ s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s) : D(1_s) \\ \hline s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_R(d, f) : D(f) \\ s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_R(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s) : D(1_s) \\ \hline \end{cases}$$



-

 Use the fact that the subcategory *T*<sup>core</sup> is 'initial':

$$T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE}$$
$$s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_s)$$
$$s: T^{\text{core}}, t: T, f: \hom_T(i^{\text{op}}s, t) \vdash e_R(d, f): D(f)$$
$$s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_R(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s): D(1_s)$$



- Use the fact that the subcategory *T*<sup>core</sup> is 'initial':
  - ▶ for every  $(s, t, f) \in \int_{T^{core} \times T} hom$ there is a unique morphism  $(1_s, f) : (s, s, 1_s) \rightarrow (s, t, f)$  with domain in  $T^{core}$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \texttt{TYPE} & s: T^{\texttt{core}}, t: T, f: \texttt{hom}_T(i^{\texttt{op}}s, t) \vdash D(f) & \texttt{TYPE} \\ & s: T^{\texttt{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_s) \\ \hline \\ \hline s: T^{\texttt{core}}, t: T, f: \texttt{hom}_T(i^{\texttt{op}}s, t) \vdash e_R(d, f): D(f) \\ & s: T^{\texttt{core}} \vdash e_R(d, 1_s) \equiv d(s): D(1_s) \end{array}$$



- Use the fact that the subcategory *T*<sup>core</sup> is 'initial':
  - ▶ for every  $(s, t, f) \in \int_{T^{core} \times T} hom$ there is a unique morphism  $(1_s, f) : (s, s, 1_s) \rightarrow (s, t, f)$  with domain in  $T^{core}$
- Set  $e_R(d)_{(s,t,f)} := D(1_s, f)d_{(s,s,1_s)}$

$$\frac{T \text{ TYPE } s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_{T}(s, it) \vdash D(f) \text{ TYPE}}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash d(s): D(1_{s})}$$

$$\frac{s: T^{\text{op}}, t: T^{\text{core}}, f: \hom_{T}(s, it) \vdash e_{L}(d, f): D(f)}{s: T^{\text{core}} \vdash e_{L}(d, 1_{s}) \equiv d(s): D(1_{s})}$$

 Replace T by T<sup>op</sup> and apply right hom elimination and computation.

## Outline

Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

## A homotopical perspective

While the homotopy theory of isomorphisms in categories

$$\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{(\cong)} \to \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$$

provides an interpretation of Martin-Löf's identity type, the homotopy theory of morphisms in categories

$$\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{(\to)} \to \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$$

provides an interpretation of this hom former.

## The weak factorization system

- Let (≅) denote the category with two objects and one isomorphism between them.
- Let (→) denote the category with two objects and one morphism between them.
- Then factorize the codiagonal of the one-point category in two ways

$$* + * \rightarrow (\cong) \rightarrow * \qquad * + * \rightarrow (\twoheadrightarrow) \rightarrow *$$

 which produces a factorization of any diagonal in two ways which each generate weak factorization systems.

$$\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{(\cong)} \to \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \qquad \qquad \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}^{(\bigstar)} \to \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C}$$

- The first gives an interpretation of the ld type in *Cat*.
- The second underlies this interpretation of the hom type in *Cat*.

### The weak factorization system continued

 The right class of this weak factorization system are those functors p : E → B which have the enriched right lifting property



- so all Grothendieck opfibrations (dependent projections) are in the right class.
- ▶ The functor  $1_{\bullet}: T^{core} \hookrightarrow \int_{T^{core} \times T}$  hom is the left part of the factorization of

$$i: T^{core} \to T.$$

Then the right hom elimination and computation rule arises from the weak factorization system.



## Outline

Introduction

Directed homotopy theory

The hom type former

An interpretation in the category of categories

A homotopical perspective

Conclusion

#### Summary

We have:

a directed type theory

#### Summary

We have:

- a directed type theory
- with a model in *Cat*.

#### Summary

We have:

- a directed type theory
- with a model in Cat.

#### Future work

We need to:

- integrate this into traditional Martin-Löf type theory
  - integrate Id and hom in the same theory
  - specify Σ, Π, etc

#### Summary

We have:

- a directed type theory
- with a model in Cat.

#### Future work

We need to:

- integrate this into traditional Martin-Löf type theory
  - integrate Id and hom in the same theory
  - specify Σ, Π, etc
- find interpretations in categories of directed spaces
  - build 'directed' weak factorization systems
  - build universes

Thank you!

# Further Reading



#### L. Fajstrup et al.

Directed Algebraic Topology and Concurrency. Springer International Publishing, 2016.



#### E. Finster and S. Mimram.

A Type-Theoretical Definition of Weak  $\omega$ -Categories.

2017 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, 1–12, 2017.



#### D. R. Licata and R. Harper.

2-Dimensional Directed Type Theory. Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, 276 (2011), pp. 263-289.



#### A. Nyuts.

Towards a Directed Homotopy Type Theory based on 4 Kinds of Variance. MA thesis. KU Leuven, 2015.



#### E. Riehl and M. Shulman.

A type theory for synthetic  $\infty$ -categories. Higher Structures, 1(1):116-193, 2017.



#### M. Warren.

Directed Type Theory Talk at IAS, 10 April 2013.