

Notes on Models of Type Theory

S. Awodey, IAS, 10/5/12

(1) Def. (Dybjer via Coquand)

CwF

A Category w/ families consists of:

(i) - a category \mathcal{C} (of "contexts"), written

$$\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$$

(ii) for each T , a collection of "types"

$$\text{Types}(T) \ni A$$

written

$$T + A$$

with action by $\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow T$
denoted

$$\Delta \vdash A\sigma$$

s.t.

$$\begin{aligned} A1 &= A \\ (A\sigma)\tau &= A(\sigma\tau) \end{aligned}$$

(2)

(iii) • for each $\Pi + A$, a collection of elements

$$\text{Elm}(\Pi, A) \ni a$$

written

$$\Pi + a : A ,$$

with action by $\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow \Pi$
denoted

$$\Delta + a\sigma : A_\sigma$$

s.t.

$$a1 = a$$

$$a(\sigma\tau) = (a\sigma)\tau .$$

(iv) • for each $\Pi + A$, an "extension"

$$\Pi.A \in \text{ob } \mathcal{C} ,$$

$$, P : \Pi.A \rightarrow \Pi \in \text{ar } \mathcal{C} ,$$

$$, q \text{ where } \Pi.A \vdash q : A_P .$$

• for each $\sigma : \Delta \rightarrow \Pi$, $\Delta \vdash a : A_\sigma$,
a map:

$$(\sigma, a) : \Delta \rightarrow \Pi.A .$$

(3)

These should satisfy :

$$p \circ (\sigma, a) = \cancel{\sigma} \circ a$$

$$q(\sigma, a) = a$$

$$(\sigma, a) \circ \delta = (\sigma \circ \delta, a \delta)$$

$$(p, q) = 1$$

(2) These data specify :

Presheaf

(i) a cat \mathcal{C}

(ii) a presheaf $T: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$

(iii) a presheaf $E: \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$
together with a nat. map

$$p: E \rightarrow T$$

Let's see how this works before doing (iv).

Recall the Yoneda Lemma : for any $P \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$\underline{x \in PC}$$

$$x: y \in \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow P$$

(4)

So we can write

$$\mathcal{T} + A$$

as

$$y\mathcal{T} \xrightarrow[A]{} T \quad \text{in } \hat{\mathcal{C}}$$

Moreover, given $E(\mathcal{T})$

$$A \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}) \quad \downarrow P_{\mathcal{T}}$$

let $E(\mathcal{T}, A) = P_{\mathcal{T}}^{-1}(A)$,

then we have

$$\mathcal{T} + a : A$$

\Leftrightarrow

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \nearrow a & \downarrow P \\ y\mathcal{T} & \xrightarrow[A]{} & T \end{array}$$

(5)

Def (Grothendieck) A map of presheaves

$$f: Y \rightarrow X$$

is representable if all of its fibers are representable, in the sense:

for all $A \in \mathcal{C}$ $\exists x \in X(A)$, there's $f_x \downarrow_{A \in \mathcal{C}}$

s.t. :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} yB & \xrightarrow{\quad} & Y \\ \downarrow f_x & \perp & \downarrow f \\ yA & \xrightarrow{x} & X \end{array}$$

Prop. If C , $p: E \rightarrow T$ is a CwF ,
then p is representable.

Pf. Take

$$\begin{array}{ccc} y\pi_A & \xrightarrow{q} & E \\ \downarrow p_A & & \downarrow p \\ y\pi & \xrightarrow{A} & T \end{array}$$

(6)

Then the converse is also true :

if $C \& P: E \rightarrow T$ is representable,

then there are operations $(-, -), q$
making $C, E, T, P, (-, -), q$ a CwF.

Pf. Use

$$\begin{array}{ccc} ST & \xrightarrow{P} & C \\ \downarrow C & & \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C & & C \end{array}$$

(3) Length the equivalence between the notions
of "CwF" & "representable map of
presheaves" makes it clear how many
different such things there are.

Note that composites of representable
maps are representable, & these are also
closed under pullback, coproducts, and ...

One way to restrict such structures is
by requiring a "length operation".

(7)

Def A length function on a CwF is

$$l: \mathcal{C}_o \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

s.t.

- $l(\mathbb{1}) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{1} = 1$

(term. obj.)

- for $T \vdash A$,

$$l(T.A) = l(T) + 1$$

- for any $l(\Delta) \neq 0$, there's a unique

$T' \not\vdash T \vdash A$ s.t.

$$\Delta = T'.A$$

($\& \text{ so: } l\Delta = lT'.A = lT + 1$).

So in particular, every object Δ of \mathcal{C} is generated from 1 by context extension $T.A$.

(8)

Now let $p: E \rightarrow T$ be representable,
and fun:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & C \\
 & p_2 \nearrow & \uparrow \text{den} \\
 (T, A) \quad F = S^T & \xrightarrow{p} & C \rightarrow \\
 & \downarrow \text{ad} & \\
 & p_1 \searrow & \downarrow \\
 & & T
 \end{array}$$

Def. A length (grading) on (C, p) is

$$l: C_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

s.t.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 (1) & T_0 & \xrightarrow{p_2} & C_0 & \xrightarrow{l} \mathbb{N} \\
 & \downarrow & & & \downarrow s \\
 & p_1 \downarrow & & & \\
 & C_0 & \xrightarrow{l} & \mathbb{N} &
 \end{array}$$

(2)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 & = & 1 \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow l_0 \\
 C_0 & \xrightarrow{l} & \mathbb{N}
 \end{array}$$

(9)

Prop. These notions of "length" are equivalent.

Note that given a grading on

$$P: E \rightarrow T$$

we have a p.b. :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\pi}_0 + 1 & \xrightarrow{\text{elp}_2 + 1} & N + 1 \\ (P_1, 1) \downarrow z & & \downarrow z(s, o) \\ C_0 & \longrightarrow & N \end{array}$$

Therefore :

$$C_0 \cong \overline{\pi}_0 + 1$$