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But this definition is tricky to make precise.
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The notion of $\infty$-category is made precise by several models:

- Topological categories and relative categories are the simplest to define but do not have enough maps between them.
- Quasi-categories (nee. weak Kan complexes), Rezk spaces (nee. complete Segal spaces), Segal categories, and (saturated 1-trivial weak) 1-complicial sets each have enough maps and also an internal hom, and in fact any of these categories can be enriched over any of the others.
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Q: How might you develop the category theory of $\infty$-categories?
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• work synthetically in a simplicial type theory augmenting HoTT to prove theorems in Rezk (R-Shulman: an $\infty$-category is a type with unique binary composites in which isomorphism is equivalent to identity)
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Adjunctions between $\infty$-categories

defn. An adjunction between $\infty$-categories is an adjunction in the homotopy 2-category, consisting of:

- $\infty$-categories $A$ and $B$
- $\infty$-functors $u : A \to B$, $f : B \to A$
- $\infty$-natural transformations $\downarrow \eta$, $\downarrow \epsilon$

satisfying the triangle equalities

Write $f \dashv u$ to indicate that $f$ is the left adjoint and $u$ is the right adjoint.
The 2-category theory of adjunctions

Since an adjunction between $\infty$-categories is just an adjunction in the homotopy 2-category, all 2-categorical theorems about adjunctions become theorems about adjunctions between $\infty$-categories.
The 2-category theory of adjunctions

Since an adjunction between $\infty$-categories is just an adjunction in the homotopy 2-category, all 2-categorical theorems about adjunctions become theorems about adjunctions between $\infty$-categories.

Prop. Adjunctions compose:

\[
\begin{align*}
C & \dashv f' & B & \dashv f & A \\
& \sim & & & \Rightarrow & & C & \dashv \left(f f'\right) \\
& u' & & u & & & & u' u
\end{align*}
\]

Prop. Adjoints to a given functor $u : A \to B$ are unique up to canonical isomorphism: if $f \dashv u$ and $f' \dashv u$ then $f \cong f'$.

Prop. Any equivalence can be promoted to an adjoint equivalence: if $u : A \simto B$ then $u$ is left and right adjoint to its equivalence inverse.
Composing adjunctions

Prop. Adjunctions compose:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \overset{f'}{\to} & B \\
\downarrow_{u'} & \quad & \downarrow_u \\
C & \overset{f}{\to} & A
\end{array}
\nonumber
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \overset{f f'}{\to} & A \\
\downarrow_{u' u} & \quad & \downarrow_{u' u}
\end{array}
\nonumber
\]

Proof: The composite 2-cells

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \longrightarrow & C \\
\downarrow_{f'} & \quad & \downarrow_{u'} \\
B & \longrightarrow & B \\
\downarrow_{\eta'} & \quad & \downarrow_{\eta} \\
A & \longrightarrow & A
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
C & \longrightarrow & C \\
\downarrow_{u' u} & \quad & \downarrow_{u' u} \\
B & \longrightarrow & B \\
\downarrow_{\epsilon' u} & \quad & \downarrow_{\epsilon} \\
A & \longrightarrow & A
\end{array}
\]

define the unit and counit of \(ff' \dashv u' u\) satisfying the triangle equalities.
defn. An $\infty$-category $A$ has a terminal element iff $1 \xrightarrow{t} A$. 

Prop. Right adjoints preserve terminal elements. 
Proof: Compose the adjunctions $1_A \xleftarrow{u} B \xrightarrow{f} A$. 

More generally: 
Prop. Right adjoints preserve limits and left adjoints preserve colimits. 
Proof: The usual one!
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**Prop.** Right adjoints preserve terminal elements.
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defn. An $\infty$-category $A$ has a terminal element iff $1 \xrightarrow{t} A$.
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More generally:
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Proof: The usual one!
The universal property of adjunctions

**defn.** Any $\infty$-category $A$ has an $\infty$-category of arrows $A^2$, pulling back

$$\text{Hom}_A(f, g) \longrightarrow A^2$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$(\text{cod}, \text{dom})$$

$$C \times B \quad \longrightarrow \quad A \times A$$

$$(\text{cod}, \text{dom})$$

$$\downarrow$$

$g \times f$$

to define the *comma $\infty$-category*:

Prop. $u \perp f$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(f, A) \simeq A \times B \text{Hom}_B(B, u)$.

Prop. If $f \dashv u$ with unit $\eta$ and counit $\epsilon$ then

• $\eta$ is initial in $\text{Hom}_B(B, u)$ over $B$.

• $\epsilon$ is terminal in $\text{Hom}_A(f, A)$ over $A$. 
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defn. Any $\infty$-category $A$ has an $\infty$-category of arrows $A^2$, pulling back

$$\text{Hom}_A(f, g) \to A^2$$

to define the comma $\infty$-category:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C \times B & \xrightarrow{g \times f} & A \times A \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{(cod, dom)} & & \text{(cod, dom)}
\end{array}$$

Prop. $A \perp B$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(f, A) \simeq_{A \times B} \text{Hom}_B(B, u)$. 
The universal property of adjunctions

defn. Any ∞-category $A$ has an ∞-category of arrows $A^2$, pulling back
$$
\text{Hom}_A(f, g) \xrightarrow{(\text{cod, dom})} A^2
$$
to define the comma ∞-category:
$$
C \times B \xrightarrow{g \times f} A \times A
$$

Prop. $A \perp B$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(f, A) \simeq_{A \times B} \text{Hom}_B(B, u)$.

Prop. If $f \dashv u$ with unit $\eta$ and counit $\epsilon$ then
- $\eta$ is initial in $\text{Hom}_B(B, u)$ over $B$.
- $\epsilon$ is terminal in $\text{Hom}_A(f, A)$ over $A$. 

The synthetic theory of $\infty$-categories (in homotopy type theory)
## The Curry-Howard-Voevodsky correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>type theory</strong></th>
<th><strong>set theory</strong></th>
<th><strong>logic</strong></th>
<th><strong>homotopy theory</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A$</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>proposition</td>
<td>space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x : A$</td>
<td>element</td>
<td>proof</td>
<td>point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\emptyset, 1$</td>
<td>$\emptyset, {\emptyset}$</td>
<td>$\bot, \top$</td>
<td>$\emptyset, *, \ast$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \times B$</td>
<td>set of pairs</td>
<td>$A$ and $B$</td>
<td>product space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A + B$</td>
<td>disjoint union</td>
<td>$A$ or $B$</td>
<td>coproduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A \rightarrow B$</td>
<td>set of functions</td>
<td>$A$ implies $B$</td>
<td>function space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x : A \vdash B(x)$</td>
<td>family of sets</td>
<td>predicate</td>
<td>fibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x : A \vdash b : B(x)$</td>
<td>fam. of elements</td>
<td>conditional proof</td>
<td>section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\prod_{x : A} B(x)$</td>
<td>product</td>
<td>$\forall x. B(x)$</td>
<td>space of sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{x : A} B(x)$</td>
<td>disjoint sum</td>
<td>$\exists x. B(x)$</td>
<td>total space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p : x =_A y$</td>
<td>$x = y$</td>
<td>proof of equality</td>
<td>path from $x$ to $y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum_{x,y : A} x =_A y$</td>
<td>diagonal</td>
<td>equality relation</td>
<td>path space for $A$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Path induction

The identity type family is freely generated by the terms $\text{refl}_x : x =_A x$. 
The identity type family is freely generated by the terms $\text{refl}_x : x =_A x$. 

Path induction. If $B(x, y, p)$ is a type family dependent on $x, y : A$ and $p : x =_A y$, then to prove $B(x, y, p)$ it suffices to assume $y$ is $x$ and $p$ is $\text{refl}_x$. 

Path induction.
Path induction

The identity type family is freely generated by the terms \( \text{refl}_x : x =_A x \).

Path induction. If \( B(x, y, p) \) is a type family dependent on \( x, y : A \) and \( p : x =_A y \), then to prove \( B(x, y, p) \) it suffices to assume \( y \) is \( x \) and \( p \) is \( \text{refl}_x \). I.e., there is a function

\[
\text{path-ind} : \left( \prod_{x:A} B(x, x, \text{refl}_x) \right) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{x,y:A} \prod_{p : x =_A y} B(x, y, p) \right).
\]
The intended model

\[ \text{Set}^{\Delta^{\text{op}} \times \Delta^{\text{op}}} \supset \text{Reedy} \supset \text{Segal} \supset \text{Rezk} \]

- bisimplicial sets
- types
- types with composition
- types with composition & univalence
The intended model

\[ \text{Set}^{\Delta \text{op} \times \Delta \text{op}} \supset \text{Reedy} \supset \text{Segal} \supset \text{Rezk} \]

- bisimplicial sets
- types
- types with composition
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**Theorem (Shulman).** Homotopy type theory is modeled by the category of **Reedy fibrant** bisimplicial sets.
The intended model

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Set}^{\Delta^{\text{op}} \times \Delta^{\text{op}}} & \supset & \text{Reedy} & \supset \\
\Downarrow & & \Downarrow & \\
\text{bisimplicial sets} & & \text{types} & \\
& & \Downarrow & \\
& & \text{types with composition} & \\
& & \Downarrow & \\
& & \text{types with composition \\
& & \& \text{univalence} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Theorem (**Shulman**). Homotopy type theory is modeled by the category of **Reedy fibrant** bisimplicial sets.

Theorem (**Rezk**). \(\infty\)-categories are modeled by **Rezk spaces** aka complete Segal spaces.
Shapes in the theory of the directed interval

Our types may depend on other types and also on shapes $\Phi \subset 2^n$, polytopes embedded in a directed cube, defined in a language

$$\top, \bot, \land, \lor, \equiv \quad \text{and} \quad 0, 1, \leq$$

satisfying intuitionistic logic and strict interval axioms.
Shapes in the theory of the directed interval

Our types may depend on other types and also on shapes $\Phi \subset 2^n$, polytopes embedded in a directed cube, defined in a language

$$\top, \bot, \land, \lor, \equiv \quad \text{and} \quad 0, 1, \leq$$

satisfying intuitionistic logic and strict interval axioms.

$$\Delta^n := \{(t_1, \ldots, t_n) : 2^n \mid t_n \leq \cdots \leq t_1\} \quad \text{e.g.} \quad \Delta^1 := 2$$

$$\begin{align*}
\Delta^2 \ := \ &\begin{cases}
(t,t) & (1,1) \\
(0,0) & (0,1) \\
(t,0) & (1,0)
\end{cases} \\
\partial \Delta^2 \ := \ &\{(t_1, t_2) : 2^2 \mid (t_2 \leq t_1) \land ((0 = t_2) \lor (t_2 = t_1) \lor (t_1 = 1))\} \\
\Lambda^2_1 \ := \ &\{(t_1, t_2) : 2^2 \mid (t_2 \leq t_1) \land ((0 = t_2) \lor (t_1 = 1))\}
\end{align*}$$
Extension types

Formation rule for extension types

\[ \Phi \subset \Psi \] shape
\[ A \] type
\[ a : \Phi \rightarrow A \]

\[ \langle \Phi \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \rangle \] type

A term \( f : \langle \Phi \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \rangle \) defines \( f : \Psi \rightarrow A \) so that \( f(t) \equiv a(t) \) for \( t : \Phi \).

The simplicial type theory allows us to prove equivalences between extension types along composites or products of shape inclusions.
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Formation rule for extension types

\[
\Phi \subset \Psi \text{ \ shape} \quad A \text{ \ type} \quad \alpha : \Phi \rightarrow A
\]

\[
\left\langle \Phi \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \right\rangle \text{ \ type}
\]

A term \( f : \left\langle \Phi \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \right\rangle \) defines
Extension types

Formation rule for extension types

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\Phi \subset \Psi & \text{shape} \\
\hline
A & \text{type} \\
\hline
\langle \Phi \xrightarrow{a} A \rangle & \text{type}
\end{array}
\]

A term \( f : \langle \Phi \xrightarrow{a} A \rangle \) defines

\[ f : \Psi \rightarrow A \text{ so that } f(t) \equiv a(t) \text{ for } t : \Phi. \]
Extension types

Formation rule for extension types

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Phi \subseteq \Psi \text{ shape} \\
\Phi \rightarrow A \text{ type} \\
\Phi \rightarrow A
\end{array}
\]

A term \( f : \langle \Phi \rightarrow A \rangle \) defines \( f : \Psi \rightarrow A \) so that \( f(t) \equiv a(t) \) for \( t : \Phi \).

The simplicial type theory allows us to prove equivalences between extension types along composites or products of shape inclusions.
Hom types

The hom type for $A$ depends on two terms in $A$:

\[ x, y : A \vdash \text{Hom}_A(x, y) \]
Hom types

The hom type for $A$ depends on two terms in $A$:

$$x, y : A \vdash \text{Hom}_{A}(x, y)$$

$$\text{Hom}_{A}(x, y) := \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\partial \Delta^1 \\
\gamma \\
\Delta^1 \\
\end{array} \xrightarrow{[x, y]} A \right\rangle \text{ type}$$
Hom types

The hom type for $A$ depends on two terms in $A$:

$$x, y : A \vdash \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

\[ \text{Hom}_A(x, y) := \left< \partial \Delta^1 \xrightarrow{[x,y]} A \right> \text{ type} \]

A term $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ defines an arrow in $A$ from $x$ to $y$. 
Hom types

The hom type for $A$ depends on two terms in $A$:

$$x, y : A \vdash \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

A term $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ defines an arrow in $A$ from $x$ to $y$.

Semantically, $\sum_{x, y : A} \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ recovers the $\infty$-category of arrows $A^2$ in the $\infty$-cosmos Rezk and $\text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ recovers the comma $\infty$-category from $x$ to $y$. 
Segal types \equiv types with binary composition

A type \( A \) is Segal iff every composable pair of arrows has a unique composite.
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A type $A$ is Segal iff every composable pair of arrows has a unique composite, i.e., for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$ the type
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\left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\Lambda^2_1 \\
\downarrow \\
\Delta^2
\end{array} [f, g] \rightarrow A \right\rangle
$$

is contractible.
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is contractible.

Semantically, a Reedy fibrant bisimplicial set $A$ is Segal if and only if $A^{\Delta^2} \to A^{\Lambda^1_2}$ has contractible fibers.
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is contractible.

Semantically, a Reedy fibrant bisimplicial set $A$ is Segal if and only if $A^{\Delta^2} \to A^{\Lambda^2_1}$ has contractible fibers.

By contractibility, $\langle \Lambda^2_1 \xrightarrow{[f, g]} A \rangle$ has a unique inhabitant.
Segal types $\equiv$ types with binary composition

A type $A$ is Segal iff every composable pair of arrows has a unique composite, i.e., for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$ the type

\[
\langle \Lambda^2_1 \xrightarrow{[f,g]} A \rangle
\]

is contractible.

Semantically, a Reedy fibrant bisimplicial set $A$ is Segal if and only if $A^\Delta^2 \rightarrow A^{\Lambda^2_1}$ has contractible fibers.

By contractibility, \[
\langle \Lambda^2_1 \xrightarrow{[f,g]} A \rangle
\]
has a unique inhabitant. Write $g \circ f : \text{Hom}_A(x, z)$ for its inner face, the composite of $f$ and $g$. 
Identity arrows

For any $x : A$, the constant function defines a term

$$
id_x := \lambda t.x : \text{Hom}_A(x, x) := \left\langle \begin{array}{c}
\partial \Delta^1 \\
\text{[}x,x\text{]} \\
\Delta^1 \\
\text{[}x,x\text{]} \\
A
\end{array} \right\rangle,$$

which we denote by $id_x$ and call the identity arrow.
Identity arrows

For any $x : A$, the constant function defines a term

$$\text{id}_x := \lambda t.x : \text{Hom}_A(x, x) := \left \langle \begin{array}{c}
\partial \Delta^1 \\
\downarrow \\
\Delta^1
\end{array} \xrightarrow{[x, x]} A \right \rangle,$$

which we denote by $\text{id}_x$ and call the identity arrow.

For any $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ in a Segal type $A$, the term

$$\lambda(s, t).f(t) : \left \langle \begin{array}{c}
\Lambda^2_1 \\
\downarrow \\
\Delta^2
\end{array} \xrightarrow{[\text{id}_x, f]} A \right \rangle$$

witnesses the unit axiom $f = f \circ \text{id}_x$. 
Associativity of composition

Let $A$ be a Segal type with arrows

\[ f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y), \quad g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z), \quad h : \text{Hom}_A(z, w). \]
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Let \( A \) be a Segal type with arrows

\[ f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y), \quad g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z), \quad h : \text{Hom}_A(z, w). \]

Prop. \[ h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f. \]
Associativity of composition

Let $A$ be a Segal type with arrows

$$f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y), \quad g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z), \quad h : \text{Hom}_A(z, w).$$

Prop.

$$h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f.$$  

Proof: Consider the composable arrows in the Segal type $\Delta^1 \to A$: 

```
\[\begin{array}{ccc}
x & \overset{g}{\longrightarrow} & y \\
\downarrow{f} & & \downarrow{g} \\
y & \overset{g \circ f}{\longrightarrow} & z & \overset{h \circ g}{\longrightarrow} & w \\
\downarrow{g} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{h} \\
\\
\end{array}\]
```
Associativity of composition

Let $A$ be a Segal type with arrows

\[ f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y), \quad g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z), \quad h : \text{Hom}_A(z, w). \]

Prop. \[ h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f. \]

Proof: Consider the composable arrows in the Segal type $\Delta^1 \to A$:

Composing defines a term in the type $\Delta^2 \to (\Delta^1 \to A)$
Associativity of composition

Let $A$ be a Segal type with arrows

$$f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y), \quad g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z), \quad h : \text{Hom}_A(z, w).$$

Prop.

$$h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f.$$  

Proof: Consider the composable arrows in the Segal type $\Delta^1 \rightarrow A$:

Composing defines a term in the type $\Delta^2 \rightarrow (\Delta^1 \rightarrow A)$ which yields a term $\ell : \text{Hom}_A(x, w)$ so that $\ell = h \circ (g \circ f)$ and $\ell = (h \circ g) \circ f$. 
An arrow $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ in a Segal type is an isomorphism if it has a two-sided inverse $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)$. However, the type

$$\sum_{g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} (g \circ f = \text{id}_x) \times (f \circ g = \text{id}_y)$$

has higher-dimensional structure and is not a proposition.
Isomorphisms

An arrow $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ in a Segal type is an isomorphism if it has a two-sided inverse $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)$. However, the type

$$\sum_{g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} (g \circ f = \text{id}_x) \times (f \circ g = \text{id}_y)$$

has higher-dimensional structure and is not a proposition. Instead define

$$\text{isiso}(f) := \left( \sum_{g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} g \circ f = \text{id}_x \right) \times \left( \sum_{h : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} f \circ h = \text{id}_y \right).$$
An arrow $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ in a Segal type is an isomorphism if it has a two-sided inverse $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)$. However, the type

$$\sum_{g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} (g \circ f = \text{id}_x) \times (f \circ g = \text{id}_y)$$

has higher-dimensional structure and is not a proposition. Instead define

$$\text{isiso}(f) := \left(\sum_{g : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} g \circ f = \text{id}_x\right) \times \left(\sum_{h : \text{Hom}_A(y, x)} f \circ h = \text{id}_y\right).$$

For $x, y : A$, the type of isomorphisms from $x$ to $y$ is:

$$x \cong_A y := \sum_{f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)} \text{isiso}(f).$$
Rezk types $\equiv \infty$-categories

By path induction, to define a map

$$\text{path-to-iso} : (x =_A y) \rightarrow (x \cong_A y)$$

for all $x, y : A$ it suffices to define

$$\text{path-to-iso}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x.$$
Rezk types $\equiv \infty$-categories

By path induction, to define a map

$$\text{path-to-iso} : (x =_A y) \to (x \cong_A y)$$

for all $x, y : A$ it suffices to define

$$\text{path-to-iso}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x.$$

A Segal type $A$ is Rezk iff every isomorphism is an identity.
Rezk types $\equiv \infty$-categories

By path induction, to define a map

\[
\text{path-to-iso}: (x =_A y) \to (x \cong_A y)
\]

for all $x, y : A$ it suffices to define

\[
\text{path-to-iso}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x.
\]

A Segal type $A$ is Rezk iff every isomorphism is an identity, i.e., iff the map

\[
\text{path-to-iso}: \prod_{x,y:A} (x =_A y) \to (x \cong_A y)
\]

is an equivalence.
Discrete types $\equiv \infty$-groupoids

Similarly by path induction define

$$\text{path-to-arr} : (x =_A y) \to \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

for all $x, y : A$ by $\text{path-to-arr}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x$. 
Discrete types $\equiv \infty$-groupoids

Similarly by path induction define

$$\text{path-to-arr}: (x =_A y) \to \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

for all $x, y : A$ by $\text{path-to-arr}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x$.

A type $A$ is discrete iff every arrow is an identity, i.e., iff $\text{path-to-arr}$ is an equivalence.
Discrete types \( \equiv \infty \text{-} \text{groupoids} \)

Similarly by path induction define

\[
\text{path-to-arr}: \ (x =_A y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(x, y)
\]

for all \( x, y : A \) by \( \text{path-to-arr}(\text{refl}_x) := \text{id}_x \).

A type \( A \) is discrete iff every arrow is an identity, i.e., iff \( \text{path-to-arr} \) is an equivalence.

**Prop.** A type is discrete if and only if it is Rezk and all of its arrows are isomorphisms.

**Proof:**

\[
\begin{align*}
& x =_A y \quad \text{path-to-arr} \quad \text{Hom}_A(x, y) \\
\downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \quad \downarrow \\
& x \cong_A y \quad \text{path-to-iso}
\end{align*}
\]
An $\infty$-groupoid is a type in which arrows are equivalent to identities:

$$\text{path-to-arr}: (x =_A y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

is an equivalence.
defn. An $\infty$-groupoid is a type in which arrows are equivalent to identities:

$$\text{path-to-arr}: (x =_A y) \to \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$$

is an equivalence.

defn. An $\infty$-category is a type

- which has unique binary composites of arrows:

$$\left\langle \begin{array}{c} \Lambda^2_1 \to A \\ \Delta^2 \to A \end{array} \right\rangle \quad [f, g]$$

is contractible
**∞-categories for undergraduates**

**defn.** An **∞-groupoid** is a type in which arrows are equivalent to identities:

\[
\text{path-to-arr}: (x =_A y) \to \text{Hom}_A(x, y)
\]

is an equivalence.

---

**defn.** An **∞-category** is a type

- which has unique binary composites of arrows:

\[
\Lambda^2_1 \xrightarrow{[f, g]} \Delta^2 \xrightarrow{A}
\]

is contractible

- and in which isomorphisms are equivalent to identities:

\[
\text{path-to-iso}: (x =_A y) \to (x \cong_A y)
\]

is an equivalence.
A type family $x : A \vdash B(x)$ over a Segal type $A$ is covariant if for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $u : B(x)$ there is a unique lift of $f$ with domain $u$. 
A type family $x : A \vdash B(x)$ over a Segal type $A$ is **covariant** if for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $u : B(x)$ there is a unique lift of $f$ with domain $u$.

The codomain of the unique lift defines a term $f_* u : B(y)$. 

---

**Prop.** For $u : B(x)$, $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$, and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$, $g_* (f_* u) = (g \circ f)_* u$ and $(\text{id}_x)_* u = u$.

**Prop.** If $x : A \vdash B(x)$ is covariant then for each $x : A$ the fiber $B(x)$ is discrete. Thus covariant type families are fibered in $\infty$-groupoids.

**Prop.** Fix $a : A$. The type family $x : A \vdash \text{Hom}_A(a, x)$ is covariant.
Covariant type families $\equiv$ categorical fibrations

A type family $x : A \vdash B(x)$ over a Segal type $A$ is covariant if for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $u : B(x)$ there is a unique lift of $f$ with domain $u$.

The codomain of the unique lift defines a term $f_*u : B(y)$.

Prop. For $u : B(x)$, $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$, and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$,

$$g_*(f_*u) = (g \circ f)_*u \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{id}_x)_*u = u.$$
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The codomain of the unique lift defines a term $f_* u : B(y)$.

Prop. For $u : B(x)$, $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$, and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$,

$$g_*(f_* u) = (g \circ f)_* u$$

and

$$(\text{id}_x)_* u = u.$$

Prop. If $x : A \vdash B(x)$ is covariant then for each $x : A$ the fiber $B(x)$ is discrete. Thus covariant type families are fibered in $\infty$-groupoids.
A type family $x : A \vdash B(x)$ over a Segal type $A$ is covariant if for every $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $u : B(x)$ there is a unique lift of $f$ with domain $u$.

The codomain of the unique lift defines a term $f_*u : B(y)$.

Prop. For $u : B(x)$, $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$, and $g : \text{Hom}_A(y, z)$,

$$g_*(f_*u) = (g \circ f)_*u \quad \text{and} \quad (\text{id}_x)_*u = u.$$ 

Prop. If $x : A \vdash B(x)$ is covariant then for each $x : A$ the fiber $B(x)$ is discrete. Thus covariant type families are fibered in $\infty$-groupoids.

Prop. Fix $a : A$. The type family $x : A \vdash \text{Hom}_A(a, x)$ is covariant.
The Yoneda lemma

Let $x : A \vdash B(x)$ be a covariant family over a Segal type and fix $a : A$. 

Yoneda lemma. The maps $\text{ev-id} := \lambda \phi. \phi(a, \text{id}_a) : \prod_{x : A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x)$ and $\text{yon} := \lambda u. \lambda x. \lambda f. f^* u : B(a) \to \prod_{x : A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x)$ are inverse equivalences.

Corollary. A natural isomorphism $\phi : \prod_{x : A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \cong \text{Hom}_A(b, x)$ induces an identity $\text{ev-id}(\phi) : b = A \cdot a$ if the type $A$ is Rezk.
The Yoneda lemma

Let $x : A \vdash B(x)$ be a covariant family over a Segal type and fix $a : A$.

Yoneda lemma. The maps

$$\text{ev-id} := \lambda \phi. \phi(a, \text{id}_a) : \left( \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right) \to B(a)$$

and
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are inverse equivalences.
The Yoneda lemma

Let \( x : A \vdash B(x) \) be a covariant family over a Segal type and fix \( a : A \).

Yoneda lemma. The maps

\[
\text{ev-id} := \lambda \phi.\phi(a, \text{id}_a) : \left( \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right) \to B(a)
\]

and

\[
\text{yon} := \lambda u.\lambda x.\lambda f.f_*u : B(a) \to \left( \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right)
\]

are inverse equivalences.

Corollary. A natural isomorphism \( \phi : \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \cong \text{Hom}_A(b, x) \) induces an identity \( \text{ev-id}(\phi) : b =_A a \) if the type \( A \) is Rezk.
Yoneda lemma. If $A$ is a Segal type and $B(x)$ is a covariant family dependent on $x : A$, then evaluation at $(a, \text{id}_a)$ defines an equivalence

$$\text{ev-id} : \left( \prod_{x : A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right) \to B(a)$$
The dependent Yoneda lemma

Yoneda lemma. If \( A \) is a Segal type and \( B(x) \) is a covariant family dependent on \( x : A \), then evaluation at \((a, \text{id}_a)\) defines an equivalence

\[
\text{ev-id} : \left( \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right) \to B(a)
\]

The Yoneda lemma is a “directed” version of the “transport” operation for identity types, suggesting a dependently-typed generalization analogous to the full induction principle for identity types.
The dependent Yoneda lemma

Yoneda lemma. If $A$ is a Segal type and $B(x)$ is a covariant family dependent on $x : A$, then evaluation at $(a, \text{id}_a)$ defines an equivalence

$$\text{ev-id} : \left( \prod_{x:A} \text{Hom}_A(a, x) \to B(x) \right) \to B(a)$$

The Yoneda lemma is a “directed” version of the “transport” operation for identity types, suggesting a dependently-typed generalization analogous to the full induction principle for identity types.

Dependent Yoneda lemma. If $A$ is a Segal type and $B(x, y, f)$ is a covariant family dependent on $x, y : A$ and $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$, then evaluation at $(x, x, \text{id}_x)$ defines an equivalence

$$\text{ev-id} : \left( \prod_{x,y:A} \prod_{f:\text{Hom}_A(x,y)} B(x, y, f) \right) \to \prod_{x:A} B(x, x, \text{id}_x)$$
Dependent Yoneda is directed path induction

Slogan: the dependent Yoneda lemma is directed path induction.
Dependent Yoneda is directed path induction

Slogan: the dependent Yoneda lemma is directed path induction.

Path induction. If $B(x, y, p)$ is a type family dependent on $x, y : A$ and $p : x =_A y$, then to prove $B(x, y, p)$ it suffices to assume $y$ is $x$ and $p$ is $\text{refl}_x$. I.e., there is a function

$$\text{path-ind} : \left( \prod_{x:A} B(x, x, \text{refl}_x) \right) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{x,y:A} \prod_{p:x=_{A}y} B(x, y, p) \right).$$
Dependent Yoneda is directed path induction

Slogan: the dependent Yoneda lemma is directed path induction.

Path induction. If $B(x, y, p)$ is a type family dependent on $x, y : A$ and $p : x =_A y$, then to prove $B(x, y, p)$ it suffices to assume $y$ is $x$ and $p$ is $\text{refl}_x$. I.e., there is a function

$$\text{path-ind} : \left( \prod_{x : A} B(x, x, \text{refl}_x) \right) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{x, y : A} \prod_{p : x =_A y} B(x, y, p) \right).$$

Arrow induction. If $B(x, y, f)$ is a covariant family dependent on $x, y : A$ and $f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)$ and $A$ is Segal, then to prove $B(x, y, f)$ it suffices to assume $y$ is $x$ and $f$ is $\text{id}_x$. I.e., there is a function

$$\text{id-ind} : \left( \prod_{x : A} B(x, x, \text{id}_x) \right) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{x, y : A} \prod_{f : \text{Hom}_A(x, y)} B(x, y, f) \right).$$
More theorems about $\infty$-categories can be proven using analytic methods in a particular model, but there are other advantages to the synthetic approach:

• efficiency: a large part of the theory can be developed simultaneously in many models by working synthetically with $\infty$-categories as objects in an $\infty$-cosmos.
• simplification: the axioms of an $\infty$-cosmos are chosen to simplify proofs by working strictly up to isomorphism insofar as possible.
• model-independence: $\infty$-cosmology may be used to demonstrate that both analytically- and synthetically-proven results about $\infty$-categories transfer across suitable “change-of-model” functors.
• compatible with new foundations: synthetic constructions can easily be adapted to simplicial HoTT, which yields further streamlining.
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- **compatible with new foundations**: synthetic constructions can easily be adapted to simplicial HoTT, which yields further streamlining.
References

For more on the synthetic theories of $\infty$-categories, see:

Emily Riehl and Dominic Verity

- draft book in progress:
  
  Elements of $\infty$-Category Theory
  www.math.jhu.edu/~eriehl/elements.pdf

- mini-course lecture notes:
  
  $\infty$-Category Theory from Scratch
  arXiv:1608.05314

Emily Riehl and Michael Shulman

- A type theory for synthetic $\infty$-categories, Higher Structures

Thank you!