

Constructive Sheaf Models of Type Theory

Thierry Coquand, Fabian Ruch, and Christian Sattler

Computer Science Department, University of Gothenburg

Introduction

Despite being relatively recent, the notion of (pre)sheaf model has a rich and intricate history which mixes different intuitions coming from topology, logic and algebra. Eilenberg and Zilber [14] used a presheaf model (simplicial sets) to represent geometrical objects, and the intuition is *geometrical*: we think of the objects I, J, \dots of the base category as basic “shapes”; a presheaf A is then given by a family of sets $A(I)$ of objects of each shape I , which are related by the restriction maps $A(I) \rightarrow A(J)$. A little later, but independently, Beth [7] and Kripke [20] used a sheaf and a presheaf model over trees, respectively, to provide a formal semantics for intuitionistic logic. Their motivations were logical, and the intuition is of a *temporal* nature instead: we think of the objects of the node of the tree as “stages of knowledge” and of the ordering as “increase in knowledge”. Scott [27] described a presheaf model of higher-order logic and pointed out the potential interest for the semantics of λ -calculus. This was refined by Martin Hofmann [16] who provided a presheaf model of dependent type theory with universes. Hofmann’s presheaf model was subsequently used in an essential way in works on constructive semantics of type theory with *univalent* universes [9, 10, 22].

The generalization of such presheaf models of dependent type theory, and especially of universes, to a *sheaf* model semantics is however non-trivial. The problem in generalising this semantics for universes comes essentially from the fact that the collection of sheaves does not form a sheaf in any natural way: if we are given locally sheaves that are compatible, one can patch them together but not in a *unique* way, only unique *up to isomorphism*. This problem was the motivation for the introduction of stacks and a more subtle notion of patching of sheaves (cf. [15, Section 3.3]), and in general patching of mathematical structures. The generalization of this to patching of higher structures was the content of the first part of Joyal’s letter to Grothendieck [17]. One contribution of the present paper is to provide a constructive version of this notion¹ by describing a sheaf model semantics of type theory with univalence [35, 34]. This uses in a crucial way the fact that we have a *constructive* interpretation of univalence as in [9, 22], which can be relativized to any presheaf model. The main point is then that the operation sending an object to its object of descent data (a compatible collection of elements of its restrictions) defines a *left exact modality* (see [34, 23, 24]), which can then be used to build internally models of univalent type theory [23].

This work opens the possibility of generalising works of sheaf models of intuitionistic logic as in [33] to sheaf models of univalent type theory. It extends the previous work in [11] to a complete model of univalence, and has no restrictions for representing (higher) data types. We give only one application (independence of countable choice), but we expect for instance that results such as in [21] can be generalized as well, and that we can give a constructive account of works such as in [30, 37]. The present semantics (in a preliminary version) has already been used by Weaver and Licata [36] for building a constructive model of directed univalence.

This paper is organized as follow. We first introduce the notion of lex operation as an operation acting on types and families of types. A descent data operation is then a lex operation which defines a left exact modality [34, 23, 24]. These two notions are formulated purely syntactically in the framework of type theory. We show next how to instantiate these operations for cubical presheaves. In this setting, we can understand the notion of being modal for a descent data operation as a generalization of the sheaf condition, where the compatibility requirements are expressed up to path equality instead of being

¹Joyal’s argument was using non-constructive reasoning in simplicial sets and then Barr’s theorem (see [5]). The present paper can be developed directly in the constructive framework of CZF with universes introduced by Aczel [1].

expressed as strict equalities. We then provide some examples and the application to the unprovability of countable choice. In an appendix we explain how some of our results about descent data operations can be generalized to accessible left exact modalities.

1 Abstract notion of descent data

In this article, we take terminology in type theory with potentially both strict and homotopical meaning to have the strict meaning by default. For example, equality (denoted by the symbol $=$) refers to the strict equality (as opposed to identity or path types), isomorphisms refer to strictly invertible maps, and pullbacks refer to strict pullbacks.

We use the following notations. We write $\mathbf{1}$ for the unit type and $() : \mathbf{1}$ for its unique element. Given a type A and a family B of types over A , we write $\sum_A B$ for their sum type and $\prod_A B$ for their product type. The pairing operation is denoted by $(a, b) : \sum_A B$ for $a : A$ and $b : B a$. The projection maps are denoted by π_1 and π_2 . We write id_A for the identity function on A and $g \circ f$ for the composition of $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$. If B is a family of types over A and $f : A' \rightarrow A$, we also write $B \circ f$ for the family of types over A' obtained from B by reindexing along f .

1.1 Lex operation

The concept of lex operations is defined for a dependent type theory with only unit type, dependent sums, dependent product and universes. In particular, path types are not needed. Intuitively, a lex operation is an endofunctor on the category of types and functions (compatible with substitution) which preserves the unit type and dependent projections of sum types up to isomorphism.

A *lex operation*² is given by an operation D on types and functions forming a functor: we have $Df : DA \rightarrow DB$ if $f : A \rightarrow B$ with $D(g \circ f) = Dg \circ Df$ and $D(\text{id}_A) = \text{id}_{DA}$.

The operation D should also preserve the unit type $\mathbf{1}$ up to isomorphism. Specifically we have an element $\langle \rangle$ in $D\mathbf{1}$ and $x = \langle \rangle$ if x is in $D\mathbf{1}$.

Furthermore, D should preserve dependent projections of sum types up to isomorphism. We assert this by an operation on families of types: $\tilde{D}B$ is family of types over DA if B is a family of types over A . This should be natural in A together with operations ensuring that $D(\sum_A B)$ is naturally isomorphic to $\sum_{DA} \tilde{D}B$ over DA . Naturality in A means $\tilde{D}(B \circ f) = \tilde{D}B \circ Df : DA' \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ for $f : A' \rightarrow A$. The natural isomorphism between $D(\sum_A B)$ and $\sum_{DA} \tilde{D}B$ over DA is given by an operation $\tilde{D}s : \prod_{DA} \tilde{D}B$ on sections $s : \prod_A B$ satisfying $\tilde{D}(s \circ f) = \tilde{D}s \circ Df : \prod_{DA'} \tilde{D}(B \circ f)$ and a pairing operation $\langle u, v \rangle : D(\sum_A B)$ for elements $u : DA$ and $v : (\tilde{D}B) u$ satisfying

$$(D\pi_1)\langle u, v \rangle = u \quad (\tilde{D}\pi_2)\langle u, v \rangle = v \quad \langle (D\pi_1)w, (\tilde{D}\pi_2)w \rangle = w$$

where $w : D(\sum_A B)$.

We also assume that universes reflect these operations. This means we have $DA : \mathcal{U}$ if $A : \mathcal{U}$ and $\tilde{D}B : DA \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ if $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and A a type (crucially, A need not be in \mathcal{U} here).

The canonical example of a lex operation is exponentiation with a fixed type R (assumed to be in all universes). We define $DA = A^R$, $(\tilde{D}B)u = \prod_{x:R} B(ux)$, and $(\tilde{D}s)u = \lambda_{x:R} s(ux)$. The pairing is given by $\langle u, v \rangle = \lambda_{x:R} (ux, vx)$.

Remark 1.1. Let \mathcal{U} be a universe. The action of the operation \tilde{D} on \mathcal{U} -small families is uniquely determined by the universal case $L = \tilde{D}\text{id}_{\mathcal{U}} : D\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$: we have (and can define) $\tilde{D}B = L \circ DB$ with $DB : DA \rightarrow D\mathcal{U}$ for $B : A \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. This corresponds to the “escaping” function in Section 2.5 of [26]. We can thus describe the action of \tilde{D} on \mathcal{U} -small families and associated operations by requiring that D applied to the “universal \mathcal{U} -small fibration” $\sum_{X:\mathcal{U}} X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is isomorphic to a “ \mathcal{U} -small fibration” (a projection of a type in \mathcal{U}), and that D preserves pullbacks of this map.

²The notion of lex operation appears implicitly in a natural way when describing the rules of inductive data types [12]. If we have a family D_a of lex operations indexed over $a : A$, we can consider the inductive type T with constructor $\text{sup} : \prod_{a:A} (D_a T \rightarrow T)$ and elimination rule $\text{rec } f : \prod_{a:A} \prod_{u:D_a T} (\tilde{D}_a P u \rightarrow P(\text{sup}_a u))$. We can then write the computation rule

$$\text{rec } f(\text{sup}_a u) = f_a u (\tilde{D}_a(\text{rec } f) u)$$

For justifying the use of such inductive definitions, we need some “accessibility” assumption on the functor D , which will be satisfied in the examples. In the special case where $D_a X$ is X^{B_a} for B a family of over A we recover the W -type $W_A B$.

Proposition 1.2. *Any lex operation D is uniquely pointed.*³

Proof. We define $\eta_A a = (D\epsilon_a) \langle \rangle$ with $\epsilon_a = \lambda_{x:1} a$. We then have for $f : A \rightarrow B$

$$(Df)(\eta_A a) = (Df \circ D\epsilon_a) \langle \rangle = (D\epsilon_{f a}) \langle \rangle = \eta_B(f a)$$

Note furthermore that this natural transformation η_A is uniquely determined, since we should have $\eta_1 () = \langle \rangle$ and so $\eta_A a = \eta_A(\epsilon_a ()) = (D\epsilon_a)(\eta_1 ()) = (D\epsilon_a) \langle \rangle$. \square

Remark 1.3. For $T : \mathcal{U}$, the map $(\tilde{D}\epsilon_T) \langle \rangle \rightarrow \sum_{D1} \tilde{D}\epsilon_T \rightarrow D(\sum_1 \epsilon_T) \rightarrow DT$ is an isomorphism, as a composition of isomorphisms. As a consequence, the map

$$(\tilde{D}B)(\eta_A a) \longrightarrow D(B a) \quad v \longmapsto (D\pi_2) \langle \langle \rangle, v \rangle$$

is an isomorphism for a type A , a family B over A , and $a : A$.

Note that $\eta_A a = \lambda_{x:R} a$ for the example $DA = A^R$ where the lex operation is exponentiation. The isomorphisms of Remark 1.3 are identities in this example.⁴ In fact, this will happen for all the example lex operations we will consider in this article.

Remark 1.4. Recall our assumption that universes reflect the operation D on types and the operation \tilde{D} on families. Remark 1.3 shows that only the reflection of \tilde{D} is essential. If D is not reflected, we can define an isomorphic operation $D'A = \tilde{D}(\epsilon_A) \langle \rangle$ on types that is reflected. The remaining structure of D transports across the isomorphism to define a lex operation D' .

Remark 1.5. Let \mathcal{E} be a category with families [13] modelling our type theory. A lex operation in \mathcal{E} can be defined from a pseudomorphism of cwfs with universes [18] from \mathcal{E} to itself that is pointed as an endofunctor. When working externally with a model, this is a convenient way of constructing a lex operation in it. Note that the given pointing is then reconstructed by Proposition 1.2.

Remark 1.6. For readers familiar with Martin Hofmann’s semantic methodology [16], we note a concise description of lex operations expressed internally in presheaves over the category of contexts. The object **Type** of types has the structure of a cwf with universes (context extension is given by sum types). Up to the discussion of Remark 1.4, a lex operation is a pseudomorphism of cwfs with universes from **Type** to itself. This definition can be written in the language of two-level type theory [3].

1.2 D -modal types

The notion of lex operation is defined at the level of “pure” dependent type theory, without assuming any notion of path types. In presence of path types, we automatically have the following preservation property.

Theorem 1.7. *Let D be a lex operation. Then D preserves equivalences.*

Proof. Note that if f_0 and f_1 are path equal then so are Df_0 and Df_1 by path induction. It follows that if f and g are inverses, then so are Df and Dg . \square

Avigad et al. [4] explain how to build a fibration category from a model of dependent type theory. Theorem 1.7 implies that any lex operation defines an endomorphism of the associated fibration category. A lex operation preserves all finite homotopy limits (e.g., contractible types, homotopy pullbacks, homotopy equalizers, homotopy fibers, ...).

In presence of path types, we can also define the following important notion of modal types.

Definition 1.8. A type A is called D -modal if the unit map $\eta_A : A \rightarrow DA$ is an equivalence.

Proposition 1.9. *If A is D -modal and B is a family of types over A , then B is a family of D -modal types over A if, and only if, $T = \sum_A B$ is D -modal.*

Proof. Let f be the map $T \rightarrow \sum_{DA} \tilde{D}B$, $(a, b) \mapsto (\eta_A a, \eta_{B a} b)$. Since η_A is an equivalence, each map $\eta_{B a}$ is an equivalence if, and only if, the map f is an equivalence [34]. But f is an equivalence if and only if η_T is an equivalence. \square

³We owe this observation to Dan Licata.

⁴This assumes that function types are implemented via dependent products.

1.3 Abstract notion of descent data

Theorem 1.10. *The following conditions are equivalent, for a lex operation D*

1. D defines a modality as axiomatized in [23, 24]
2. the map $D\eta_A$ is an equivalence, and $D\eta_A$ and η_{DA} are path equal

Proof. The first condition implies the second using the results in [23, 24].

Conversely, assume that the map $D\eta_A$ is an equivalence, and $D\eta_A$ and η_{DA} are path equal. Then η_{DA} is an equivalence as well and each type DA is D -modal. Proposition 1.9 shows that D -modal types are closed by dependent sum types. We thus only have to prove that the map

$$F : (DA \rightarrow B) \longrightarrow (A \rightarrow B) \quad f \longmapsto f \circ \eta_A$$

is an equivalence if B is D -modal [23].

Let p_B be a map $DB \rightarrow B$ such that $p_B \circ \eta_B$ is path equal to id_B . We define a map

$$G : (A \rightarrow B) \longrightarrow (DA \rightarrow B) \quad u \longmapsto p_B \circ Du$$

We then have $F(Gu) = p_B \circ Du \circ \eta_A = p_B \circ \eta_B \circ u$ which is path equal to u and $G(Ff) = p_B \circ D(f \circ \eta_A) = p_B \circ Df \circ D\eta_A$ which is path equal to $p_B \circ Df \circ \eta_{DA} = p_B \circ \eta_B \circ f$ which is path equal to f . Hence G is an inverse to F and F is an equivalence. \square

Definition 1.11. A *descent data operation* is a lex operation D satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 1.10.

Note that the first condition of Theorem 1.10 is a (homotopy) proposition. The second condition is the one which will be convenient to verify for the main examples.

We write $\text{isMod}_D(A)$ for the type (proposition) expressing that A is D -modal.

1.4 Closure properties

Let D be a descent data operation.

Lemma 1.12. *For the map $\eta_A : A \rightarrow DA$ to be an equivalence, it is enough to have a patch function $p_A : DA \rightarrow A$ such that $p_A \circ \eta_A$ is path equal to the identity of A .*

Proof. If p_A is such a patch function, we have $\text{id}_{DA} = D(\text{id}_A) = D(p_A \circ \eta_A) = Dp_A \circ D\eta_A$ which is path equal to $Dp_A \circ \eta_{DA} = \eta_A \circ p_A$. Hence p_A is an inverse of η_A and η_A is an equivalence. \square

Lemma 1.13. *For B a family of types over A and any $u : DA$, the type $(\tilde{D}B)u$ is D -modal.*

Proof. Since $D(\sum_A B)$ is D -modal, so is the isomorphic type $\sum_{DA} \tilde{D}B$. Using Proposition 1.9, we have that $(\tilde{D}B)u$ is a D -modal type for any $u : DA$. \square

Proposition 1.14. *The type $\mathcal{U}_D = \sum_{\mathcal{U}} \text{isMod}_D$ is a D -modal type.*

Proof. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D\mathcal{U}_D & & \\ \eta \uparrow & \searrow \tilde{D}\pi_1 & \\ \mathcal{U}_D & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \mathcal{U}. \end{array}$$

It commutes up to homotopy since $(\tilde{D}\pi_1)(\eta X)$ is isomorphic to $D(\pi_1 X)$ by Remark 1.3, which is path equal to $\pi_1 X$ for any $X : \mathcal{U}_D$ by univalence(!). Note also that π_1 is an embedding since isMod_D is a family of propositions.

Since $(\tilde{D}\pi_1)A$ is D -modal by Lemma 1.13 for any $A : D\mathcal{U}_D$, the map $\tilde{D}\pi_1 : D\mathcal{U}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ factorizes through $\pi_1 : \mathcal{U}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and the corresponding map $D\mathcal{U}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_D$ is a left inverse of $\eta : \mathcal{U}_D \rightarrow D\mathcal{U}_D$ since π_1 is an embedding. Hence \mathcal{U}_D is D -modal by Lemma 1.12. \square

1.5 Model associated to a descent data operation

We can now define an internal translation which provides a new model of univalent type theory with higher inductive types for any descent data operation D , following the work in [23]. A type A, p of the new model is a type A *together with* a proof p that this type is D -modal, while an element of a pair A, p is an element of A .

In order to interpret the type of natural numbers with the desired computation rules (not covered in [23]), we need to use the following higher inductive type:⁵

$$\begin{aligned} \text{zero} & : \text{Nat} \\ \text{succ} & : \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat} \\ \text{patch} & : D \text{Nat} \rightarrow \text{Nat} \\ \text{linv} & : \prod_{x:\text{Nat}} \text{patch}(\eta_{\text{Nat}} x) =_{\text{Nat}} x \end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to the type DN where N is the usual inductive type with constructors **zero** and **succ**, but the type DN does not satisfy the required computation rules.

The same idea applies to the interpretation of other inductive types such as the W -type.

It also works for higher inductive types. For instance the suspension of a type A will be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{north, south} & : T \\ \text{merid} & : A \rightarrow \text{north} =_T \text{south} \\ \text{patch} & : DT \rightarrow T \\ \text{linv} & : \prod_{z:T} \text{patch}(\eta_T z) =_T z \end{aligned}$$

Note that having D defined as a *strict* functor is essential for such definitions.

1.6 Generalization to a family of descent data operations

More generally, if we have a *family* of descent data operations D_S indexed by a given type $S : \mathbf{C}$, with corresponding maps $\eta_A^S : A \rightarrow D_S A$, we can consider $\text{isMod}_{\mathbf{C}}(A)$ to be the proposition $\prod_{S:\mathbf{C}} \text{isMod}_{D_S}(A)$ and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{C})$ which is $\sum_{\mathcal{U}} \text{isMod}_{\mathbf{C}}$. We use the slightly shorter notation \mathcal{U}_S to denote the previously defined type $\mathcal{U}_{D_S} = \sum_{\mathcal{U}} \text{isMod}_{D_S}$.

We let the preorder $D_1 \leq D_2$ on descent data operations mean that any D_1 -modal type is D_2 -modal. We say that \mathbf{C} is *filtered* if we have $\exists_{S:\mathbf{C}} D_S \leq D_{S_1} \wedge D_S \leq D_{S_2}$ for any $S_1, S_2 : \mathbf{C}$.⁶

Theorem 1.15. *If \mathbf{C} is filtered then $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{C})$ satisfies $\text{isMod}_{\mathbf{C}}$.*

Proof. For any $D_S \leq D_{S_1}$ in \mathbf{C} , \mathcal{U}_S is D_S -modal by Proposition 1.14 and so D_{S_1} -modal, and hence $\eta^{S_1} : \mathcal{U}_S \rightarrow D_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_S$ has an inverse. It follows that the map $\tilde{D}_{S_1} \pi_1 : D_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ factorizes through $\mathcal{U}_S \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and hence that for any $A : D_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}}$ the type $(\tilde{D}_{S_1} \pi_1) A$ is D_S -modal.

If \mathbf{C} is filtered, this implies that the type $(\tilde{D}_{S_1} \pi_1) A$ is D_{S_2} -modal for any S_2 in \mathbf{C} . Hence the map $\tilde{D}_{S_1} \pi_1 : D_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ factorizes through $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ and the corresponding map $\tilde{D}_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}}$ is a left inverse of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}} \rightarrow D_{S_1} \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{C}}$. Hence $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{C})$ is D_{S_1} -modal for any S_1 in \mathbf{C} by Lemma 1.12. \square

This shows that for a family of descent data operations satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 1.15, we still get a model of univalent type theory (with higher inductive types), interpreting a type as a type together with a proof that this type is modal for each descent data operation. Of all type formers, only the universe has to deal with interaction between the elements of the given family of descent data operations.

1.7 Example

If R is a *proposition*, then for the lex operation defined by $DA = A^R$ the two maps $D\eta_A$ and η_{DA} are path equal equivalences and hence exponentiation defines a descent data operation in that case.

The next section will define a new kind of descent data operation for any presheaf model.

⁵To justify the use of such inductive definitions, we need some accessibility assumption on the functor D that will be satisfied in the examples.

⁶Existence is defined as the propositional truncation of the dependent sum type [34].

2 Cubical presheaf models

2.1 Cubical models

Cubical models are presheaf models of univalent type theory specified by two parameters, an *interval object* \mathbb{I} and a *cofibration classifier* Φ . Formally, we say that a *cubical model* is a presheaf category with the following structure, as in Orton and Pitts [22].

- The interval object \mathbb{I} is connected and has distinct points 0 and 1. Exponentiation with \mathbb{I} has a right adjoint. We also assume that \mathbb{I} has the structure of a bounded distributive lattice.⁷
- The universal cofibration $\top : 1 \rightarrow \Phi$ is a levelwise decidable inclusion. In the internal language of presheaves, we will work with Φ as a universe of certain propositions and leave the decoding function (given by equality with $\top : \Phi$) implicit. Isomorphic cofibrations are equal.⁸ The interval endpoint inclusions $0, 1 : 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{I}$ are cofibrations. Cofibrations are closed under finite union (finite disjunction), composition (dependent conjunction), and universal quantification over \mathbb{I} .

It is then known, following the work in [9, 22, 10], how to define a model of univalent type theory with higher inductive types.

2.2 Presheaves in cubical models

For the remainder of this section, we fix a cubical model given by presheaves over a small category \mathcal{B} . We refer to this as the *base model* (for example, it can be cubical sets). We write I, J, K, \dots for the objects of \mathcal{B} . We have the interval object by $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and the cofibration classifier $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$.

Let \mathcal{C} be another small category. We write X, Y, Z, \dots for its objects. We describe possibilities for turning presheaves over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ into a cubical model. For the interval object \mathbb{I} , we simply take $\mathbb{I}(X, I) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}(I)$. For the cofibration classifier, we have two reasonable options:

1. The first example is simply to take $\Phi(X, I) = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(I)$.
2. The second example is to define an element ψ of $\Phi_{\text{lw}}(X, I)$ to be a family ψ_f in $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(I)$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $\psi_f \leq \psi_g$ if furthermore $g : Z \rightarrow Y$. We then define the restriction operation $\psi(f, l)$ to be the family $\psi(f, l)_g = \psi_{fg}l$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$.

The motivation for the second example is that if $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(I)$ is the collection of (decidable) sieves on I , then $\Phi_{\text{lw}}(X, I)$ becomes the collection of (decidable) sieves on (X, I) .⁹

The interval object \mathbb{I} and any of the choices Φ and Φ_{lw} fit all the requirements listed in Subsection 2.1. This turns presheaves over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ into a cubical model. In particular, we get a model of univalent type theory (and higher inductive types). We are going to analyse the model obtained using the choice Φ for the cofibration classifier and then indicate how to adapt these results for Φ_{lw} .

In this model, a context Γ is interpreted by a presheaf over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ so a family of sets $\Gamma(X, I)$ with suitable restriction maps $\rho \mapsto \rho(f, l)$ with $f : Y \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} and $l : J \rightarrow I$ in \mathcal{B} .

A dependent type A over Γ is then given by a presheaf over the category of elements of Γ : for any ρ in $\Gamma(X, I)$ we have a set $A\rho$ with suitable restriction maps $A\rho \rightarrow A\rho(f, l)$ denoted by $u \mapsto u(f, l)$ together with a filling operation (see [9, 22]). We write $\text{Type}(\Gamma)$ for the collection of all types with a composition operation over Γ . The set $\text{Elem}(\Gamma, A)$ is then the set of sections: a family $a\rho$ in $A\rho$ such that $(a\rho)(f, l) = a(\rho(f, l))$ for any ρ in $\Gamma(X, I)$ and f, l map of codomain X, I .

Given a constructive Grothendieck universe U (see [1]) containing \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} , we write $\text{Type}_U(\Gamma)$ for the set of U -types, such that each set $A\rho$ is in U . The presheaf Type_U is then represented by a fibrant type \mathcal{U} , which is univalent [9].

⁷This assumption simplifies one of our arguments (Proposition 3.9). However, our results also apply to the Cartesian variation of cubical models of Angiuli et al. [2]). There, one removes this hypothesis and instead adds that the diagonal $\mathbb{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \times \mathbb{I}$ is a cofibration.

⁸This assumption is not strictly speaking necessary, but simplifies the theory.

⁹Classically, this corresponds to having all monomorphisms as cofibrations.

2.3 Internal language description

This was an external description of the presheaf model. It is also possible to describe this model using the internal logic of the presheaf topos over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ as in [22, 10] but also using the internal logic of the presheaf topos over \mathcal{B} . We will use both descriptions.

In the internal logic of the presheaf topos over \mathcal{B} , a context of the presheaf model over \mathcal{C} is interpreted as a family of “spaces” $\Gamma(X)$ with restriction maps $\rho \mapsto \rho f$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$. (Each space $\Gamma(X)$ is itself a presheaf over \mathcal{B} with $\Gamma(X)(I) = \Gamma(X, I)$.) A dependent type A over Γ is given by a family of spaces $A\rho$ for ρ in $\Gamma(X)$ with restriction maps $u \mapsto uf$. The presheaf Φ of cofibration is the constant presheaf $\Phi(X) = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$. The interval \mathbb{I} is the constant interval $\mathbb{I}(X) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}$.

It will be convenient to introduce the following notation: if γ is an element of $\Gamma(X)^{\mathbb{I}}$ and $f : Y \rightarrow X$, we write γf^+ in $\Gamma(Y)^{\mathbb{I}}$ for $\lambda_i \gamma(i)f$. Similarly if $u(i)$ is a section in $A\gamma(i)$ we write uf^+ for $\lambda_i u(i)f$.

A *filling operation* (see [22, 10]) for A is given by an operation c_A which takes as argument γ in $\Gamma(X)^{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{B}}}$ and ψ in $\Phi(X) = \Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ and a family of elements $u(i)$ in $A\gamma(i)f$ on the extent $\psi \vee i = 0$. (There is a dual operation with $i = 1$ instead.) It produces an element $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)$ in $A\gamma(i)$ such that

1. $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i) = u(i)$ on $\psi \vee i = 0$,
2. $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)f = c_A(Y, \gamma f^+, \psi, uf^+)(i)$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$.

Given such an operation, we also call A *fibrant* (note this is structure rather than property).

If A is a type over Γ , we get a family of dependent types $A(X)$ over $\Gamma(X)$, each of them having a filling operation, but furthermore these filling operations commute with the restriction maps.

Similarly an *extension operation* for A , witnessing that A is contractible (see [9]), is given by an operation e_A which takes as argument ρ in $\Gamma(X)$ and a partial element u on the extent ψ and produces an element $e_A(X, \rho, \psi, u)$ in $A\rho$ such that

1. $e_A(X, \rho, \psi, u) = u$ on ψ ,
2. $e_A(X, \rho, \psi, u)f = e_A(Y, \rho f, \psi, uf)$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$.

Given such an operation, we also call A *trivially fibrant* (again, this is structure rather than property).

If A is contractible, each $A(X)$ is a contractible family of types over $\Gamma(X)$. But conversely, it may be that each $A(X)$ has an extension operation $e_A(X)$ which does not commute with restriction (see Subsection 2.4). Similarly, a map $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ which is an equivalence defines a family of equivalences $\sigma_X : A(X) \rightarrow B(X)$ but it may be that each map σ_X is an equivalence, without σ being an equivalence.

Remark 2.1. We have a canonical map from Φ to Φ_{lw} sending $\psi : \Phi(X)$ to the constant family on ψ . This map commutes (up to isomorphism) with the decoding to propositions. It follows that there is a natural map from extension operations for Φ to extension operations for Φ_{lw} , and the same holds for filling operations. It follows that a (contractible) type for the cubical presheaf model for Φ is naturally also a (contractible) type for the cubical presheaf model for Φ_{lw} .

Remark 2.2. Let \mathcal{C} be a groupoid. Then for $\psi : \Phi_{\text{lw}}(X)$ and $f : Y \rightarrow X$, we have $\psi_{\text{id}_X} \leq \psi_f \leq \psi_{ff^{-1}} = \psi_{\text{id}_X}$. It follows that ψ is the constant family on ψ_{id_X} . Thus, the map $\Phi \rightarrow \Phi_{\text{lw}}$ from Remark 2.1 is invertible. It follows that the cubical presheaf models for Φ and Φ_{lw} are the same. We thank Emily Riehl for this observation.

2.4 Examples

Let \mathcal{B} be a concrete cube category, for instance the Cartesian [2], distributive lattice, or de Morgan one [22, 9]. Then we have a nerve functor from groupoids to cubical sets in the sense of presheaves over \mathcal{B} . In this way, we can see any groupoid as a cubical set with a canonical filling operation.

For the first example, let \mathcal{C} be the group $\mathbb{Z}/(2)$. Let τ be the non-trivial element of this group. A context is a space with an involutive action $\rho \mapsto \rho\tau$. A dependent type A over Γ has also an involutive action $A\rho \rightarrow A\rho\tau$ denoted by $u \mapsto u\tau$ with a filling operation which is equivariant, meaning $c_A(\gamma, \psi, u)(i)\tau = c_A(\gamma\tau^+, \psi, u\tau^+)(i)$. Let A be the groupoid with two isomorphic objects swapped by τ . Then A is pointwise contractible, but is not contractible in the presheaf model, since it has no global point. Another way to describe this example is that the unique map $A \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ is a pointwise equivalence, but is not an equivalence.

For the second example, let \mathcal{C} be the poset on objects $\perp, 0, 1$ with $\perp < 0$ and $\perp < 1$. We define a global type A as follows. We take $A(0)$ and $A(1)$ to consist of a single object a_0 and a_1 , respectively. We take $A(\perp)$ to consist of an isomorphism between the restrictions of a_0 and a_1 . Then A is levelwise contractible (i.e., $A(\perp), A(0), A(1)$ are contractible), but A is not contractible since it has no global point.

We note that the second example is fixed by working with the cofibration classifier Φ_{lw} . However, as explained by Remark 2.2, this does not apply to the first example.

3 Homotopy descent data

3.1 A lex operation

In this subsection, we work in the internal language of the presheaf topos over \mathcal{B} . We first define a lex operation on presheaf types, and then show that this lex operation extends to types with a filling operation.

For any A presheaf over Γ we define EA presheaf over Γ . An element u of $(EA)\rho$, for ρ in $\Gamma(X)$ is given by a family of elements $u(f)$ in $A\rho f$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$. We define the restriction uf in $(EA)\rho f$ by $uf(g) = u(fg)$ if $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$.

If B is presheaf over $\Gamma.A$, we define $\tilde{E}(B)$ presheaf over $\Gamma.EA$. If ρ is in $\Gamma(X)$ and u is in $(EA)\rho$, then $\tilde{E}(B)(\rho, u)$ is the space of families $v(f)$ in $B(\rho f, u(f))$.

We define a natural transformation $\alpha : A \rightarrow EA$ by $(\alpha a)(f) = af$.

Next, we extend the action of E to types with a filling operation. Actually, we define a filling operation $E(c_A)$ on EA assuming only that c_A is a *pointwise* filling operation on A .

Proposition 3.1. *We can define a filling operation $E(c_A)$ on EA if c_A is a pointwise filling operation on A , in a way which commutes with substitution.*

Proof. We assume that A has a pointwise filling operation $c_A(X)$. We define then, for $f : Y \rightarrow X$

$$E(c_A)(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)(f) = c_A(Y)(\gamma f^+, \psi, u f^+)(i)$$

We can then check for $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$

$$c_{EA}(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)f(g) = c_A(Z)(\gamma(fg)^+, \psi, u(fg)^+)(i) = c_{EA}(Y, \gamma f^+, \psi, u f^+)(i)(g)$$

and hence c_{EA} is natural in X .

We can also define $\langle \rangle$ in $E\mathbf{1}$ by $\langle \rangle(f) = ()$ and $\langle u, v \rangle : E(\sum_A B)\rho$ by $\langle u, v \rangle(f) = (u(f), v(f))$ for u in $(EA)\rho$ and v in $(\tilde{E}B)(\rho, u)$, and check that all conditions for a lex operations are satisfied.

Any universe \mathcal{U} reflects the operations E and \tilde{E} since the Grothendieck universe U used to construct \mathcal{U} was assumed to contain \mathcal{C} . \square

Proposition 3.2. *If A is pointwise contractible then EA is contractible.*

Proof. We assume that A has a pointwise extension operation $e_A(X)$. We define then, for $f : Y \rightarrow X$

$$e_{EA}(X, \rho, \psi, u)(f) = e_A(Y)(\rho f, \psi, u f)$$

We can then check for $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and $g : Z \rightarrow Y$

$$e_{EA}(X, \rho, \psi, u)f(g) = e_A(Z)(\rho fg, \psi, u fg) = e_{EA}(Y, \rho f, \psi, u f)(g)$$

and hence e_{EA} is an extension operation for EA natural in X . \square

In general, E may not be a descent data operation, since EA does not need to be E -modal. The next subsection will use the lex operation E to define a descent data operation.

3.2 Homotopy descent data

In this subsection, unless explicitly stated, we work in the internal language of the presheaf model over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$. Starting from the lex operation E , we define a new lex operation D . As before, we first define D on presheaves, and then show that it extends to a lex operation on presheaves with a filling operation. On presheaves with a filling operation, D will be a descent data operation.

We let P_n be the subpresheaf of \mathbb{I}^{n+1} of elements (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) satisfying $i_0 = 1 \vee \dots \vee i_n = 1$.

Let $s_k : \mathbb{I}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{I}^n$ be the map which omits the k th component, for $k = 0, \dots, n$. Note that $s_k \vec{i}$ is in P_{n-1} if \vec{i} is in P_n and $i_k = 0$.

Definition 3.3. An element of DA is given by a family $u(\vec{i})$ in $E^{n+1}A$ defined on P_n and satisfying the compatibility conditions¹⁰ $u(\vec{i}) = E^k(\alpha)u(s_k \vec{i})$ on $i_k = 0$.

For instance we have

$$u(0, i_1, i_2) = \alpha u(i_1, i_2) \quad u(i_0, 0, i_2) = E(\alpha)u(i_0, i_2) \quad u(i_0, i_1, 0) = E^2(\alpha)u(i_0, i_1)$$

We have an element $u(\vec{1})$ in each $E^{n+1}A$. We have a path $u(1, i)$ between $\alpha u(1)$ and $u(1, 1)$ and a path $u(i, 1)$ between $E(\alpha)u(1)$ and $u(1, 1)$ in E^2A . But, in general, we need further higher coherence conditions.

We define $\eta_A : A \rightarrow DA$ by $(\eta_A a)(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = \alpha^{n+1}a$.

If A is a family of types over Γ we define DA family of types over Γ by $(DA)\rho = D(A\rho)$.

Proposition 3.4. *If A is a family of types with a pointwise filling operation, then DA has a filling operation.*

Proof. We use that each $E^{n+1}A$ has a (uniform) filling operation by Proposition 3.1 hence is a family of types in the model over $\mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$. We assume given γ in Γ^1 and ψ in Φ and a partial element u_j in $(DA)\gamma(j)$ defined over $\psi \vee j = 0$. We explain how to define a total extension v_j in $(DA)\gamma(j)$. For this we define $v_j(\vec{i})$ in $E^{n+1}A$ by induction on n . Since $E^{n+1}A$ has a filling operation, we apply this filling operation to the partial element equal to $u_j(\vec{i})$ on $\psi \vee j = 0$ and equal to $E^k(\alpha)v_j(s_k(\vec{i}))$ if $i_k = 0$. \square

Corollary 3.5. *D defines a lex operation.* \square

A similar argument as the one for Proposition 3.4 using Proposition 3.2 instead proves the following.

Proposition 3.6.

- (i) *If A is a pointwise contractible family of types over Γ , then DA is contractible.*
- (ii) *If B is a pointwise contractible family of types over a family of types A over Γ , then $\tilde{D}B$ is contractible over DA .* \square

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ be map between fibrant families of types over Γ . If σ is pointwise an equivalence, then $D\sigma$ is an equivalence.*

Proof. The fiber $\text{fib}(\sigma)$ defines a pointwise contractible family of types over B . Hence $\tilde{D}\text{fib}(\sigma)$ is contractible over DB . Since D is a lex operation, $\text{fib}(D\sigma)$ is contractible over DB and $D\sigma$ is an equivalence. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Let A be a fibrant family of types over Γ . Then η_A is pointwise an equivalence and $D\eta_A$ is an equivalence.*

Proof. For this proposition, we work in the presheaf model over \mathcal{B} . If \vec{f} is a composable chain of arrows we write $\langle \vec{f} \rangle$ for its composition.

Let A be a type over Γ . For ρ in $\Gamma(X)$, an element u of $(DA)\rho$ is a family of elements $u(\vec{i})(\vec{f})$ in $A\rho\langle \vec{f} \rangle$ satisfying the compatibility conditions. For a in $A\rho$ the element $\eta_A a$ is the family of element

$$(\eta_A a)(\vec{i})(\vec{f}) = a\langle \vec{f} \rangle$$

¹⁰It is suggestive to think of the elements of DA as *choice sequences* [33] extended in a *spatial* rather than *temporal* dimension.

We define an inverse $G : DA(X) \rightarrow A(X)$ of $\eta_A(X)$ by taking Gu to be the element $u(1)(\text{id}_X)$. We then have $G(\eta_A a) = a$. The element $\eta_A(Gu)$ satisfies

$$(\eta_A(Gu))(\vec{i})(\vec{f}) = (Gu)(\langle \vec{f} \rangle) = u(1)(\text{id})(\langle \vec{f} \rangle) = u(1, \vec{0})(\text{id}, \vec{f})$$

Define the element \tilde{u} in $(DA)\rho$ by $\tilde{u}(\vec{i})(\vec{f}) = u(1, \vec{i})(\text{id}, \vec{f})$. We can define a homotopy

$$u_k(\vec{i})(\vec{f}) = u(1, k \wedge \vec{i})(\text{id}, \vec{f})$$

between $\eta_A(Gu)$ and \tilde{u} and we can define a homotopy

$$v_k(\vec{i})(\vec{f}) = u(k, \vec{i})(\text{id}, \vec{f})$$

between u and \tilde{u} .¹¹ By composition, there is a path between u and $\eta_A(Gu)$ and G is an inverse of $\eta_A(X)$.

This shows that η_A is pointwise an equivalence. Then $D\eta_A$ is an equivalence by Corollary 3.7. \square

One way to understand the definition of D from E is the following. Being a pointed endofunctor, E defines a cosemisimplicial diagram starting from EA , and DA is a strict way to realize the homotopy limit of this diagram using a \mathbf{P} -weighted limit. We can think of \mathbf{P} as a cofibrant resolution of the constant diagram on 1. A remark is that E , and hence each E^l , preserves the \mathbf{P} -weighted limit defining D . In particular, an element of $E^l(DA)$ is determined by a family $u(\vec{i})$ in $E^{l+n+1}A$ satisfying $u(\vec{i}) = E^{l+k}(\alpha)u(s_k \vec{i})$ on $i_k = 0$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let A be a fibrant family of types over Γ . We can build a path between η_{DA} and $D\eta_A$.*

Proof. An element of $(D^2A)\rho$ is given by a family $v(\vec{i})(\vec{j})$ in $E^{n+m+2}A$ satisfying the conditions

1. $v(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = E^k(\alpha)v(s_k \vec{i})(\vec{j})$ on $i_k = 0$
2. $v(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = E^{n+1+l}(\alpha)v(\vec{i})(s_l \vec{j})$ on $j_l = 0$

Given u in $(DA)\rho$ we define an element \tilde{u} in $(D^2A)\rho$ by $\tilde{u}(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = u(\vec{i}, \vec{j})$.

We compute, for u in $(DA)\rho$

$$(\eta_{DA} u)(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = \alpha^{n+1} u(\vec{j}) = u(\vec{0}, \vec{j})$$

and we have a homotopy connecting this map to \tilde{u} by defining

$$v_k(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = u(\vec{i} \wedge k, \vec{j}).$$

We also have

$$((D\eta_A) u)(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = E^{n+1}(\alpha^{m+1}) u(\vec{i}) = u(\vec{i}, \vec{0})$$

and we have a homotopy connecting this map to \tilde{u} by defining

$$w_k(\vec{i})(\vec{j}) = u(\vec{i}, k \wedge \vec{j})$$

By composition, we have a path between $D\eta_A$ and η_{DA} . \square

Corollary 3.10. *D defines a descent data operation.*

Proof. By Propositions 3.8 and 3.9. \square

Note that a direct consequence of Corollary 3.7 is the following strictification result.

Theorem 3.11. *Let A and B be fibrant families of types over Γ that are D -modal. Then any pointwise equivalence $\sigma : A \rightarrow B$ is an equivalence.* \square

Let us note the following consequence of Proposition 3.8.

¹¹At this point that we use that the object \mathbf{I} in \mathcal{B} has lattice operations but one could however instead define a homotopy in a more complex way by induction on the dimension for Cartesian cubes. The same remark applies for the proof of the next proposition.

Corollary 3.12. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *all fibrant families of types are D -modal,*
2. *all pointwise equivalences between fibrant families of types are equivalences,*
3. *all fibrant families of types that are pointwise contractible are contractible.*

Proof. The direction from condition 1 to condition 2 is Theorem 3.11. In the reverse direction, given a fibrant family of types A , recall that η_A is a pointwise equivalence by Proposition 3.8. Then η_A is an equivalence and hence D -modal. Condition 3 is a special case of condition 2. The reverse direction holds since a (pointwise) equivalence can be described as a map with (pointwise) contractible fibers. \square

The way from which we get D from E can also be applied to the lex operation $EA = A^R$, where R is an arbitrary type. This amounts to give a map which is *coherently constant* as defined by Kraus [19] and so a map $\|R\| \rightarrow A$ from the propositional truncation of R to A [19].

Our development actually provides a way to recover this result in the cubical setting. Indeed, an element of DA is a sequence of elements $u(\vec{i})(\vec{x})$ in A for \vec{i} in \mathbf{P}_n and \vec{x} in R^{n+1} with $u(\vec{i})(\vec{x}) = u(s_k \vec{i})(s_k \vec{x})$ on $i_k = 0$. Given an element x in R , we can build a left inverse p_A of $\eta_A : A \rightarrow DA$ by taking $p_A u = u(1)(x)$. Hence we get an element of $R \rightarrow \text{isEquiv}(\eta_A)$, and so of $\|R\| \rightarrow \text{isEquiv}(\eta_A)$ which provides a factorization of a coherently constant map $R \rightarrow A$ through $R \rightarrow \|R\|$.

3.3 Case of a monoid

We consider the special case where the base category is a monoid M . If \vec{x} is a sequence (x_0, \dots, x_n) , we write $t_k \vec{x}$ for the sequence where we omit x_k and replace x_{k+1} by $x_k x_{k+1}$ for $k < n$ and $t_n \vec{x}$ is the sequence where we omit x_n . A type in the presheaf model is a type A with an M -action, and an element of DA is then a family of elements $u(\vec{i})(\vec{x})$ in A with \vec{i} in \mathbf{P}_n and \vec{x} in M^{n+1} satisfying the compatibility conditions

1. $u(\vec{i})(\vec{x}) = u(s_k \vec{i})(t_k \vec{x})$ on $i_k = 0$ for $k < n$ and
2. $u(\vec{i})(\vec{x}) = u(s_n \vec{i})(t_n \vec{x}) x_n$ on $i_n = 0$

We define the M -action on DA by $ux(\vec{i})(x_0, \dots, x_n) = u(\vec{i})(xx_0, \dots, x_n)$.

As a special case, let M be the walking idempotent. Let $e^2 = e$ be the non-trivial idempotent element of M . Here is an example of a non-modal type which is pointwise contractible, but not contractible. Let Γ be the set with elements ρ_1, ρ_2 and ρ with $\rho_1 e = \rho_2 e = \rho$. We let A be the following type. We let $A\rho_1$ be the point a_1 and $A\rho_2$ be the point a_2 and $A\rho$ be the groupoid with two isomorphic objects u_1, u_2 with $a_i e = u_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. The type A is then pointwise contractible but it has no global point.¹²

3.4 Generalization to a Grothendieck topology

A Grothendieck topology \mathbf{J} on the category \mathcal{C} defines a set $\mathbf{C}(X, I) = \mathbf{J}(X)$ and we have a family E_S indexed by $S : \mathbf{C}$ defined as follows. Let ρ be in $\Gamma(X)$, and S is in $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, so that $S\rho$ is in $\mathbf{C}(X) = \mathbf{J}(X)$, which is a set of sieves on X .

An element of $(E_S A)\rho$ is now a family $u(f)$ in $A\rho f$ with f in $S\rho$. We define in this way a family of lex operations E_S and an associated family of descent data operations D_S indexed by $S : \mathbf{C}$.

Note that if $S_1\rho$ is a subset of $S_2\rho$ for all ρ , then we have a canonical projection map $D_{S_2} A \rightarrow D_{S_1} A$ that coheres with the pointings. If A is D_{S_1} -modal a left inverse of $\eta_A^{S_1}$ composed with this projection map is a left inverse of $\eta_A^{S_2}$. Hence a D_{S_1} -modal type is also D_{S_2} -modal and we have $D_{S_1} \leq D_{S_2}$ for the preorder defined in Subsection 1.6. Since \mathbf{J} is a Grothendieck topology, the family D_S over $S : \mathbf{C}$ is filtered. Thus, we can apply Theorem 1.15 to obtain a model of univalent type theory with higher inductive types. This can be seen as constructively modelling higher sheaves over \mathbf{J} in the cubical model over \mathcal{B} .

The next proposition will be used for building such a sheaf model where countable choice does not hold. The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 3.4.

¹²If a is such a point, we should have $a\rho_i = a_i$ and then $(a\rho_i)e = u_i$ and $a(\rho_1 e) = a(\rho_2 e) = a\rho$ which is not possible since u_1, u_2 are distinct.

Proposition 3.13. *If A in $\text{Type}(\Gamma)$ and S in $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and A is D_S -modal and ρ in $\Gamma(X)$ and $A\rho f$ is (pointwise) contractible for each f in $S\rho$ then we can find a uniform extension operation $e_{A\rho}(f, \psi, u)$ in $A\rho f$ for all $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and u partial element in $A\rho f$ of extent ψ . \square*

By uniform, we mean that we have

$$e_{A\rho}(f, \psi, u)g = e_{A\rho}(fg, \psi, ug)$$

in $A\rho fg$ for any $g : Z \rightarrow Y$.

3.5 A model with the negation of countable choice

Using in an essential way the notion of *homotopy* descent data, we build a model of univalent type theory with higher inductive types with a countable family of sets E_n such that each the homotopy propositional truncation $\|E_n\|$ is inhabited, but $\|\prod_{n:N} E_n\|$ is not globally inhabited.

We consider the following space, corresponding to the lattice generated by formal elements X_n and L_n with the relations $X_0 = 1$, $X_n = L_n \vee X_{n+1}$ and $L_{n+1} = L_n \wedge X_{n+1}$. Using Proposition 3.13 one can show the following result.

Proposition 3.14. *The type $\|L_0 + X_n\|$ is contractible for all n while L_0 is the homotopy propositional truncation of $\prod_{n:N} (L_0 + X_n)$. \square*

Corollary 3.15. *There exists a model of univalent type theory with higher inductive types where countable choice does not hold. \square*

As stressed in [32], it is yet unknown how to build a model of univalent type theory and higher inductive types satisfying countable choice in a constructive metatheory. (Countable choice holds in a classical metatheory in the simplicial set model.)

4 Variation with another notion of cofibration

We explain how to modify the definition of filling operation if we work with the other notion of cofibration classified by Φ_{lw} . Recall that an element of $\Phi_{\text{lw}}(X)$ is no longer constant, but is given by a family of elements ψ_f in $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ for $f : Y \rightarrow X$ and satisfying $\psi_f \leq \psi_{fg}$ if $g : Z \rightarrow Y$.

All the main results above still hold for this new notion of cofibration, suitably modified. The notion of *filling operation* for A is given by an operation c_A which takes as argument γ in $\Gamma(X)^{\mathbb{I}\mathcal{B}}$ and ψ in $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}(X)$ and a family of elements $u(i)$ in $A\gamma(i)f$ on the extent $\psi_f \vee i = 0$ such that $u_f(i)g = u_{fg}(i)$ for $g : Z \rightarrow Y$ on the extent $\psi_f \vee i = 0$. (There is a dual operation with $i = 1$ instead.) It produces an element $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)$ in $A\gamma(i)$ such that

1. $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)f = u_f(i)$ on $\psi_f \vee i = 0$,
2. $c_A(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)f = c_A(Y, \gamma', \psi_f, u')(i)$ with $\gamma'(i) = \gamma(i)f$ and $u'_g(i) = u_{fg}(i)$ on the extent $\psi_{fg} \vee i = 0$ for $g : Z \rightarrow Y$.

For instance, Proposition 3.1 becomes the following result.

Lemma 4.1. *If A has a pointwise filling operation $c_A(X)$ then EA has a filling operation.*

Proof. We take γ in $\Gamma(X)^{\mathbb{I}\mathcal{B}}$ and $u_f(i)$ in $(EA)\gamma(i)f$ on the extent $\psi_f \vee i = 0$ and we define $v(i) = c_{EA}(X, \gamma, \psi, u)(i)$ in $(EA)\gamma(i)$. For $f : Y \rightarrow X$, we take (filling at level Y)

$$v(i)(f) = c_A(Y)(\gamma', \psi', u')$$

where $\gamma'(i) = \gamma(i)f$ and $\psi' = \psi_f$ and $u'(i) = u_f(i)(\text{id}_Y)$ in $A\gamma(i)f$ on the extent $\psi_f \vee i = 0$. \square

Let us give some examples.

The first example is when \mathcal{C} is the poset $0 \leq 1$. In this case, a global type A is given by two spaces with a map $A(1) \rightarrow A(0)$. An element of $\Phi_{\text{lw}}(0)$ is an element of $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ while an element of $\Phi_{\text{lw}}(1)$ is a pair

ψ_1, ψ_0 of elements of $\Phi_{\mathcal{B}}$ with $\psi_1 \leq \psi_0$. One can check that A is fibrant exactly if $A(0)$ is fibrant and $A(1) \rightarrow A(0)$ is a fibration, and a similar characterization holds in the relative situation (for a type A over Γ) and for trivial fibrations. Using condition 3 of Corollary 3.12, one sees that every type in the model is D -modal. The model coincides with the Reedy presheaf model described in [29] over the direct category \mathcal{C} in the model of univalent type theory given by the base model. More generally, this will be the case for an arbitrary direct category \mathcal{C} for which the inclusion of objects into morphisms given by identities is decidable.

The second example is the walking retract \mathcal{C} generated by maps $f: 0 \rightarrow 1$ and $g: 1 \rightarrow 0$ satisfying $gf = \text{id}_0$. Note that \mathcal{C} is the idempotent splitting of the walking idempotent monoid \mathcal{M} considered in Subsection 3.3. This makes the cubical presheaf models (for both Φ and Φ_{lw}) over \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{M} equivalent. Level 0 in the model over \mathcal{C} correspond to the fixpoints of the action of e in the model over \mathcal{M} . Taking Φ_{lw} as the cofibration classifier, the model of modal types gives a model for pointed families in a cubical model. It is homotopically correct in the sense that the equivalences are levelwise.

One might ask if types in the above model are already D -modal, similar to what happens for the poset $0 \leq 1$. More generally, one might attempt to generalize from a direct category \mathcal{C} to a Reedy category \mathcal{C} that is elegant [6]; the walking retract is an example of an elegant Reedy category, with coface map f and codegeneracy map g . Taking Φ_{lw} as the cofibration classifier, one might ask if the (trivial) fibrations are given by the (trivial) Reedy fibrations; as before, this would imply that every type in the model is D -modal. An equivalent condition is that the levelwise cofibrations (classified by Φ_{lw}) are also the Reedy cofibrations. This holds true in classical situations where cofibrations and monomorphisms coincide and gives rise to the classical model [28] over an elegant Reedy category.

Unfortunately, this fails to hold in our constructive setting. Ultimately, this is because the inclusions $A(X) \rightarrow A(Y)$ are not generally cofibrations for a global type A and a codegeneracy map $Y \rightarrow X$ in \mathcal{C} . For the case of the walking retract, this is the inclusion $A(0) \rightarrow A(1)$. In terms of a global type A in the model over the walking monoid \mathcal{M} , it is the inclusion of fixpoints of the action of e on A . For a counterexample, let S be a discrete space with non-decidable equality in one of the concrete cubical models listed in Subsection 2.4. Take $A = S \times S$ with the action of e given by swapping.

5 Related and future work

Shulman [31] shows that all $(\infty, 1)$ -toposes have strict univalent universes, using a classical metatheory. This work does not cover however (yet) higher inductive types and cumulativity of universes. There are close connections between Shulman’s work and ours, which we plan to explore in future work. His work inspired some results about pointwise weak equivalences in Subsection 3.2, in particular Corollary 3.7.

Once we have a presheaf model of univalence with homotopical features such as ours, it is now understood (see e.g. [25, 8]) how to define a Quillen model structure whose (trivial) fibrations coincide with the (contractible) types. For the model of D -modal types, we expect that, similar to [31], that the weak equivalences are the levelwise weak equivalences and the fibrations are a variation¹³ of the injective fibrations. We leave this to future work.

Instead of parameterizing our construction over an external category \mathcal{C} , we could start from a internal category \mathcal{C} in presheaves over \mathcal{B} . Note that the category of presheaves over an internal category in presheaves is still a presheaf category. Compared to the construction of [31] (which instantiates at this level of generality), we seem to need less fibrancy assumptions on this internal category. We leave this generalization to future work.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Mathieu Anel, Steve Awodey, Martín Escardó, Eric Finster, Dan Licata, Emily Riehl, Mike Shulman, Bas Spitters and Matthew Weaver for many discussions and remarks.

¹³We define a family of types to be injectively fibrant if it lifts against cofibrations that are levelwise trivial cofibrations.

A General results for lex modalities

Some of our results hold for modalities in the sense of [24] that are not necessarily presented in a strict manner by a lex operation. The main example is the case of accessible modalities, which are implemented using higher inductive types that rarely give rise to a lex operation. The purpose of this appendix is to prove these more general statements. We work in the homotopy type theory setting of [24]. Universes are assumed univalent and closed under dependent sums, dependent products, identity types. For statements involving accessible modalities, we also assume closure under higher inductive types.

In this appendix, we take terminology with potentially both strict and homotopical meaning to have the homotopical meaning by default. This is opposed to the rest of the article, where we default to the strict meaning. For example, equality refers to the identity type, and pullbacks refer to homotopy pullbacks (expressed using the identity type).

We write $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$ for the type of modalities on a universe \mathcal{U} . Recall from [24] that $M : \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$ has an underlying subuniverse¹⁴ of \mathcal{U} , the M -modal types \mathcal{U}_M . Subuniverses of \mathcal{U} carry an evident poset structure. Following [24, Subsection 3.2], we obtain a poset structure also on $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$.

Definition A.1. Let \mathcal{U} be a universe contained in a universe \mathcal{U}' . A modality M' on \mathcal{U}' is an *extension* of a modality M on \mathcal{U} if every M -modal type in \mathcal{U} is M' -modal in \mathcal{U}' and for $X : \mathcal{U}$, the canonical map $M'X \rightarrow MX$ is invertible.

The above conditions mean that a \mathcal{U} -small type is M -modal exactly if it is M' -modal and M -connected exactly if it is M' -connected. In terms of the stable factorization systems $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{R}')$ corresponding to M and M' , this means that \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} are the restrictions of \mathcal{L}' and \mathcal{R}' to maps between \mathcal{U} -small types. For this, recall [24, Subsection 1.2] that the left and right classes of the stable factorization system corresponding to a modality are the connected and modal maps, which are defined by having connected and modal fibers, respectively.

We write $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$ for the type of pairs (M, M') with M a modality on \mathcal{U} and M' an extension of M to \mathcal{U}' . The poset structures on $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$ and $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U}')$ extend to a poset structure on $\text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$.

The following statement makes precise that up to (essential) size issues, a modality is lex exactly if the universe of modal types is modal. In particular, a “size-polymorphic” modality (acting compatibly on all universes) whose action on maps preserves smallness of fibers is lex exactly if universes of modal types are modal. This generalizes Proposition 1.14 to modalities; the smallness condition on fibers mirrors the dependent action \tilde{D} on \mathcal{U} -small types we require for a lex operation D . For $M : \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$, we denote by \mathcal{U}_M the subuniverse of \mathcal{U} of M -modal types.

Proposition A.2. For $(M, M') : \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$:

- (i) if M' is lex and preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers, then \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal;
- (ii) if \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal, then M is lex and M' preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers.

Proof. For part (i), let M' be lex and preserve maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers. To show that \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal, it suffices to construct a left inverse to $\eta_{\mathcal{U}_M}^{M'}$ ([24, Lemma 1.20]). By univalence of \mathcal{U}_M , this means to find an extension

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sum_{X:\mathcal{U}_M} X & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & Z \\ \downarrow & \eta_{\mathcal{U}_M}^{M'} \searrow & \downarrow \text{\scriptsize \mathcal{U}-small and} \\ \mathcal{U}_M & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & M'\mathcal{U}_M. \end{array} \quad \text{\scriptsize M-modal fibers}$$

We use the naturality square of $\eta^{M'}$ at the left map. The square is a pullback because M' is lex. The right map has \mathcal{U} -small fibers by assumption and has M -modal fibers because it is M' -modal as it goes between M' -modal types.

For part (ii), assume that \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal. Then \mathcal{U}_M is right orthogonal against M' -connected types, in particular M -connected types. This verifies condition (xiii) of [24, Theorem 3.1], making M lex. It

¹⁴By a subuniverse of \mathcal{U} , we mean a subobject of \mathcal{U} , i.e. a predicate on \mathcal{U} . This is formally a map $\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ where \mathbf{Prop} is the universe of (homotopy) propositions. It is not to be confused with a subuniverse in the set-theoretic sense in a model where universes are built out of sets. We note that the size of the propositions in \mathbf{Prop} here does not matter for us; one choice is propositions in \mathcal{U} , but one could allow also a larger universe.

remains to show that M' preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers. Given such a map, we factor it using M as an M' -connected map followed by a map with fibers in \mathcal{U}_M . Since M' sends M' -connected maps to equivalences, it remains to show, given $Y : X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_M$, that $M'(\sum_X Y) \rightarrow M'X$ has \mathcal{U} -small fibers. Since \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal, it is right orthogonal against $X \rightarrow M'X$. Thus, $Y : X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_M$ extends uniquely to a map $Y' : M'X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_M$. Looking at the classified maps, we obtain the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sum_X Y & \longrightarrow & \sum_{z:M'X} Y'(z) \\ \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow \\ X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X^{M'}} & M'X. \end{array}$$

Since the right map has M -modal (hence also M' -modal) fibers, it is M' -modal. The top map is a pullback of $\eta_X^{M'}$, hence M' -connected. Since

$$\sum_X Y \longrightarrow \sum_{z:M'X} Y'(z) \longrightarrow M'X$$

and

$$\sum_X Y \longrightarrow M'(\sum_X Y) \longrightarrow M'X$$

are $(M'$ -connected, M' -modal)-factorizations of the same map, they coincide. This shows that the map $M'(\sum_X Y) \rightarrow M'X$ is equal to $\sum_{z:M'X} Y'(z) \rightarrow M'X$, hence has \mathcal{U} -small fibers. \square

Recall from [24, Subsection 2.3] that accessible modalities admit canonical extensions to larger universes. If the accessible modality is lex, we observe that it satisfies the technical condition on smallness of fibers of Proposition A.2. This means that part (i) of that statement can also be regarded as a generalization of the direction from condition (i) to condition (iii) in [24, Theorem 3.11].

Corollary A.3. *Let M be an accessible lex modality on a universe \mathcal{U} . Let M' be its extension to a universe \mathcal{U}' containing \mathcal{U} . The M' preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers.*

Proof. This follows from part (ii) of Proposition A.2 since \mathcal{U}_M is M' -modal by [24, Theorem 3.11]. \square

Let $M : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$ be a family of modalities. We write

$$\mathcal{U}(M) = \sum_{X:\mathcal{U}} \prod_{i:I} X \text{ is } M_i\text{-modal.} \quad (1)$$

for the meet of the subuniverses of modal types of M_i over $i : I$. We call a given meet $\bigwedge M$ of M *structural* if it is preserved under the forgetful functor to the poset of subuniverses. This means that its subuniverse of modal types is $\mathcal{U}(M)$. By [24, Theorem 3.11, part (i)], M has a structural meet exactly if \mathcal{U}_M admits a reflection in \mathcal{U} . In that case, $\bigwedge M$ is given by the reflection operation.

Given a family $(M, M') : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$, we say that a given meet of (M, M') is structural if it is sent to structural meets of M and M' by the forgetful functors. Note that (M, M') has a structural meet exactly if M and M' have structural meets $\bigwedge M$ and $\bigwedge M'$, respectively, and $\bigwedge M'$ is an extension of $\bigwedge M$ to \mathcal{U}' . This unfolds to the following conditions:

- the subuniverse \mathcal{U}_M of \mathcal{U} admits a reflection L ,
- the subuniverse $\mathcal{U}'_{M'}$ of \mathcal{U}' admits a reflection L' ,
- for $X : \mathcal{U}$, the canonical map $L'X \rightarrow LX$ is invertible.

When considering diagrams in a poset, we will restrict our attention to shapes that are themselves posets. Note that in any poset, the limit of a (poset-indexed) diagram coincides with the meet over the object components of the diagram. Nonetheless, it is useful to speak about limits of diagrams because this allows us to constrain the relations between the inputs objects.

A poset I is *filtered* if it is merely inhabited and for any two elements $x_0, x_1 : I$, there merely exists $y : I$ with $x_0, x_1 \leq y$. It is *cofiltered* if I^{op} is filtered. The following statement generalizes Theorem 1.15 to modalities.

Proposition A.4. *Let $(M, M') : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$ be a \mathcal{U} -small cofiltered diagram. If \mathcal{U}_{M_i} is M'_i -modal for all $i : I$, then $\mathcal{U}(M) : \mathcal{U}'$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}'(M')$.*

Proof. Given $i : I$, we have to show that $\mathcal{U}(M)$ is M'_i -modal. Because I is cofiltered, we have

$$\mathcal{U}(M) = \mathcal{U}((M_j)_{j \leq i}),$$

so it suffices to show that $\mathcal{U}((M_j)_{j \leq i})$ is M'_i -modal. By assumption, \mathcal{U}_{M_j} is M'_j -modal, hence M'_i -modal for $j \leq i$. We now use that a type X over \mathcal{U}_{M_i} (M'_i -modal) is M'_i -modal exactly if the map $X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$ is M'_i -modal. Given that $\mathcal{U}_{M_j} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$ is M'_i -modal for $j \leq i$, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{U}((M_j)_{j \leq i}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_{M_i}$ is M'_i -modal. Observe that the fibers of the latter embedding are products of the fibers of the former embeddings. So the claim holds since modal types are closed under product ([24, Lemma 1.26]). \square

Corollary A.5. *Let $(M, M') : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$ be a \mathcal{U} -small cofiltered diagram with a structural meet $(\bigwedge M, \bigwedge M')$. If \mathcal{U}_{M_i} is M'_i -modal for all $i : I$, then $\mathcal{U}_{\bigwedge M}$ is $\bigwedge M'$ -modal.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Proposition A.4 and the definition of structural meet. \square

The following statement says that, up to the same size issues of Proposition A.2, lex modalities are closed under structural cofiltered limits of modalities. In particular, structural cofiltered limits of “size-polymorphic” modalities whose actions on maps preserve smallness of fibers preserve left exactness.

Corollary A.6. *In the situation of Corollary A.5, if M'_i is lex for $i : I$ and preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers, then $\bigwedge M$ is lex and $\bigwedge M'$ preserves maps with \mathcal{U} -small fibers.*

Proof. This is the combination of Proposition A.2 and Corollary A.5. \square

Finally, we specialize to the important case of accessible modalities.

Corollary A.7. *Let $M : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U})$ be a \mathcal{U} -small cofiltered diagram. If M_i is lex and accessible for all $i : I$, then the meet $\bigwedge M$ exists and also has these properties.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{U}' be a universe containing \mathcal{U} . Let $(M, M') : I \rightarrow \text{Modality}(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{U}')$ be the extension of M given by [24, Theorem 3.36]. By [24, Theorem 3.29], the meet of (M, M') exists, is structural, and $\bigwedge M$ is again accessible. By [24, Theorem 3.11], \mathcal{U}_{M_i} is M'_i -modal for $i : I$. Applying Corollary A.5, $\mathcal{U}_{\bigwedge M}$ is $\bigwedge M'$ -modal. By [24, Theorem 3.29], this makes $\bigwedge M$ is lex. \square

References

- [1] Peter Aczel. On relating type theories and set theories. In Thorsten Altenkirch, Wolfgang Naraschewski, and Bernhard Reus, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs, International Workshop TYPES '98, Kloster Irsee, Germany, March 27-31, 1998, Selected Papers*, volume 1657 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–18. Springer, 1998.
- [2] Carlo Angiuli, Guillaume Brunerie, Thierry Coquand, Kuen-Bang Hou (Favonia), Robert Harper, and Daniel R. Licata. Cartesian cubical type theory. Draft, December 2017.
- [3] Danil Annenkov, Paolo Capriotti, Nicolai Kraus, and Christian Sattler. Two-level type theory and applications. *CoRR*, abs/1705.03307, 2017.
- [4] Jeremy Avigad, Krzysztof Kapulkin, and Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine. Homotopy limits in type theory. *Math. Struct. Comput. Sci.*, 25(5):1040–1070, 2015.
- [5] Michael Barr. Toposes without points. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 5:265–280, 1974.
- [6] Julia E. Bergner and Charles Rezk. Reedy categories and the Θ -construction. *Math. Z.*, 274(1-2):499–514, 2013.
- [7] Evert W. Beth. *Semantic Construction of Intuitionistic Logic*. Mededelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 19, No. 11. N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, Amsterdam, 1956.
- [8] Simon Pierre Boulier. *Extending type theory with syntactic models. (Etendre la théorie des types à l'aide de modèles syntaxiques)*. PhD thesis, Ecole nationale supérieure Mines-Télécom Atlantique Bretagne Pays de la Loire, France, 2018.

- [9] Cyril Cohen, Thierry Coquand, Simon Huber, and Anders Mörtberg. Cubical type theory: A constructive interpretation of the univalence axiom. In Tarmo Uustalu, editor, *21st International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs, TYPES 2015, May 18-21, 2015, Tallinn, Estonia*, volume 69 of *LIPICs*, pages 5:1–5:34. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015.
- [10] Thierry Coquand, Simon Huber, and Anders Mörtberg. On higher inductive types in cubical type theory. In Anuj Dawar and Erich Grädel, editors, *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2018, Oxford, UK, July 09-12, 2018*, pages 255–264. ACM, 2018.
- [11] Thierry Coquand, Bassel Mannaa, and Fabian Ruch. Stack semantics of type theory. In *32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2017, Reykjavik, Iceland, June 20-23, 2017*, pages 1–11. IEEE Computer Society, 2017.
- [12] Thierry Coquand and Christine Paulin. Inductively defined types. In Per Martin-Löf and Grigori Mints, editors, *COLOG-88, International Conference on Computer Logic, Tallinn, USSR, December 1988, Proceedings*, volume 417 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 50–66. Springer, 1988.
- [13] Peter Dybjer. Internal type theory. In Stefano Berardi and Mario Coppo, editors, *Types for Proofs and Programs, International Workshop TYPES’95, Torino, Italy, June 5-8, 1995, Selected Papers*, volume 1158 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 120–134. Springer, 1995.
- [14] Samuel Eilenberg and J. A. Zilber. Semi-simplicial complexes and singular homology. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 51:499–513, 1950.
- [15] A. Grothendieck. Éléments de géométrie algébrique. I. Le langage des schémas. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 4:228, 1960.
- [16] Martin Hofmann. Syntax and semantics of dependent types. In *Semantics and logics of computation (Cambridge, 1995)*, volume 14 of *Publ. Newton Inst.*, pages 79–130. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [17] André Joyal. Lettre à Grothendieck, 1984.
- [18] Ambrus Kaposi, Simon Huber, and Christian Sattler. Gluing for type theory. In Herman Geuvers, editor, *4th International Conference on Formal Structures for Computation and Deduction, FSCD 2019, June 24-30, 2019, Dortmund, Germany*, volume 131 of *LIPICs*, pages 25:1–25:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [19] Nicolai Kraus. *Truncation levels in homotopy type theory*. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham, UK, 2015.
- [20] Saul A. Kripke. Semantical analysis of intuitionistic logic. I. In *Formal Systems and Recursive Functions (Proc. Eighth Logic Colloq., Oxford, 1963)*, pages 92–130. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1965.
- [21] Bassel Mannaa and Thierry Coquand. Dynamic Newton-Puiseux theorem. *J. Logic & Analysis*, 5, 2013.
- [22] Ian Orton and Andrew M. Pitts. Axioms for modelling cubical type theory in a topos. In Jean-Marc Talbot and Laurent Regnier, editors, *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic, CSL 2016, August 29 - September 1, 2016, Marseille, France*, volume 62 of *LIPICs*, pages 24:1–24:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2016.
- [23] Kevin Quirin. *Lawvere-Tierney sheafification in Homotopy Type Theory. (Faisceautisation de Lawvere-Tierney en théorie des types homotopiques)*. PhD thesis, École des mines de Nantes, France, 2016.
- [24] Egbert Rijke, Michael Shulman, and Bas Spitters. Modalities in homotopy type theory. *CoRR*, abs/1706.07526, 2017.

- [25] Christian Sattler. The equivalence extension property and model structures. *CoRR*, abs/1704.06911, 2017.
- [26] Urs Schreiber and Michael Shulman. Quantum gauge field theory in cohesive homotopy type theory. In Ross Duncan and Prakash Panangaden, editors, *Proceedings 9th Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic, QPL 2012, Brussels, Belgium, 10-12 October 2012*, volume 158 of *EPTCS*, pages 109–126, 2012.
- [27] Dana S. Scott. Relating theories of the λ -calculus. In *To H. B. Curry: essays on combinatory logic, lambda calculus and formalism*, pages 403–450. Academic Press, London-New York, 1980.
- [28] Michael Shulman. The univalence axiom for elegant reedy presheaves, 2013.
- [29] Michael Shulman. Univalence for inverse diagrams and homotopy canonicity. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25(5):1203–1277, 2015.
- [30] Michael Shulman. Brouwer’s fixed-point theorem in real-cohesive homotopy type theory. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 28(6):856–941, 2018.
- [31] Michael Shulman. All $(\infty, 1)$ -toposes have strict univalent universes. *CoRR*, abs/1904.07004, 2019.
- [32] Andrew Swan and Taichi Uemura. On Church’s thesis in cubical assemblies. *CoRR*, abs/1905.03014, 2019.
- [33] A. S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen. *Constructivism in mathematics. Vol. II*, volume 123 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1988. An introduction.
- [34] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
- [35] Vladimir Voevodsky. An experimental library of formalized mathematics based on the univalent foundations. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25(5):1278–1294, 2015.
- [36] Matthew Z. Weaver and Daniel R. Licata. A constructive model of directed univalence in bicubical sets. In Holger Hermanns, Lijun Zhang, Naoki Kobayashi, and Dale Miller, editors, *LICS ’20: 35th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, Saarbrücken, Germany, July 8-11, 2020*, pages 915–928. ACM, 2020.
- [37] Felix Wellen. *Formalizing Cartan Geometry in Modal Homotopy Type Theory*. PhD thesis, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Germany, 2017.