

# The nerve theorem and Grothendieck's hypothesis on homotopy types

Clemens Berger

University of Nice

CT2010

Genova, June 20-26, 2010

- 1 Monadic squares
- 2 Nerves and theories
- 3 Higher categories and wreath products
- 4 Grothendieck's hypothesis and  $\Theta_n$ -spaces

A *monadic square* is a commutative diagram of functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

such that

- (i)  $U_1, U_2$  are monadic functors with left adjoints  $F_1, F_2$ ;
- (ii) the induced 2-cell  $\phi = \epsilon_2 G' F_1 \circ F_2 G \eta_1$  (the “mate”)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 F_1 \uparrow & \phi & \uparrow F_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

is invertible.

A *monadic square* is a commutative diagram of functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

such that

- (i)  $U_1, U_2$  are monadic functors with left adjoints  $F_1, F_2$ ;
- (ii) the induced 2-cell  $\phi = \epsilon_2 G' F_1 \circ F_2 G \eta_1$  (the “mate”)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 F_1 \uparrow & \phi & \uparrow F_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

is invertible.

A *monadic square* is a commutative diagram of functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

such that

- (i)  $U_1, U_2$  are monadic functors with left adjoints  $F_1, F_2$ ;
- (ii) the induced 2-cell  $\phi = \epsilon_2 G' F_1 \circ F_2 G \eta_1$  (the “mate”)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 F_1 \uparrow & \phi \Leftarrow & \uparrow F_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

is invertible.

Let  $(T_1, \mu_1, \eta_1), (T_2, \mu_2, \eta_2)$  be monads on  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$  respectively.

A (strong) monad morphism  $(G, \psi) : (\mathcal{E}_1, T_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}_2, T_2)$  is a functor  $G : \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$  together with an (invertible) 2-cell  $\psi : T_2 G \Rightarrow G T_1$  such that  $G\eta_1 = \psi \circ \eta_2 G$  and  $\psi \circ \mu_2 G = G\mu_1 \circ G\psi T_1 \circ T_2\psi G$ .

A strong monad morphism  $(G, \psi)$  induces a monadic square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_{T_1} & \xrightarrow{G'} & \text{Alg}_{T_2} \\ U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2 \end{array}$$

with  $G'(X, \xi : T_1 X \rightarrow X) = (GX, G\xi \circ \psi : T_2 GX \rightarrow GX)$

Conversely, a monadic square induces a strong monad morphism from which it derives up to canonical equivalence.

Let  $(T_1, \mu_1, \eta_1), (T_2, \mu_2, \eta_2)$  be monads on  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$  respectively.

A (strong) monad morphism  $(G, \psi) : (\mathcal{E}_1, T_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}_2, T_2)$  is a functor  $G : \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$  together with an (invertible) 2-cell

$\psi : T_2 G \Rightarrow G T_1$  such that  $G \eta_1 = \psi \circ \eta_2 G$  and  $\psi \circ \mu_2 G = G \mu_1 \circ G \psi T_1 \circ T_2 \psi G$ .

A strong monad morphism  $(G, \psi)$  induces a monadic square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_{T_1} & \xrightarrow{G'} & \text{Alg}_{T_2} \\ U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2 \end{array}$$

with  $G'(X, \xi : T_1 X \rightarrow X) = (GX, G\xi \circ \psi : T_2 GX \rightarrow GX)$

Conversely, a monadic square induces a strong monad morphism from which it derives up to canonical equivalence.

Let  $(T_1, \mu_1, \eta_1), (T_2, \mu_2, \eta_2)$  be monads on  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$  respectively.

A (strong) monad morphism  $(G, \psi) : (\mathcal{E}_1, T_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}_2, T_2)$  is a functor  $G : \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$  together with an (invertible) 2-cell

$\psi : T_2 G \Rightarrow G T_1$  such that  $G \eta_1 = \psi \circ \eta_2 G$  and  $\psi \circ \mu_2 G = G \mu_1 \circ G \psi T_1 \circ T_2 \psi G$ .

A strong monad morphism  $(G, \psi)$  induces a monadic square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_{T_1} & \xrightarrow{G'} & \text{Alg}_{T_2} \\ U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2 \end{array}$$

with  $G'(X, \xi : T_1 X \rightarrow X) = (GX, G\xi \circ \psi : T_2 GX \rightarrow GX)$

Conversely, a monadic square induces a strong monad morphism from which it derives up to canonical equivalence.



Let  $(T_1, \mu_1, \eta_1), (T_2, \mu_2, \eta_2)$  be monads on  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2$  respectively.

A (strong) monad morphism  $(G, \psi) : (\mathcal{E}_1, T_1) \rightarrow (\mathcal{E}_2, T_2)$  is a functor  $G : \mathcal{E}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_2$  together with an (invertible) 2-cell

$\psi : T_2 G \Rightarrow G T_1$  such that  $G\eta_1 = \psi \circ \eta_2 G$  and  $\psi \circ \mu_2 G = G\mu_1 \circ G\psi T_1 \circ T_2\psi G$ .

A strong monad morphism  $(G, \psi)$  induces a monadic square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_{T_1} & \xrightarrow{G'} & \text{Alg}_{T_2} \\ U_1 \downarrow & = & \downarrow U_2 \\ \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{E}_2 \end{array}$$

with  $G'(X, \xi : T_1 X \rightarrow X) = (GX, G\xi \circ \psi : T_2 GX \rightarrow GX)$

Conversely, a monadic square induces a strong monad morphism from which it derives up to canonical equivalence.

## Proposition

In any monadic square like above, if  $G$  is faithful (resp. fully faithful resp. an equivalence) then so is  $G'$ .

## Proposition

For a fully faithful functor  $G$ , the essential image factorisation of  $G$  decomposes the monadic square into two monadic squares

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Im}(G) \times_{\mathcal{E}_2} \mathcal{E}'_2 & \xrightarrow{ff} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 U_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow U_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Im}(G) & \xrightarrow{ff} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

In particular, the essential image of  $G'$  is given by restriction of the monadic functor  $U_2$  to the essential image of  $G$ .

### Proposition

In any monadic square like above, if  $G$  is faithful (resp. fully faithful resp. an equivalence) then so is  $G'$ .

### Proposition

For a fully faithful functor  $G$ , the essential image factorisation of  $G$  decomposes the monadic square into two monadic squares

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{E}'_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Im}(G) \times_{\mathcal{E}_2} \mathcal{E}'_2 & \xrightarrow{ff} & \mathcal{E}'_2 \\
 U_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow U_2 \\
 \mathcal{E}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Im}(G) & \xrightarrow{ff} & \mathcal{E}_2
 \end{array}$$

In particular, the essential image of  $G'$  is given by restriction of the monadic functor  $U_2$  to the essential image of  $G$ .

A *category with arities*  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a small dense subcategory  $i_0 : \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. the induced *nerve functor*  $\nu_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0 : X \mapsto \mathcal{E}(i_0(-), X)$  is fully faithful.

For each object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  the functor  $\xi_X : i_0/X \rightarrow \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  induces a colimit cocone  $\text{colim}_{i_0/X} \xi_X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$ .

A *monad with arities* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a monad  $T$  such that the composite functor  $\nu_0 \circ T$  preserves the  $\Theta_0$ -colimit cones.

The *theory*  $\Theta_T$  induced by a monad with arities  $T$  is obtained by factoring  $\Theta_0 \xrightarrow{i_0} \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F_T} \text{Alg}_T$  into a bijective-on-objects functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  followed by a fully faithful functor  $\Theta_T \rightarrow \text{Alg}_T$ .

$\Theta_T$  is called *homogeneous* if  $\Theta_T$  admits a *generic/free factorisation system*  $\Theta_T = (\Theta_{T,gen}, \Theta_0)$ .

A *category with arities*  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a small dense subcategory  $i_0 : \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. the induced *nerve functor*  $\nu_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0 : X \mapsto \mathcal{E}(i_0(-), X)$  is fully faithful.

For each object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  the functor  $\xi_X : i_0/X \rightarrow \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  induces a colimit cocone  $\text{colim}_{i_0/X} \xi_X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$ .

A *monad with arities* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a monad  $T$  such that the composite functor  $\nu_0 \circ T$  preserves the  $\Theta_0$ -colimit cones.

The *theory*  $\Theta_T$  induced by a monad with arities  $T$  is obtained by factoring  $\Theta_0 \xrightarrow{i_0} \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F_T} \text{Alg}_T$  into a bijective-on-objects functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  followed by a fully faithful functor  $\Theta_T \rightarrow \text{Alg}_T$ .

$\Theta_T$  is called *homogeneous* if  $\Theta_T$  admits a *generic/free* factorisation system  $\Theta_T = (\Theta_{T,gen}, \Theta_0)$ .

A *category with arities*  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a small dense subcategory  $i_0 : \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. the induced *nerve functor*  $\nu_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0 : X \mapsto \mathcal{E}(i_0(-), X)$  is fully faithful.

For each object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  the functor  $\xi_X : i_0/X \rightarrow \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  induces a colimit cocone  $\text{colim}_{i_0/X} \xi_X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$ .

A *monad with arities* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a monad  $T$  such that the composite functor  $\nu_0 \circ T$  preserves the  $\Theta_0$ -colimit cones.

The *theory*  $\Theta_T$  induced by a monad with arities  $T$  is obtained by factoring  $\Theta_0 \xrightarrow{i_0} \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F_T} \text{Alg}_T$  into a bijective-on-objects functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  followed by a fully faithful functor  $\Theta_T \rightarrow \text{Alg}_T$ .

$\Theta_T$  is called *homogeneous* if  $\Theta_T$  admits a *generic/free* factorisation system  $\Theta_T = (\Theta_{T,gen}, \Theta_0)$ .

A *category with arities*  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a small dense subcategory  $i_0 : \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. the induced *nerve functor*  $\nu_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0 : X \mapsto \mathcal{E}(i_0(-), X)$  is fully faithful.

For each object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  the functor  $\xi_X : i_0/X \rightarrow \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  induces a colimit cocone  $\text{colim}_{i_0/X} \xi_X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$ .

A *monad with arities* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a monad  $T$  such that the composite functor  $\nu_0 \circ T$  preserves the  $\Theta_0$ -colimit cones.

The *theory*  $\Theta_T$  induced by a monad with arities  $T$  is obtained by factoring  $\Theta_0 \xrightarrow{i_0} \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F_T} \text{Alg}_T$  into a bijective-on-objects functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  followed by a fully faithful functor  $\Theta_T \rightarrow \text{Alg}_T$ .

$\Theta_T$  is called *homogeneous* if  $\Theta_T$  admits a *generic/free* factorisation system  $\Theta_T = (\Theta_{T,gen}, \Theta_0)$ .

A *category with arities*  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a category  $\mathcal{E}$  equipped with a small dense subcategory  $i_0 : \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$ , i.e. the induced *nerve functor*  $\nu_0 : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0 : X \mapsto \mathcal{E}(i_0(-), X)$  is fully faithful.

For each object  $X$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  the functor  $\xi_X : i_0/X \rightarrow \Theta_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{E}$  induces a colimit cocone  $\text{colim}_{i_0/X} \xi_X \xrightarrow{\cong} X$ .

A *monad with arities* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a monad  $T$  such that the composite functor  $\nu_0 \circ T$  preserves the  $\Theta_0$ -colimit cones.

The *theory*  $\Theta_T$  induced by a monad with arities  $T$  is obtained by factoring  $\Theta_0 \xrightarrow{i_0} \mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{F_T} \text{Alg}_T$  into a bijective-on-objects functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  followed by a fully faithful functor  $\Theta_T \rightarrow \text{Alg}_T$ .

$\Theta_T$  is called *homogeneous* if  $\Theta_T$  admits a *generic/free factorisation system*  $\Theta_T = (\Theta_{T,gen}, \Theta_0)$ .



## Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

## Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

## Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

### Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

### Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

### Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

### Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

### Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

### Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

### Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

### Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

### Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

### Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

### Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

### Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

### Example (algebraic theories and symmetric operads)

Consider sets with arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the subcategory of finite sets.

- A monad  $T$  has arities  $\mathcal{T}_0$  iff  $T$  preserves filtered colimits;
- $\Theta_T$  is (the dual of) Lawvere's algebraic theory for  $T$ -algebras;
- $\Theta_T$  is homogeneous iff  $T$  is induced by a symmetric operad.

### Theorem (B. '02, Leinster '04, Weber '07, Mellies '10)

For a monad with arities  $T$  on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ , the theory  $\Theta_T$  is dense in  $\text{Alg}_T$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is spanned by those  $X : \Theta_T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  whose restriction  $j^*X$  belongs to  $\text{Im}(\nu_0)$ .

### Remark

If  $\mathcal{E} = \widehat{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $\Theta_0$  contains the representables, the essential image of  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  is spanned by sheaves on  $\Theta_0$ . The essential image of  $\nu_T : \text{Alg}_T \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_T$  is then given by a *restricted* sheaf condition.

## Proof of the nerve theorem.

Since  $T$  is a monad with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_T & \xrightarrow{\nu_T} & \widehat{\Theta}_T \\ U_T \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\ \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\nu_0} & \widehat{\Theta}_0 \end{array}$$

is *pseudomonadic* and  $\nu_0$  is fully faithful. □

A *theory* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a bijective-on-objects faithful functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  such that  $j^*j_!$  preserves the essential image of  $\nu_0$ .

Theorem (B. '02, Mellies '10)

There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between monads with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  and theories on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ .

## Proof of the nerve theorem.

Since  $T$  is a monad with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Alg}_T & \xrightarrow{\nu_T} & \widehat{\Theta}_T \\ U_T \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\ \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\nu_0} & \widehat{\Theta}_0 \end{array}$$

is *pseudomonadic* and  $\nu_0$  is fully faithful. □

A *theory* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a bijective-on-objects faithful functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  such that  $j^*j_!$  preserves the essential image of  $\nu_0$ .

Theorem (B. '02, Mellies '10)

There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between monads with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  and theories on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ .



### Proof of the nerve theorem.

Since  $T$  is a monad with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Alg}_T & \xrightarrow{\nu_T} & \widehat{\Theta}_T \\
 U_T \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\nu_0} & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

is *pseudomonadic* and  $\nu_0$  is fully faithful. □

A *theory* on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  is a bijective-on-objects faithful functor  $j : \Theta_0 \rightarrow \Theta_T$  such that  $j^*j_!$  preserves the essential image of  $\nu_0$ .

### Theorem (B. '02, Mellies '10)

There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between monads with arities on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$  and theories on  $(\mathcal{E}, \Theta_0)$ .

Each *finite level tree*  $S$  defines a globular set  $S_*$  with  $\text{ht}(S) = \dim(S_*)$  (Batanin's star-construction '98).

The category of arities  $\Theta_0$  is the full subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$  spanned by the  $S_*$  where  $S$  runs through the set of finite level trees.

The Grothendieck topology on  $\Theta_0$  induced by the nerve  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  has the characteristic property that a presheaf  $X$  on  $\Theta_0$  is a sheaf if and only if  $X$  transforms the canonical colimit cones

$$\text{colim}_{\sigma \in \text{el}(S_*)} \sigma \xrightarrow{\cong} S_*$$

into limit cones.

A theory  $\Theta_A$  on  $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}, \Theta_0)$  is called *globular*. The presheaves  $X$  such that  $j^*X$  is a sheaf are called  $\Theta_A$ -*models*. According to the nerve theorem they correspond to  $\underline{A}$ -algebras for a monad  $\underline{A}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ .

Each *finite level tree*  $S$  defines a globular set  $S_*$  with  $\text{ht}(S) = \dim(S_*)$  (Batanin's star-construction '98).

The category of arities  $\Theta_0$  is the full subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$  spanned by the  $S_*$  where  $S$  runs through the set of finite level trees.

The Grothendieck topology on  $\Theta_0$  induced by the nerve  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  has the characteristic property that a presheaf  $X$  on  $\Theta_0$  is a sheaf if and only if  $X$  transforms the canonical colimit cones

$$\text{colim}_{\sigma \in \text{el}(S_*)} \sigma \xrightarrow{\cong} S_*$$

into limit cones.

A theory  $\Theta_A$  on  $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}, \Theta_0)$  is called *globular*. The presheaves  $X$  such that  $j^*X$  is a sheaf are called  $\Theta_A$ -*models*. According to the nerve theorem they correspond to  $\underline{A}$ -algebras for a monad  $\underline{A}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ .

Each *finite level tree*  $S$  defines a globular set  $S_*$  with  $\text{ht}(S) = \dim(S_*)$  (Batanin's star-construction '98).

The category of arities  $\Theta_0$  is the full subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$  spanned by the  $S_*$  where  $S$  runs through the set of finite level trees.

The Grothendieck topology on  $\Theta_0$  induced by the nerve  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  has the characteristic property that a presheaf  $X$  on  $\Theta_0$  is a sheaf if and only if  $X$  transforms the canonical colimit cones

$$\text{colim}_{\sigma \in \text{el}(S_*)} \sigma \xrightarrow{\cong} S_*$$

into limit cones.

A theory  $\Theta_A$  on  $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}, \Theta_0)$  is called *globular*. The presheaves  $X$  such that  $j^*X$  is a sheaf are called  $\Theta_A$ -*models*. According to the nerve theorem they correspond to  $\underline{A}$ -algebras for a monad  $\underline{A}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ .

Each *finite level tree*  $S$  defines a globular set  $S_*$  with  $\text{ht}(S) = \dim(S_*)$  (Batanin's star-construction '98).

The category of arities  $\Theta_0$  is the full subcategory of  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$  spanned by the  $S_*$  where  $S$  runs through the set of finite level trees.

The Grothendieck topology on  $\Theta_0$  induced by the nerve  $\nu_0 : \widehat{\mathbb{G}} \rightarrow \widehat{\Theta}_0$  has the characteristic property that a presheaf  $X$  on  $\Theta_0$  is a sheaf if and only if  $X$  transforms the canonical colimit cones

$$\text{colim}_{\sigma \in \text{el}(S_*)} \sigma \xrightarrow{\cong} S_*$$

into limit cones.

A theory  $\Theta_A$  on  $(\widehat{\mathbb{G}}, \Theta_0)$  is called *globular*. The presheaves  $X$  such that  $j^*X$  is a sheaf are called  $\Theta_A$ -*models*. According to the nerve theorem they correspond to  $\underline{A}$ -algebras for a monad  $\underline{A}$  on  $\widehat{\mathbb{G}}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Alg}_{\underline{A}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Theta_A} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_A \\
 U_{\underline{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Theta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

A globular theory  $\Theta_A$  is called *homogeneous* if there is a factorisation system  $\Theta_A = (\Theta_{A,gen}, \Theta_0)$  such that each *generic* operator  $\phi : S \rightarrow T$  satisfies  $\text{ht}(S) \geq \text{ht}(T)$ .

Theorem (Makkai-Zawadowski '01, B. '02)

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous globular theories and globular operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $\omega$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial disks.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Alg}_{\underline{A}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Theta_A} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_A \\
 U_{\underline{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Theta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

A globular theory  $\Theta_A$  is called *homogeneous* if there is a factorisation system  $\Theta_A = (\Theta_{A,gen}, \Theta_0)$  such that each *generic* operator  $\phi : S \rightarrow T$  satisfies  $\text{ht}(S) \geq \text{ht}(T)$ .

Theorem (Makkai-Zawadowski '01, B. '02)

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous globular theories and globular operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $\omega$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial disks.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Alg}_{\underline{A}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Theta_A} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_A \\
 U_{\underline{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Theta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

A globular theory  $\Theta_A$  is called *homogeneous* if there is a factorisation system  $\Theta_A = (\Theta_{A,gen}, \Theta_0)$  such that each *generic* operator  $\phi : S \rightarrow T$  satisfies  $\text{ht}(S) \geq \text{ht}(T)$ .

### Theorem (Makkai-Zawadowski '01, B. '02)

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous globular theories and globular operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $\omega$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial disks.



$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Alg}_{\underline{A}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Theta_A} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_A \\
 U_{\underline{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Theta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

A globular theory  $\Theta_A$  is called *homogeneous* if there is a factorisation system  $\Theta_A = (\Theta_{A,gen}, \Theta_0)$  such that each *generic* operator  $\phi : S \rightarrow T$  satisfies  $\text{ht}(S) \geq \text{ht}(T)$ .

### Theorem (Makkai-Zawadowski '01, B. '02)

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous globular theories and globular operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $\omega$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial disks.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Alg}_{\underline{A}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Theta_A} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_A \\
 U_{\underline{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow j^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Theta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Theta}_0
 \end{array}$$

A globular theory  $\Theta_A$  is called *homogeneous* if there is a factorisation system  $\Theta_A = (\Theta_{A,gen}, \Theta_0)$  such that each *generic* operator  $\phi : S \rightarrow T$  satisfies  $\text{ht}(S) \geq \text{ht}(T)$ .

### Theorem (Makkai-Zawadowski '01, B. '02)

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous globular theories and globular operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $\omega$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial disks.

## Corollary

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous  $n$ -globular theories and globular  $n$ -operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $n$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial  $n$ -disks.

Example ( $n=1$ , Segal condition)

The terminal graphical theory is the simplex category  $\Delta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Cat} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Delta} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta} \\
 \mathcal{U} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{J}^* \\
 \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Delta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta}_0
 \end{array}$$

$\Delta_0 = \{\text{distance-preserving operators}\},$

$\Delta_{\text{gen}} = \{\text{endpoint-preserving operators}\}.$

## Corollary

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous  $n$ -globular theories and globular  $n$ -operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $n$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial  $n$ -disks.

Example ( $n=1$ , Segal condition)

The terminal graphical theory is the simplex category  $\Delta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Cat} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Delta} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta} \\
 \mathcal{U} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{J}^* \\
 \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Delta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta}_0
 \end{array}$$

$\Delta_0 = \{\text{distance-preserving operators}\},$

$\Delta_{\text{gen}} = \{\text{endpoint-preserving operators}\}.$

## Corollary

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous  $n$ -globular theories and globular  $n$ -operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $n$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial  $n$ -disks.

Example ( $n=1$ , Segal condition)

The terminal graphical theory is the simplex category  $\Delta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Cat} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Delta} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta} \\
 \downarrow U & & \downarrow & & \downarrow J^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Delta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta}_0
 \end{array}$$

$\Delta_0 = \{\text{distance-preserving operators}\},$

$\Delta_{gen} = \{\text{endpoint-preserving operators}\}.$

## Corollary

- There is a canonical one-to-one correspondence between homogeneous  $n$ -globular theories and globular  $n$ -operads;
- The terminal such theory is the theory of strict  $n$ -categories; it is the dual of Joyal's category of finite combinatorial  $n$ -disks.

Example ( $n=1$ , Segal condition)

The terminal graphical theory is the simplex category  $\Delta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \text{Cat} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Mod}_{\Delta} & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta} \\
 U \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow J^* \\
 \widehat{\mathbb{G}}_1 & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Sh}(\Delta_0) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{\Delta}_0
 \end{array}$$

$\Delta_0 = \{\text{distance-preserving operators}\},$

$\Delta_{gen} = \{\text{endpoint-preserving operators}\}.$

The terminal  $n$ -globular theory  $\Theta_n$  is dense in  $n\text{Cat}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Theta_n & \hookrightarrow & n\text{Cat} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Theta_{n+1} & \hookrightarrow & (n+1)\text{Cat}
 \end{array}$$

The *wreath product*  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$  is the category

- with objects  $([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{A}^m$ ,  $m \geq 0$ ;
- with morphisms

$$(\phi; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : ([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \rightarrow ([n], b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

$$\phi : [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta$$

$$\phi_i : \mathcal{A}[a_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i)+1}] \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i+1)}] \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

The terminal  $n$ -globular theory  $\Theta_n$  is dense in  $n\text{Cat}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Theta_n & \hookrightarrow & n\text{Cat} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Theta_{n+1} & \hookrightarrow & (n+1)\text{Cat}
 \end{array}$$

The *wreath product*  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$  is the category

- with objects  $([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{A}^m, m \geq 0$ ;
- with morphisms

$$(\phi; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : ([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \rightarrow ([n], b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

$$\phi : [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta$$

$$\phi_i : \mathcal{A}[a_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i)+1}] \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i+1)}] \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$



The terminal  $n$ -globular theory  $\Theta_n$  is dense in  $n\text{Cat}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Theta_n & \hookrightarrow & n\text{Cat} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Theta_{n+1} & \hookrightarrow & (n+1)\text{Cat}
 \end{array}$$

The *wreath product*  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$  is the category

- with objects  $([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{A}^m$ ,  $m \geq 0$ ;
- with morphisms

$$(\phi; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : ([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \rightarrow ([n], b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

$$\phi : [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta$$

$$\phi_i : \mathcal{A}[a_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i)+1}] \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i+1)}] \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

The terminal  $n$ -globular theory  $\Theta_n$  is dense in  $n\text{Cat}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Theta_n & \hookrightarrow & n\text{Cat} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Theta_{n+1} & \hookrightarrow & (n+1)\text{Cat}
 \end{array}$$

The *wreath product*  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$  is the category

- with objects  $([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{A}^m, m \geq 0$ ;
- with morphisms

$$(\phi; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : ([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \rightarrow ([n], b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

$$\phi : [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta$$

$$\phi_i : \mathcal{A}[a_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i)+1}] \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i+1)}] \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

The terminal  $n$ -globular theory  $\Theta_n$  is dense in  $n\text{Cat}$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Theta_n & \hookrightarrow & n\text{Cat} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \Theta_{n+1} & \hookrightarrow & (n+1)\text{Cat}
 \end{array}$$

The *wreath product*  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$  is the category

- with objects  $([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \Delta \times \mathcal{A}^m$ ,  $m \geq 0$ ;
- with morphisms

$$(\phi; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_m) : ([m], a_1, \dots, a_m) \rightarrow ([n], b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

$$\phi : [m] \rightarrow [n] \text{ in } \Delta$$

$$\phi_i : \mathcal{A}[a_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i)+1}] \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}[b_{\phi(i+1)}] \text{ in } \widehat{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Proposition (B. '07, Steiner '07, Oury '10)

$$\Theta_{n+1} = \Delta \wr \Theta_n \quad (n \geq 1)$$

This identification is compatible with the theory structures.

Remark (Batatin's category of quasi-bijections '10)

- If  $\mathcal{A}$  is augmented over Segal's category  $\Gamma$  then so is  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$ .
- There is thus a canonical functor  $\gamma_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow \Gamma$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .
- Batatin's category  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  of quasi-bijections is (dual to) the subcategory of  $\Theta_n$  spanned by *pruned  $n$ -level trees* and containing those operators of  $\Theta_n$  whose image under  $\gamma_n$  is invertible.

Proposition (B. '07, Steiner '07, Oury '10)

$$\Theta_{n+1} = \Delta \wr \Theta_n \quad (n \geq 1)$$

This identification is compatible with the theory structures.

Remark (Batatin's category of quasi-bijections '10)

- If  $\mathcal{A}$  is augmented over Segal's category  $\Gamma$  then so is  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$ .
- There is thus a canonical functor  $\gamma_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow \Gamma$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .
- Batatin's category  $Q_n$  of quasi-bijections is (dual to) the subcategory of  $\Theta_n$  spanned by *pruned  $n$ -level trees* and containing those operators of  $\Theta_n$  whose image under  $\gamma_n$  is invertible.

Proposition (B. '07, Steiner '07, Oury '10)

$$\Theta_{n+1} = \Delta \wr \Theta_n \quad (n \geq 1)$$

This identification is compatible with the theory structures.

Remark (Batatin's category of quasi-bijections '10)

- If  $\mathcal{A}$  is augmented over Segal's category  $\Gamma$  then so is  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$ .
- There is thus a canonical functor  $\gamma_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow \Gamma$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .
- Batatin's category  $Q_n$  of quasi-bijections is (dual to) the subcategory of  $\Theta_n$  spanned by *pruned  $n$ -level trees* and containing those operators of  $\Theta_n$  whose image under  $\gamma_n$  is invertible.

Proposition (B. '07, Steiner '07, Oury '10)

$$\Theta_{n+1} = \Delta \wr \Theta_n \quad (n \geq 1)$$

This identification is compatible with the theory structures.

Remark (Batatin's category of quasi-bijections '10)

- If  $\mathcal{A}$  is augmented over Segal's category  $\Gamma$  then so is  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$ .
- There is thus a canonical functor  $\gamma_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow \Gamma$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .
- Batatin's category  $Q_n$  of quasi-bijections is (dual to) the subcategory of  $\Theta_n$  spanned by *pruned  $n$ -level trees* and containing those operators of  $\Theta_n$  whose image under  $\gamma_n$  is invertible.

Proposition (B. '07, Steiner '07, Oury '10)

$$\Theta_{n+1} = \Delta \wr \Theta_n \quad (n \geq 1)$$

This identification is compatible with the theory structures.

Remark (Batatin's category of quasi-bijections '10)

- If  $\mathcal{A}$  is augmented over Segal's category  $\Gamma$  then so is  $\Delta \wr \mathcal{A}$ .
- There is thus a canonical functor  $\gamma_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow \Gamma$  for each  $n \geq 1$ .
- Batatin's category  $Q_n$  of quasi-bijections is (dual to) the subcategory of  $\Theta_n$  spanned by *pruned  $n$ -level trees* and containing those operators of  $\Theta_n$  whose image under  $\gamma_n$  is invertible.



Each topological space  $X$  is (weakly) homotopy equivalent to the inverse limit of its Postnikov tower

$$\cdots \longrightarrow X_{\leq n+1} \longrightarrow X_{\leq n} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

In principle this allows to reconstruct the homotopy type of  $X$  through cohomological invariants, called *Postnikov invariants* of  $X$ .

The fundamental groupoid  $\Pi_1(X)$  captures the homotopy type of the Postnikov section  $X_{\leq 1}$ , but it is known that for  $n \geq 3$  there cannot exist a strict fundamental  $n$ -groupoid capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$  for all  $X$ .

Grothendieck (in Pursuing Stacks '83) conjectured that there exists a general notion of *weak* fundamental  $n$ -groupoid  $\Pi_n(X)$  capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$ .

Each topological space  $X$  is (weakly) homotopy equivalent to the inverse limit of its Postnikov tower

$$\cdots \longrightarrow X_{\leq n+1} \longrightarrow X_{\leq n} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

In principle this allows to reconstruct the homotopy type of  $X$  through cohomological invariants, called *Postnikov invariants* of  $X$ .

The fundamental groupoid  $\Pi_1(X)$  captures the homotopy type of the Postnikov section  $X_{\leq 1}$ , but it is known that for  $n \geq 3$  there cannot exist a strict fundamental  $n$ -groupoid capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$  for all  $X$ .

Grothendieck (in Pursuing Stacks '83) conjectured that there exists a general notion of *weak* fundamental  $n$ -groupoid  $\Pi_n(X)$  capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$ .

Each topological space  $X$  is (weakly) homotopy equivalent to the inverse limit of its Postnikov tower

$$\cdots \longrightarrow X_{\leq n+1} \longrightarrow X_{\leq n} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

In principle this allows to reconstruct the homotopy type of  $X$  through cohomological invariants, called *Postnikov invariants* of  $X$ .

The fundamental groupoid  $\Pi_1(X)$  captures the homotopy type of the Postnikov section  $X_{\leq 1}$ , but it is known that for  $n \geq 3$  there cannot exist a strict fundamental  $n$ -groupoid capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$  for all  $X$ .

Grothendieck (in Pursuing Stacks '83) conjectured that there exists a general notion of *weak* fundamental  $n$ -groupoid  $\Pi_n(X)$  capturing the homotopy type of  $X_{\leq n}$ .

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!



Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.

These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .

Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

Strict  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -sets fulfilling a restricted sheaf condition.

“Weak”  $n$ -categories are  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are *fibrant* for a Quillen model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces, introduced by Rezk '10.








These fibrant  $\Theta_n$ -spaces (the Rezk  $n$ -categories) are essentially those  $\Theta_n$ -spaces  $X$  for which  $j^*X$  is a *homotopy sheaf* on  $\Theta_{n,0}$ .







Rezk proves Grothendieck's hypothesis for his  $n$ -groupoids.

There are discrete versions Rezk's  $n$ -categories:

- Segal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -spaces which are discrete on  $\Theta_{n-1}$ ;
- Joyal  $n$ -categories, i.e. fibrant objects for a suitable model structure on  $\Theta_n$ -sets.

These discretized model structures have been shown to exist only for  $n = 1$ , cf. Joyal-Tierney '07 !!

-  M. Batanin – *Monoidal globular categories as natural environment for the theory of weak  $n$ -category*, Adv. Math. 136 (1998).
-  M. Batanin – *Locally constant  $n$ -operads as higher braided operads*, J. Noncommut. Geom. 4 (2010).
-  C. Berger – *A cellular nerve for higher categories*, Adv. Math. 169 (2002).
-  C. Berger – *Iterated wreath product of the simplex category and iterated loop spaces*, Adv. Math. 213 (2007).
-  A. Joyal – *Disks, duality and  $\theta$ -categories*, preprint 1997.
-  A. Joyal, M. Tierney – *Quasi-categories vs Segal spaces*, Contemp. Math. 431 (2007).
-  T. Leinster – *Nerves of algebras*, CT 2004.

-  M. Makkai, M. Zawadowski – *Duality for simple  $\omega$ -categories and disks*, TAC 8 (2001).
-  P.-A. Melliès – *Segal condition meets computational effects*, see his homepage.
-  C. Rezk – *A cartesian presentation of weak  $n$ -categories*, GT 14 (2010).
-  R. Steiner – *Simple omega-categories and chain complexes*, HHA 9 (2007).
-  D. Oury – *On the duality between trees and disks*, arXiv:1002.2747.
-  M. Weber – *Familial 2-functors and parametric right adjoints*, TAC 22 (2007).