

The theory of
topos-theoretic
bridges,
five years later

Olivia Caramello

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

The theory of topos-theoretic *bridges*, five years later

Olivia Caramello

Université Paris 7

Toposes as unifying 'bridges' in Mathematics

In this lecture, whenever I use the word 'topos', I really mean 'Grothendieck topos'.

The theory of topos-theoretic 'bridges' was introduced in the paper

The unification of Mathematics via Topos Theory

in 2010.

This theory provides means for exploiting the technical flexibility inherent to the concept of topos to build **unifying 'bridges'** across different mathematical theories having an equivalent, or strictly related, semantic content.

In the past five years, many **applications** of this general methodology have been obtained in different fields of Mathematics. In fact, 'bridges' have proved useful not only for connecting different theories with each other, but also for working inside a fixed mathematical domain.

A few selected applications

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

- **Model theory** (topos-theoretic Fraïssé theorem)
- **Proof theory** (various results for first-order theories)
- **Algebra** (topos-theoretic generalization of topological Galois theory)
- **Topology** (topos-theoretic interpretation/generation of Stone-type and Priestley-type dualities)
- **Functional analysis** (various results on Gelfand spectra and Wallman compactifications)
- **Many-valued logics and lattice-ordered groups** (two joint papers with A. C. Russo)
- **Cyclic homology**, as reinterpreted by A. Connes (work on “*cyclic theories*”, jointly with N. Wentzlaff)
- **Algebraic geometry** (logical analysis of (co)homological motives, cf. the paper “*Syntactic categories for Nori motives*” joint with L. Barbieri-Viale and L. Lafforgue)

Plan of the talk

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

- Topos-theoretic background
- The 'bridge-building' technique: its key principles and the underlying vision
- Analysis of a few notable 'bridges' in light of the general theory
- Future perspectives and the unification programme

The eclectic nature of toposes

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

Toposes are particularly eclectic objects, which can be profitably approached from different points of view.

In fact, as it is well-known, a **Grothendieck topos** can be seen as:

- a **generalized space**
- a **mathematical universe**
- a **theory modulo 'Morita-equivalence'**

We shall now briefly review each of these different points of view.

Toposes as generalized spaces

- The notion of **topos** was introduced in the early sixties by A. Grothendieck with the aim of bringing a topological or geometric intuition also in areas where actual topological spaces do not occur.
- Grothendieck realized that many important properties of topological spaces **X** can be naturally formulated as (invariant) properties of the categories **$\mathbf{Sh}(X)$** of sheaves of sets on the spaces.
- He then defined **toposes** as **more general** categories of sheaves of sets, by replacing the topological space X by a pair $(\mathcal{C}, J)$ consisting of a (small) category $\mathcal{C}$ and a 'generalized notion of covering' J on it, and taking sheaves (in a generalized sense) over the pair:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \dashrightarrow & \mathbf{Sh}(X) \\ \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \wr \\ (\mathcal{C}, J) & \dashrightarrow & \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, J) \end{array}$$

Toposes as mathematical universes

A decade later, W. Lawvere and M. Tierney discovered that a topos could not only be seen as a generalized space, but also as a **mathematical universe** in which one can do mathematics similarly to how one does it in the classical context of sets (with the only exception that one must argue constructively).

Amongst other things, this discovery made it possible to:

- Exploit the inherent 'flexibility' of the notion of topos to construct '**new mathematical worlds**' having particular properties.
- Consider **models** of any kind of (first-order) mathematical theory not just in the classical set-theoretic setting, but inside every topos, and hence '**relativise**' Mathematics.

Toposes as mathematical universes

A decade later, W. Lawvere and M. Tierney discovered that a topos could not only be seen as a generalized space, but also as a **mathematical universe** in which one can do mathematics similarly to how one does it in the classical context of sets (with the only exception that one must argue constructively).

Amongst other things, this discovery made it possible to:

- Exploit the inherent 'flexibility' of the notion of topos to construct '**new mathematical worlds**' having particular properties.
- Consider **models** of any kind of (first-order) mathematical theory not just in the classical set-theoretic setting, but inside every topos, and hence '**relativise**' Mathematics.

Toposes as theories up to 'Morita-equivalence'

It was realized in the seventies (thanks to the work of several people, notably including W. Lawvere, A. Joyal, G. Reyes and M. Makkai) that:

- To any (geometric first-order) mathematical theory $\mathbb{T}$ one can canonically associate a topos $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}$, called the **classifying topos** of the theory, which represents its 'semantical core'.
- The topos $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}$ is characterized by the following universal property: for any Grothendieck topos $\mathcal{E}$ we have an equivalence of categories

$$\mathbf{Geom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}) \simeq \mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{E})$$

natural in $\mathcal{E}$, where $\mathbf{Geom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}})$ is the category of geometric morphisms $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathcal{E})$ is the category of $\mathbb{T}$ -models in $\mathcal{E}$.

Toposes as theories up to 'Morita-equivalence'

The theory of
topos-theoretic
bridges,
five years later

Olivia Caramello

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background


Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES



Classifying topos

Toposes as theories up to 'Morita-equivalence'

- Two mathematical theories have the same classifying topos (up to equivalence) if and only if they have the same 'semantical core', that is if and only if they are indistinguishable from a semantic point of view; such theories are said to be **Morita-equivalent**.
- Conversely, every Grothendieck topos arises as the classifying topos of some theory.
- So a topos can be seen as a **canonical representative** of equivalence classes of theories modulo Morita-equivalence.

Toposes as theories up to 'Morita-equivalence'

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

- Two mathematical theories have the same classifying topos (up to equivalence) if and only if they have the same 'semantical core', that is if and only if they are indistinguishable from a semantic point of view; such theories are said to be **Morita-equivalent**.
- Conversely, every Grothendieck topos arises as the classifying topos of some theory.
- So a topos can be seen as a **canonical representative** of equivalence classes of theories modulo Morita-equivalence.

Toposes as theories up to 'Morita-equivalence'

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

- Two mathematical theories have the same classifying topos (up to equivalence) if and only if they have the same 'semantical core', that is if and only if they are indistinguishable from a semantic point of view; such theories are said to be **Morita-equivalent**.
- Conversely, every Grothendieck topos arises as the classifying topos of some theory.
- So a topos can be seen as a **canonical representative** of equivalence classes of theories modulo Morita-equivalence.

Toposes as *bridges*

- The notion of Morita-equivalence is **ubiquitous** in Mathematics; indeed, it formalizes in many situations the feeling of 'looking at the same thing in different ways', or 'constructing a mathematical object through different methods'.
- In fact, many important **dualities** and **equivalences** in Mathematics can be naturally interpreted in terms of **Morita-equivalences**.
- On the other hand, **Topos Theory** itself is a primary source of Morita-equivalences. Indeed, different representations of the same topos can be interpreted as Morita-equivalences between different mathematical theories.
- Any two theories which are **biinterpretable** in each other are Morita-equivalent but, very importantly, the converse does not hold.
- Moreover, the notion of Morita-equivalence captures the intrinsic **dynamism** inherent to the notion of mathematical theory; indeed, a mathematical theory **alone** gives rise to an **infinite number** of Morita-equivalences.

Toposes as *bridges*

- The notion of Morita-equivalence is **ubiquitous** in Mathematics; indeed, it formalizes in many situations the feeling of 'looking at the same thing in different ways', or 'constructing a mathematical object through different methods'.
- In fact, many important **dualities** and **equivalences** in Mathematics can be naturally interpreted in terms of **Morita-equivalences**.
- On the other hand, **Topos Theory** itself is a primary source of Morita-equivalences. Indeed, different representations of the same topos can be interpreted as Morita-equivalences between different mathematical theories.
- Any two theories which are **biinterpretable** in each other are Morita-equivalent but, very importantly, the converse does not hold.
- Moreover, the notion of Morita-equivalence captures the intrinsic **dynamism** inherent to the notion of mathematical theory; indeed, a mathematical theory **alone** gives rise to an **infinite number** of Morita-equivalences.

Toposes as *bridges*

- The notion of Morita-equivalence is **ubiquitous** in Mathematics; indeed, it formalizes in many situations the feeling of 'looking at the same thing in different ways', or 'constructing a mathematical object through different methods'.
- In fact, many important **dualities** and **equivalences** in Mathematics can be naturally interpreted in terms of **Morita-equivalences**.
- On the other hand, **Topos Theory** itself is a primary source of Morita-equivalences. Indeed, different representations of the same topos can be interpreted as Morita-equivalences between different mathematical theories.
- Any two theories which are **biinterpretable** in each other are Morita-equivalent but, very importantly, the converse does not hold.
- Moreover, the notion of Morita-equivalence captures the intrinsic **dynamism** inherent to the notion of mathematical theory; indeed, a mathematical theory **alone** gives rise to an **infinite number** of Morita-equivalences.

Toposes as *bridges*


- The notion of Morita-equivalence is **ubiquitous** in Mathematics; indeed, it formalizes in many situations the feeling of 'looking at the same thing in different ways', or 'constructing a mathematical object through different methods'.
- In fact, many important **dualities** and **equivalences** in Mathematics can be naturally interpreted in terms of **Morita-equivalences**.
- On the other hand, **Topos Theory** itself is a primary source of Morita-equivalences. Indeed, different representations of the same topos can be interpreted as Morita-equivalences between different mathematical theories.
- Any two theories which are **biinterpretable** in each other are Morita-equivalent but, very importantly, the converse does not hold.
- Moreover, the notion of Morita-equivalence captures the intrinsic **dynamism** inherent to the notion of mathematical theory; indeed, a mathematical theory **alone** gives rise to an **infinite number** of Morita-equivalences.

Toposes as *bridges*

- The notion of Morita-equivalence is **ubiquitous** in Mathematics; indeed, it formalizes in many situations the feeling of 'looking at the same thing in different ways', or 'constructing a mathematical object through different methods'.
- In fact, many important **dualities** and **equivalences** in Mathematics can be naturally interpreted in terms of **Morita-equivalences**.
- On the other hand, **Topos Theory** itself is a primary source of Morita-equivalences. Indeed, different representations of the same topos can be interpreted as Morita-equivalences between different mathematical theories.
- Any two theories which are **biinterpretable** in each other are Morita-equivalent but, very importantly, the converse does not hold.
- Moreover, the notion of Morita-equivalence captures the intrinsic **dynamism** inherent to the notion of mathematical theory; indeed, a mathematical theory **alone** gives rise to an **infinite number** of Morita-equivalences.

Toposes as *bridges*

- The existence of **different theories** with the same classifying topos translates, at the technical level, into the existence of **different representations** (technically speaking, sites of definition) for the same topos.
- Topos-theoretic invariants can thus be used to transfer information from one theory to another:



- The **transfer of information** takes place by expressing a given invariant in terms of the different representation of the topos.

Toposes as bridges


- As such, different properties (resp. constructions) arising in the context of theories classified by the same topos are seen to be different *manifestations* of a *unique* property (resp. construction) lying at the topos-theoretic level.
- Any topos-theoretic invariant behaves in this context like a 'pair of glasses' which allows to discern certain information which is 'hidden' in the given Morita-equivalence; different invariants allow to **transfer** different information.
- This methodology is technically effective because the relationship between a topos and its representations is often **very natural**, enabling us to easily **transfer invariants** across different representations (and hence, between different theories).
- The **level of generality** represented by topos-theoretic invariants is ideal to capture several important features of mathematical theories. Indeed, as shown in my papers, important topos-theoretic invariants considered on the classifying topos $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}$ of a geometric theory $\mathbb{T}$ translate into interesting logical (i.e. syntactic or semantic) properties of $\mathbb{T}$.

Toposes as bridges

- As such, different properties (resp. constructions) arising in the context of theories classified by the same topos are seen to be different *manifestations* of a *unique* property (resp. construction) lying at the topos-theoretic level.
- Any topos-theoretic invariant behaves in this context like a 'pair of glasses' which allows to discern certain information which is 'hidden' in the given Morita-equivalence; different invariants allow to *transfer* different information.
- This methodology is technically effective because the relationship between a topos and its representations is often *very natural*, enabling us to easily *transfer invariants* across different representations (and hence, between different theories).
- The *level of generality* represented by topos-theoretic invariants is ideal to capture several important features of mathematical theories. Indeed, as shown in my papers, important topos-theoretic invariants considered on the classifying topos $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbb{T}}$ of a geometric theory $\mathbb{T}$ translate into interesting logical (i.e. syntactic or semantic) properties of $\mathbb{T}$.

Toposes as bridges

- The fact that topos-theoretic invariants specialize to important properties or constructions of natural mathematical interest is a clear indication of the **centrality** of these concepts in Mathematics. In fact, whatever happens at the level of toposes has '**uniform**' ramifications in Mathematics as a whole: for instance




Lattices of theories

This picture represents the lattice structure on the collection of the subtoposes of a topos $\mathcal{E}$ inducing lattice structures on the collection of 'quotients' of geometric theories $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathbf{S}$, $\mathbf{R}$ classified by it.

The 'bridge-building' technique

- **Decks** of 'bridges': **Morita-equivalences** (or more generally morphisms or other kinds of relations between toposes)
- **Arches** of 'bridges': **Site characterizations** (or more generally 'unravelings' of topos-theoretic invariants in terms of concrete representations of the relevant topos)



The 'bridge' yields a logical equivalence (or an implication) between the 'concrete' properties $P_{(\mathcal{C}, J)}$ and $Q_{(\mathcal{D}, K)}$, interpreted in this context as **manifestations** of a **unique** property I lying at the level of the topos.

Toposes as 'bridges' and the Erlangen Program

*The methodology 'toposes as bridges' is a vast extension of
Felix Klein's Erlangen Program (A. Joyal)*

More specifically:

- Every **group** gives rise to a **topos** (namely, the category of actions on it), but the notion of topos is much more general.
- As Klein classified geometries by means of their **automorphism groups**, so we can study first-order geometric theories by studying the associated **classifying toposes**.
- As Klein established surprising connections between very different-looking geometries through the study of the **algebraic properties** of the associated automorphism groups, so the methodology 'toposes as bridges' allows to discover non-trivial connections between properties, concepts and results pertaining to different mathematical theories through the study of the **categorical invariants** of their classifying toposes.

Structural translations

The method of bridges can be interpreted linguistically as a methodology for **translating** concepts from one context to another.

But which kind of translation is this?

In general, we can distinguish between two essentially different approaches to translation.

- The '**dictionary-oriented**' or 'bottom-up' approach, consisting in a dictionary-based renaming of the single words composing the sentences.
- The '**invariant-oriented**' or 'top-down' approach, consisting in the identification of appropriate concepts that should remain invariant in the translation, and in the subsequent analysis of how these invariants can be expressed in the two languages.

The topos-theoretic translations are of the latter kind. Indeed, the invariant properties are topos-theoretic invariants defined on toposes, and the expression of these invariants in terms of the two different theories is essentially determined by the **structural relationship** between the topos and its two different representations.

Some examples of 'bridges'

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

We shall now discuss a few 'bridges' established in the context of the **applications** mentioned at the beginning of the talk:

- Theories of presheaf type
- Topos-theoretic Fraïssé theorem
- Topological Galois theory
- Stone-type dualities

The results are completely *different*... but the methodology is always the *same*!

Theories of presheaf type

Definition

A geometric theory is said to be of **presheaf type** if it is classified by a presheaf topos.

Theories of presheaf type are very important in that they constitute the basic **'building blocks'** from which every geometric theory can be built. Indeed, as every Grothendieck topos is a subtopos of a presheaf topos, so every geometric theory is a 'quotient' of a theory of presheaf type.

Every **finitary algebraic theory** is of presheaf type, but this class contains **many other** interesting mathematical theories.

Any theory of presheaf type $\mathbb{T}$ gives rise to two different representations of its classifying topos, which can be used to build 'bridges' connecting its **syntax** and **semantics**:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & [\text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set}), \mathbf{Set}] \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}) & \\ \text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{\text{op}} & \text{---} & (\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}}) \end{array}$$

Here $\text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ denotes the category of finitely presentable $\mathbb{T}$ -models and $(\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{T}})$ is the syntactic site of $\mathbb{T}$.

Theories of presheaf type


Here are two examples of theorems obtained by applying the 'bridge' technique:

Theorem

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a theory of presheaf type over a signature Σ . Then

- (i) Any finitely presentable $\mathbb{T}$ -model in **Set** is presented by a $\mathbb{T}$ -irreducible geometric formula $\phi(\vec{x})$ over Σ ;
- (ii) Conversely, any $\mathbb{T}$ -irreducible geometric formula $\phi(\vec{x})$ over Σ presents a $\mathbb{T}$ -model.


In fact, the category $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{op}$ is equivalent to the full subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}}^{irr}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbb{T}}$ on the $\mathbb{T}$ -irreducible formulae.



Theories of presheaf type

Theorem

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a theory of presheaf type and suppose that we are given, for every finitely presentable **Set**-model $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{T}$, a subset $R_{\mathcal{M}}$ of $\mathcal{M}^n$ in such a way that every $\mathbb{T}$ -model homomorphism $h: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ maps $R_{\mathcal{M}}$ into $R_{\mathcal{N}}$. Then there exists a geometric formula-in-context $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $R_{\mathcal{M}} = [[\vec{x} \cdot \phi]]_{\mathcal{M}}$ for each finitely presentable $\mathbb{T}$ -model $\mathcal{M}$.




Topos-theoretic Fraïssé theorem

The following result, which generalizes Fraïssé's theorem in classical model theory, arises from a triple 'bridge'.

Definition


A set-base model M of a geometric theory $\mathbb{T}$ is said to be **homogeneous** if for any arrow $y : c \rightarrow M$ in $\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ and any arrow f in $\text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ there exists an arrow u in $\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ such that $u \circ f = y$:



Theorem

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a theory of presheaf type such that the category $\text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ is non-empty and has AP and JEP. Then the theory $\mathbb{T}'$ of homogeneous $\mathbb{T}$ -models is complete and atomic; in particular, assuming the axiom of countable choices, any two countable homogeneous $\mathbb{T}$ -models in $\mathbf{Set}$ are isomorphic.

Topos-theoretic Fraïssé theorem



Topological Galois theory

Theorem

Let $\mathbb{T}$ be a theory of presheaf type such that its category $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ of finitely presentable models satisfies AP and JEP, and let M be a *f.p. $\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ -universal* and *f.p. $\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ -ultrahomogeneous* model of $\mathbb{T}$. Then we have an *equivalence of toposes*

$$\mathbf{Sh}(f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{op}, J_{at}) \simeq \mathbf{Cont}(Aut(M)),$$

where $Aut(M)$ is endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence.

This equivalence is induced by the functor

$$F : f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{Cont}(Aut(M))$$

sending any model c of $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ to the set

$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})}(c, M)$ (endowed with the obvious action by $Aut(M)$) and any arrow $f : c \rightarrow d$ in $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ to the $Aut(M)$ -equivariant map

$$- \circ f : \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})}(d, M) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})}(c, M).$$

Topological Galois theory

The following result arises from two bridges, obtained respectively by considering the invariant notions of **atom** and of **arrow between atoms**.

Theorem

*Under the hypotheses of the last theorem, the functor F is **full and faithful** if and only if every arrow of $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ is a **strict monomorphism** and it is an **equivalence** onto the full subcategory $\mathbf{Cont}_t(\mathbf{Aut}(M))$ of $\mathbf{Cont}(\mathbf{Aut}(M))$ on the transitive actions if moreover $f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})$ is **atomically complete**.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{Sh}(f.p.\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{\text{op}}, J_{at}) \simeq \mathbf{Cont}(\mathbf{Aut}(M)) & \\ \text{f.p.}\mathbb{T}\text{-mod}(\mathbf{Set})^{\text{op}} & \text{---} & \mathbf{Cont}_t(\mathbf{Aut}(M)) \end{array}$$

This theorem generalizes **Grothendieck's theory of Galois categories** and can be applied to obtain Galois-type theories in different fields of Mathematics, for instance one for **finite groups** and one for **finite graphs**.

Stone-type dualities

All the classical Stone-type dualities/equivalences between special kinds of preorders and locales or topological spaces can be obtained by **functorializing** 'bridges' of the form

$$\mathcal{C} \text{ --- } \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{C}, J_{\mathcal{C}}) \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(\mathcal{D}, K_{\mathcal{D}}) \text{ --- } \mathcal{D}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is a $J_{\mathcal{C}}$ -dense subcategory of a preorder category $\mathcal{C}$.

For instance, take $\mathcal{D}$ equal to a Boolean algebra and $\mathcal{C}$ equal to the lattice of open sets of its Stone space for **Stone duality**, $\mathcal{C}$ equal to an atomic complete Boolean algebra and $\mathcal{D}$ equal to the collection of its atoms for **Lindenbaum-Tarski duality**.

This method also allows to generate many new dualities for other kinds of pre-ordered structures (for instance, a localic duality for **meet-semilattices**, a duality for **k-frames**, a duality for **disjunctively distributive lattices**, a duality for **preframes generated by their directedly irreducible elements** etc. It also naturally generalizes to the setting of arbitrary categories.

The unification programme

The evidence provided by the results obtained so far shows that toposes can effectively act as **unifying spaces** for transferring information between distinct mathematical theories.

We plan to continue the research along these lines to further develop this unification programme. **Central themes** in this project will be:

- Deriving specific Morita-equivalences from the common mathematical practice
- Introducing new methods for generating Morita-equivalences
- Introducing new topos-theoretic invariants admitting natural characterizations
- Compiling a sort of '**encyclopedia of invariants and their characterizations**' so that the 'working mathematician' can easily identify properties of theories and toposes which directly relate to his questions of interest
- **Applying** these methods in specific situations of interest in classical mathematics
- **Automatizing** the methodology 'toposes as bridges' on a computer to generate new and non-trivial mathematical results in a mechanical way

For further reading

- A list of papers is available from my website
www.oliviacaramello.com
- A [book](#) for Oxford University Press provisionally entitled
Lattices of Theories will appear in a few months.

The theory of
topos-theoretic
bridges,
five years later

Olivia Caramello

Introduction

Topos-theoretic
background

Toposes as
bridges

Examples of
'bridges'

Future directions

For further
reading

Topos à l'IHES

International conference on topos theory

Topos à l'IHÉS

23-27 November 2015
Marilyn and James Simons Conference Centre

Organizers: O. CARMELLO*, P. CARTIER, A. CONNES, S. DUGOWSON, A. KHELIF

23-24 November Tutorials by: **Olivia CARMELLO** et **André JOYAL**
25-27 November Invited speakers:

Mathieu ANEL (Université Paris-Diderot)
Luca BARBIERI-VIALE (Università degli Studi di Milano)
Jean BÉNABOU (Université Paris 13)
Denis-Charles CISINSKI (Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse)
Caterina CONSANI (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore)
Thierry COQUAND (University Göteborg)
Simon HENRY (Radboud University, Nijmegen)
André JOYAL (Université du Québec, Montréal)
Mike PREST (University of Manchester)
Urs SCHREIBER (Eduard Čech Institute for Algebra, Geometry and Physics, Prague)
Carlos SIMPSON (Université de Nice-Sophia-Antipolis)
Bertrand TOËN (Université de Montpellier 2)
Michel VAQUIÉ (Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse)

*Holder of a fellowship "Eduard Čech Institute for Algebra, Geometry and Physics" which supports the conference

Information & registration : www.ihes.fr

*Tous les chevaux du roi
y pourraient boire ensemble*
Alexander Grothendieck

Everyone is welcome!