A Two-level Foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

Pietro Sabelli
j.w.w. Maria Emilia Maietti

Department of Logic
Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences

TYPES 2025
University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, 9-13 June 2025

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathrm{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

However

Their judgments are undecidable

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

However

Their judgments are undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ no normalization procedure for their terms

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

However

Their judgments are undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ no normalization procedure for their terms

$\Rightarrow$ difficult to implement as proof-assistants
(not impossible: see Nuprl, Andromeda)

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

However

Their judgments are undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ no normalization procedure for their terms

$\Rightarrow$ difficult to implement as proof-assistants
(not impossible: see Nuprl, Andromeda)

Possible solution: switch to intensional theories with extensional features.

Who's afraid of extensionality?

Full extensional type theories

$$\frac{p : \mathsf{Id}(A, a, b)}{a = b : A}$$

- are closer to standard mathematical practice;
- save you from setoid and transport hells;
- enjoy simpler categorical semantics.

However

Their judgments are undecidable

$\Rightarrow$ no normalization procedure for their terms

$\Rightarrow$ difficult to implement as proof-assistants (not impossible: see Nuprl, Andromeda)

Possible solution: switch to intensional theories with extensional features. Or...

To Each His Own: two-level foundations

M. E. Maietti. "A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics". 2009

M. E. Maietti, G. Sambin. "Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics". 2005

G. Sambin, S. Valentini. "Building up a toolbox for Martin-Löf's type theory: subset theory". 1995

To Each His Own: two-level foundations

Following the forget-restore principle, a two-level foundation consists of:

M. E. Maietti. "A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics". 2009

M. E. Maietti, G. Sambin. "Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics". 2005

G. Sambin, S. Valentini. "Building up a toolbox for Martin-Löf's type theory: subset theory". 1995

To Each His Own: two-level foundations

Following the forget-restore principle, a two-level foundation consists of:

1. An intensional level for computer scientists. The computational content is stored in its decidable judgments.

M. E. Maietti. "A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics". 2009

M. E. Maietti, G. Sambin. "Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics". 2005

G. Sambin, S. Valentini. "Building up a toolbox for Martin-Löf's type theory: subset theory". 1995

To Each His Own: two-level foundations

Following the forget-restore principle, a two-level foundation consists of:

1. An intensional level for computer scientists. The computational content is stored in its decidable judgments.
2. An extensional level for the mathematicians, obtained by *forgetting* irrelevant content (e.g. explicit proof terms, type and term equalities). The computational content is "hidden" in its derivations.

M. E. Maietti. "A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics". 2009

M. E. Maietti, G. Sambin. "Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics". 2005

G. Sambin, S. Valentini. "Building up a toolbox for Martin-Löf's type theory: subset theory". 1995

To Each His Own: two-level foundations

Following the forget-restore principle, a two-level foundation consists of:

1. An intensional level for computer scientists. The computational content is stored in its decidable judgments.
2. An extensional level for the mathematicians, obtained by *forgetting* irrelevant content (e.g. explicit proof terms, type and term equalities). The computational content is "hidden" in its derivations.
3. An interpretation of the extensional level into the intensional one, which reads off an extensional derivation and *restore* its computational content as an intensional judgment.

M. E. Maietti. "A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics". 2009

M. E. Maietti, G. Sambin. "Toward a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics". 2005

G. Sambin, S. Valentini. "Building up a toolbox for Martin-Löf's type theory: subset theory". 1995

The Minimalist Foundation

Selling point: it formalizes agnostic mathematics. A foundation for those who don't want to commit to any particular foundation.

The Minimalist Foundation

Selling point: it formalizes agnostic mathematics. A foundation for those who don't want to commit to any particular foundation.

1. Its intensional level is **mTT**

   $\approx$ intensional Martin-Löf's type theory

   $+$ primitively-defined propositions

The Minimalist Foundation

Selling point: it formalizes agnostic mathematics. A foundation for those who don't want to commit to any particular foundation.

1. Its intensional level is **mTT**
   $\approx$ intensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
2. Its extensional level is **emTT**
   $\approx$ extensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
   $+$ quotients

The Minimalist Foundation

Selling point: it formalizes agnostic mathematics. A foundation for those who don't want to commit to any particular foundation.

1. Its intensional level is **mTT**
   $\approx$ intensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
2. Its extensional level is **emTT**
   $\approx$ extensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
   $+$ quotients
3. The restore interpretation is obtained through a setoid model.

The Minimalist Foundation

Selling point: it formalizes agnostic mathematics. A foundation for those who don't want to commit to any particular foundation.

1. Its intensional level is **mTT**
   $\approx$ intensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
2. Its extensional level is **emTT**
   $\approx$ extensional Martin-Löf's type theory
   $+$ primitively-defined propositions
   $+$ quotients
3. The restore interpretation is obtained through a setoid model.

Idea
The Minimalist Foundation is a predicative version of the Calculus of Constructions.

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

1. We take as the intensional level $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

1. We take as the intensional level $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$
   $= \mathbf{CC}$ extended with
   + cumulativity $\mathsf{Prop} \subset \mathsf{Type}$
   + basic inductive types N_0, N_1, List, $+$, and Σ

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

1. We take as the intensional level $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$
   $=$ **CC** extended with
   $+$ cumulativity $\mathrm{Prop} \subset \mathrm{Type}$
   $+$ basic inductive types N_0, N_1, List, $+$, and Σ
2. We take as the extensional level $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$
   $=$ the *impredicative* version of **emTT**

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

1. We take as the intensional level $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$
   $=$ **CC** extended with
   + cumulativity $\mathrm{Prop} \subset \mathrm{Type}$
   + basic inductive types N_0, N_1, List, $+$, and Σ
2. We take as the extensional level $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$
   $=$ the *impredicative* version of **emTT**
   $=$ extensional Martin-Löf's type theory extended with
   + a primitive kind of propositions
   + quotient types A/R
   + power types $\mathcal{P}(A)$ with canonical elements $\{x : A \mid \varphi(x)\}$

A two-level foundation for the Calculus of Constructions

1. We take as the intensional level $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathsf{ML}}$
   $=$ **CC** extended with
   $+$ cumulativity Prop $\subset$ Type
   $+$ basic inductive types N_0, N_1, List, $+$, and Σ
2. We take as the extensional level $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathsf{imp}}$
   $=$ the *impredicative* version of **emTT**
   $=$ extensional Martin-Löf's type theory extended with
   $+$ a primitive kind of propositions
   $+$ quotient types A/R
   $+$ power types $\mathcal{P}(A)$ with canonical elements $\{x : A \mid \varphi(x)\}$
3. The restore interpretation is obtained by lifting the setoid model of the Minimalist Foundation to the present theories.

Equiconsistency Results

Theorem

The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathsf{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathsf{ML}}$ *are equiconsistent.*

M. E. Maietti, P. Sabelli. "Equiconsistency of the Minimalist Foundation with its classical version". 2025

Equiconsistency Results

Theorem
The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ *are equiconsistent.*

Theorem
The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ *prove the same statements formulated in the language of higher-order arithmetic.*

M. E. Maietti, P. Sabelli. "Equiconsistency of the Minimalist Foundation with its classical version". 2025

Equiconsistency Results

Theorem

The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ *are equiconsistent.*

Theorem

The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\mathrm{ML}}$ *prove the same statements formulated in the language of higher-order arithmetic.*

Definition

Let $\mathbf{emTT}^{c}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ be the *classical version* $\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}$ obtained by adding the Law of Excluded Middle to it.

M. E. Maietti, P. Sabelli. "Equiconsistency of the Minimalist Foundation with its classical version". 2025

Equiconsistency Results

Theorem

The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\text{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\text{ML}}$ *are equiconsistent.*

Theorem

The two levels $\mathbf{emTT}_{\text{imp}}$ *and* $\mathbf{CC}_{\text{ML}}$ *prove the same statements formulated in the language of higher-order arithmetic.*

Definition

Let $\mathbf{emTT}^{c}_{\text{imp}}$ be the *classical version* $\mathbf{emTT}_{\text{imp}}$ obtained by adding the Law of Excluded Middle to it.

Theorem

$\mathbf{emTT}^{c}_{\text{imp}}$ *is equiconsistent with* $\mathbf{emTT}_{\text{imp}}$ *via a double-negation translation.*

M. E. Maietti, P. Sabelli. "Equiconsistency of the Minimalist Foundation with its classical version". 2025

Categorical semantics: quasi-toposes

Definition

A *quasi-topos* is a locally cartesian closed category with finite colimits and a regular subobject classifier.
It is *arithmetical* if moreover has a natural number object.

M. E. Maietti. "Modular correspondence between dependent type theories and categories including pretopoi and topoi". 2005
J. Penon. "Quasi-topos". 1973

Categorical semantics: quasi-toposes

Definition

A *quasi-topos* is a locally cartesian closed category with finite colimits and a regular subobject classifier.
It is *arithmetical* if moreover has a natural number object.

Theorem (*)

There is an equivalence of categories

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbf{ArithQuasiTopos} \arrow[rr, bend left, "\mathrm{Lang}"] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\simeq"] & & \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{emTT}_{\mathrm{imp}}) \arrow[ll, bend left, "\mathrm{Synt}"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

M. E. Maietti. "Modular correspondence between dependent type theories and categories including pretopoi and topoi". 2005
J. Penon. "Quasi-topos". 1973

Thanks for your attention!

A Rosetta Stone for quasi-toposes

emTT$_{\text{imp}}$	**Quasi-topos**
Context, (Closed) Type	Object
Dependent type	Arrow
Dependent mono-type	Monomorphism
Dependent proposition	Regular monomorphism
Term	Section
Type constructors	*Quasitopos structure*
Empty set	Initial object
Singleton set	Terminal object
Dependent sum	Dependent coproduct
Dependent product	Dependent product
Disjoint sum	Binary coproduct
Quotient set	Coequalizer
Equality	Equalizer
Universal quantifier	Dependent product
Powerset	Exponentials of the classifier