

The basic idea of natural deduction in Martin-Löf's style is to let each logical connective unfold into its meta-level representation in terms of hypothetical and parametric judgments. The proof really takes place in the meta-language, using the properties of these judgments. Logical connectives are *internalizations* of pre-existing meta-level judgments.

The question arises: how concise can we be? What is the minimal number of connectives needed to internalize *all* the essential features of the meta-language (hyp. and para. judgments)?

The answer, perhaps surprisingly, is *one* connective, together with function types in the term language. The steps of the construction are:

1. Parametric judgments are converted to meta-functions.
2. Hypothetical judgments are converted to meta-equality.
3. Meta-functions are internalized by object functions.
4. Meta-equality is internalized by object equality.

First, we establish the syntactic categories of types, terms, and proofs.

```
tp  : type.
tm  : tp -> type.
o   : tp.
pf  : tm o -> type.
```

We define some preliminary concepts surrounding meta-equality (Leibniz equality).

```
eqv = [P] [Q] (pf P -> pf Q) & (pf Q -> pf P).
eq  = [S] [T] {p:tm A -> tm o} eqv (p S) (p T).
feq = [F] [G] {p:(tm A -> tm B) -> tm o} eqv (p F) (p G).
```

Now we introduce axioms for each step of the construction.

1. *Parametric judgments are converted to meta-functions.*

```
abs  : ({x} eq (F x) (G x)) -> feq F G.
```

The converse of `abs` is already a consequence of the general properties of hypothetico-parametric judgments.

2. *Hypothetical judgments are converted to meta-equality.*

```
oext : eqv P Q -> eq P Q.
```

Again, the converse follows by general properties of hypothetico-parametric judgments.

3. *Meta-functions are internalized by object functions.*

```
-->  : tp -> tp -> tp.
lam  : (tm A -> tm B) -> tm (A --> B).
app  : tm (A --> B) -> (tm A -> tm B).
beta : feq (app (lam F)) F.
eta  : eq (lam (app T)) T.
```

4. *Meta-equality is internalized by object equality.*

```
==   : tm A -> tm A -> tm o.
in   : eq S T -> pf (S == T).
out  : pf (S == T) -> eq S T.
```

The definition of all the usual connectives of intuitionistic higher-order logic in terms of `==` is left as an exercise for the reader. I conjecture that the provable closed formulae of this system are exactly those of HOL Light (without set types, infinity, or choice).