1 Introduction

A logical framework is language for defining logical systems, in particular type theories. The definition of a logical system consists of a collection of generators that populate a collection of classifying sorts, and a collection of equations that govern the objects of those sorts. The generators specify the sorts of the objects that constitute the logical system—say, the sort of types and, for each type, the sort of its elements—and in addition specify the objects of each of these sorts. These objects comprise the syntactic entities of the logical system—the types and their elements—and are specified using higher-order abstract syntax to express the binding and scopes of variables. The native equality of the framework is a congruence—an equivalence relation compatible with the generators—and defines substitution of objects for variables in another object. The defining equations of a logical system enrich the native equality to specify the behavior of the represented objects—such as the inversion and unicity properties of type constructors or connectives.

The integration of the defining equations with the native equations of the framework constrains the meaning of the defined system within the framework in the sense that any interpretation must obey the specified laws. There being no limitations on the nature of these equations, the enriched equality judgment of the framework may or may not be (feasibly or infeasibly) decidable. A syntactic logical framework Harper et al. (1993) is one that presents a logical system using only generators, and no relations, so that the induced equational theory is the native one, which is decidable. A semantic logical theory Smith et al. (1990) admits the specification of an equational theory that may not be (feasibly) decidable. Each logical system is a problem of its own, and it is in general difficult to transfer results from one case to another.

This note defines a semantic logical framework suitable for defining a broad—but by no means comprehensive—class of logical systems, including full-scale dependent type theories. It is a dependently typed language with a single Russellian universe of sorts, an extensional equality types governing the objects of a sort, and closed under the formation of dependent function types. The definition of a logical system is a form of context, called a signature, that specifies generators that populate the sorts and the equality types that govern them. The adequacy of a signature expresses the intended correspondence between the components of the represented logical system and their counterpart objects in the logical framework.
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Variables $X, x$

Classes $K, S ::= S | \text{Sort} | \{X : S_1\} K_2 | O_1 =_{S} O_2$

Objects $O, S ::= X | \{X : S_1\} S_2 | [X : S_1] K_2 | O_1 O_2 | \cdot$

Contexts $\Gamma ::= \varepsilon | \Gamma , X : K$

Figure 1: Abstract Syntax of LF

$\Gamma \text{ctx}$ $\Gamma$ is a context

$\Gamma \vdash K \text{cls}$ $K$ is a class in context $\Gamma$

$\Gamma \vdash O : K$ $O$ is an object of class $K$ in context $\Gamma$

$\Gamma \vdash K = K' \text{cls}$ $K$ and $K'$ are equal classes in context $\Gamma$

$\Gamma \vdash O = O' : K$ $O$ and $O'$ are equal objects of class $K$ in context $\Gamma$

Figure 2: Judgment Forms of LF

2 A Logical Framework

The syntax of the logical framework LF is given in Figure 1. It is a dependently typed $\lambda$-calculus with the structure specified in the introduction. The types of LF are called classes, $K$ or $S$, and their elements are called objects, $O$ or $S$.\(^1\) The notation is inspired by AUTOMATH, using square brackets for $\lambda$-abstraction, curly braces for $\Pi$-types, and juxtaposition for application. The binding and scopes of identifiers are understood; all classes and objects are identified up to renaming of bound variables. Substitution of an object for a variable within a class is defined in the usual way up to such renamings.

LF uses dependent function classes to define the hypothetico-general judgment form that is central to the definition of many logical systems. It uses (extensional) equality classes as a convenient way to present equational theories, and it uses the objects of class $\text{Sort}$ for the syntactic categories of a logical system. It is itself defined in the conventional manner in terms of the hypothetico-general judgment forms given in Figure 2.

A signature $\Sigma$ is a context. The variables declared in a signature are written $C$ and $c$ to suggest their role as constants, or generators. The specialization of the judgment forms of LF to a particular signature $\Sigma$ are defined in Figure 3 using concatenation of contexts defined in the evident manner.

The rules defining the LF judgment forms are given in Figures 4, 5, and 6 which are to be understood as constituting one simultaneous inductive definition. Rule incl specifies that every sort is itself a class; the class $\text{Sort}$ is thus formulated as a Russellian universe of “small” classes. Rule $\Pi_1$ and associated rules $\text{lam}$ and $\text{app}$, are restricted to require that $S_1$ be a sort, rather than a general class,\(^2\) and, similarly, equality classes are limited to equations between objects of a sort. The class $\text{Sort}$ is required to be closed under dependent function sorts. Rule $\text{eq}$ defines the class of equations between objects of a sort; rule $\text{self}$ specifies that every object is equal to itself. Rules $\text{obj-cls}$ and $\text{obj-eq-cls}$ specifies that equal classes classify the same objects. Rules $\text{app-lam}$ and $\text{lam-app}$ specify the inversion principles governing abstraction and application. Rule $\text{reflection}$ specifies that the equality class internalizes equality, and rule $\text{uniquity}$ specifies that an equation is “at most true,” there being no distinction between two objects witnessing its truth.

\(^1\)The double role of the meta-variable $S$ will be explained shortly.
\(^2\)But variables are nevertheless permitted to range over classes.
The essence of dependent typing is to generalize from types to families of types indexed by types: let \( \text{tp} \), then \( \text{el} (A) \rightarrow \text{tp} \) is the class of \( A \)-indexed families of types. As a starting point, a reformulation of Gödel’s \( T \) in the dependent setting is given in Figure 8. The main changes are to extend simple function types to dependent function types, and to generalize the recursor to eliminate into a \text{n}at-indexed family of result types. The fully explicit notation remains burdensome, but can be abbreviated in an implementation to permit inference of omitted parameters and arguments.

3 Two Type Theories

The benefit of a logical framework is that it permits the concise specification of type theories, or other logical systems, as a signature.

3.1 Gödel’s \( T \)

The signature \( \Sigma_T \) defining Gödel’s System \( T \) is given in Figure 7. The specifications are verbose, but an implementation would eliminate much of the redundancy.

3.2 Dependent \( T \)

The essence of dependent typing is to generalize from types to families of types indexed by types:
Figure 4: Formation Judgments

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SORT} & \quad & \text{INCL} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{ctx} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash \text{Sort cls} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{PI-CLS} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S_1 : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash S_1 \text{ cls} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash \{X : S_1\} K_2 \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{EQ-CLS} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O_1 : S & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O_2 : S & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O_1 =_S O_2 \text{ cls} & \quad & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{PI-SORT} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S_1 : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash X \vdash S_1 \vdash S_2 : \text{Sort} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash \{X : S_1\} S_2 : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{LAM} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash S_1 : \text{Sort} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash X \vdash S_1 \vdash O_2 : K_2 & \quad & \Gamma \vdash [X : S_1] O_2 : \{X : S_1\} K_2 & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{APP} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O : \{X : S_1\} K_2 & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O_1 : S_1 & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O O_1 : [O_1/X] K_2 & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SELF} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O : S & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash \bullet : O =_S O & \quad & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Figure 5: Structural Judgments

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{EMP} & \quad & \text{SNOC} & \quad \\
\varepsilon \vdash \text{ctx} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash X : K \text{ ctx} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{VAR} & \quad & \text{CLS-RFL} & \quad \\
\Gamma_1 X : K_1\Gamma_2 \vdash X : K & \quad & \Gamma \vdash K \vdash K \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{CLS-ST} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash K = K' \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash K'' = K'' \text{ cls} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash K = K'' \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{OBJ-RFL} & \quad & \text{OBJ-ST} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O : K & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O = O' : K & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O'' = O' : K & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O'' = O' : K & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{OBJ-CLS} & \quad & \text{OBJ-EQ-CLS} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O : K & \quad & \Gamma \vdash K = K' \text{ cls} & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash O : K' & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O = O' : K & \quad \\
\Gamma \vdash K = K' \text{ cls} & \quad & \Gamma \vdash O = O' : K & \quad \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incl-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S = S' : \text{Sort}$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S = S'$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pi-Class-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S_1 = S'_1 : \text{Sort}$,$\Gamma, X:S_1 \vdash K_2 = K'_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash {X : S_1} K_2 = {X : S'_1} K'_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eq-Class-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S = S' : \text{Sort}$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash {X : S_1} K_2 = {X : S'_1} K'_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pi-Sort-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S_1 = S'_1 : \text{Sort}$,$\Gamma, X:S_1 \vdash S_2 = S'_2 : \text{Sort}$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash {X : S_1} S_2 = {X : S'_1} S'_2 : \text{Sort}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lam-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash S_1 = S'_1$,$\Gamma \vdash S_1 = S'_1$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash X : S_1 \vdash O_2 = O'_2 : K_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>App-Eq</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O = O' : {X : S_1} K_2$,$\Gamma \vdash O_1 = O'_1$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O \equiv {O'_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>App-Lam</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma, X:S_1 \vdash O_2 = O'_2 : K_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash ([X : S_1] O_2) O_1 = [O_1 / X] O_2 : [O_1 / X] K_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lam-App</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O \equiv {O'_1</td>
<td>O_1 / X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflection</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O \equiv O_1 = S O_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O_1 = O_2 : S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unicity</strong></td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O \equiv O_1 = S O_2$</td>
<td>$\Gamma \vdash O' \equiv O_1 = S O_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Equality Judgments
tp : Sort
nat : tp
arr : tp → tp → tp
   el : tp → Sort
zero : el nat
succ : el nat → el nat
   rec : \{A : tp\} el A → (el nat → el A → el A) → el A
   \text{nat-\(\beta\)-z} : \{A : tp\} \{b : el A\} \{s : el nat → el A → el A\}
      \text{rec } A \ b \ s \ \text{zero } =_{el A} b
   \text{nat-\(\beta\)-s} : \{A : tp\} \{b : el A\} \{s : el nat → el A → el A\}
      \{n : el nat\} \text{rec } A \ b \ s \ (\text{succ } n) =_{el A} s \ n \ (\text{rec } A \ b \ s \ n)
   \text{lam} : \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : tp\} (el A_1 → el A_2) → el (arr A_1 A_2)
   \text{app} : \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : tp\} el (arr A_1 A_2) → el A_1 → el A_2
   \text{arr-\(\beta\)} : \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : tp\} \{F : el A_1 → el A_2\} \{M_1 : el A_1\}
      \text{app } A_1 A_2 (\text{lam } A_1 A_2 F) M_1 =_{el A_2} F \ M_1
   \text{arr-\(\eta\)} : \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : tp\} \{M : el (arr A_1 A_2)\}
      M =_{el (arr A_1 A_2)} \text{lam } A_1 A_2 ([x : el A_1] \text{app } A_1 A_2 M x)

Figure 7: Signature of Gödel’s T
\begin{align*}
tp &: \text{Sort} \\
nat &: tp \\
\pi &: \{A : tp\} (el A \to tp) \to tp \\
el &: tp \to \text{Sort} \\
zero &: el \text{nat} \\
succ &: el \text{nat} \to el \text{nat} \\
rec &: \{A : el \text{nat} \to tp\} \{b : el (A \text{zero})\} \{s : \{m : el \text{nat}\} el (A m) \to el (A (\text{succ} m))\} \\
\text{nat-}\beta\text{-z} &: \{A : el \text{nat} \to tp\} \{b : el (A \text{zero})\} \{s : \{m : el \text{nat}\} el (A m) \to el (A (\text{succ} m))\} \\
\text{rec Abs zero} &= el (A \text{zero}) b \\
\text{nat-}\beta\text{-s} &: \{A : el \text{nat} \to tp\} \{b : el (A \text{zero})\} \{s : \{m : el \text{nat}\} el (A m) \to el (A (\text{succ} m))\} \\
\text{rec Abs (succ n)} &= el (A (\text{succ} n)) s n (\text{rec Abs succ n}) \\
\text{lam} &: \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : el A_1 \to tp\} \{\{x : el A_1\} el (A_2 x)\} \to el (\text{pi} A_1 A_2) \\
\text{app} &: \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : el A_1 \to tp\} el (\text{pi} A_1 A_2) \to \{x : el A_1\} el (A_2 x) \\
\text{pi-}\beta &: \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : el A_1 \to tp\} \{F : \{x : el A_1\} el (A_2 x)\} \{M_1 : el A_1\} \\
\text{app A_1 A_2 (lam A_1 A_2 F) M_1} &= el (A_2 M_1) F M_1 \\
\text{pi-}\eta &: \{A_1 : tp\} \{A_2 : el A_1 \to tp\} \{M : el (\text{pi} A_1 A_2)\} \\
M &= el (\text{pi} A_1 A_2) \text{lam A_1 A_2 (x : el A_1) app A_1 A_2 M x} \\
\end{align*}

Figure 8: Signature of Dependent Gödel's T
3.3 Equality and Identity Types

Dependent types become interesting only when there are families of types, the principal examples of which are the extensional and intensional equality types. Their formulations are given in Figures 9 and 10. The elimination rule for the extensional equality type is the corresponding equality class whose elimination principle derives the corresponding equality judgment.\(^3\) It follows from this that equality at function type is extensional. The unicity rule for equality types states that any two objects of the same equality class are judgmentally equal; that is, equality classes are “at most true” in that the evidence is immaterial beyond its existence. The intensional identity type has the same formation and introduction rules, but has a different elimination rule expressing that the identity type is the least reflexive relation on the elements of a type. It is said to be intensional because it does not validate function extensionality.

3.4 Tarskian Universes

To add a cumulative hierarchy of universes requires that LF be extended with a class of natural numbers, written \textbf{Nat}, with elements 0 and \(i + 1\) for \(i : \textbf{Nat}\). A Tarskian formulation of universes is given in Figure 11. Each \(u_i\) is a \textit{universe} whose elements \(a\) are \textit{type codes} whose extension as a type is \(\text{ext} \ i \ a\). Cumulativity is expressed by sending \(a\) in \(u_i\) to \(\uparrow i \ a\) in \(u(i + 1)\). The extension of each of the type codes is defined by equations suggested by the notation.

\(^3\)It is sometimes said that equality reflection cannot be formulated in a logical framework, and is therefore suspect. But whether this is so depends on the choice of framework; it is certainly not problematic here.
Figure 11: Tarskian Universes
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