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## 1 Introduction

We consider the simplest type system $T S$ where we can formulate the main homotopy notions and some of the resizing axioms. For that we need the standard dependent products, dependent sums, Martin-Lof identity types and a universe $U U$. In our specification we use pure contexts (without judgements attached) to represent types which normally would be "parked" in an auxiliary universe $U U 1$ which can not be a part of any constructions. In our approach to specifications of type systems we do not need to introduce a name for this auxiliary universe.
We will build $T S$ in several steps. The first type system we consider has only $U U$ and dependent products and does not have any reduction rules (other than $\alpha$-conversion i.e. the renaming of bound variables). It will be denoted $T S_{0}$.

## 2 Type system $T S_{0}$ and its models

## 1 System of expressions underlying $T S_{0}$

The system of expressions underlying $T S_{0}$ is the free system of expressions with the following "generators":

1. constant $U U$,
2. one-variable quantifier of valency 2 denoted by $\Pi$,
3. one variable quantifier of valency 2 denoted by $\lambda$,
4. function symbol of valency 2 denoted by eval.

We use bold font to denote names of variables and the usual font to denote names of special symbols and expressions. We use the notation $\Pi \mathbf{x}: R . S$ for $\Pi$ which bounds variable $x$ and has $R$ and $S$ as
its first and second branch respectively. Similarly we use $\lambda \mathbf{x}: R . f$ for $\lambda$ which bounds $\mathbf{x}$ and has $R$ and $f$ as the first and second branch respectively. We use parenthesis to avoid ambiguity whenever necessary. For eval we use the standard convention when one writes $A B$ instead of eval $(A, B)$.
All expressions are considered modulo $\alpha$-equivalence i.e. up to renaming of bound variables.

## 2 Contexts and judgements of $T S_{0}$

Below are the rules for the formation of contexts and judgements in $T S_{0}$. As usual $\Gamma, \Delta$ etc. denote an arbitrary context or a segment of a context and it is understood that any expression has as free variables only the variables which have been declared and assigned types strictly prior to the use of this expression. We use commas to separate variable declarations in a context. The notation $\mathrm{x} \notin \Gamma$ means that the variable name x has not been declared in $\Gamma$.

## Empty context, diagonals

$$
\digamma \quad \frac{\Gamma, \mathbf{x}: T, \Gamma^{\prime} \vdash}{\Gamma, \mathbf{x}: T, \Gamma^{\prime} \vdash \mathbf{x}: T}
$$

## Universe structure

$$
\frac{\Gamma \vdash}{\Gamma, \mathrm{x}: U U \vdash} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash T: U U}{\Gamma, \mathrm{x}: T \vdash} \quad(\mathrm{x} \notin \Gamma)
$$

## Dependent Products

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{\Gamma, \mathbf{x}: R, \mathbf{y}: S \vdash}{\Gamma, \mathbf{z}: \Pi \mathbf{x}: R . S \vdash} \quad(\mathbf{z} \notin \Gamma) \\
\frac{\Gamma, \mathbf{x}: R \vdash s: S}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda \mathbf{x}: R . s: \prod \mathbf{x}: R . S} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash f: \prod \mathbf{x}: R . S \quad \Gamma \vdash r: R}{\Gamma \vdash f r: S[\mathbf{x} / r]}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Dependent products and the universe

$$
\frac{\Gamma \vdash R: U U \quad \Gamma, \mathrm{x}: R \vdash S: U U}{\Gamma \vdash \Pi \mathrm{x}: R \cdot S: U U}
$$

Remark 2.1 One could re-write our specification using two universes $U U$ and $U U 1$ and only using judgements but not "pure" contexts. Then the system described so far will look very similar to the system $\lambda \underline{\omega}$ of Barndregt's $\lambda$-cube (see [1][p. 206]) which has the "signature" (loc.cit. p.214):

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathcal{S}=(U U, U U 1) \\
\mathcal{A}=((U U, U U 1)) \\
\mathcal{R}=((U U, U U, U U),(U U 1, U U 1, U U 1))
\end{gathered}
$$

and considered without $\beta$-reduction. However, we also have the inclusion $U U \subset U U 1$ which takes us outside of the class of systems considered by Barendregt. We prefer the specification given above since it emphasizes the fact that the second universe $U U 1$ can not be a part of any constructions.

Remark 2.2 As was pointed out by Dan Doel, in the two universe specification, it is possible to achieve the effect of having the inclusion $U U \subset U U 1$ by introducing an additional rule to the $\mathcal{R}$ component of the signature of the form $(U U, U U, U U 1)$. The idea is that since $\Pi$ is the only type forming constructor any particular type expression which types to $U U$ according to the repeated application of the $(U U, U U, U U)$ rule can be re-typed to $U U 1$ using the rule $(U U, U U, U U 1)$ the last time the rule $(U U, U U, U U)$ was used. This however requires a formal proof and leads to proliferation of rules in the case of more complex systems and we prefer to have a direct inclusion rule instead.

## 3 Proof that $T S_{0}$ is a type system

Let us recall the following definitions.
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