This is a repository copy of *Constructive zermelo-fraenkel set theory, power set, and the calculus of constructions*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/75182/

Book Section:
Rathjen, M (2012) Constructive zermelo-fraenkel set theory, power set, and the calculus of constructions. In: Dybjer, P, Lindström, S, Palmgren, E and Sundholm, G, (eds.) Epistemology versus ontology: Essays on the philosophy and foundations of mathematics in honour of Per Martin-Löf. Logic, Epistemology, and the Unity of Science, 27 . Springer , Dordrecht, Netherlands , 313 - 349. ISBN 9789400744356

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4435-6

Constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory, Power Set, and the Calculus of Constructions

Michael Rathjen[*]

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of Leeds

Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

`rathjen@maths.leeds.ac.uk`

May 4, 2012

Abstract

Full intuitionistic Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, **IZF**, is obtained from constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, **CZF**, by adding the full separation axiom scheme and the power set axiom. The strength of **CZF** plus full separation is the same as that of second order arithmetic, using a straightforward realizability interpretation in classical second order arithmetic and the fact that second order Heyting arithmetic is already embedded in **CZF** plus full separation. This paper is concerned with the strength of **CZF** augmented by the power set axiom, $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$. It will be shown that it is of the same strength as Power Kripke-Platek set theory, $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$, as well as a certain system of type theory, $\mathbf{MLV_P}$, which is a calculus of constructions with one universe. The reduction of $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$ to $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ uses a realizability interpretation wherein a realizer for an existential statement provides a set of witnesses for the existential quantifier rather than a single witness. The reduction of $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ to $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$ employs techniques from ordinal analysis which, when combined with a special double negation interpretation that respects extensionality, also show that $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ can be reduced to **CZF** with the negative power set axiom. As **CZF** augmented by the latter axiom can be interpreted in $\mathbf{MLV_P}$ and this type theory has a types-as-classes interpretation in $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$, the circle will be completed.

1 Introduction

If the power set operation is considered as a definite operation, but the universe of all sets is regarded as an indefinite totality, we are led to systems of set theory having Power Set as an axiom but only Bounded Separation axioms and intuitionistic logic for reasoning about the universe at large. The study of subsystems of **ZF** formulated in intuitionistic logic with Bounded Separation but containing the Power Set axiom was apparently initiated by Pozsgay [27, 28] and then pursued

---

more systematically by Tharp [39], Friedman [12] and Wolf [43]. These systems are actually semi-intuitionistic as they contain the law of excluded middle for bounded formulae. Pozsgay had conjectured that his system is as strong as **ZF**, but Tharp and Friedman proved its consistency in **ZF** using a modification of Kleene's method of realizability. Wolf established the equivalence in strength of several related systems.

In the classical context, weak subsystems of **ZF** with Bounded Separation and Power Set have been studied by Thiele [40], Friedman [13] and more recently at great length by Mathias [20]. Mac Lane has singled out and championed a particular fragment of **ZF**, especially in his book *Form and Function* [18]. *Mac Lane Set Theory*, christened **MAC** in [20], comprises the axioms of Extensionality, Null Set, Pairing, Union, Infinity, Power Set, Bounded Separation, Foundation, and Choice. **MAC** is naturally related to systems derived from topos-theoretic notions and, moreover, to type theories.

Type theories à la Martin-Löf embodying weak forms of Power Set (such as the calculus of constructions with its impredicative type of propositions) have been studied by Aczel [3, 4] and Gambino [15].

Intuitionistic Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, **IZF**, is obtained from **CZF**, by adding the full separation axiom scheme and the power set axiom. The strength of **CZF** plus full separation, as has been shown by Lubarsky [17], is the same as that of second order arithmetic, using a straightforward realizability interpretation in classical second order arithmetic and the fact that second order Heyting arithmetic is already embedded in **CZF** plus full separation. This paper is concerned with the strength of **CZF** augmented by the power set axiom, $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$. It will be shown that it is of the same strength as Power Kripke-Platek set theory, $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$, as well as a certain system of type theory, $\mathbf{MLV_P}$, which is a version of the calculus of constructions with one universe. It is perhaps worth pointing out that $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ is not the theory **KP** plus power set, **Pow**. An upper bound for the proof-theoretic strength of $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$ is Zermelo's set theory, **Z**, so that it doesn't even prove the existence of $V_{\omega+\omega}$ whereas $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ proves the existence of V_α for any ordinal α.

The reduction of $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$ to $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ uses a realizability interpretation wherein a realizer for an existential statement provides a set of witnesses for the existential quantifier rather than a single witness. Tharp [39] also used realizability to give an interpretation of a semi-intuitionistic set theory closely related to Pozsgay's system. Tharp's realizers are codes for $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ definable partial functions, i.e., functions whose graphs are Σ_1 in the powerset operation $\mathcal{P}(x)$, which is taken as a primitive. For the realizability interpretation he needs a $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{P}}$-definable search operation on the set-theoretic universe and in point of fact assumes $V = L$. As it turns out, this realizability interpretation could be formalized in $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P}) + V = L$. However, the assumption $V = L$ is not harmless in this context since $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P}) + V = L$ is a much stronger theory than $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ (cf. [20, 35]), and therefore one would like to remove this hypothesis. This paper shows that this can be achieved by using a notion of realizability with sets of witnesses in the existential quantifier case, and thereby yields a realizability interpretation of a theory in a theory of equal proof-theoretic strength.

The reduction of $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ to $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is based on results from [35] whose proofs are obtained via techniques from ordinal analysis. They can be used to show that $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ is reducible to **CZF** with the *Negative Power Set Axiom*. As **CZF** plus the negative powerset can be interpreted in $\mathbf{MLV_P}$, utilizing work from [4, 15], and the latter type theory has a types-as-classes interpretation in $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$, the circle will be completed. We also get a characterization of a subtheory of Tharp's set theory [39]. The theory in [39] has the following axioms (cf. section 2.1): Extensionality, Empty Set, Pairing , Union, Powerset, Infinity, Set Induction, Strong Collection[1], Excluded Middle for

---

[1]Curiously, Tharp calls this scheme Replacement.

power bounded formulae[2] and an axiom **Ord-Im** which asserts that every set is the image of an ordinal, i.e., for every set x there exists an ordinal α and a surjective function $f : \alpha \to x$.

In the Theorem below we use several acronyms. **RDC** stands for the relativized dependent choices axiom. Given a family of sets $(B_a)_{a \in A}$ over a set A we define the dependent product $\prod_{a \in A} B_a$ and the dependent sum $\sum_{a \in A} B_a$ as follows:

$$\prod_{a \in A} B_a \quad := \quad \{f \mid \mathrm{Fun}(f) \wedge \mathrm{dom}(f) = A \wedge \forall z \in A \ f(z) \in B_a\}$$

$$\sum_{a \in A} B_a \quad := \quad \{\langle a, u \rangle \mid a \in A \wedge u \in B_a\}$$

where $\mathrm{Fun}(f)$ signifies that f is a function and $\mathrm{dom}(f)$ stands for its domain.

Let X be the smallest class of sets containing ω and all elements of ω which is closed under dependent products and sums. $\mathbf{\Pi\Sigma - AC}$ asserts that every set A in X is a base, i.e., if $(B_a)_{a \in A}$ is family of sets over A such that B_a is inhabited for every $a \in A$ then there exists a function f with domain A such that $\forall a \in A \ f(a) \in A_a$. (For more information on $\mathbf{\Pi\Sigma - AC}$ see [2, 30, 34].)

The negative power set axiom, $\mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$ for short, asserts that for every set a there exists a set c containing all the subsets x of a for which $\forall u \in a(\neg\neg u \in x \to u \in x)$ holds.

The intuitionistic version of $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$. Both $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ and $\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$ can be subjected to ordinal analysis which reduces them to theories $\mathbf{Z} + \{`V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$ and $\mathbf{IZ} + \{`V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$, respectively. Here $\mathbf{Z}$ stands for classical Zermelo set theory and $\mathbf{IZ}$ for its intuitionistic version. BH refers to an ordinal representation system for the Bachmann-Howard ordinal (cf. [37]). For $\tau \in \mathrm{BH}$ the statement 'V_τ *exists*' expresses that the powerset operation can be iterated τ times.

Theorem 1.1 *The following theories are of the same proof-theoretic strength.*

(i) $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$

(ii) $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}} + \mathbf{RDC} + \mathbf{\Pi\Sigma - AC}$

(iii) $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$

(iv) $\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$

(v) *Tharp's [39] quasi-intuitionistic set theory but without* **Ord-Im**.

(vi) $\mathbf{MLV_P}$

(vii) $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$

(viii) $\mathbf{Z} + \{`V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$

(ix) $\mathbf{IZ} + \{`V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$

Presenting a proof of Theorem 1.1 is the main goal of this article.

---

[2] The $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$-formulae of Definition 2.4.

2 The theories CZF and KP($\mathcal{P}$)

2.1 CZF

We briefly summarize the language and axioms of **CZF**, a variant of Myhill's CST (see [23]). The language of **CZF** is based on the same first order language as that of classical Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory, whose only non-logical symbol is $\in$. The logic of **CZF** is intuitionistic first order logic with equality. Among its non-logical axioms are *Extensionality*, *Pairing* and *Union* in their usual forms. **CZF** has additionally axiom schemata which we will now proceed to summarize.

Infinity: $\exists x \forall u[u \in x \leftrightarrow (\emptyset = u \vee \exists v \in x\; u = v + 1)]$ where $v + 1 = v \cup \{v\}$.

Set Induction: $\forall x[\forall y \in x A(y) \rightarrow A(x)] \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$

Bounded Separation: $\forall a \exists b \forall x[x \in b \leftrightarrow x \in a \wedge A(x)]$

for all *bounded* formulae A. A set-theoretic formula is *bounded* or *restricted* if it is constructed from prime formulae using $\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \forall x \in y$ and $\exists x \in y$ only.

Strong Collection: For all formulae A,

$$\forall a[\forall x \in a \exists y A(x,y) \;\rightarrow\; \exists b\, [\forall x \in a\, \exists y \in b\, A(x,y) \wedge \forall y \in b\, \exists x \in a\, A(x,y)]].$$

Subset Collection: For all formulae B,

$$\forall a \forall b \exists c \forall u\, [\forall x \in a\, \exists y \in b\, B(x,y,u) \;\rightarrow$$
$$\exists d \in c\, [\forall x \in a\, \exists y \in d\, B(x,y,u) \wedge \forall y \in d\, \exists x \in a\, B(x,y,u)]].$$

The Powerset Axiom, **Pow**, is the following:

$$\forall x\, \exists y\, \forall z\, (z \subseteq x \rightarrow z \in y).$$

Remark 2.1 Subset Collection plays no role when we study **CZF**$_{\mathcal{P}}$ since it is a consequence of **Pow** and the other axioms of **CZF**.

To save us work when proving realizability of the axioms of **CZF** it is useful to know that the axiom scheme of bounded separation can be deduced from a single instance (in the presence of strong collection).

Lemma 2.2 *Let* **Binary Intersection** *be the statement* $\forall x \forall y \exists z\, x \cap y = z$. *If* **CZF**$_0$ *denotes* **CZF** *without bounded separation and subset collection, then every instance of bounded separation is provable in* **CZF**$_0$ + Binary Intersection.

Proof: [5, Proposition 4.8] is a forerunner of this result. It is proved in the above form in [6, Corollary 9.5.7]. $\qquad\square$

2.2 Kripke-Platek set theory

A particularly interesting (classical) subtheory of **ZF** is Kripke-Platek set theory, **KP**. Its standard models are called *admissible sets*. One of the reasons that this is an important theory is that a great deal of set theory requires only the axioms of **KP**. An even more important reason is that admissible sets have been a major source of interaction between model theory, recursion theory and set theory (cf. [7]). **KP** arises from **ZF** by completely omitting the power set axiom and restricting separation and collection to bounded formulae. These alterations are suggested by the informal notion of 'predicative'. To be more precise, the axioms of **KP** consist of *Extensionality, Pair, Union, Infinity, Bounded Separation*

$$\exists x\, \forall u\, [u \in x \leftrightarrow (u \in a \,\wedge\, A(u))]$$

for all bounded formulae $A(u)$, *Bounded Collection*

$$\forall x \in a\, \exists y\, B(x,y) \,\rightarrow\, \exists z\, \forall x \in a\, \exists y \in z\, B(x,y)$$

for all bounded formulae $B(x,y)$, and *Set Induction*

$$\forall x\, [(\forall y \in x\, C(y)) \rightarrow C(x)] \,\rightarrow\, \forall x\, C(x)$$

for all formulae $C(x)$.

A transitive set A such that $(A, \in)$ is a model of **KP** is called an *admissible set*. Of particular interest are the models of **KP** formed by segments of Gödel's *constructible hierarchy* L. The constructible hierarchy is obtained by iterating the definable powerset operation through the ordinals

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{L}_0 &= \emptyset, \\
\mathrm{L}_\lambda &= \bigcup\{\mathrm{L}_\beta : \beta < \lambda\}\ \lambda\ \text{limit} \\
\mathrm{L}_{\beta+1} &= \{X :\ X \subseteq \mathrm{L}_\beta;\ X\ \text{definable over}\ \langle \mathrm{L}_\beta, \in \rangle\}.
\end{aligned}$$

So any element of L of level α is definable from elements of L with levels $< \alpha$ and the parameter L_α. An ordinal α is *admissible* if the structure $(\mathrm{L}_\alpha, \in)$ is a model of **KP**.

Remark 2.3 Our system **KP** is not quite the same as the theory **KP** in Mathias' paper [20], p. 111. There **KP** does not have an axiom of Infinity and set induction only holds for Σ_1 formulae, or what amounts to the same, Π_1 foundation ($A \neq \emptyset \rightarrow \exists x \in A\ x \cap A = \emptyset$ for Π_1 classes A).

2.3 Power Kripke-Platek set theory

We use subset bounded quantifiers $\exists x \subseteq y\, \ldots$ and $\forall x \subseteq y\, \ldots$ as abbreviations for $\exists x (x \subseteq y \wedge \ldots)$ and $\forall x (x \subseteq y \rightarrow \ldots)$, respectively.

We call a formula of $\mathcal{L}_\in \Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$ if all its quantifiers are of the form $Q\, x \subseteq y$ or $Q\, x {\in} y$ where Q is $\forall$ or $\exists$ and x and y are distinct variables.

Definition 2.4 The $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$ formulae are the smallest class of formulae containing the atomic formulae closed under $\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow, \neg$ and the quantifiers

$$\forall x \in a,\ \exists x \in a,\ \forall x \subseteq a,\ \exists x \subseteq a.$$

Definition 2.5 $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ has the same language as **ZF**. Its axioms are the following: Extensionality, Pairing, Union, Infinity, Powerset, $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$-Separation and $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$-Collection.

The transitive models of $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ have been termed **power admissible** sets in [13].

Remark 2.6 Alternatively, $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ can be obtained from $\mathbf{KP}$ by adding a function symbol $\mathcal{P}$ for the powerset function as a primitive symbol to the language and the axiom

$$\forall y \, [y \in \mathcal{P}(x) \leftrightarrow y \subseteq x]$$

and extending the schemes of Δ_0 Separation and Collection to the Δ_0 formulae of this new language.

Lemma 2.7 $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ *is* **not** *the same theory as* $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$. *Indeed,* $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$ *is a much weaker theory than* $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ *in which one cannot prove the existence of* $V_{\omega + \omega}$.

Proof: Note that in the presence of full Separation and Infinity there is no difference between our system $\mathbf{KP}$ and Mathias's [20] $\mathbf{KP}$. It follows from [20, Theorem 14] that $\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{AC}$ is conservative over $\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{AC}$ for stratifiable sentences. $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{AC}$ are of the same proof-theoretic strength as the constructible hierarchy can be simulated in $\mathbf{Z}$; a stronger statement is given in [20, Theorem 16]. As a result, $\mathbf{Z}$ and $\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{KP}$ are of the same strength. As $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$ is a subtheory of $\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{KP}$, we have that $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$ is not stronger than $\mathbf{Z}$. If $\mathbf{KP} + \mathbf{Pow}$ could prove the existence of $V_{\omega + \omega}$ it would prove the consistency of $\mathbf{Z}$. On the other hand $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ prove the existence of V_α for every ordinal α and hence proves the existence of arbitrarily large transitive models of Z. □

Remark 2.8 Our system $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ is not quite the same as the theory $\mathbf{KP}^{\mathcal{P}}$ in Mathias' paper [20, 6.10]. The difference between $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ and $\mathbf{KP}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is that in the latter system set induction only holds for $\Sigma_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ formulae, or what amounts to the same, $\Pi_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ foundation ($A \neq \emptyset \to \exists x \in A \; x \cap A = \emptyset$ for $\Pi_1^{\mathcal{P}}$ classes A).

2.4 Extended E-recursive functions

We would like to have unlimited application of sets to sets, i.e. we would like to assign a meaning to the symbol $[\,a\,](x)$ where a and x are sets. In generalized recursion theory this is known as *E-recursion* or *set recursion* (see, e.g., [24] or [38, Ch.X]). However, we shall introduce an extended notion of E-computability, christened $E_\wp$-computability, rendering the functions $exp(a, b) = {}^a b$ and $\mathcal{P}(x) = \{u \mid u \subseteq x\}$ computable as well, (where ${}^a b$ denotes the set of all functions from a to b). Moreover, the constant function with value ω is taken as an initial function in $E_\wp$-computability. $E_\wp$-computability is closely related to power recursion, where the power set operation is regarded to be an initial function. The latter notion has been studied by Moschovakis [21] and Moss [22].

There is a lot of leeway in setting up $E_\wp$-recursion. The particular schemes we use are especially germane to our situation. Our construction will provide a specific set-theoretic model for the elementary theory of operations and numbers **EON** (see, e.g., [8, VI.2], or the theory **APP** as described in [42, Ch.9, Sect.3]). We utilize encoding of finite sequences of sets by the usual pairing function $\langle, \rangle$ with $\langle x, y \rangle = \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\}$, letting $\langle x \rangle = x$ and $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle, x_{n+1} \rangle$. We use functions $(\,)_0$ and $(\,)_1$ to retrieve the left and right components, respectively, of an ordered pair $a = \langle x, y \rangle$, i.e., $(a)_0 = x$ and $(a)_1 = y$.

Below we use the notation $[\,x\,](y)$ rather than the more traditional $\{x\}(y)$ to avoid any ambiguity with the singleton set $\{x\}$.

Definition 2.9 ($\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$, $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$) First, we select distinct non-zero natural numbers $\mathbf{k}$, $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{p_0}$, $\mathbf{p_1}$, $\mathbf{s_N}$, $\mathbf{p_N}$, $\mathbf{d_N}$, $\mathbf{\bar{0}}$, $\bar{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, $\boldsymbol{\upsilon}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, $\mathbf{i_1}$, $\mathbf{i_2}$, $\mathbf{i_3}$, and $\bar{\wp}$ which will provide indices for special $E_\wp$-recursive partial (class) functions. Inductively we shall define a class $\mathbb{E}$ of triples $\langle e, x, y \rangle$. Rather than

"$\langle e, x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E}$", we shall write "$[e](x) \simeq y$", and moreover, if $n > 0$, we shall use $[e](x_1, \ldots, x_n) \simeq y$ to convey that

$$[e](x_1) \simeq \langle e, x_1 \rangle \;\wedge\; [\langle e, x_1 \rangle](x_2) \simeq \langle e, x_1, x_2 \rangle \;\wedge\; \ldots \;\wedge\; [\langle e, x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1} \rangle](x_n) \simeq y.$$

We shall say that $[e](x)$ is defined, written $[e](x) \downarrow$, if $[e](x) \simeq y$ for some y. Let $\mathbb{N} := \omega$. $\mathbb{E}$ is defined by the following clauses:

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{k}](x, y) &\simeq x \\
[\mathbf{s}](x, y, z) &\simeq [[x](z)]([y](z)) \\
[\mathbf{p}](x, y) &\simeq \langle x, y \rangle \\
[\mathbf{p_0}](x) &\simeq (x)_0 \\
[\mathbf{p_1}](x) &\simeq (x)_1 \\
[\mathbf{s_N}](n) &\simeq n + 1 \text{ if } n \in \mathbb{N} \\
[\mathbf{p_N}](0) &\simeq 0 \\
[\mathbf{p_N}](n + 1) &\simeq n \text{ if } n \in \mathbb{N} \\
[\mathbf{d_N}](n, m, x, y) &\simeq x \text{ if } n, m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n = m \\
[\mathbf{d_N}](n, m, x, y) &\simeq y \text{ if } n, m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n \neq m \\
[\bar{\mathbf{0}}](x) &\simeq 0 \\
[\bar{\omega}](x) &\simeq \omega \\
[\boldsymbol{\pi}](x, y) &\simeq \{x, y\} \\
[\boldsymbol{\upsilon}](x) &\simeq \bigcup x \\
[\boldsymbol{\gamma}](x, y) &\simeq x \cap (\bigcap y) \\
[\boldsymbol{\rho}](x, y) &\simeq \{[x](u) \mid u \in y\} \text{ if } [x](u) \text{ is defined for all } u \in y \\
[\boldsymbol{i_1}](x, y, z) &\simeq \{u \in x \mid y \in z\} \\
[\boldsymbol{i_2}](x, y, z) &\simeq \{u \in x \mid u \in y \to u \in z\} \\
[\boldsymbol{i_3}](x, y, z) &\simeq \{u \in x \mid u \in y \to z \in u\} \\
[\bar{\wp}](x) &\simeq \mathcal{P}(x).
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $[\mathbf{s}](x, y, z)$ is not defined unless $[x](z)$, $[y](z)$ and $[[x](z)]([y](z))$ are already defined. The clause for $\mathbf{s}$ is thus to be read as a conjunction of the following clauses: $[\mathbf{s}](x) \simeq \langle \mathbf{s}, x \rangle$, $[\langle \mathbf{s}, x \rangle](y) \simeq \langle \mathbf{s}, x, y \rangle$ and, if there exist a, b, c such that $[x](z) \simeq a$, $[y](z) \simeq b$, $[a](b) \simeq c$, then $[\langle \mathbf{s}, x, y \rangle](z) \simeq c$. Similar restrictions apply to $\boldsymbol{\rho}$.

Lemma 2.10 $(\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}, \mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P}))$ $\mathbb{E}$ is an inductively defined class and $\mathbb{E}$ is functional in that for all e, x, y, y',

$$\langle e, x, y \rangle \in \mathbb{E} \;\wedge\; \langle e, x, y' \rangle \in \mathbb{E} \;\Rightarrow\; y = y'.$$

Proof. The inductive definition of $\mathbb{E}$ falls under the heading of [5, Theorem 11.4]. If $[e](x) \simeq y$ the uniqueness of y follows by induction on the stages (see [5, Lemma 5.2]) of that inductive definition. $\qquad\square$

Definition 2.11 *Application terms* are defined inductively as follows:

(i) The constants The constants $\mathbf{k}$, $\mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{p_0}$, $\mathbf{p_1}$, $\mathbf{s_N}$, $\mathbf{p_N}$, $\mathbf{d_N}$, $\bar{\mathbf{0}}$, $\bar{\omega}$, γ, ρ, υ, π, $\mathbf{i_1}$, $\mathbf{i_2}$ $\mathbf{i_3}$, and $\bar{\wp}$ singled out in Definition 2.9 are *application terms*;

(ii) variables are *application terms*;

(iii) if s and t are *application terms* then (st) is an *application term*.

Definition 2.12 Application terms are easily formalized in $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$. However, rather than translating application terms into the set–theoretic language of $\mathbf{CZF}_{\mathcal{P}}$, we define the translation of expressions of the form $t \simeq u$, where t is an application term and u is a variable. The translation proceeds along the way that t was built up:

$$[c \simeq u]^\wedge \quad \text{is} \quad c = u \text{ if } c \text{ is a constant or a variable;}$$
$$[(st) \simeq u]^\wedge \quad \text{is} \quad \exists x \exists y ([s \simeq x]^\wedge \wedge [t \simeq y]^\wedge \wedge \langle x, y, u \rangle \in \mathbb{E}).$$

Abbreviations. For application terms s, t, $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ we will use:

$$\begin{aligned}
s(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \quad &\text{as a shortcut for} \quad ((\ldots (st_1) \ldots) t_n); \quad \textit{(parentheses associated to the left)}; \\
st_1 \ldots t_n \quad &\text{as a shortcut for} \quad s(t_1, \ldots, t_n); \\
t{\downarrow} \quad &\text{as a shortcut for} \quad \exists x (t \simeq x)^\wedge; \quad \textit{(t is defined)} \\
(s \simeq t)^\wedge \quad &\text{as a shortcut for} \quad (s{\downarrow} \vee t{\Downarrow}) \rightarrow \exists x ((s \simeq x)^\wedge \wedge (t \simeq x)^\wedge).
\end{aligned}$$

A *closed* application term is an application term that does not contain variables. If t is a closed application term and $a_1, \ldots, a_n, b$ are sets we use the abbreviation

$$t(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \simeq b \quad \text{for} \quad \exists x_1 \ldots x_n \exists y \, (x_1 = a_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge x_n = a_n \wedge y = b$$
$$\wedge \, [t(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \simeq y]^\wedge).$$

Definition 2.13 Every closed application term gives rise to a partial class function. A partial n-place (class) function Υ is said to be an $E_{\wp}$-*recursive partial function* if there exists a closed application term t_Υ such that

$$\text{dom}(\Upsilon) \quad = \quad \{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \mid t_\Upsilon(a_1, \ldots, a_n) {\downarrow}\}$$

and for all for all sets $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \text{dom}(\Upsilon)$,

$$t_\Upsilon(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \quad \simeq \quad \Upsilon(a_1, \ldots, a_n).$$

In the latter case, t_Υ is said to be an *index* for Υ.

If Υ_1, Υ_2 are $E_{\wp}$-recursive partial functions, then $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a}) \simeq \Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ iff neither $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a})$ nor $\Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ are defined, or $\Upsilon_1(\vec{a})$ and $\Upsilon_2(\vec{a})$ are defined and equal.

The next two results can be proved in the theory **APP** and thus hold true in any applicative structure. Thence the particular applicative structure considered here satisfies the Abstraction Lemma and Recursion Theorem (see e.g. [11] or [8]).

Lemma 2.14 (Abstraction Lemma, cf. [8, VI.2.2])
For every application term $t[x]$ there exists an application term $\lambda x.t[x]$ with $\text{FV}(\lambda x.t[x]) := \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subseteq \text{FV}(t[x]) \backslash \{x\}$ such that the following holds:

$$\forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_n (\lambda x.t[x]{\downarrow} \wedge \forall y \, (\lambda x.t[x])y \simeq t[y]).$$

8

Proof. (i) $\lambda x.x$ is $\mathbf{skk}$; (ii) $\lambda x.t$ is $\mathbf{k}t$ for t a constant or a variable other than x; (iii) $\lambda x.uv$ is $(\mathbf{s}(\lambda x.u))(\lambda x.v)$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 2.15 (Recursion Theorem, cf. [8, VI.2.7])
There exists a closed application term rec *such that for any* f, x,

$$\mathsf{rec}f \downarrow \ \wedge \ \mathsf{rec}fx \simeq f(\mathsf{rec}f)x.$$

Proof. Take rec to be $\lambda f.tt$, where t is $\lambda y\lambda x.f(yy)x$. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 2.16 *For any* $E_\wp$*-recursive partial function* Υ *there exists a closed application term* τ_{fix} *such that* $\tau_{fix} \downarrow$ *and for all* $\vec{a}$,

$$\Upsilon(\bar{e},\vec{a}) \ \simeq \ \tau_{fix}(\vec{a}),$$

where $\tau_{fix} \simeq \bar{e}$. *Moreover,* τ_{fix} *can be effectively (e.g. primitive recursively) constructed from an index for* Υ.

3 Defining realizability with sets of witnesses for set theory

Realizability semantics are a crucial tool in the study of intuitionistic theories (see [41, 31]). We introduce a form of realizability based on general set recursive functions where a realizer for an existential statement provides a set of witnesses for the existential quantifier rather than a single witness. Realizability based on indices of general set recursive functions was introduced in [33] and employed to prove, inter alia, metamathematical properties for **CZF** augmented by strong forms of the axiom of choice in [34, Theorems 8.3,8.4]. There are points of contact with a notion of realizability used by Tharp [39] who employed (indices of) Σ_1 definable partial (class) functions as realizers, though there are important differences, too, as Tharp works in a classical context and assumes a definable search operation on the universe which basically amounts to working under the hypothesis $V = L$. Moreover, there are connections with Lifschitz' realizability [16] where a realizer for an existential arithmetical statement provides a finite co-recursive set of witnesses (see [25, 9] for extensions to analysis and set theory).
We adopt the conventions and notations from the previous section. However, we prefer to write $\jmath_0 e$ and $\jmath_1 e$ rather than $(e)_0$ and $(e)_1$, respectively, and instead of $[a](b) \simeq c$ we shall write $a \bullet b \simeq c$.

Definition 3.1 Bounded quantifiers will be treated as quantifiers in their own right, i.e., bounded and unbounded quantifiers are treated as syntactically different kinds of quantifiers.
We use the expression $a \neq \emptyset$ to convey that the set a is inhabited, that is $\exists x\, x \in a$.
We define a relation $a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B$ between sets a and formulae of set theory. $a \bullet f \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B$ will be an abbreviation for $\exists x[a \bullet f \simeq x \wedge x \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B]$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \quad &\text{iff} \quad A \text{ holds for atomic formulae } A\\
a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \wedge B \quad &\text{iff} \quad \jmath_0 a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \ \wedge \ \jmath_1 a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B\\
a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \vee B \quad &\text{iff} \quad a \neq \emptyset \ \wedge \ (\forall d \in a)([\jmath_0 d = 0 \ \wedge \ \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A] \ \vee\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad [\jmath_0 d = 1 \ \wedge \ \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B])\\
a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \neg A \quad &\text{iff} \quad \forall c \, \neg c \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A\\
a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \to B \quad &\text{iff} \quad \forall c \, [c \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \ \to \ a \bullet c \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B]
\end{aligned}
$$

9

$$a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (\forall x \in b)\, A \quad \text{iff} \quad (\forall c \in b)\, a \bullet c \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A[x/c]$$
$$a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (\exists x \in b)\, A \quad \text{iff} \quad a \neq \emptyset \wedge (\forall d \in a)[\jmath_0 d \in b \wedge \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A[x/\jmath_0 d]]$$
$$a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x A \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall c\ a \bullet c \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A[x/c]$$
$$a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists x A \quad \text{iff} \quad a \neq \emptyset \wedge (\forall d \in a)\ \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A[x/\jmath_0 d]$$
$$\Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists a\, a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B.$$

In the course of proving that certain formulae are realized, e.g.

$$(A \vee B) \to [(A \to C) \to ((B \to C) \to C)]$$

or the rule for introducing an existential quantifier in the antecendent of an implication, we will be faced with the problem that we have a non-empty set of realizers where a single realizer is required. The next Lemma shows that we can effectively pass from a set of realizers to a single realizer.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\vec{x} = x_1, \ldots, x_r$ and $\vec{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_r$. To each formula $A(\vec{x})$ of **CZF** (with all free variables among $\vec{x}$) we can effectively assign (a code of) an $E_\wp$-recursive partial function χ_A such that*

$$\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P}) \vdash \forall \vec{a}\, \forall c \neq \emptyset\, [\, (\forall d \in c)\, d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a})) \to \chi_A(\vec{a}, c) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a})].$$

Proof: We use induction on the buildup of A.

If A is atomic, let $\chi_A(\vec{a}, c) := 0$.

Let $A(\vec{x})$ be $B(\vec{x}) \wedge C(\vec{x})$ and χ_B and χ_C be already defined. Then

$$\chi_A(\vec{a}, c) := \jmath(\chi_B(\vec{a}, \{\jmath_0 x \mid x \in c\}), \chi_C(\vec{a}, \{\jmath_1 x \mid x \in c\}))$$

will do the job.

Let $A(\vec{x})$ be $B(\vec{x}) \to C(\vec{x})$ and suppose χ_B and χ_C have already been defined. Assume that $c \neq \emptyset$ and $(\forall d \in c)\, d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [B(\vec{a}) \to C(\vec{a})]$. Suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a})$. Define the $E_\wp$-recursive partial function ϑ by

$$\vartheta(c, e) \simeq \{d \bullet e \mid d \in c\}.$$

Then $\vartheta(c, e) \neq \emptyset$ and hence, by the inductive assumption, $\chi_C(\vec{a}, \vartheta(c, e)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} C(\vec{a})$, so that

$$\lambda e. \chi_C(\vec{a}, \vartheta(c, e)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a}).$$

Now let $A(\vec{x})$ be of the form $\forall y\, B(\vec{x}, y)$. Suppose that $c \neq \emptyset$ and $(\forall d \in c)\, d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a})$. Fixing b, we then have $(\forall d \in c)\, d \bullet b \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}, b)$, thus, $\forall d' \in \vartheta(c, b)\ d' \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}, b)$, and therefore, by the inductive assumption, $\chi_B(\vec{a}, \vartheta(c, b)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}, b)$. As a result

$$\lambda b. \chi_B(\vec{a}, \vartheta(c, b)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a}).$$

The case of $A(\vec{x})$ starting with a bounded universal quantifier is similar to the previous case.

In all the remaining cases, $\chi_A(\vec{a}, c) := \bigcup c$ will work owing to the definition of realizability in these cases. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 3.3 ($\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$) *Realizers for equality laws:*

(i) $0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} x = x$.

(ii) $\lambda u. u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} x = y \to y = x$.

(iii) $\lambda u.u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (x = y \land y = z) \rightarrow x = z$.

(iv) $\lambda u.u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (x = y \land y \in z) \rightarrow x \in z$.

(v) $\lambda u.u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (x = y \land z \in x) \rightarrow z \in y$.

(vi) $\lambda u.\jmath_1 u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (x = y \land A(x)) \rightarrow A(y)$ *for any formula* A.

Proof: (i) - (v) are obvious. (vi) follows by a trivial induction on the buildup of A. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 3.4 (IKP($\mathcal{P}$)) *Realizers for logical axioms: Below we use the $E_\wp$-recursive function* $\mathfrak{sg}(a) := \{a\}$.

(IPL1) $\mathbf{k} \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow A)$.

(IPL2) $\mathbf{s} \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow C)] \rightarrow [(A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow (A \rightarrow C)]$.

(IPL3) $\lambda e.\lambda d.\jmath(e,d)\rangle \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow A \land B)$.

(IPL4) $\lambda e.\jmath_0 e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \land B \rightarrow A$.

(IPL5) $\lambda e.\jmath_1 e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \land B \rightarrow B$.

(IPL6) $\lambda e.\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(0,e)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \rightarrow A \lor B$.

(IPL7) $\lambda e.\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(1,e))\rangle \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B \rightarrow A \lor B$.

(IPL8) $\mathfrak{k}(\vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (A \lor B) \rightarrow [(A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow C)]$, *for some $E_\wp$-recursive partial function* $\mathfrak{k}$, *where $\vec{a}$ comprises all parameters appearing in the formula*.

(IPL9) $\lambda e.\lambda d.0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (A \rightarrow B) \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow \neg B) \rightarrow \neg A)$.

(IPL10) $\lambda e.0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \rightarrow (\neg A \rightarrow B)$.

(IPL11) $\lambda e.e \bullet b \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x A(x) \rightarrow A(b)$.

(IPL12) $\lambda e.\mathfrak{sg}(e) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(a) \rightarrow \exists x A(x)$.

Proof: As for IPL1 and IPL2, this justifies the combinators $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{k}$. Combinatory completeness of these two combinators is equivalent to the fact that these two laws together with modus ponens generate the full set of theorems of propositional implicational intuitionistic logic.
Except for IPL8, one easily checks that the proposed realizers indeed realize the pertaining formulae. So let's check IPL8. $A \lor B \rightarrow ((A \rightarrow C) \rightarrow ((B \rightarrow C) \rightarrow C))$. Suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \lor B$. Then $e \neq \emptyset$. Let $d \in e$. Then $\jmath_0 d = 0 \land \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A$ or $\jmath_0 d = 1 \land \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B$. Suppose $f \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \rightarrow C$ and $g \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B \rightarrow C$. Define an $E_\wp$-recursive partial function $\mathfrak{f}$ by

$$\mathfrak{f}(d', f', g') = [\mathbf{d_N}](\jmath_0 d', 0, f' \bullet (\jmath_1 d'), g' \bullet (\jmath_1 d')).$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{f}(d', f', g') = \begin{cases} f' \bullet (\jmath_1 d') & \text{if } \jmath_0 d' = 0 \\ g' \bullet (\jmath_1 d') & \text{if } \jmath_0 d' = 1 \end{cases}$$

As a result, $\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} C$ and hence $\lambda f.\lambda g.\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (A \to C) \to ((B \to C) \to C)$. Thus, $\Phi(e, \lambda d.\lambda f.\lambda g.\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g)) \neq \emptyset$ and for all $p \in \Phi(e, \lambda d.\lambda f.\lambda g.\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g))$ we have

$$p \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (A \to C) \to ((B \to C) \to C).$$

Let $E(\vec{a}) := (A \to C) \to ((B \to C) \to C)$, where $\vec{a}$ comprises all parameters appearing in the formula on the right hand side. The upshot is that by Lemma 3.2 we can conclude

$$\chi_E(\vec{a}, \Phi(e, \lambda d.\lambda f.\lambda g.\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g))) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} E(\vec{a}).$$

And consequently we have

$$\mathfrak{k}(\vec{a}) := \lambda e.\chi_E(\vec{a}, \Phi(e, \lambda d.\lambda f.\lambda g.\mathfrak{f}(d, f, g))) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A \vee B \to E(\vec{a}).$$

$\square$

Theorem 3.5 *Let $D(u_1, \ldots, u_r)$ be a formula of $\mathcal{L}_{\in}$ all of whose free variables are among $u_1, \ldots, u_r$. If*

$$\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow} \vdash D(u_1, \ldots, u_r),$$

then one can effectively construct an index of an $E_{\wp}$-recursive function g such that

$$\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P}) \vdash \forall a_1, \ldots, a_r\, g(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(a_1, \ldots, a_r).$$

Proof: We use a standard Hilbert-type systems for intuitionistic predicate logic. The proof proceeds by induction on the derivation. For the logical axioms and the equality axioms we have already produced appropriate $E_{\wp}$-recursive functions in Lemmata 3.3 and 3.4. It remains to deal with logical inferences and set-theoretic axioms. We start with the rules.

The only rule from propositional logic is modus ponens. Suppose that we have $E_{\wp}$-recursive functions g_0 and g_1 such that for all $\vec{a}$, $g_0(\vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a}) \to B(\vec{a})$ and $g_1(\vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{a})$. Then $g(\vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a})$ holds with the $E_{\wp}$-recursive function $g(\vec{a}) := g_0(\vec{a}) \bullet g_1(\vec{a})$.

For the $\forall$ quantifier we have the rule: from $B(\vec{u}) \to A(x, \vec{u})$ infer $B(\vec{u}) \to \forall x A(x, \vec{u})$ if x is not free in $B(\vec{u})$. Inductively we have an $E_{\wp}$-recursive function $\mathfrak{h}$ such that for all $b, \vec{a}$,

$$\mathfrak{h}(b, \vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}) \to A(b, \vec{a}).$$

Suppose $d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a})$. Then $\mathfrak{h}(b, \vec{a}) \bullet d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(b, \vec{a})$ holds for all b, whence $\lambda x.(\mathfrak{h}(x, \vec{a}) \bullet d) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x A(x, \vec{a})$. As a result,

$$\lambda d.\lambda x.(\mathfrak{h}(x, \vec{a}) \bullet d) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}) \to \forall x A(x, \vec{a}).$$

For the $\exists$ quantifier we have the rule: from $A(x, \vec{u}) \to B(\vec{u})$ infer $\exists x\, A(x, \vec{u}) \to B(\vec{u})$ if x is not free in $B(\vec{u})$. Inductively we then have an $E_{\wp}$-recursive function $\mathfrak{g}$ such that for all $b, \vec{a}$,

$$\mathfrak{g}(b, \vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(b, \vec{a}) \to B(\vec{a}).$$

Suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists x A(x, \vec{a})$. Then $e \neq \emptyset$ and for all $d \in e$, $\jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a})$. Consequently, $(\forall d \in e)\, \mathfrak{g}(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a}) \bullet \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a})$. We then have $\Phi(e, \lambda d.\mathfrak{g}(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a}) \bullet \jmath_1 d) \neq \emptyset$ and

$$(\forall y \in \Phi(e, \lambda d.\mathfrak{g}(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a}) \bullet \jmath_1 d))\, y \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a}).$$

Using Lemma 3.2 we arrive at $\chi_B(\vec{a}, \Phi(e, \lambda d.\mathfrak{g}(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a}) \bullet \jmath_1 d)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{a})$; whence

$$\lambda e.\chi_B(\vec{a}, \Phi(e, \lambda d.\mathfrak{g}(\jmath_0 d, \vec{a}) \bullet \jmath_1 d)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists x A(x, \vec{a}) \to B(\vec{a}).$$

Next we show that every axiom of **CZF + Pow** is realized by an $E_\wp$-recursive function. We treat the axioms one after the other.

(**Extensionality**): Since $e \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall x(x \in a \leftrightarrow x \in b)$ implies $a = b$, and hence $0 \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} a = b$, it follows that
$$\lambda u.0 \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} [\forall x(x \in a \leftrightarrow x \in b) \to a = b].$$

(**Pair**): There is an $E_\wp$-recursive function ℓ such that
$$\ell(a, b, c) := \{\jmath(0, a) \mid c = a\} \ \cup \ \{\jmath(1, b) \mid c = b\}.$$

We have $\forall u \in \{a, b\} \ \ell(a, b, u) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} (u = a \vee u = b)$ and hence, letting $c := \{a, b\}$,
$$\lambda u.\ell(a, b, u) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall x \in c(x = u \vee x = b).$$

We also have $\jmath(0, 0) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} (a \in c \wedge b \in c)$, so that
$$\jmath(\lambda u.\ell(a, b, u), \jmath(0, 0)) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall x \in c(x = a \vee x = b) \ \wedge \ (a \in c \wedge b \in c).$$

Thus we arrive at
$$\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\mathfrak{p}(a, b), \jmath(\lambda u.\ell(a, b, u), \jmath(0, 0)))) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists y \, [\forall x \in y(x = a \vee x = b) \ \wedge \ (a \in y \wedge b \in y)].$$

(**Union**): Let ℓ_U be the $E_\wp$-recursive function defined by
$$\ell_U(a, u) \ = \ \{\jmath(x, \jmath(0, 0)) \mid x \in a \wedge u \in x\}.$$

For $u \in \bigcup a$ we then have $\ell_U(a, u) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists x \in a \ u \in x$, and therefore
$$\lambda u.\ell_U(u, a) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} (\forall u \in \bigcup a)(\exists x \in a) \ u \in x.$$

Obviously $\lambda u.\lambda v.0 \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} (\forall x \in a)(\forall y \in x) \ y \in \bigcup a$. Therefore we have
$$\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\bigcup a, \jmath(\lambda u.\ell_U(u, a), \lambda u.\lambda v.0))) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists w \, [(\forall u \in w)(\exists x \in a) \ u \in x \ \wedge \ (\forall x \in a)(\forall y \in x) \ y \in w].$$

(**Empty Set**): Obviously $\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\emptyset, \lambda v.0)) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists x \, (\forall u \in x)u \neq u$.

(**Binary Intersection**): Let $c := a \cap b$. As
$$\lambda v.\jmath(0, 0) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall x \in c \, (x \in a \wedge x \in b)$$

and $\lambda u.0 \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall x \, (x \in a \wedge x \in b \to x \in c)$ hold, we conclude that
$$\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(a \cap b, \jmath(\lambda v.\jmath(0, 0), \lambda u.0))) \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists y \, [\forall x \in y \, (x \in a \wedge x \in b) \ \wedge \ \forall x \, (x \in a \wedge x \in b \to x \in y)].$$

(**Powerset**): It suffices to find a realizer for the formula
$$\exists y \, \forall x(x \subseteq a \to x \in y)]$$

since realizability of the power set axiom follows then with the help of Δ_0 Separation. One easily verifies that $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall u(u \in b \rightarrow u \in a)$ implies $b \subseteq a$ and consequently $b \in \mathcal{P}(a)$. Therefore we have

$$\lambda u.\lambda v.0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x[x \subseteq a \rightarrow x \in \mathcal{P}(a)],$$

thus $\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\mathcal{P}(a), \lambda u.\lambda v.0)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists y \forall x[x \subseteq a \rightarrow x \in y]$.

(**Set Induction**): Suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x[\forall y(y \in x \rightarrow A(y)) \rightarrow A(x)]$. Then, for all a,

$$e \bullet a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [\forall y(y \in a \rightarrow A(y)) \rightarrow A(a)].$$

Suppose we have an index e^* such that for all $b \in a$, $e^* \bullet b \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(b)$. As $v \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} b \in a$ entails $b \in a$, we get

$$\lambda u.\lambda v.e^* \bullet u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall y(y \in a \rightarrow A(y)),$$

and hence

$$(e \bullet a) \bullet (\lambda u.\lambda v.e^* \bullet u) \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad A(a). \tag{1}$$

By the recursion theorem we can effectively cook up an index $\mathfrak{q}$ such that

$$(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet a \simeq (e \bullet a) \bullet (\lambda u.\lambda v.(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet u).$$

In view of the above it follows by set induction that for all a, $(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet a \downarrow$ and $(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet a \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(a)$. As a result we have $\lambda w.(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet w \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x\, A(x)$, yielding

$$\lambda e \lambda w.(\mathfrak{q} \bullet e) \bullet w \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall x[\forall y(y \in x \rightarrow A(y)) \rightarrow A(x)] \rightarrow \forall x\, A(x).$$

(**Strong Collection**): Suppose

$$e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall u(u \in a \rightarrow \exists y\, B(u, y)). \tag{2}$$

Then we have, for all $b \in a$, $(e \bullet b) \bullet 0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists y\, B(b, y)$, and so $(e \bullet b) \bullet 0 \neq \emptyset$ and

$$(\forall d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0) \qquad \jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(b, \jmath_0 d). \tag{3}$$

Let

$$C^* := \{\jmath_0 d \mid (\exists x \in a)[d \in (e \bullet x) \bullet 0]\}.$$

C^* is a set in our background theory, using Replacement or Strong Collection.

Now assume $e' \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} b \in a$. Then $b \in a$ and hence, by the above, $(e \bullet b) \bullet 0 \neq \emptyset$ and

$$(\forall d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0)\ \jmath(0, \jmath_1 d) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [\jmath_0 d \in C^* \wedge B(b, \jmath_0 d)]. \tag{4}$$

There is an $E_\wp$-recursive function ℓ_2 defined by

$$\ell_2(e, b) \simeq \{\jmath(\jmath_0 d, \jmath(0, \jmath_1 d)) \mid d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0\}.$$

From (4) we can infer that $\ell_2(e, b) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists y\, [y \in C^* \wedge B(b, y)]$ and hence

$$\lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_2(e, u) \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad \forall x(x \in a \rightarrow \exists y\, [y \in C^* \wedge B(x, y)]). \tag{5}$$

Now assume $c \in C^*$. Then there exists $b \in a$ and $d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0$ such that $c = \jmath_0 d$. Moreover, by (3), whenever $b \in a$, $d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0$ and $\jmath_0 d = c$, then $\jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(b,c)$. Letting ℓ_3 be the $E_\wp$-recursive function defined by

$$\ell_3(a,c,e) \simeq \{\jmath(b, \jmath(0, \jmath_1 d)) \mid b \in a \ \wedge \ \exists d \in (e \bullet b) \bullet 0 \ \jmath_0 d = c\},$$

we then have

$$\ell_3(a,c,e) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists x(x \in a \ \wedge \ B(x,c)), \tag{6}$$

thus

$$\lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_3(a,u,e) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall y[y \in C^* \to \exists x(x \in a \ \wedge \ B(x,y))]. \tag{7}$$

Finally observe that there is an $E_\wp$-recursive function $\mathfrak{l}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{l}(a,e) := \{\jmath_0 d \mid d \in \bigcup_{x \in a}((e \bullet x) \bullet 0)\} = \{\jmath_0 d \mid (\exists x \in a)[d \in (e \bullet x) \bullet 0]\} = C^*.$$

Thus in view of (5) and (7) we arrive at

$$\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\mathfrak{l}(a,e), \jmath(\lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_2(e,u), \lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_3(a,u,e)))) \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad \exists z \, [\forall x(x \in a \to \exists y \, [y \in z \ \wedge \ B(x,y)])$$
$$\wedge \ \forall y[y \in z \to \exists x(x \in a \ \wedge \ B(x,y))]].$$

As a result, $\lambda w.\lambda q.\mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\mathfrak{l}(w,q), \jmath(\lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_2(q,u), \lambda u.\lambda v.\ell_3(w,u,q))))$ is a realizer for each instance of Strong Collection.

(**Infinity**): By [6, Lemma 9.2.2] it suffices to find a realizer for the formula

$$\exists z \, \forall x(x \in z \ \leftrightarrow \ [x = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in z \, x = y \cup \{y\}]).$$

Here $x = \emptyset$ is an abbreviation for $\forall y(y \in x \to y \neq y)$ and $(\exists y \in z) \, x = y \cup \{y\}$ is an abbreviation for

$$\exists y(y \in z \ \wedge \ [\forall w(w \in x \to [w \in y \vee w = y]) \ \wedge \ [\forall w(w \in y \to w \in x) \ \wedge \ y \in x]]).$$

We have

$$\lambda u'.\lambda v'.0 \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad \forall y(y \in \emptyset \to y \neq y). \tag{8}$$

For $n + 1 \in \omega$ we have

$$\ell_4(n+1) \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad \forall w(w \in n+1 \to (w \in n \vee w = n)) \tag{9}$$

for the $E_\wp$-recursive function

$$\ell_4(u) := \lambda w.\lambda v'.\{\jmath(0,0) \mid w \in [\mathbf{p_N}](u)\} \ \cup \ \{\jmath(1,0) \mid w = [\mathbf{p_N}](u)\}.$$

We also have $\jmath(\lambda w'.\lambda v'.0, 0) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall w(w \in n \to w \in n+1) \wedge n \in n+1$. Thus

$$\ell_5(n+1) \quad \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \quad n \in \omega \ \wedge \ [\forall w(w \in n+1 \to (w \in n \vee w = n)) \tag{10}$$
$$\wedge \ [\forall w(w \in n \to w \in n+1) \ \wedge \ n \in n+1]].$$

15

with $\ell_5(n+1) := \jmath(0, \jmath(\ell_4(n+1), \jmath(\lambda w'.\lambda v'.0, 0)))$. From (10) we conclude that

$$\ell_6(n+1) \quad \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \quad (\exists y \in \omega)(n+1 = y \cup \{y\}), \tag{11}$$

where $\ell_6(m) := \mathfrak{sg}(\jmath([\mathbf{p_N}](m), \ell_5(m)))$. Now from (8) and (11) we conclude that for every $m \in \omega$:

$$\mathfrak{sg}([\mathbf{d_N}](0, m, \jmath(0, \lambda u'.\lambda v'.0), \jmath(1, \ell_6(m)))) \quad \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \quad m = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in \omega \, m = y \cup \{y\}.$$

If $e \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} a \in \omega$ then $a \in \omega$, and hence with $\ell_7(\omega) := \lambda u.\mathfrak{sg}([\mathbf{d_N}](0, u, \jmath(0, \lambda u'.\lambda v'.0), \jmath(1, \ell_6(u))))$,

$$\ell_7(\omega) \quad \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \quad (\forall x \in \omega)[x = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in \omega \, x = y \cup \{y\}]. \tag{12}$$

Conversely, if $e \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \forall y(y \in a \to y \neq y)$, then really $\forall y \in a \, y \neq y$, and hence $a = \emptyset$, so that $a \in \omega$. Also, if $e' \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists y \in \omega \, a = y \cup \{y\}$ then by unraveling this definition it turns out that $a \in \omega$ holds. As a result, if $d \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} [a = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in \omega \, a = y \cup \{y\}]$ then there exists $f \in d$ such that $\jmath_0 f = 0$ and $\jmath_1 f \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} a = \emptyset$ or $\jmath_0 f = 1$ and $\jmath_1 f \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \exists y \in \omega \, a = y \cup \{y\}$. In either case we have $a \in \omega$, and so

$$\lambda x.\lambda e.0 \quad \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \quad \forall x([x = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in \omega \, x = y \cup \{y\}] \to x \in \omega). \tag{13}$$

Combining (12) and (13), we have with $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{sg}(\jmath(\omega, \lambda v.\jmath(\lambda d.(\ell_7(\omega) \bullet v), \lambda e.0)))$ that

$$\mathfrak{h} \quad \Vdash_\mathfrak{w} \quad \exists z \forall x(x \in z \leftrightarrow [x = \emptyset \vee \exists y \in z \, x = y \cup \{y\}]). \tag{14}$$

$\square$

We would like to show that $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ also realizes every theorem of Tharp's quasi-intuitionistic set theory without $\mathbf{Ord\text{-}Im}$. This requires a special Lemma about realizability of bounded formulae.

Definition 3.6 To each $\Delta_0^\mathcal{P}$ formula $D(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ of $\mathcal{L}_\in$ all of whose free variables are among $\vec{x} = x_1, \ldots, x_r$, we assign a total $E_\wp$-recursive function $\mathfrak{k}_D$ of arity r as follows:

1. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{0\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is atomic.

2. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\{\langle 0, z \rangle\} \mid z \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}) \wedge A(\vec{x})\} \cup \{\{\langle 1, z \rangle\} \mid z \in \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x}) \wedge B(\vec{x})\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is of the form $A(\vec{x}) \vee B(\vec{x})$.

3. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\langle z, w \rangle \mid z \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}) \wedge w \in \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x})\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is of the form $A(\vec{x}) \wedge B(\vec{x})$.

4. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda v.\chi_B(\vec{x}, \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x}))\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is of the form $A(\vec{x}) \to B(\vec{x})$.

5. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\{\langle z, v \rangle\} \mid z \in x_i \wedge v \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z) \wedge A(\vec{x}, z)\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is of the form $\exists z \in x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$.

6. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z))\}$ if $D(\vec{z})$ is of the form $\forall z \in x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$.

7. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\{\langle z, \langle \lambda y.0, v \rangle \rangle\} \mid z \in \mathcal{P}(x_i) \wedge v \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z) \wedge A(\vec{x}, z)\}$ if $D(\vec{x})$ is of the form $\exists z \subseteq x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$.

8. $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda y.\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z))\}$ if $D(\vec{z})$ is of the form $\forall z \subseteq x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$.

In the above, we tacitly used the fact that for every $\Delta_0^\mathcal{P}$ formula $A(\vec{x}, u)$ there is an $E_\wp$-recursive function $\mathfrak{f}_A$ such that $\mathfrak{f}_A(\vec{x}, a) = \{u \in a \mid A(\vec{x}, u)\}$. This is proved in [36, Lemma 2.20].

For Δ_0-formulae realizability and truth coincide as the following Proposition shows.

Proposition 3.7 *Let $D(\vec{x})$ be a $\Delta_0^{\mathcal{P}}$ formula whose free variables are among $\vec{x} = x_1, \ldots, x_r$. Then the following are provable in* **IKP**$(\mathcal{P})$:

(i) $D(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset \wedge \forall u \in \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x})\, u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$.

(ii) $(\exists e\, e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})) \rightarrow D(\vec{x})$.

Proof: We show (i) and (ii) simultaneously by induction on the complexity of D.

1. For atomic D this is obvious.

2. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $A(\vec{x}) \vee B(\vec{x})$. First suppose that $D(\vec{x})$ holds. Then the induction hypothesis entails that $A(\vec{x})$ and $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$ or $B(\vec{x})$ and $\mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$. In every case we have $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$.
If $u \in \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x})$ then either $u = \{\langle 0, z \rangle\}$ and $A(\vec{x})$ for some $z \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x})$ or $u = \{\langle 1, z \rangle\}$ and $B(\vec{x})$ for some $z \in \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x})$. In the first case the inductive assumption yields $z \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x})$ and hence $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$. In the second case the inductive assumption yields $z \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{x})$ and hence also $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$. This shows (i).
As to (ii), suppose that $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$. Then there exists $u \in e$ such that $u = \langle 0, d \rangle \wedge d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x})$ or $u = \langle 1, d \rangle \wedge d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{x})$ for some d. The induction hypothesis yields $A(\vec{x})$ or $B(\vec{x})$, thus $D(\vec{x})$.

3. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $A(\vec{x}) \wedge B(\vec{x})$. Then (i) and (ii) are immediate by the induction hypothesis.

4. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $A(\vec{x}) \rightarrow B(\vec{x})$. By definition, $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda v.\chi_B(\vec{x}, \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x}))\} \neq \emptyset$. As to (i), assume that $D(\vec{x})$ holds and $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x})$. Then the induction hypothesis (ii) applied to $A(\vec{x})$ yields that $A(\vec{x})$ holds, which implies that $B(\vec{x})$ holds. The induction hypothesis (i) for the latter formula yields that $\mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall u \in \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x})\, u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{x})$. An application of Lemma 3.2 thus yields $\chi_B(\vec{x}, \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x})) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{x})$. As a result, $\lambda v.\chi_B(\vec{x}, \mathfrak{k}_B(\vec{x})) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$ confirming (i).
For (ii), suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} (A(\vec{x}) \rightarrow B(\vec{x}))$ and $A(\vec{x})$ holds. By the induction hypothesis (i) for the latter formula, $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall u \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x})\, u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x})$. Thus, picking $u_0 \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x})$ we have $e \bullet u_0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} B(\vec{x})$, and hence the induction hypothesis (ii) for the latter formula yields that $B(\vec{x})$ holds.

5. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $\exists z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$. To verify (i), suppose $\exists z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds. Then there is $z \in x_i$ such that $A(\vec{x}, z)$. The induction hypothesis (i) for the latter formula yields that $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z) \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$. Now suppose $u \in \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x})$. Then $u = \{\langle z, v \rangle\}$ for some $z \in x_i$ and $v \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z)$. As $A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds the induction hypothesis (i) yields that $v \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z)$, whence $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$.
For (ii), assume $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$. Then $e \neq \emptyset$. Picking $d \in e$ we have $\jmath_0 d \in x_i$ and $\jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, \jmath_0 d)$, thus $A(\vec{x}, \jmath_0 d)$ by the induction hypothesis (ii), thence $\exists z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds.

6. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $\forall z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$. To verify (i), suppose $\forall z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$ is true. By definition, $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z))\} \neq \emptyset$. If $z_0 \in x_i$ we have $A(\vec{x}, z_0)$, so that inductively $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall d \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0)\, d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z_0)$. Whence, by Lemma 3.2, $\chi_A(\vec{x}, z_0, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{z}, z_0)$. As a result, $\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$.
As for (ii), suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$. Thus $e \bullet z \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z)$ for all $z \in x_i$, so that inductively $\forall z \in x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds.

7. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $\exists z \subseteq x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$. To verify (i), suppose $\exists z \subseteq x_i\, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds. Then there is $z \in \mathcal{P}(x_i)$ such that $A(\vec{x}, z)$. The induction hypothesis (i) for the latter formula yields that $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z) \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) \neq \emptyset$. Now suppose $u \in \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x})$. Then $u = \{\langle z, \langle \lambda y.0, v \rangle \rangle\}$ for some $z \subseteq x_i$ and $v \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z)$. As $A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds the induction hypothesis (i) yields that $v \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z)$. Also $\lambda y.0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} z \subseteq x_i$. Whence $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists z\,(z \subseteq x_i \wedge A(\vec{x}, z))$.

For (ii), assume $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \exists z \, [z \subseteq x_i \ \wedge \ A(\vec{x}, z)]$. Then $e \neq \emptyset$. Picking $d \in e$ we have $\jmath_1 d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [\jmath_0 d \subseteq x_i \ \wedge \ A(\vec{x}, \jmath_0 d)]$. This entails $\jmath_0 d \subseteq x_i$ and $\jmath_1(\jmath_1 d) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, \jmath_0 d)$. Thus $A(\vec{x}, \jmath_0 d)$ by the induction hypothesis (ii), thence $\exists z \subseteq x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds.

8. Let $D(\vec{x})$ be of the form $\forall z \in x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$. To verify (i), suppose $\forall z \in x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$ is true. By definition, $\mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{x}) = \{\lambda y.\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z))\} \neq \emptyset$. If $y \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} z_0 \subseteq x_i$, then $z_0 \subseteq x_i$ holds and we have $A(\vec{x}, z_0)$, so that inductively $\mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $\forall d \in \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0) \, d \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z_0)$. Whence, by Lemma 3.2, $\chi_A(\vec{x}, z_0, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z_0)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{z}, z_0)$. As a result, $\lambda y.\lambda z.\chi_A(\vec{x}, z, \mathfrak{k}_A(\vec{x}, z)) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{x})$.

As for (ii), suppose $e \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \forall z \subseteq x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$. Thus $e \bullet z \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} [z \subseteq x_i \to A(\vec{x}, z)]$ for all z. If $z \subseteq x_i$, then $\lambda y.0 \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} z \subseteq x_i$, so that $(e \bullet z) \bullet (\lambda y.0) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} A(\vec{x}, z)$, and therefore, by the inductive assumption, $A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds. As a result, $\forall z \in x_i \, A(\vec{x}, z)$ holds. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 3.8 *Let $\mathcal{T}^-$ denote Tharp's [39] quasi-intuitionistic set theory without **Ord-Im**. Let $D(u_1, \ldots, u_r)$ be a formula of $\mathcal{L}_\in$ all of whose free variables are among $u_1, \ldots, u_r$. If*

$$\mathcal{T}^- \vdash D(u_1, \ldots, u_r),$$

then one can effectively construct an index of an $E_\wp$-recursive function g such that

$$\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P}) \vdash \forall a_1, \ldots, a_r \, g(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(a_1, \ldots, a_r).$$

Proof: Note that with the exception of excluded middle for power bounded formulae, the axioms of $\mathcal{T}^-$ are axioms of $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$, too. Let $D(\vec{u})$ be $\Delta_0^\mathcal{P}$. Define

$$\mathfrak{d}_D(\vec{a}) := \{\langle 0, u \rangle \mid u \in \mathfrak{k}_D(\vec{a})\} \ \cup \ \{\langle 1, u \rangle \mid u \in \mathfrak{k}_{\neg D}(\vec{a})\},$$

with $\mathfrak{k}_D, \mathfrak{k}_{\neg D}$ defined as in Definition 3.6. Note that $\mathfrak{d}_D$ is E-recursive. By Proposition 3.7(i) and classical logic we have that $\mathfrak{d}_D(\vec{a}) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, if $\langle i, u \rangle \in \mathfrak{d}_D(\vec{a})$ then either $i = 0$ and $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{a})$ or $i = 1$ and $u \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} \neg D(\vec{a})$. Thus $\mathfrak{d}_D(\vec{a}) \Vdash_{\mathfrak{w}} D(\vec{a}) \vee \neg D(\vec{a})$.

In view of the previous Theorem 3.5 we thus found realizers for all theorems of $\mathcal{T}^-$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 3.9 $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$ *is a subtheory of $\mathcal{T}^-$.*

Proof: The only axioms of $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$ that do not already belong to $\mathcal{T}^-$ are the instances of Bounded Separation. Let $A(u)$ be bounded. We shall reason in $\mathcal{T}^-$. Using excluded middle for bounded formulae, Pairing and Emptyset, we have

$$\forall u \in a \, \exists z \, [(A(u) \wedge z = \{u\}) \ \vee \ (\neg A(u) \wedge z = 0)].$$

Thus, by Strong Collection, there exists a set b such that

$$\forall u \in a \, \exists z \in b \, [(A(u) \wedge z = \{u\}) \ \vee \ (\neg A(u) \wedge z = 0)] \tag{15}$$
$$\wedge \, \forall z \in b \, \exists u \in a \, (A(u) \wedge z = \{u\}) \ \vee \ (\neg A(u) \wedge z = 0)].$$

By Union, $\bigcup b$ is a set, and by (15), $\bigcup b = \{u \in a \mid A(u)\}$. $\qquad\square$

4 A type theory pertaining to $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$

Let $\mathbf{ML}_1$ be Martin-Löf's type theory with a single universe $\mathbf{U}$ but without any W-types (cf. [19]). The type $\mathbf{U}$ of small types reflects the basic forms of type. These are $\mathbf{N}_0$ (empty type), $\mathbf{N}$ (type of naturals), $(\Pi x : A)F(x)$, $(\Sigma x : A)F(x)$, $A + B$ and $I(A, b, c)$ where A and B are types, F is a family of types over A and $b, c : A$.

$\mathbf{ML_1V}$ is the extension of $\mathbf{ML}_1$ with Aczel's type of iterative sets $\mathbf{V}$ (cf. [1]). $\mathbf{V}$ is inductively specified by the rule

$$\frac{A : \mathbf{U} \quad x : A \Rightarrow F : \mathbf{V}}{\mathbf{sup}(x : A)F : \mathbf{V}}$$

It is this type $\mathbf{V}$ with the above introduction rule and a corresponding elimination rule (or rule of transfinite recursion on $\mathbf{V}$) that has been used in [1] to give an interpretation of constructive set theory (for more details see [2, 29]).

Remark 4.1 $\mathbf{V}$ can be viewed as a single W-type on top of $\mathbf{U}$. $\mathbf{V}$ should certainly not be construed as an additional universe on top of $\mathbf{U}$. As it turns out, adding $\mathbf{V}$ amounts to the same as adding an elimination rule to $\mathbf{U}$ which renders $\mathbf{U}$ an inductively defined type. $\mathbf{V}$ can then be explicitly defined from $\mathbf{U}$ in extensional $\mathbf{ML}_1$ augmented by the principle of transfinite recursion on $\mathbf{U}$ as has been shown by Palmgren in [26].

We extend the syntax of $\mathbf{ML_1V}$ with a type constant $\mathbf{P}$ and several other constants pertaining to it. The rules for $\mathbf{P}$ render it an impredicatively Π-closed type universe inside $\mathbf{U}$. The rules governing $\mathbf{P}$ are given by the schemes

$$0_\mathbf{P} : \mathbf{P} \qquad \mathbf{P} : \mathbf{U} \qquad \frac{a : \mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(a) : \mathbf{U}} \qquad \frac{a : \mathbf{P} \quad b_1 : \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(a) \quad b_2 : \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(a)}{b_1 = b_2 : \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(a)}$$

$$\frac{A : \mathbf{U} \quad x : A \Rightarrow B : \mathbf{P}}{(\pi x : A)B : \mathbf{P}} \qquad \frac{A : \mathbf{U} \quad x : A \Rightarrow B_1 = B_2 : \mathbf{P}}{(\pi x : A)B_1 = (\pi x : A)B_2 : \mathbf{P}}$$

$$\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(0_\mathbf{P}) = N_0 \qquad \frac{A : \mathbf{U} \quad x : A \Rightarrow B : \mathbf{P}}{s_{A,B} : \mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}((\pi x : A)B) \leftrightarrow (\Pi x : A)\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(B)} \quad (\star).$$

The formulation of the rules for the type $\mathbf{P}$, embodies the principle that elements of $\mathbf{P}$ are only codes for types, hence the need for a decoding function $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}$ and the π-binder. $0_\mathbf{P}$ represents the false proposition and thus $\mathbf{T}_\mathbf{P}(0_\mathbf{P})$ should be the empty type.

With these rules the type $\mathbf{P}$ behaves like the impredicative type of propositions of the calculus of constructions, with the additional property that all propositions in $\mathbf{P}$ are proof-irrelevant. The equivalence in the rule $(\star)$ was already introduced in [10]. This type theory will be denoted by $\mathbf{MLV_P}$.

5 Reducing $\mathbf{MLV_P}$ to $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$

Here we build on the types-as-classes interpretation from [33] and [34, Definition 6.7] that uses classes of indices of generalized set recursive functions to interpret large Π-types. [34, Theorem 6.8] shows that this provides a translation of $\mathbf{ML_1V}$ into $\mathbf{CZF}$. In this interpretation the type $\mathbf{U}$ is emulated by the inductively defined class $\mathbf{Y}^*$ introduced in [34, Definition 2.8]. A larger class $\mathbf{Y}^{**}$ is obtained by adding a fifth clause to the definition of $\mathbf{Y}^*$ which just says that the powerset

of $\{0\}$ and every set $x \subseteq \{0\}$ is in $\mathbf{Y}^{**}$. To deal with $\mathbf{MLV_P}$, $\mathbf{U}$ will be interpreted as $\mathbf{Y}^{**}$ and the type $\mathbf{V}$ will then be interpreted as the class $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Y}^{**})$ which is defined in the same vein as $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{Y}^*)$ in [34, Definition 3.1]. The type $\mathbf{P}$ will be interpreted by $\mathcal{P}(\{0\})$, the powerset of $\{0\}$. For sets A and a function $F : A \to \mathcal{P}(\{0\})$ let $\pi(A, F) := \{y \in \{0\} \mid \forall x \in A \, F(x) = \{0\}\}$. This is the way we interpret the π-binder. $\mathbf{T_P}$ will be interpreted as the identity function while $s_{A,B}$ is the unique 1-1 correspondence between the sets $\pi(A, F)$ and $\Pi_{x \in A} F(x)$.

Theorem 5.1 *The types-as-classes translation provides an interpretation of* $\mathbf{MLV_P}$ *in* $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$.

Proof: For details see [34, Theorem 6.8] and [29, Theorem 4.11]. □

6 Reducing $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$ to $\mathbf{MLV_P}$

Recall that the negative power set axiom, $\mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$, asserts that for every set a there exists a set c containing all the subsets x of a for which $\forall u \in a(\neg\neg u \in x \to u \in x)$ holds. The latter set will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(a)$.

Lemma 6.1 *The theory obtained from* $\mathbf{CZF}$ *by adding the axiom* '$\mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(\{0\})$ *is a set' is equivalent to* $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$.

Proof: [15, Lemma 4.3.2]. □

Theorem 6.2 *The theory* $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$ *can be justified in the type theory* $\mathbf{MLV_P}$.

Proof: For the axioms of $\mathbf{CZF}$ this is due to Aczel [1]. The validity of the negative power set axiom in a type theory with $\mathbf{P}$ was shown by Gambino [15, Lemma 4.3.7]. □

7 Completing the circle: the proof of Theorem 1.1

The main thing we know so far is that $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$ is proof-theoretically no stronger than $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ (Theorem 3.5). As for the proof-theoretic equivalence of ((i) and (ii) in Theorem 1.1, we need to show that $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P} + \mathbf{RDC} + \mathbf{\Pi\Sigma} - \mathbf{AC}$ is no stronger than $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$. We shall draw on the formulae-as-classes interpretation of [33] to achieve this.

Theorem 7.1 $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P} + \mathbf{RDC} + \mathbf{\Pi\Sigma} - \mathbf{AC}$ *has a formulae-as-classes interpretation in* $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$.

Proof: The interpretation of $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{RDC} + \mathbf{\Pi\Sigma} - \mathbf{AC}$ into $\mathbf{CZF}$ of [33, Theorem 4.13] can be lifted to the theories with $\mathbf{Pow}$ added on both sides if one uses the stronger notion of computability introduced in Definition 2.9. One just needs to show that the power set axiom is validated in this interpretation if one has it in the background theory and uses the stronger notion of computability. This is not very difficult. □

To get back from $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$ to $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$ we shall rely on [35]. Let $\mathcal{OT}(\vartheta) = (\mathrm{BH}, \prec)$ be the primitive recursive ordinal representation system for the Bachmann-Howard ordinal given in [37, Lemma 1.3]; here $\mathrm{OT}(\vartheta)$ is a primitive recursive set of naturals equipped with a primitive recursive well-ordering $\prec$ and

$$\mathrm{BH} := \{\alpha \in \mathrm{OT}(\vartheta) \mid \alpha \prec \Omega\}.$$

For $\tau \in \mathrm{BH}$ let

$$V_\tau \quad := \quad \bigcup_{\nu \prec \tau} \mathcal{P}(V_\nu) \tag{16}$$

$$V_\tau^{\neg\neg} \quad := \quad \bigcup_{\nu \prec \tau} \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\nu^{\neg\neg}). \tag{17}$$

Let 'V_τ exists' be the statement

$$\exists F\,[F \text{ function} \wedge \mathrm{dom}(f) = \{\nu \in \mathrm{BH} \mid \nu \prec \tau\} \wedge \forall \nu \prec \tau\, F(\nu) = \bigcup_{\xi \prec \nu} \mathcal{P}(F(\xi))].$$

Lemma 7.2 *For every (meta) $\tau \in \mathrm{BH}$, **CZF** proves the scheme of transfinite induction up to τ, i.e.,*

$$\forall \nu \prec \tau[(\forall \mu \prec \nu\, \varphi(\mu)) \to \varphi(\nu)] \to \forall \nu \prec \tau\, \varphi(\nu)$$

for all formulae $\varphi(\nu)$.

Proof: This is a consequence of [32, Lemma 4.3, Theorem 4.13]. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7.3 *Let $\tau \in \mathrm{BH}$. The following are provable in **CZF** + **Pow**$^{\neg\neg}$ for all $\beta \preceq \alpha \preceq \tau$:*

(i) '$V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ *exists*'.

(ii) $V_0^{\neg\neg} = \emptyset$.

(iii) If α is a limit, then $V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} = \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha} V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$.

(iv) $V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg} = V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \cup \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\alpha^{\neg\neg})$.

(v) $V_\beta^{\neg\neg} \subseteq V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$.

(vi) $V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ *is transitive.*

(vii) $u \in x \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \to \exists \xi \prec \alpha\, u \in V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$.

Proof: (i) follows by transfinite recursion on α using Lemma 7.2 and Replacement. (ii) holds because $V_0^{\neg\neg} = \bigcup_{\xi \prec 0} V_\xi^{\neg\neg} = \emptyset$.

(iii): $V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} = \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\xi^{\neg\neg}) = \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha} \bigcup_{\zeta \prec \xi} \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\zeta^{\neg\neg}) = \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha} V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$ when α is a limit.

(iv):

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg} \quad &= \quad \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha+1} \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\xi^{\neg\neg}) \\
&= \quad \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}) \cup \bigcup_{\xi \prec \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\xi^{\neg\neg}) \\
&= \quad \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}) \cup V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}.
\end{aligned}
$$

(v): Suppose $\beta \prec \alpha$. It suffices to show that $V_\beta^{\neg\neg} \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\beta^{\neg\neg})$. But this is clearly the case since $V_\beta^{\neg\neg} \subseteq V_\beta^{\neg\neg}$ and (trivially)

$$\forall y \in V_\beta^{\neg\neg}(\neg\neg y \in V_\beta^{\neg\neg} \to y \in V_\beta^{\neg\neg}).$$

(vi) and (vii): Let $u \in x \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$. Then $u \in x \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\xi^{\neg\neg})$ for some $\xi \prec \alpha$. Hence $u \in V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$ for some $\xi \prec \alpha$, so that $u \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ by (v). $\qquad\square$

Theorem 7.4 *(i) The following theories are proof-theoretically equivalent:*

1. $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$

2. $\mathbf{Z} + \{\,'V_\tau\ exists'\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$.

(ii) The following theories are proof-theoretically equivalent:

1. $\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$

2. $\mathbf{IZ} + \{\,'V_\tau\ exists'\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$.

Proof: This is shown in [35]. □

7.1   Reducing $\mathbf{Z} + \{\,'V_\tau\ \mathbf{exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$ to $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$

The next step is to employ a double negation interpretation to reduce $\mathbf{Z} + \{\,'V_\tau\ exists'\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$ to an intuitionistic theory. Here we don't follow Friedman's approach in [14]. Instead we use two new relations $=_\infty$ and $\in_\infty$ to interpret $=$ and $\in$, respectively. Moreover, these relations are designed to be stable under double negation. This Ansatz was inspired by a double negation interpretation of Zermelo set theory in $V_{\omega+\omega}^{\neg\neg}$ due to Gambino (see [15, Proposition 2.3.21]). In it he uses Aczel's a-relations, which combine the idea of bisumulation with stability of doubly negated formulae, to interpret set-theoretic equality (for details see [15, Definition 2.2.14]). Our interpretation, however, does not employ a-relations since our background theory has only Bounded Separation. Instead it uses an equivalence relation defined by transfinite recursion on the ordinal representations of BH.

Theorem 7.5 *For every $\rho \in \mathrm{BH}$, the theory $\mathbf{Z} + 'V_\rho^{\neg\neg}$ exists' has an interpretation in $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$.*

The proof of 7.5 will occupy the remainder of this subsection. Given $\rho \in \mathrm{BH}$ one can effectively find $\rho^* \in \mathrm{BH}$ such that $\rho \prec \rho^*$ and ρ^* is a limit ordinal bigger than ω. In view of Theorem 7.4 we also know that $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$ proves $'V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ exists'. We would like to use the set $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ to provide a model for the theory $\mathbf{Z} + 'V_\rho$ exists'. The idea is, of course, to use some kind of double negation interpretation. But as is well known, the extensionality axiom creates a problem when one uses the usual Gödel-Gentzen translation. To overcome this problem we define an equivalence relation $=_\infty$ on $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ which will be used to interpret set-theoretic equality and thereby also membership.

Definition 7.6 Let $x, y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. By transfinite recursion on $\alpha \prec \rho^*$ define

$$
\begin{aligned}
x =_\alpha y \quad &\text{iff} \quad x, y \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \wedge \forall u \in x \,\neg\neg\exists v \in y \,\exists \beta \prec \alpha\ u =_\beta v \\
&\qquad\qquad \wedge\ \forall v \in y \,\neg\neg\exists u \in x \,\exists \beta \prec \alpha\ u =_\beta v \\
x =_\infty y \quad &\text{iff} \quad \neg\neg\exists \alpha \prec \rho^*\ x =_\alpha y \\
x \in_\infty y \quad &\text{iff} \quad \neg\neg\exists \alpha \prec \rho^*\ \exists u \in y\ x =_\alpha u\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 7.7 *Let $x, y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and $\alpha \prec \beta \prec \rho^*$. Then we have*

(i) $x =_\alpha y \rightarrow x =_\beta y$.

(ii) $x, y \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \wedge x =_\beta y \rightarrow x =_\alpha y$.

(iii) $=_\alpha$ *is a symmetric and transitive relation.* $=_\alpha$ *is a reflexive relation on* $V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$.

Proof: (i) Suppose $x =_\alpha y$. Then $x, y \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$, thus $x, y \in V_\beta^{\neg\neg}$ by Lemma 7.3(v). Clearly we have $\exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi v \rightarrow \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \beta \, u =_\xi v$, thus

$$\neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi v \rightarrow \neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \beta \, u =_\xi v \,,$$

and hence
$$\forall u \in x \, \neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi v \rightarrow \forall u \in x \, \neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi \prec \beta \, u =_\xi v \,.$$

Likewise, $\forall v \in y \, \neg\neg \exists u \in x \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi v \rightarrow \forall v \in y \, \neg\neg \exists u \in x \, \exists \xi \prec \beta \, u =_\xi v$. As a result, $x =_\beta y$.

(ii): We use induction on α. Suppose that $x, y \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ and $x =_\beta y$. If $u \in x$ and $v \in y$, then $u \in x \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_{\xi_0}^{\neg\neg})$ and $v \in y \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_{\xi_1}^{\neg\neg})$ for some $\xi_0, \xi_1 \prec \alpha$. Hence $u \in V_{\xi_0}^{\neg\neg}$ and $v \in V_{\xi_1}^{\neg\neg}$. Due to the linearity of $\prec$ and in view of Lemma 7.3(v), there exists $\alpha_0 \prec \alpha$ such that $u, v \in V_{\alpha_0}^{\neg\neg}$. As a result, if $u \in x$ and $\exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \beta \, u =_\zeta v$, then the induction hypothesis yields $\exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \alpha \, u =_\zeta v$. Thus $u \in x$ and $\neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \beta \, u =_\zeta v$ imply $\neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \alpha \, u =_\zeta v$. Consequently,

$$\forall u \in x \, \neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \beta \, u =_\zeta v \quad \rightarrow \quad \forall u \in x \, \neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \zeta \prec \alpha \, u =_\zeta v \,. \tag{18}$$

Likewise one proves

$$\forall v \in y \, \neg\neg \exists x \in u \, \exists \zeta \prec \beta \, u =_\zeta v \quad \rightarrow \quad \forall v \in y \, \neg\neg \exists u \in x \, \exists \zeta \prec \alpha \, u =_\zeta v \,. \tag{19}$$

Hence, since we assumed that $x =_\beta y$ we get $x =_\alpha y$ from (18) and (19).

(iii) follows by induction on α. As for transitivity, suppose $x, y, z \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$, $x =_\alpha y$, and $y =_\alpha z$. Assume that $u \in x$, $v \in y$, $w \in z$ and $u =_{\xi_0} v$ and $v =_{\xi_1} w$ hold for some $\xi_0, \xi_1 \prec \alpha$. Then, using (i) and the linearity of $\prec$, we find $\xi \prec \alpha$ such that $u =_\xi v$ and $v =_\xi w$, so that, by the induction hypothesis, we get $u =_\xi w$. As a result, letting A be $u \in x \wedge v \in y \wedge \exists \xi_0 \prec \alpha \, u =_{\xi_0} v$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
A &\rightarrow (\exists w \in z \, \exists \xi_1 \prec \alpha \, v =_{\xi_0} w \rightarrow \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w) \\
A &\rightarrow (\neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi_1 \prec \alpha \, v =_{\xi_0} w \rightarrow \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w) \\
A &\rightarrow \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w \quad (\text{since } y =_\alpha z) \\
u \in x &\rightarrow (\exists v \in y \, \exists \xi_0 \prec \alpha \, u =_{\xi_0} v \rightarrow \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w) \\
u \in x &\rightarrow (\neg\neg \exists v \in y \, \exists \xi_0 \prec \alpha \, u =_{\xi_0} v \rightarrow \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w) \\
u \in x &\rightarrow \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w \quad (\text{since } x =_\alpha y)
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence $\forall u \in x \, \neg\neg \exists w \in z \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w$. Likewise one shows that $\forall w \in z \, \neg\neg \exists u \in x \, \exists \xi \prec \alpha \, u =_\xi w$. Thus $x =_\alpha z$.
Symmetry and reflexivity are established similarly. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.8 *Let* $x, y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. *Then:*

$$x =_\infty y \ \leftrightarrow \ \forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (u \in_\infty x \ \leftrightarrow \ u \in_\infty y) \,.$$

Proof: "$\rightarrow$": Suppose $\alpha, \beta \prec \rho^*$, $v \in x$, $u =_\alpha v$, $w \in y$, and $v =_\beta w$. Letting $\gamma := \max(\alpha, \beta)$, we obtain $u =_\gamma v$ and $v =_\gamma w$ by Lemma 7.7(i), and hence $u =_\gamma w$ by Lemma 7.7(iii). Thus, letting B

stand for the conjunction of $\alpha \prec \rho^*$, $v \in x$, and $u =_\alpha v$, we have the following implications:

$$
\begin{aligned}
B \,\wedge\, \exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \,\exists w' \in y \; v =_{\beta'} w' &\;\rightarrow\; \exists \gamma' \prec \rho^* \,\exists w' \in y \; u =_{\gamma'} w' \\
B \,\wedge\, \neg\neg\exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \,\exists w' \in y \; v =_{\beta'} w' &\;\rightarrow\; \neg\neg\exists \gamma' \prec \rho^* \,\exists w' \in y \; u =_{\gamma'} w' \\
B \,\wedge\, \exists \eta \prec \rho^* \; x =_\eta y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \\
B \,\wedge\, \neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \rho^* \; x =_\eta y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \\
B \,\wedge\, x =_\infty y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \\
\exists \alpha \prec \rho^* \,\exists v \in x \; u =_\alpha v \,\wedge\, x =_\infty y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \\
\neg\neg\exists \alpha \prec \rho^* \,\exists v \in x \; u =_\alpha v \,\wedge\, x =_\infty y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \\
u \in_\infty x \,\wedge\, x =_\infty y &\;\rightarrow\; u \in_\infty y \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above, we used several times that $C \rightarrow \neg\neg C$ and

$$(A \rightarrow \neg\neg C) \rightarrow (\neg\neg A \rightarrow \neg\neg C)$$

are intuitionistically valid propositions.

"$\leftarrow$": Assume that $\forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (u \in_\infty x \;\leftrightarrow\; u \in_\infty y)$. Choose $\alpha \prec \rho^*$ such that $x, y \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$. Let $u \in x$. Then $u \in V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$ for some $\xi \prec \alpha$ by Lemma 7.2(vii). By Lemma 7.7(iii), we have $u =_\xi u$, which implies $u \in_\infty x$, and hence $u \in_\infty y$ by our standing assumption. We also have

$$\exists \eta \prec \rho^* \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w \rightarrow \exists \eta \prec \alpha \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w \,,$$

and hence

$$\neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \rho^* \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w \rightarrow \neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \alpha \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w \,,$$

using Lemma 7.7(ii). Thence, as $u \in_\infty y$, we can conclude that $\neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \alpha \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w$. As a result,

$$\forall u \in x \,\neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \alpha \,\exists w \in y \; u =_\eta w$$

Likewise, we can conclude that $\forall v \in y \,\neg\neg\exists \eta \prec \alpha \,\exists u \in x \; v =_\eta u$, so that $x =_\alpha y$, and consequently $x =_\infty y$. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.9 *Let $x, y, z \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. Then:*

$$x =_\infty y \,\wedge\, x \in_\infty z \rightarrow y \in_\infty z \,.$$

Proof: Suppose $x =_\alpha y$, $x =_\beta u$, and $u \in z$ for some $\alpha, \beta \prec \rho^*$. Pick $\delta \prec \rho^*$ such that $x, y, z \in V_\delta^{\neg\neg}$. By Lemma 7.7 we have $x =_\delta y$, $x =_\delta u$, and thus $y =_\delta u$, which entails $y \in_\infty z$. As a result of the foregoing we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\exists \alpha \prec \rho^* \; x =_\alpha y \,\wedge\, \exists \delta' \prec \rho^* \,\exists u \in z \; x = u &\;\rightarrow\; y \in_\infty z \,, \text{ thus} \\
x =_\infty y \,\wedge\, x \in_\infty z &\;\rightarrow\; y \in_\infty z \,,
\end{aligned}
$$

exploiting (again) that $y \in_\infty z$ is a twice negated formula. $\qquad\square$

Next we will show in $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$ that the structure $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty)$ models the double negation translation of all the axioms of $\mathbf{Z} + {}$ 'V_ρ *exists*' when the elementhood and equality symbols are interpreted as $\in_\infty$ and $=_\infty$, respectively.

Definition 7.10 (*N*-translation) Let the map $(.)^N$ from the language of set theory into itself be defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(x \in y)^N &:= && x \in_\infty y \\
(x = y)^N &:= && x =_\infty y \\
(A \wedge B)^N &:= && A^N \wedge B^N \\
(A \vee B)^N &:= && \neg(\neg A^N \wedge \neg B^N) \\
(A \rightarrow B)^N &:= && A^N \rightarrow B^N \\
(\neg A)^N &:= && \neg A^N \\
(\forall x A)^N &:= && \forall x\, A^N \\
(\exists x A)^N &:= && \neg\forall x\, \neg A^N .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that the formulae $x \in_\infty y$ and $x =_\infty y$ are already doubly negated, so that there is no need to put double negations in front of them.

Lemma 7.11 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (Extensionality)^N$.

Proof: Observe that $(\text{Extensionality})^N$ is

$$
\forall x, \forall y\, [x =_\infty y \;\leftrightarrow\; \forall u\, (u \in_\infty x \;\leftrightarrow\; u \in_\infty y)].
$$

So the claimed assertion is a consequence of Corollary 7.8. $\qquad\square$

Corollary 7.12 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models \forall x \forall y\, [A(x) \wedge x = y \rightarrow A(y)]$.

Proof: This follows from Lemma 7.11 and Corollary 7.9 by formula induction on $A(x)$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7.13 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (Pairing)^N$.

Proof: Let $a, b \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. Pick $\alpha \prec \rho^*$ such that $a, b \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ and let

$$
c := \{x \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \mid \neg\neg(x =_\infty a \vee x =_\infty b)\}.
$$

Note that $c \subseteq V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$. If $u \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ and $\neg\neg u \in c$, then $\neg\neg(\neg\neg(u =_\infty a \vee u =_\infty b))$, hence $\neg\neg(u =_\infty a \vee u =_\infty b)$, so that $u \in c$. This shows that $c \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_\alpha^{\neg\neg})$, thus $c \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg}$.

Now suppose $z =_\infty x$ and $x \in c$. Then $\neg\neg(x =_\infty a \vee x =_\infty b)$, and thus, by Corollary 7.12, $\neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b)$. Hence, as $z =_\beta x$ implies $z =_\infty x$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge x \in c \wedge z =_\beta x &\;\rightarrow\; \neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b) \\
\exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists x \in c\; z =_\beta x &\;\rightarrow\; \neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b) \\
\neg\neg\exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists x \in c\; z =_\beta x &\;\rightarrow\; \neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b) \\
z \in_\infty c &\;\rightarrow\; \neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b).
\end{aligned}
$$

Conversely, $z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b$ implies $z \in_\infty c$ by Corollary 7.12 since $a \in_\infty c$ and $b \in_\infty c$. Thus $\neg\neg(z =_\infty a \vee z =_\infty b)$ implies $z \in_\infty c$ since the latter formula starts with a negation. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7.14 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (Union)^N$.

25

Proof: Let $a \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. Pick $\alpha \prec \rho^*$ such that $a \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$ and let

$$c := \{v \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg} \mid \neg\neg\exists z \in a \; v \in_{\infty} z\}.$$

Note that $c \subseteq V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$. If $v \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$ and $\neg\neg v \in c$, then $\neg\neg(\neg\neg\exists z \in a \; v \in_{\infty} z)$, hence $\neg\neg\exists z \in a \; v \in_{\infty} z$, so that $v \in c$. This shows that $c \in \mathcal{P}^{\neg\neg}(V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg})$, thus $c \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg}$.

For $x \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge v \in c \wedge x =_{\beta} v &\rightarrow x =_{\infty} v \wedge \neg\neg\exists z \in a \; v \in_{\infty} z \\
\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge v \in c \wedge x =_{\beta} v &\rightarrow x =_{\infty} v \wedge \neg\neg\exists z \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (z \in_{\infty} a \wedge v \in_{\infty} z) \\
\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge v \in c \wedge x =_{\beta} v &\rightarrow \neg\neg\exists y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (y \in_{\infty} a \wedge x \in_{\infty} y) \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
\neg\neg\exists \gamma \prec \rho^* \exists u \in c \; x =_{\beta} u &\rightarrow \neg\neg\exists y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (y \in_{\infty} a \wedge x \in_{\infty} y) \\
x \in_{\infty} c &\rightarrow \neg\neg\exists y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (y \in_{\infty} a \wedge x \in_{\infty} y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Conversely, let $x, y, z \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and $\beta, \delta \prec \rho^*$. Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
y \in a \wedge u \in y &\rightarrow u \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg} \wedge \exists z \in a \; u \in_{\infty} z \\
y \in a \wedge u \in y &\rightarrow u \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg} \wedge \neg\neg\exists z \in a \; u \in_{\infty} z \\
y \in a \wedge u \in y &\rightarrow u \in_{\infty} c \\
y \in a \wedge u \in y \wedge x =_{\beta} u &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
y \in a \wedge \neg\neg\exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \exists u' \in y \; x =_{\beta'} u' &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \\
y \in a \wedge x \in_{\infty} y &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \\
y \in a \wedge z =_{\delta} y \wedge x \in_{\infty} z &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
\exists \delta' \prec \rho^* \exists y' \in a \; z =_{\delta} y' \wedge x \in_{\infty} z &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \\
\neg\neg\exists \delta' \prec \rho^* \exists y' \in a \; z =_{\delta} y' \wedge x \in_{\infty} z &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \\
z \in_{\infty} a \wedge x \in_{\infty} z &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c \\
\neg\neg\exists z' \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (z' \in_{\infty} a \wedge x \in_{\infty} z') &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} c .
\end{aligned}
$$

From the above we conclude that $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_{\infty}, =_{\infty}) \models (\text{Union})^N$. $\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Lemma 7.15 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_{\infty}, =_{\infty}) \models (\text{full Separation})^N$.

Proof: Let $a \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and let $A(v)$ be a formula with parameters from $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and at most the free variable v. Let $A^*(v)$ arise from $A(v)$ by first applying the N-translation and subsequently restricting all unbounded quantifiers to $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. Pick $\alpha \prec \rho^*$ such that $a \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$ and let

$$c := \{x \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg} \mid x \in_{\infty} a \wedge (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_{\infty}, =_{\infty}) \models A^*(x)\}.$$

c is a set by bounded Separation in our background theory. Obviously $c \subseteq V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$. Suppose $u \in V_{\alpha}^{\neg\neg}$ and $\neg\neg u \in c$. Then $\neg\neg u \in_{\infty} a$ and $\neg\neg A^*(u)$, thus $u \in_{\infty} a$ and $A^*(u)$ since both formulae are negative. As a result, $c \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg}$.

Now let $x \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and $\beta \prec \rho^*$. Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u \in c &\rightarrow u \in_{\infty} a \wedge A^*(u) \\
u \in c \wedge x =_{\beta} u &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} a \wedge A^*(x) \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
\exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \exists u \in c \; x =_{\beta} u &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} a \wedge A^*(x) \\
\neg\neg\exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \exists u \in c \; x =_{\beta} u &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} a \wedge A^*(x) \quad \text{(succedent is negative)} \\
x \in_{\infty} c &\rightarrow x \in_{\infty} a \wedge A^*(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

26

$$
\begin{aligned}
u \in a \wedge A^*(u) &\rightarrow u \in c \\
u \in a \wedge A^*(u) &\rightarrow u \in_\infty c \\
u \in a \wedge x =_\beta u \wedge A^*(x) &\rightarrow x \in_\infty c \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
\exists \beta' \prec \rho^* \, \exists u \in a \; x =_\beta u \wedge A^*(x) &\rightarrow x \in_\infty c \\
x \in_\infty a \wedge A^*(x) &\rightarrow x \in_\infty c \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

As a result of the above we have

$$
(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models \exists z \, \forall x [x \in_\infty z \; \leftrightarrow \; (x \in_\infty a \wedge A^N(x))] \,.
$$

$\square$

Lemma 7.16 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (\textit{Set Induction})^N$.

Proof: Let $A(v)$ be a formula with parameters from $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ and at most the free variable v. Let $A^*(v)$ arise from $A(v)$ by first applying the N-translation and subsequently restricting all unbounded quantifiers to $V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$. Assume that

$$
\forall z \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} [\forall y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (y \in_\infty z \rightarrow A^*(y)) \rightarrow A^*(z)] \,. \tag{20}
$$

Let $a \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}$ where $\alpha \prec \rho^*$. The aim is to show that $A^*(a)$ holds. To this end we proceed by induction on α. If $u \in a$ then $u \in V_\xi^{\neg\neg}$ for some $\xi \prec \alpha$ by Lemma 7.3(vii), thus $A^*(u)$ holds by the inductive assumption. For $x \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ we thus have

$$
\begin{aligned}
x =_\beta u \wedge u \in a &\rightarrow A^*(x) \quad \text{(by Corollary 7.12)} \\
\exists \beta \prec \rho^* \, \exists u \in a \; x =_\beta u &\rightarrow A^*(x) \\
x \in_\infty a &\rightarrow A^*(x) \quad (A^*(x) \text{ being negative}) \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

In view of our assumption (20) we thus have $A^*(a)$. $\square$

Lemma 7.17 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (\textit{Power Set})^N$.

Proof: For $x, y \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ define $x \subseteq_\infty y$ as $\forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (u \in_\infty x \rightarrow u \in_\infty y)$.
Let $a \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg}$ for some $\alpha \prec \rho^*$. Let

$$
c := \{x \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg} \mid x \subseteq_\infty a\} \,.
$$

Then $c \subseteq V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg}$ and we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
w \in V_{\alpha+1}^{\neg\neg} \wedge \neg\neg w \in c \;&\rightarrow\; \neg\neg w \subseteq_\infty a \\
&\rightarrow\; \neg\neg \forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (u \in_\infty w \rightarrow u \in_\infty a) \\
&\rightarrow\; \forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} \neg\neg (u \in_\infty w \rightarrow u \in_\infty a) \\
&\rightarrow\; \forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (\neg\neg u \in_\infty w \rightarrow \neg\neg u \in_\infty a) \\
&\rightarrow\; \forall u \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (u \in_\infty w \rightarrow u \in_\infty a) \\
&\rightarrow\; w \subseteq_\infty a \\
&\rightarrow\; w \in c \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that $c \in V_{\alpha+2}^{\neg\neg}$.

Now suppose $y \subseteq_\infty a$. Let

$$y^* := \{v \in V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \mid v \in_\infty y\}.$$

Then $y^* \subseteq_\infty y$. Let $u \in_\infty y$. Then $u \in a$ and hence

$$\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge u =_\beta v \wedge v \in a \quad \rightarrow \quad v \in_\infty y$$
$$\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge u =_\beta v \wedge v \in a \quad \rightarrow \quad v \in_\infty y^*$$
$$\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge u =_\beta v \wedge v \in a \quad \rightarrow \quad u \in_\infty y^*$$
$$\exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists v \in a \, u =_\beta v \quad \rightarrow \quad u \in_\infty y^*$$
$$\neg\neg \exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists v \in a \, u =_\beta v \quad \rightarrow \quad u \in_\infty y^*$$
$$u \in_\infty y \quad \rightarrow \quad u \in_\infty y^*.$$

So $y \subseteq_\infty y^*$, which together with $y^* \subseteq_\infty y$ yields $y =_\infty y^*$, and hence $y \in_\infty c$. As a result,

$$y \subseteq_\infty a \quad \rightarrow \quad y \in_\infty c. \tag{21}$$

Conversely, suppose $y \in_\infty c$. Then we have

$$\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge y =_\beta z \wedge z \in c \quad \rightarrow \quad z \subseteq_\infty a$$
$$\beta \prec \rho^* \wedge y =_\beta z \wedge z \in c \quad \rightarrow \quad y \subseteq_\infty a$$
$$\exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists z \in c \, y =_\beta z \quad \rightarrow \quad y \subseteq_\infty a$$
$$\neg\neg \exists \beta \prec \rho^* \exists z \in c \, y =_\beta z \quad \rightarrow \quad y \subseteq_\infty a$$
$$y \in_\infty c \quad \rightarrow \quad y \subseteq_\infty a. \tag{22}$$

(21) and (22) imply that the Powerset axiom holds in $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty)$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 7.18 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (Infinity)^N$.

Proof: By recursion on $n \in \omega$ define

$$0^* \quad := \quad \emptyset$$
$$(n+1)^* \quad := \quad \{u \in V_{n+1}^{\neg\neg} \mid \neg\neg(u \in_\infty n^* \vee u =_\infty n^*)\}$$
$$\omega^* \quad := \quad \{u \in V_\omega^{\neg\neg} \mid \neg\neg \exists n \in \omega \, u =_\infty n^*\}.$$

By induction on n one readily verifies that $n^* \in V_{n+1}^{\neg\neg}$. Also $\omega^* \in V_{\omega+1}^{\neg\neg}$. Moreover, it is by now routine (though tedious) to verify that the following statement holds in $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty)$:

$$\forall x \, [x \in \omega^* \ \leftrightarrow \ \neg\neg \, (\neg\neg \exists u \, u \in x \ \vee \ \neg\neg \exists y \, [y \in \omega^* \wedge \forall v \, (v \in_\infty x \ \leftrightarrow \ \neg\neg(v \in y \vee v = y))])]. \tag{23}$$

It is a consequence of (23) that the N-translation of the Infinity axiom holds in $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty)$. $\quad\square$

Lemma 7.19 $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \vdash (V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (V_\rho \ exists)^N$.

Proof: The elements of the ordinal representation system $\mathcal{OT}(\vartheta) = (\mathrm{OT}(\vartheta) \cap \Omega, \prec)$ are elements of ω. In the proof of Lemma 7.18 we defined the internalization $n^* \in V_{n+1}^{\neg\neg}$ of $n \in \omega$ in the structure $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty)$. We will now define the internalization $H(\alpha)$ of the ordered pair $\langle \alpha^*, V_\alpha^{\neg\neg} \rangle$ for each $\alpha \prec \rho$. Recall that we chose ρ to be of the form ω^{ρ_0} for some $\rho_0 \succ 1$, so that for all $\alpha \prec \rho$, $\alpha + \omega \prec \rho$. For $x \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}$ we use $x \in_\infty OP(\alpha^*, V_\alpha^{\neg\neg})$ to abbreviate the following formula:

$$\neg\neg \left[\forall v \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (v \in_\infty x \leftrightarrow v =_\infty \alpha^*) \ \vee \ \forall v \in V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg} (v \in_\infty x \leftrightarrow \neg\neg (v =_\infty \alpha^* \vee v =_\infty V_\alpha^{\neg\neg})) \right].$$

For $\alpha \prec \rho$ define

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(\alpha) &:= \{ x \in V_{\omega + \alpha + 2}^{\neg\neg} \mid x \in_\infty OP(\alpha^*, V_\alpha^{\neg\neg}) \} \\
V_\rho^* &:= \{ z \in V_\rho^{\neg\neg} \mid \neg\neg \exists \alpha \prec \rho \ z =_\infty H(\alpha) \}.
\end{aligned}
$$

One readily checks that $H(\alpha) \in V_{\omega + \alpha + 3}^{\neg\neg}$ and $V_\rho^* \in V_{\rho+1}^{\neg\neg}$. It remains to show that V_ρ^* is the set witnessing that $(V_{\rho^*}^{\neg\neg}, \in_\infty, =_\infty) \models (V_\rho \text{ exists})^N$ holds. This is so by design of V_ρ^* but it is rather tedious to check in detail. □

7.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We use $\leq$ and $\equiv$ for the relations of being proof-theoretically reducible and proof-theoretically equivalent, respectively. We have $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P} + \mathbf{RDC} + \mathbf{\Pi\Sigma-AC} \leq \mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P} \leq \mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P})$ using Theorem 7.1 and Theorem 3.5. By Lemma 3.9 and Theorem 3.8 we get $\mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P} \leq \mathcal{T}^- \leq \mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P})$. $\mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg} \leq \mathbf{MLV_P} \leq \mathbf{CZF}_\mathcal{P}$ holds by Theorems 6.2 and 5.1. Theorems 7.5 and 7.4 yield $\mathbf{KP}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \mathbf{Z} + \{\text{`}V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}} \leq \mathbf{CZF} + \mathbf{Pow}^{\neg\neg}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{IKP}(\mathcal{P}) \equiv \mathbf{IZ} + \{\text{`}V_\tau \text{ exists'}\}_{\tau \in \mathrm{BH}}$ holds by Theorem 7.4. The upshot of these results is thus that all theories of Theorem 1.1 are proof-theoretically equivalent. □

References

[1] P. Aczel: *The Type Theoretic Interpretation of Constructive Set Theory*, in: MacIntyre, A. Pacholski, L., and Paris, J. (eds.), *Logic Colloquium '77*, North–Holland, Amsterdam 1978.

[2] P. Aczel: *The Type Theoretic Interpretation of Constructive Set Theory: Choice Principles*, in: Troelstra, A. S., van Dalen, D. (eds), *The L.E.J. Brouwer Centenary Symposium*, North–Holland, Amsterdam 1982.

[3] P. Aczel: *The type theoretic interpretation of constructive set theory: Inductive definitions.* In: R.B. Marcus et al. (eds.): *Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science VII* (North Holland, Amsterdam 1986) 17–49.

[4] P. Aczel: *On relating type theories and set theories,* in: T. Altenkirch, W. Naraschewski, B. Reus (eds.): Types '98, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1257 (Springer, Berlin, 2000).

[5] P. Aczel, M. Rathjen: *Notes on constructive set theory*, Technical Report 40, Institut Mittag-Leffler (The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences,Stockholm,2001). *http://www.ml.kva.se/preprints/archive2000-2001.php*

[6] P. Aczel, M. Rathjen: *Constructive set theory*, book draft, August 2010.

[7] J. Barwise: *Admissible Sets and Structures* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1975).

[8] M. Beeson: *Foundations of Constructive Mathematics.* Springer, Berlin (1985).

[9] R.-M. Chen, M. Rathjen: *Lifschitz Realizability for Intuitionistic Zermelo-Fraenkel Set Theory*, 2010, submitted.

[10] T. Coquand: *Metamathematical investigations of a calculus of constructions*, in: P. Oddifreddi (ed.): *Logic and Computer science* (Academic Press, 1990) 91–122.

[11] S. Feferman: *Constructive theories of functions and classes.* In: In: M Boffa, D. van Dalen, K. McAloon (eds.): *Logic Colloquium '78* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) 1–52.

[12] H. Friedman: *Some applications of Kleene's method for intuitionistic systems.* In: A. Mathias and H. Rogers (eds.): *Cambridge Summer School in Mathematical Logic*, volume 337 of *Lectures Notes in Mathematics* (Springer, Berlin, 1973) 113–170.

[13] H. Friedman: *Countable models of set theories.* In: A. Mathias and H. Rogers (eds.): *Cambridge Summer School in Mathematical Logic*, volume 337 of *Lectures Notes in Mathematics* (Springer, Berlin, 1973) 539–573.

[14] H. Friedman: *The consistency of classical set theory relative to a set theory with intuitionistic logic.* Journal of Symbolic Logic 38 (1973) 315–319.

[15] N. Gambino: *Types and sets: a study on the jump to full impredicativity*, Laurea Dissertation, Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics, University of Padua (1999).

[16] V. Lifschitz: CT_0 *is stronger than* CT_0*!*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 73 (1979) 101-106.

[17] R.S. Lubarsky: *CZF and Second Order Arithmetic*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 141 (2006) 29–34.

[18] S. Mac Lane: *Form and Function* (Springer, Berlin, 1992).

[19] P. Martin-Löf: *Intuitionistic Type Theory*, (Bibliopolis, Naples, 1984).

[20] A.R.D. Mathias: *The strength of Mac Lane set theory*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 110 (2001) 107-234.

[21] Y.N. Moschovakis: *Recursion in the universe of sets*, mimeographed note (1976).

[22] L. Moss: *Power set recursion*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 71 (1995) 247–306.

[23] J. Myhill: *Constructive set theory.* Journal of Symbolic Logic 40 (1975) 347–382.

[24] D. Normann: *Set recursion.* In: *Generalized recursion theory II*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1978) 303–320.

[25] J. van Oosten: *Lifschitz's Realizability*, The Journal of Symbolic Logic 55 (1990) 805–821.

[26] E. Palmgren: *Type-Theoretic Interpretations of Iterated, Strictly Positive Inductive Definitions*, Arch. Math. Logic 32, 75–99 (1993).

[27] L. Pozsgay: *Liberal intuitionism as a basis for set theory*, in Axiomatic Set Theory, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. XIII, Part 1 (1971) 321-330.

[28] L. Pozsgay: *Semi-intuitionistic set theory*, Notre Dame J. of Formal Logic 13 (1972) 546-550.

[29] M. Rathjen: *The strength of some Martin-Löf type theories.* Archive for Mathematical Logic (1994) 347–385.

[30] M. Rathjen: *Choice principles in constructive and classical set theories.* In: Z. Chatzidakis, P. Koepke, W. Pohlers (eds.): *Logic Colloquium 02*, Lecture Notes in Logic 27 (A.K. Peters, 2006) 299–326.

[31] M. Rathjen: *Realizability for constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory.* In: J. Väänänen, V. Stoltenberg-Hansen (eds.): *Logic Colloquium 2003.* Lecture Notes in Logic 24 (A.K. Peters, 2006) 282–314.

[32] M. Rathjen: *Replacement versus collection in constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory.* Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 136 (2005) 156–174.

[33] M. Rathjen: *The formulae-as-classes interpretation of constructive set theory.* In: H. Schwichtenberg, K. Spies (eds.): *Proof Technology and Computation* ,Proceedings of the International Summer School Marktoberdorf 2003 (IOS Press, Amsterdam,2006) 279–322.

[34] M. Rathjen, S. Tupailo: *Characterizing the interpretation of set theory in Martin-Löf type theory.* Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 141 (2006) 442–471.

[35] M. Rathjen: *Relativized ordinal analysis: The case of Power Kripke-Platek set theory* Centre de Recerca Matemàtica Barcelona preprint series (2011).

[36] M . Rathjen: *From the weak to the strong existence property,* Annals of Pure and Applied Logic (2012) doi:10.1016/j.apal.2012.01.012

[37] M. Rathjen and A. Weiermann: *Proof–theoretic investigations on Kruskal's theorem,* Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 60 (1993) 49–88.

[38] G. E. Sacks: *Higher Recursion Theory.* Springer, Berlin (1990)

[39] L. Tharp: *A quasi-intuitionistic set theory.* Journal of Symbolic Logic 36 (1971) 456–460.

[40] E.J. Thiele: *Über endlich axiomatisierbare Teilsysteme der Zermelo-Fraenkel'schen Mengenlehre*, Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik 14 (1968) 39-58.

[41] A.S. Troelstra: *Realizability.* In: S.R. Buss (ed.): *Handbook of proof theory* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1998) 407–473.

[42] A.S. Troelstra and D. van Dalen: *Constructivism in Mathematics, Volumes I, II.* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1988).

[43] R. S. Wolf: *Formally Intuitionistic Set Theories with Bounded Predicates Decidable*, PhD Thesis (Stanford University, 1974).