

Martin-Löf Type Theory: Example proof

Carl Factora

March 3, 2016

Preliminary definitions

```
open import Data.Nat using (; suc)
open import Relation.Binary.PropositionalEquality
  using (==; refl; cong; sym; trans)
open import Data.Product
open import Data.Empty

-- Natural Number Recursion and Induction principle
rec : (C : Set) → C → (C → C) → C
rec C c f 0 = c
rec C c f (suc n) = f n (rec C c f n)

ind : (C : Set) → C → 0 → ((n : ℕ) → C n → C (suc n))
      (n : ℕ) → C n
ind C c f zero = c
ind C c f (suc n) = f n (ind C c f n)

-- Addition
add :
add = rec (ℕ) (0) (λ n r n → suc (r n))
```

We also define the following propositions:

```
  : Set → Set
A = A
```

```

_+ : (i j : ℕ) → Set
i + j = [ k ] (add i k j)

_<_ : (i j : ℕ) → Set
i < j = (i + j) → (i + j)

0si : (i : ℕ) → (0 ≠ suc i)
0si i = ()

```

Here, we define $+$ and $<$ as:

- $i + j$ is provable if and only if there exists a k such that $i + k = j$.
- $i < j$ is provable if and only if we can provide a proof that $i + j$ and that $i + j$.

Thus, both propositions are proven by constructing by pairs. The proof for $i + j$ must be a dependent pair since its corresponding proposition uses a specific natural number (viz. k).

`0si` is a proof that 0 is never equal to the successor of a natural number. Here, we write `()` since the second assumption of the proof, `0 ≠ suc i`, allows us to simply appeal to the fact that it is absurd to say that 0 is equal to any natural number $+ 1$, by definition of the natural numbers and the fact that Agda assumes that terms that are constructed differently (i.e., 0 and `suc` for natural numbers) can never be equal.

The Proof

Using the above, we can prove the following:

```

0< : (i : ℕ) → (0 < suc i)
0< = ?

```

The proof of this proposition requires that we prove that 0 is less than all natural numbers. We do this using induction. More specifically, this proof requires us to perform induction on a natural number, i . To do this, we use the `ind` principle defined above. For each step of our proof, we also provide the corresponding proof environment (viz. **Proof Environment**) that represents the given proof obligation for each hole (viz. `{ }`).

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind { }0 { }1 { }2

```

```

{---Proof Environment
  ?0 : Set
  ?1 : 0 < suc 0
  ?2 : (n : ) 0 < suc n 0 < suc (suc n)
-}

```

The first of these obligations (i.e., ?0) requires us to declare the proposition we are wanting to prove. In general, this simply mirrors the proofs type definition.

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind ( i 0 < suc i) { }1 { }2

```

```

{---Proof Environment
  ?1 : 0 < suc 0
  ?2 : (n : ) 0 < suc n 0 < suc (suc n)
-}

```

Our next obligation requires us to prove the proposition in the case that $i = 0$ (i.e., we must show that $0 < \text{suc } 0$). Given our definition of $<$, the proof this by constructing a pair, containing proofs of $0 \text{ suc } 0$ and $(0 \text{ suc } 0)$.

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind ( i 0 < suc i)
      ({ }0 , { }1)
      { }2

```

```

{---Proof Environment
  ?0 : 0 suc 0
  ?1 : (0 suc 0)
  ?2 : (n : ) 0 < suc n 0 < suc (suc n)
-}

```

To prove ?0, we must construct a dependent pair that contains a natural number k , such that $0 + k = 1$. Thus, we construct a pair containing the natural number 1 and as well as the proof that $1 = 1$ (e.g. `refl`). To prove ?1, we use our proof of `0si` on 0 to prove that $(0 \text{ suc } 0)$.

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind ( i 0 < suc i)
        ((1 , refl) , 0si 0)
        { }2

```

```

{---Proof Environment
  ?2 : (n : ) 0 < suc n 0 < suc (suc n)
-}

```

To prove the final proposition, we must prove that for all natural numbers, n , with the assumption that 0 is less than $\text{suc } n$, we can show that 0 is less than $\text{suc } (\text{suc } n)$ (i.e., $n + 2$).

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind ( i 0 < suc i)
        ((1 , refl) , 0si 0)
        ( n ih { }0)

```

```

{---Proof Environment
  ?0 : 0 < suc (suc n)
-}

```

In this case, our inductive hypothesis, ih , is actually not necessary, since we can simply employ the same strategy as in the earlier proof for the base-case.

```

0< : (i : ) (0 < suc i)
0< = ind ( i 0 < suc i)
        ((1 , refl) , 0si 0)
        ( n _ ((suc (suc n)) , refl) , 0si (suc n))

```