

Chapter 1

Type theory

Exercises

Exercise 1.1. Given functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, define their **composite** $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$. Show that we have $h \circ (g \circ f) \equiv (h \circ g) \circ f$.

Solution (Alan).

Solution (Alex).

Exercise 1.2. Derive the recursion principle for products $\text{rec}_{A \times B}$ using only the projections, and verify that the definitional equalities are valid. Do the same for Σ -types.

Solution (Daniel). foo bar

Solution (Jake).

Solution (James).

Exercise 1.3. Derive the induction principle for products $\text{ind}_{A \times B}$, using only the projections and the propositional uniqueness principle $\text{uniq}_{A \times B}$. Verify that the definitional equalities are valid. Generalize $\text{uniq}_{A \times B}$ to Σ -types, and do the same for Σ -types. (*This requires concepts from ??.*)

Solution (Steven). I actually have no idea (yet), this is just a test. $\text{foo} = b^{a^r}$

Solution (Zack).

Exercise 1.4. Assuming as given only the *iterator* for natural numbers

$$\text{iter} : \prod_{C:\mathcal{U}} C \rightarrow (C \rightarrow C) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow C$$

with the defining equations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iter}(C, c_0, c_s, 0) &:\equiv c_0, \\ \text{iter}(C, c_0, c_s, \text{succ}(n)) &:\equiv c_s(\text{iter}(C, c_0, c_s, n)), \end{aligned}$$

derive a function having the type of the recursor $\text{rec}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Show that the defining equations of the recursor hold propositionally for this function, using the induction principle for \mathbb{N} .

Solution (Alan).

Solution (Daniel).

Exercise 1.5. Show that if we define $A + B \equiv \sum_{(x:\mathbf{2})} \text{rec}_2(\mathcal{U}, A, B, x)$, then we can give a definition of ind_{A+B} for which the definitional equalities stated in ?? hold.

Solution (Steven).

Solution (Alex).

Solution (James).

Exercise 1.6. Show that if we define $A \times B \equiv \prod_{(x:\mathbf{2})} \text{rec}_2(\mathcal{U}, A, B, x)$, then we can give a definition of $\text{ind}_{A \times B}$ for which the definitional equalities stated in ?? hold propositionally (i.e. using equality types). (This requires the function extensionality axiom, which is introduced in ??.)

Solution (Jake).

Solution (Zack).

Exercise 1.7. Give an alternative derivation of $\text{ind}'_{=A}$ from $\text{ind}_{=A}$ which avoids the use of universes. (This is easiest using concepts from later chapters.)

Solution (Alan).

Solution (Jake).

Exercise 1.8. Define multiplication and exponentiation using $\text{rec}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Verify that $(\mathbb{N}, +, 0, \times, 1)$ is a semiring using only $\text{ind}_{\mathbb{N}}$. You will probably also need to use symmetry and transitivity of equality, ????

Solution (Steven).

Solution (Alex).

Exercise 1.9. Define the type family $\text{Fin} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ mentioned at the end of ??, and the dependent function $\text{fmax} : \prod_{(n:\mathbb{N})} \text{Fin}(n+1)$ mentioned in ??.

Solution (Daniel).

Solution (Zack).

Solution (James).

Exercise 1.10. Show that the Ackermann function $\text{ack} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is definable using only $\text{rec}_{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfying the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ack}(0, n) &\equiv \text{succ}(n), \\ \text{ack}(\text{succ}(m), 0) &\equiv \text{ack}(m, 1), \\ \text{ack}(\text{succ}(m), \text{succ}(n)) &\equiv \text{ack}(m, \text{ack}(\text{succ}(m), n)). \end{aligned}$$

Solution (Alan).

Solution (Steven).

Exercise 1.11. Show that for any type A , we have $\neg\neg\neg A \rightarrow \neg A$.

Solution (Jake).

Solution (Daniel).

Solution (James).

Exercise 1.12. Using the propositions as types interpretation, derive the following tautologies.

- (i) If A , then (if B then A).
- (ii) If A , then not (not A).
- (iii) If (not A or not B), then not (A and B).

Solution (Alex).

Solution (Zack).

Exercise 1.13. Using propositions-as-types, derive the double negation of the principle of excluded middle, i.e. prove *not (not (P or not P))*.

Solution (Alan).

Solution (Zack).

Exercise 1.14. Why do the induction principles for identity types not allow us to construct a function $f : \prod_{(x:A)} \prod_{(p:x=x)} (p = \text{refl}_x)$ with the defining equation

$$f(x, \text{refl}_x) :\equiv \text{refl}_{\text{refl}_x} \quad ?$$

Solution (Daniel).

Solution (Alex).

Solution (James).

Exercise 1.15. Show that indiscernability of identicals follows from path induction.

Solution (Steven).

Solution (Jake).

Exercise 1.16. Show that addition of natural numbers is commutative: $\prod_{(i,j:\mathbb{N})} (i + j = j + i)$.