

Control Operators and Natural Numbers are Degenerate

Robin Adams

September 20, 2010

We work in a type theory that has both μ -operators, and a type of natural numbers. Suppose we have a term *iszero* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{iszero}0 &\rightarrow 1 \\ \text{iszero}(Sn) &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

In addition to the above, our type theory has the following reduction rules:

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mu\alpha.n) &\rightarrow \mu\alpha.[S[]/\alpha]n & (1) \\ \text{iszero}(\mu\alpha.n) &\rightarrow \mu\alpha.[\text{iszero}[]/\alpha]n & (2) \\ [\alpha]\mu\beta.n &\rightarrow [\alpha/\beta]n & (3) \end{aligned}$$

where, for $C[]$ a context, the term

$$[C[]/\alpha]n$$

is defined to be the result of replacing every subterm of the form $[\alpha]M$ with $[\alpha]C[M]$.

(There may be other reduction rules, too; we do not care.)

Consider the term

$$M \equiv \mu\alpha.[\alpha]S(\mu\beta.[\alpha]0)$$

Theorem 1 *The term $\text{iszero}M$ is not confluent.*

Proof Here is one reduction sequence for $\text{iszero}M$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{iszero}M \\ &\mu\alpha.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(S(\mu\beta.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(0))) \\ &\mu\alpha.[\alpha]0 \end{aligned}$$

Here is another

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{iszero}M \\
& \mu\alpha.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(S(\mu\beta.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(0))) \\
& \mu\alpha.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(\mu\beta.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(0)) \\
& \mu\alpha.[\alpha]\mu\beta.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(0) \\
& \mu\alpha.[\alpha]\text{iszero}(0) \\
& \mu\alpha.[\alpha]1
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1 *If we add to the type theory the following rule (sometimes called the η -rule for control operators):*

$$\mu\alpha.[\alpha]M \rightarrow M$$

then we have $0 \simeq 1$.

Note that, in the proof above, the first reduction sequence corresponds to a lazy or call-by-name strategy, while the second corresponds to a call-by-value strategy.

Thus, if we want to have both control operators and inductive types, we must choose what to give up:

1. We may choose to restrict reduction to call-by-value only, or to call-by-name only.
2. We may choose to remove rule (1) or (2): control operators only reduce under constructors, or only under eliminators, or neither. (The option ‘neither’ was explored by $\lambda\mu\text{PRL}$; the other two have not been explored, to the best of my knowledge.)