

## On Ackermann function and inference rules $(\eta)$ and $(\text{ap}_v)$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Ack}(0, n) &= n + 1 \\ \text{Ack}(m + 1, 0) &= \text{Ack}(m, 1) \\ \text{Ack}(m + 1, n + 1) &= \text{Ack}(m, \text{Ack}(m + 1, n))\end{aligned}$$

Remark that this is defined by the lexicographic order of  $(m, n)$ .

### 1 First term representation: **ack1**

We first give the first representation **ack1** of Ackermann function. In this article, we sometimes write  $f(x, y)$  instead of  $f(x)(y)$ , for readability.

**Definition 1.1** (**ack1**) We define **ack1** by the following equation.

$$\text{ack1} = \lambda \mathbf{m} \mathbf{n} . \text{cond}(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{n}, \lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(\mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{m})$$

#### Checking the behavior of **ack1**

$$\begin{aligned}\text{ack1}(0, n) &\mapsto \text{cond}(\mathbf{S} n, \lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(n))(0) \\ &\mapsto \mathbf{S} n\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m, 0) &\mapsto \text{cond}(\mathbf{S} 0, \lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(0))(\mathbf{S} m) \\ &\mapsto (\lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(0))(m) \\ &\mapsto \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m, 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(0) \\ &\mapsto \text{ack1}(m, 1)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{ack1}(\underline{\mathbf{S} m}, \mathbf{S} n) &\mapsto \text{cond}(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{S} n, \lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(\mathbf{S} n))(\underline{\mathbf{S} m}) \\ &\mapsto (\lambda m' . \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m', \text{ack1}(\mathbf{S} m', n')))(\mathbf{S} n))(\underline{m}) \\ &\mapsto \text{cond}(\text{ack1}(m, 1), \lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m, \text{ack1}(\underline{\mathbf{S} m}, n')))(\mathbf{S} n) \\ &\mapsto (\lambda n' . \text{ack1}(m, \text{ack1}(\underline{\mathbf{S} m}, n')))(n) \\ &\mapsto \text{ack1}(m, \text{ack1}(\underline{\mathbf{S} m}, n))\end{aligned}$$

The point of **ack1** is the last case. The term  $\underline{\mathbf{S} m}$  of the first line and  $\mathbf{S} \underline{m}$  of the last line are slightly different:  $\underline{\mathbf{S} m}$  is decomposed into  $\underline{m}$  by the cond-reduction, then  $\underline{\mathbf{S} m}$  is constructed by substituting  $m'$  of  $\mathbf{S} m'$  by  $\underline{m}$ .

#### 1.1 **ack1** : $N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$ is not in GTC (with $(\eta)$ )

**Claim** **ack1** :  $N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$  is well-typed, but does not satisfy GTC in the system with  $(\eta)$ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N \rightarrow N} (\dagger 1)}{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m') : N \rightarrow N} (\eta)}{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m', 1) : N}} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\dagger 2)}{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m') : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\eta)}{m' : \mathbf{N}, n' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')) : N} (\eta)}{\frac{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')) : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\text{cond})} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{n : N \vdash n : N}}{n : N \vdash Sn : N}}{n : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(Sn, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n)) : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\eta)}{\frac{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n) : N} (\eta)}{\frac{n : \mathbf{N}, m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n) : N} (\eta)}{\frac{n : \mathbf{N} \vdash \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n) : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\text{cond})} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{}{m : \mathbf{N}, n : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(Sn, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n))(m) : N} (\eta)}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\dagger)
\end{array}
\quad (*)$$

The problem is (ap). This cuts the trace chasing of  $\mathbf{N}$ . The infinite path  $(\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 1) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 3) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 1) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 3) \rightsquigarrow \dots$  does not contains progressing trace.

## 1.2 $\mathbf{ack1} : N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$ is not in GTC (with $(\text{ap}_v)$ )

**Claim**  $\mathbf{ack1} : N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$  is well-typed, but does not satisfy GTC in the system with  $(\text{ap}_v)$ .

The situation is the same as before. In the following, weakening is implicitly applied.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N \rightarrow N} (\dagger 1)}{m' : N \vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N \rightarrow N} (\text{ap}_v)}{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m') : N \rightarrow N} (\text{ap}_v)} \quad \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\dagger 2)}{m' : N \vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\text{ap}_v)}{m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m') : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\text{ap}_v)}{\frac{m' : \mathbf{N}, n' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')) : N} (\text{cond})} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{n : N, m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n) : N} (\text{ap}_v)}{n : \mathbf{N}, m' : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n) : N} (\text{cond})} \\
\frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{}{m : N, n : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(Sn, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n)) : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\text{ap}_v)}{m : \mathbf{N}, n : \mathbf{N} \vdash \text{cond}(Sn, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack1}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack1}(m', \mathbf{ack1}(Sm', n')))(n))(m) : N} (\text{ap}_v)}{\vdash \mathbf{ack1} : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow N} (\dagger)
\end{array}$$

## 2 Second term representation: $\mathbf{ack2}$

We give the second representation  $\mathbf{ack2}$  of Ackermann function.

**Definition 2.1** ( $\mathbf{ack2}$ ) We define  $\mathbf{ack2}$  by the following equation.

$$\mathbf{ack2} = \lambda \mathbf{mn}. \text{cond}(\mathbf{Sn}, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\mathbf{ack2}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \mathbf{ack2}(m', \mathbf{ack2}(\mathbf{m}, n')))(\mathbf{n}))(\mathbf{m})$$

## Checking the behavior of ack2

We check only the last case.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, Sn) &\mapsto \text{cond}(\text{SSn}, \lambda m'. \text{cond}(\text{ack2}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \text{ack2}(m', \text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, n')))(Sn))(\underline{Sm}) \\
&\mapsto (\lambda m'. \text{cond}(\text{ack2}(m', 1), \lambda n'. \text{ack2}(m', \text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, n')))(Sn))(\underline{m}) \\
&\mapsto \text{cond}(\text{ack2}(m, 1), \lambda n'. \text{ack2}(m, \text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, n')))(Sn) \\
&\mapsto (\lambda n'. \text{ack2}(m, \text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, n')))(n) \\
&\mapsto \text{ack2}(m, \text{ack2}(\underline{Sm}, n))
\end{aligned}$$

The point of `ack2` is that *Sm* at the first line and the one at the last line are exactly the same.

### 2.1 $\text{ack2} : N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$ is not in GTC (with $(\eta)$ )

**Claim** `ack2` :  $N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$  is well-typed, but does not satisfy GTC in the system with  $(\eta)$ .

[illegible]

The problem is (ap). This cuts the trace chasing of **N**. The infinite path  $(\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 1) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger) \rightsquigarrow (\dagger 1) \rightsquigarrow \dots$  does not contains progressing trace.

## 2.2 $\text{ack2} : N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$ is not in GTC (with $(\text{ap}_v)$ )

**Claim**  $\text{ack2} : N \rightarrow N \rightarrow N$  is well-typed, but does not satisfy GTC in the system with  $(\text{ap}_v)$ .

[illegible]

The problem is the lower most (ap<sub>v</sub>). This cuts the trace chasing of  $m : \mathbf{N}$ . Perhaps  $m : N$  at (†3) should be  $\mathbf{N}$ .

Summing up, both  $(\eta)$  and  $(\text{ap}_v)$  are problematic. Possible solution might be:

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \mathbf{N} \vdash f : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow A}{\Gamma, x : \mathbf{N} \vdash f(x) : A} \text{ (ap}_v\text{)}$$