3.4 Critical Pairs

Showing local confluence (Sketch):

Problem: If $t_1 \leftarrow_E t_0 \rightarrow_E t_2$, does there exist a term s such that $t_1 \rightarrow_E^* s \leftarrow_E^* t_2$?

If the two rewrite steps happen in different subtrees (disjoint redexes): yes.

If the two rewrite steps happen below each other (overlap at or below a variable position): yes.

If the left-hand sides of the two rules overlap at a non-variable position: needs further investigation.

Question:
Are there rewrite rules $l_1 \rightarrow r_1$ and $l_2 \rightarrow r_2$ such that some subterm l_1/p and l_2 have a common instance $(l_1/p)\sigma_1 = l_2\sigma_2$?

Observation:
If we assume w.o.l.o.g. that the two rewrite rules do not have common variables, then only a single substitution is necessary: $(l_1/p)\sigma = l_2\sigma$.

Further observation:
The mgu of l_1/p and l_2 subsumes all unifiers σ of l_1/p and l_2.

Let $l_i \rightarrow r_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two rewrite rules in a TRS R whose variables have been renamed such that $\mathrm{var}(l_1) \cap \mathrm{var}(l_2) = \emptyset$. (Remember that $\mathrm{var}(l_i) \supseteq \mathrm{var}(r_i)$.)

Let $p \in \mathrm{pos}(l_1)$ be a position such that l_1/p is not a variable and σ is an mgu of l_1/p and l_2.

Then $r_1\sigma \leftarrow l_1\sigma \rightarrow (l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p$.

$\langle r_1\sigma, (l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p\rangle$ is called a *critical pair* of R.

The critical pair is *joinable* (or: converges), if $r_1\sigma \downarrow_R (l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p$.

Theorem 3.18 ("Critical Pair Theorem") *A TRS R is locally confluent if and only if all its critical pairs are joinable.*

Proof. "only if": obvious, since joinability of a critical pair is a special case of local confluence.

"if": Suppose s rewrites to t_1 and t_2 using rewrite rules $l_i \rightarrow r_i \in R$ at positions $p_i \in \mathrm{pos}(s)$, where $i = 1, 2$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that the two rules are variable disjoint, hence $s/p_i = l_i\theta$ and $t_i = s[r_i\theta]_{p_i}$.

We distinguish between two cases: Either p_1 and p_2 are in disjoint subtrees ($p_1 \mid\mid p_2$), or one is a prefix of the other (w.o.l.o.g., $p_1 \leq p_2$).

Case 1: $p_1 \parallel p_2$.

Then $s = s[l_1\theta]_{p_1}[l_2\theta]_{p_2}$, and therefore $t_1 = s[r_1\theta]_{p_1}[l_2\theta]_{p_2}$ and $t_2 = s[l_1\theta]_{p_1}[r_2\theta]_{p_2}$.

Let $t_0 = s[r_1\theta]_{p_1}[r_2\theta]_{p_2}$. Then clearly $t_1 \rightarrow_R t_0$ using $l_2 \rightarrow r_2$ and $t_2 \rightarrow_R t_0$ using $l_1 \rightarrow r_1$.

Case 2: $p_1 \leq p_2$.

Case 2.1: $p_2 = p_1 q_1 q_2$, where l_1/q_1 is some variable x.

In other words, the second rewrite step takes place at or below a variable in the first rule. Suppose that x occurs m times in l_1 and n times in r_1 (where $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$).

Then $t_1 \rightarrow_R^* t_0$ by applying $l_2 \rightarrow r_2$ at all positions $p_1 q' q_2$, where q' is a position of x in r_1.

Conversely, $t_2 \rightarrow_R^* t_0$ by applying $l_2 \rightarrow r_2$ at all positions $p_1 q q_2$, where q is a position of x in l_1 different from q_1, and by applying $l_1 \rightarrow r_1$ at p_1 with the substitution θ', where $\theta' = \theta[x \mapsto (x\theta)[r_2\theta]_{q_2}]$.

Case 2.2: $p_2 = p_1 p$, where p is a non-variable position of l_1.

Then $s/p_2 = l_2\theta$ and $s/p_2 = (s/p_1)/p = (l_1\theta)/p = (l_1/p)\theta$, so θ is a unifier of l_2 and l_1/p.

Let σ be the mgu of l_2 and l_1/p, then $\theta = \tau \circ \sigma$ and $\langle r_1\sigma, (l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p \rangle$ is a critical pair.

By assumption, it is joinable, so $r_1\sigma \rightarrow_R^* v \leftarrow_R^* (l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p$.

Consequently, $t_1 = s[r_1\theta]_{p_1} = s[r_1\sigma\tau]_{p_1} \rightarrow_R^* s[v\tau]_{p_1}$ and $t_2 = s[r_2\theta]_{p_2} = s[(l_1\theta)[r_2\theta]_p]_{p_1} = s[(l_1\sigma\tau)[r_2\sigma\tau]_p]_{p_1} = s[((l_1\sigma)[r_2\sigma]_p)\tau]_{p_1} \rightarrow_R^* s[v\tau]_{p_1}$.

This completes the proof of the Critical Pair Theorem. □

Note: Critical pairs between a rule and (a renamed variant of) itself must be considered – except if the overlap is at the root (i. e., $p = \varepsilon$).

Corollary 3.19 *A terminating TRS R is confluent if and only if all its critical pairs are joinable.*

Proof. By Newman's Lemma and the Critical Pair Theorem. □

Corollary 3.20 *For a finite terminating TRS, confluence is decidable.*

Proof. For every pair of rules and every non-variable position in the first rule there is at most one critical pair $\langle u_1, u_2 \rangle$.

Reduce every u_i to some normal form u_i'. If $u_1' = u_2'$ for every critical pair, then R is confluent, otherwise there is some non-confluent situation $u_1' \leftarrow_R^* u_1 \leftarrow_R s \rightarrow_R u_2 \rightarrow_R^* u_2'$. □

3.5 Termination

Termination problems:

Given a finite TRS R and a term t, are all R-reductions starting from t terminating?

Given a finite TRS R, are all R-reductions terminating?

Proposition 3.21 *Both termination problems for TRSs are undecidable in general.*

Proof. Encode Turing machines using rewrite rules and reduce the (uniform) halting problems for TMs to the termination problems for TRSs. □

Consequence:

Decidable criteria for termination are not complete.

Reduction Orderings

Goal:

Given a finite TRS R, show termination of R by looking at finitely many rules $l \to r \in R$, rather than at infinitely many possible replacement steps $s \to_R s'$.

A binary relation $\sqsupset$ over $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ is called *compatible with* Σ*-operations*, if $s \sqsupset s'$ implies $f(t_1, \dots, s, \dots, t_n) \sqsupset f(t_1, \dots, s', \dots, t_n)$ for all $f \in \Omega$ and $s, s', t_i \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$.

Lemma 3.22 *The relation $\sqsupset$ is compatible with Σ-operations, if and only if $s \sqsupset s'$ implies $t[s]_p \sqsupset t[s']_p$ for all $s, s', t \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ and $p \in \mathrm{pos}(t)$.*

Note: *compatible with* Σ*-operations* = *compatible with contexts*.

A binary relation $\sqsupset$ over $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ is called *stable under substitutions*, if $s \sqsupset s'$ implies $s\sigma \sqsupset s'\sigma$ for all $s, s' \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ and substitutions σ.

A binary relation $\sqsupset$ is called a *rewrite relation*, if it is compatible with Σ-operations and stable under substitutions.

Example: If R is a TRS, then $\to_R$ is a rewrite relation.

A strict partial ordering over $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ that is a rewrite relation is called *rewrite ordering*.

A well-founded rewrite ordering is called *reduction ordering*.

Theorem 3.23 *A TRS R terminates if and only if there exists a reduction ordering $\succ$ such that $l \succ r$ for every rule $l \to r \in R$.*

Proof. "if": $s \to_R s'$ if and only if $s = t[l\sigma]_p$, $s' = t[r\sigma]_p$. If $l \succ r$, then $l\sigma \succ r\sigma$ and therefore $t[l\sigma]_p \succ t[r\sigma]_p$. This implies $\to_R \subseteq \succ$. Since $\succ$ is a well-founded ordering, $\to_R$ is terminating.

"only if": Define $\succ = \to_R^+$. If $\to_R$ is terminating, then $\succ$ is a reduction ordering. □

The Interpretation Method

Proving termination by interpretation:

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Σ-algebra; let $\succ$ be a well-founded strict partial ordering on its universe.

Define the ordering $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ over $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ by $s \succ_{\mathcal{A}} t$ iff $\mathcal{A}(\beta)(s) \succ \mathcal{A}(\beta)(t)$ for all assignments $\beta : X \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Is $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ a reduction ordering?

Lemma 3.24 *$\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ is stable under substitutions.*

Proof. Let $s \succ_{\mathcal{A}} s'$, that is, $\mathcal{A}(\beta)(s) \succ \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s')$ for all assignments $\beta : X \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let σ be a substitution. We have to show that $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)(s\sigma) \succ \mathcal{A}(\gamma)(s'\sigma)$ for all assignments $\gamma : X \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$. Choose $\beta = \gamma \circ \sigma$, then by the substitution lemma, $\mathcal{A}(\gamma)(s\sigma) = \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s) \succ \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s') = \mathcal{A}(\gamma)(s'\sigma)$. Therefore $s\sigma \succ_{\mathcal{A}} s'\sigma$. □

A function $F : U_{\mathcal{A}}^n \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$ is called *monotone* (with respect to $\succ$), if $a \succ a'$ implies $F(b_1, \dots, a, \dots, b_n) \succ F(b_1, \dots, a', \dots, b_n)$ for all $a, a', b_i \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Lemma 3.25 *If the interpretation $f_{\mathcal{A}}$ of every function symbol f is monotone w. r. t. $\succ$, then $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ is compatible with Σ-operations.*

Proof. Let $s \succ s'$, that is, $\mathcal{A}(\beta)(s) \succ \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s')$ for all $\beta : X \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$. Let $\beta : X \to U_{\mathcal{A}}$ be an arbitrary assignment. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\beta)(f(t_1, \dots, s, \dots, t_n)) &= f_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}(\beta)(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s), \dots, \mathcal{A}(\beta)(t_n)) \\
&\succ f_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}(\beta)(t_1), \dots, \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s'), \dots, \mathcal{A}(\beta)(t_n)) \\
&= \mathcal{A}(\beta)(f(t_1, \dots, s', \dots, t_n))
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $f(t_1, \dots, s, \dots, t_n) \succ_{\mathcal{A}} f(t_1, \dots, s', \dots, t_n)$. □

Theorem 3.26 *If the interpretation $f_{\mathcal{A}}$ of every function symbol f is monotone w. r. t. $\succ$, then $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a reduction ordering.*

Proof. By the previous two lemmas, $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a rewrite relation. If there were an infinite chain $s_1 \succ_{\mathcal{A}} s_2 \succ_{\mathcal{A}} \dots$, then it would correspond to an infinite chain $\mathcal{A}(\beta)(s_1) \succ \mathcal{A}(\beta)(s_2) \succ \dots$ (with β chosen arbitrarily). Thus $\succ_{\mathcal{A}}$ is well-founded. Irreflexivity and transitivity are proved similarly. □

Polynomial Orderings

Polynomial orderings:

Instance of the interpretation method:

The carrier set $U_{\mathcal{A}}$ is some subset of the natural numbers.

To every function symbol f with arity n we associate a polynomial $P_f(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in \mathbb{N}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$ and indeterminates $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Then we define $f_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = P_f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for $a_i \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Requirement 1:

If $a_1, \dots, a_n \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$, then $f_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$. (Otherwise, $\mathcal{A}$ would not be a Σ-algebra.)

Requirement 2:

$f_{\mathcal{A}}$ must be monotone (w. r. t. $\succ$).

From now on:

$U_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\, n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \geq 2 \,\}$.

If $\mathsf{arity}(f) = 0$, then P_f is a constant ≥ 2.

If $\mathsf{arity}(f) = n \geq 1$, then P_f is a polynomial $P(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, such that every X_i occurs in some monomial with exponent at least 1 and non-zero coefficient.

$\Rightarrow$ Requirements 1 and 2 are satisfied.

The mapping from function symbols to polynomials can be extended to terms: A term t containing the variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$ yields a polynomial P_t with indeterminates $X_1, \dots, X_n$ (where X_i corresponds to $\beta(x_i)$).

Example:

$\Omega = \{b,\ f,\ g\}$ with $\mathsf{arity}(b) = 0$, $\mathsf{arity}(f) = 1$, $\mathsf{arity}(g) = 3$,
$U_{\mathcal{A}} = \{\, n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \geq 2 \,\}$,
$P_b = 3, \quad P_f(X_1) = X_1^2, \quad P_g(X_1, X_2, X_3) = X_1 + X_2 X_3$.

Let $t = g(f(b), f(x), y)$, then $P_t(X, Y) = 9 + X^2 Y$.

If P, Q are polynomials in $\mathbb{N}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, we write $P > Q$ if $P(a_1, \dots, a_n) > Q(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Clearly, $l \succ_{\mathcal{A}} r$ iff $P_l > P_r$.

Question: Can we check $P_l > P_r$ automatically?

Hilbert's 10th Problem:

Given a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ with integer coefficients, is $P = 0$ for some n-tuple of natural numbers?

Theorem 3.27 *Hilbert's 10th Problem is undecidable.*

Proposition 3.28 *Given a polynomial interpretation and two terms l, r, it is undecidable whether $P_l > P_r$.*

Proof. By reduction of Hilbert's 10th Problem. $\square$

One possible solution:

Test whether $P_l(a_1, \dots, a_n) > P_r(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{\, x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 2 \,\}$.

This is decidable (but very slow). Since $U_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \{\, x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \geq 2 \,\}$, it implies $P_l > P_r$.

Another solution (Ben Cherifa and Lescanne):

Consider the difference $P_l(X_1, \dots, X_n) - P_r(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ as a polynomial with real coefficients and apply the following inference system to it to show that it is positive for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$:

$P \;\Rightarrow_{BCL}\; \top$,

if P contains at least one monomial with a positive coefficient and no monomial with a negative coefficient.

$P + cX_1^{p_1} \cdots X_n^{p_n} - dX_1^{q_1} \cdots X_n^{q_n} \;\Rightarrow_{BCL}\; P + c'X_1^{p_1} \dots X_n^{p_n}$,

if $c, d > 0$, $p_i \geq q_i$ for all i, and $c' = c - d \cdot 2^{(q_1 - p_1) + \cdots + (q_n - p_n)} \geq 0$.

$P + cX_1^{p_1} \cdots X_n^{p_n} - dX_1^{q_1} \cdots X_n^{q_n} \;\Rightarrow_{BCL}\; P - d'X_1^{q_1} \dots X_n^{q_n}$,

if $c, d > 0$, $p_i \geq q_i$ for all i, and $d' = d - c \cdot 2^{(p_1 - q_1) + \cdots + (p_n - q_n)} > 0$.

Lemma 3.29 *If $P \Rightarrow_{BCL} P'$, then $P(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq P'(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Proof. Follows from the fact that $a_i \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$ implies $a_i \geq 2$. $\square$

Proposition 3.30 *If $P \Rightarrow_{BCL}^{+} \top$, then $P(a_1, \dots, a_n) > 0$ for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in U_{\mathcal{A}}$.*

Simplification Orderings

The *proper subterm ordering* $\rhd$ is defined by $s \rhd t$ if and only if $s/p = t$ for some position $p \neq \varepsilon$ of s.

A rewrite ordering $\succ$ over $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ is called *simplification ordering,* if it has the *subterm property:* $s \rhd t$ implies $s \succ t$ for all $s, t \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$.

Example:

Let R_{emb} be the rewrite system $R_{\text{emb}} = \{\, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \to x_i \mid f \in \Omega,\, 1 \leq i \leq n = \mathsf{arity}(f) \,\}$.

Define $\rhd_{\text{emb}} = \to^+_{R_{\text{emb}}}$ and $\trianglerighteq_{\text{emb}} = \to^*_{R_{\text{emb}}}$ (*"homeomorphic embedding relation"*).

$\rhd_{\text{emb}}$ is a simplification ordering.

Lemma 3.31 *If $\succ$ is a simplification ordering, then $s \rhd_{\text{emb}} t$ implies $s \succ t$ and $s \trianglerighteq_{\text{emb}} t$ implies $s \succeq t$.*

Proof. Since $\succ$ is transitive and $\succeq$ is transitive and reflexive, it suffices to show that $s \to_{R_{\text{emb}}} t$ implies $s \succ t$. By definition, $s \to_{R_{\text{emb}}} t$ if and only if $s = s[l\sigma]$ and $t = s[r\sigma]$ for some rule $l \to r \in R_{\text{emb}}$. Obviously, $l \rhd r$ for all rules in R_{emb}, hence $l \succ r$. Since $\succ$ is a rewrite relation, $s = s[l\sigma] \succ s[r\sigma] = t$. □

Goal:

Show that every simplification ordering is well-founded (and therefore a reduction ordering).

Note: This works only for *finite* signatures!

To fix this for infinite signatures, the definition of simplification orderings and the definition of embedding have to be modified.

Theorem 3.32 ("Kruskal's Theorem") *Let Σ be a finite signature, let X be a finite set of variables. Then for every infinite sequence $t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots$ there are indices $j > i$ such that $t_j \trianglerighteq_{\text{emb}} t_i$. ($\trianglerighteq_{\text{emb}}$ is called* a well-partial-ordering (wpo).*)*

Proof. See Baader and Nipkow, page 113–115. □

Theorem 3.33 (Dershowitz) *If Σ is a finite signature, then every simplification ordering $\succ$ on $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ is well-founded (and therefore a reduction ordering).*

Proof. Suppose that $t_1 \succ t_2 \succ t_3 \succ \ldots$ is an infinite descending chain.

First assume that there is an $x \in \mathrm{var}(t_{i+1}) \setminus \mathrm{var}(t_i)$. Let $\sigma = [t_i/x]$, then $t_{i+1}\sigma \trianglerighteq x\sigma = t_i$ and therefore $t_i = t_i\sigma \succ t_{i+1}\sigma \succeq t_i$, contradicting reflexivity.

Consequently, $\mathrm{var}(t_i) \supseteq \mathrm{var}(t_{i+1})$ and $t_i \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(V)$ for all i, where V is the finite set $\mathrm{var}(t_1)$. By Kruskal's Theorem, there are $i < j$ with $t_i \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{emb}} t_j$. Hence $t_i \preceq t_j$, contradicting $t_i \succ t_j$. $\square$

There are reduction orderings that are not simplification orderings and terminating TRSs that are not contained in any simplification ordering.

Example:

Let $R = \{f(f(x)) \to f(g(f(x)))\}$.

R terminates and $\to_R^+$ is therefore a reduction ordering.

Assume that $\to_R$ were contained in a simplification ordering $\succ$. Then $f(f(x)) \to_R f(g(f(x)))$ implies $f(f(x)) \succ f(g(f(x)))$, and $f(g(f(x))) \trianglerighteq_{\mathrm{emb}} f(f(x))$ implies $f(g(f(x))) \succeq f(f(x))$, hence $f(f(x)) \succ f(f(x))$.

Recursive Path Orderings

Let $\Sigma = (\Omega, \Pi)$ be a finite signature, let $\succ$ be a strict partial ordering *("precedence")* on Ω.

The *lexicographic path ordering* $\succ_{\mathrm{lpo}}$ on $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ induced by $\succ$ is defined by: $s \succ_{\mathrm{lpo}} t$ iff

(1) $t \in \mathrm{var}(s)$ and $t \neq s$, or

(2) $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$, $t = g(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, and

- (a) $s_i \succeq_{\mathrm{lpo}} t$ for some i, or
- (b) $f \succ g$ and $s \succ_{\mathrm{lpo}} t_j$ for all j, or
- (c) $f = g$, $s \succ_{\mathrm{lpo}} t_j$ for all j, and $(s_1, \ldots, s_m)\ (\succ_{\mathrm{lpo}})_{\mathrm{lex}}\ (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$.

Lemma 3.34 $s \succ_{\mathrm{lpo}} t$ *implies* $\mathrm{var}(s) \supseteq \mathrm{var}(t)$.

Proof. By induction on $|s| + |t|$ and case analysis. $\square$

Theorem 3.35 $\succ_{\text{lpo}}$ *is a simplification ordering on* $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$.

Proof. Show transitivity, subterm property, stability under substitutions, compatibility with Σ-operations, and irreflexivity, usually by induction on the sum of the term sizes and case analysis. Details: Baader and Nipkow, page 119/120. $\square$

Theorem 3.36 *If the precedence* $\succ$ *is total, then the lexicographic path ordering* $\succ_{\text{lpo}}$ *is total on ground terms, i. e., for all* $s, t \in \mathrm{T}_\Sigma(\emptyset)$: $s \succ_{\text{lpo}} t \vee t \succ_{\text{lpo}} s \vee s = t$.

Proof. By induction on $|s| + |t|$ and case analysis. $\square$

Recapitulation:

Let $\Sigma = (\Omega, \Pi)$ be a finite signature, let $\succ$ be a strict partial ordering *("precedence")* on Ω. The *lexicographic path ordering* $\succ_{\text{lpo}}$ on $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ induced by $\succ$ is defined by: $s \succ_{\text{lpo}} t$ iff

(1) $t \in \text{var}(s)$ and $t \neq s$, or

(2) $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_m)$, $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, and

  (a) $s_i \succeq_{\text{lpo}} t$ for some i, or

  (b) $f \succ g$ and $s \succ_{\text{lpo}} t_j$ for all j, or

  (c) $f = g$, $s \succ_{\text{lpo}} t_j$ for all j, and $(s_1, \dots, s_m)\ (\succ_{\text{lpo}})_{\text{lex}}\ (t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

There are several possibilities to compare subterms in (2)(c):

compare list of subterms lexicographically left-to-right (*"lexicographic path ordering (lpo)"*, Kamin and Lévy)

compare list of subterms lexicographically right-to-left (or according to some permutation π)

compare multiset of subterms using the multiset extension (*"multiset path ordering (mpo)"*, Dershowitz)

to each function symbol f with $\mathsf{arity}(n) \geq 1$ associate a status $\in \{mul\} \cup \{\, lex_\pi \mid \pi : \{1, \dots, n\} \to \{1, \dots, n\}\,\}$ and compare according to that status (*"recursive path ordering (rpo) with status"*)

The Knuth-Bendix Ordering

Let $\Sigma = (\Omega, \Pi)$ be a finite signature, let $\succ$ be a strict partial ordering *("precedence")* on Ω, let $w : \Omega \cup X \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ be a *weight function*, such that the following admissibility conditions are satisfied:

$w(x) = w_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for all variables $x \in X$; $w(c) \geq w_0$ for all constants $c \in \Omega$.

If $w(f) = 0$ for some $f \in \Omega$ with $\mathsf{arity}(f) = 1$, then $f \succeq g$ for all $g \in \Omega$.

The weight function w can be extended to terms as follows:

$$w(t) = \sum_{x \in \mathrm{var}(t)} w(x) \cdot \#(x,t) + \sum_{f \in \Omega} w(f) \cdot \#(f,t).$$

The *Knuth-Bendix ordering* $\succ_{\mathrm{kbo}}$ on $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$ induced by $\succ$ and w is defined by: $s \succ_{\mathrm{kbo}} t$ iff

(1) $\#(x,s) \geq \#(x,t)$ for all variables x and $w(s) > w(t)$, or

(2) $\#(x,s) \geq \#(x,t)$ for all variables x, $w(s) = w(t)$, and

- (a) $t = x$, $s = f^n(x)$ for some $n \geq 1$, or
- (b) $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$, $t = g(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, and $f \succ g$, or
- (c) $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$, $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_m)$, and $(s_1, \ldots, s_m)\ (\succ_{\mathrm{kbo}})_{\mathrm{lex}}\ (t_1, \ldots, t_m)$.

Theorem 3.37 *The Knuth-Bendix ordering induced by $\succ$ and w is a simplification ordering on $\mathrm{T}_\Sigma(X)$.*

Proof. Baader and Nipkow, pages 125–129. □