

## Universal Algebra

$T_\Sigma(X)/E = T_\Sigma(X)/\approx_E = T_\Sigma(X)/\leftrightarrow_E^*$  is called the *free  $E$ -algebra* with generating set  $X/\approx_E = \{[x] \mid x \in X\}$ :

Every mapping  $\varphi : X/\approx_E \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  for some  $E$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  can be extended to a homomorphism  $\hat{\varphi} : T_\Sigma(X)/E \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ .

$T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/E = T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/\approx_E = T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/\leftrightarrow_E^*$  is called the *initial  $E$ -algebra*.

$\approx_E = \{(s, t) \mid E \models s \approx t\}$  is called the *equational theory* of  $E$ .

$\approx_E^I = \{(s, t) \mid T_\Sigma(\emptyset)/E \models s \approx t\}$  is called the *inductive theory* of  $E$ .

Example:

Let  $E = \{\forall x(x + 0 \approx x), \forall x \forall y(x + s(y) \approx s(x + y))\}$ . Then  $x + y \approx_E^I y + x$ , but  $x + y \not\approx_E y + x$ .

## Rewrite Relations

**Corollary 4.16** *If  $E$  is convergent (i. e., terminating and confluent), then  $s \approx_E t$  if and only if  $s \leftrightarrow_E^* t$  if and only if  $s \downarrow_E = t \downarrow_E$ .*

**Corollary 4.17** *If  $E$  is finite and convergent, then  $\approx_E$  is decidable.*

Reminder:

If  $E$  is terminating, then it is confluent if and only if it is locally confluent.

Problems:

Show local confluence of  $E$ .

Show termination of  $E$ .

Transform  $E$  into an equivalent set of equations that is locally confluent and terminating.

## 4.4 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  $\sigma$  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  $\text{var}(l_1) \cap \text{var}(l_2) = \emptyset$ . (Remember that  $\text{var}(l_i) \supseteq \text{var}(r_i)$ .)

Let  $p \in \text{pos}(l_1)$  be a position such that  $l_1/p$  is not a variable and  $\sigma$  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 4.18 (“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  $p_i \in \text{pos}(s)$ , 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 ( $p_1 \parallel p_2$ ), 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:  $p_2 = p_1q_1q_2$ , 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  $p_1q'q_2$ , 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  $p_1qq_2$ , 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  $\theta'$ , where  $\theta' = \theta[x \mapsto (x\theta)[r_2\theta]_{q_2}]$ .

Case 2.2:  $p_2 = p_1p$ , where  $p$  is a non-variable position of  $l_1$ .

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

Let  $\sigma$  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.  $\square$

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 4.19** *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.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.20** *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  $u'_1 \leftarrow_R^* u_1 \leftarrow_R s \rightarrow_R u_2 \rightarrow_R^* u'_2$ .  $\square$