3.6 Knuth-Bendix Completion

Completion:

Goal: Given a set E of equations, transform E into an equivalent convergent set R of rewrite rules.
(If R is finite: decision procedure for E.)

How to ensure termination?

Fix a reduction ordering $\succ$ and construct R in such a way that $\rightarrow_R \subseteq \succ$ (i. e., $l \succ r$ for every $l \rightarrow r \in R$).

How to ensure confluence?

Check that all critical pairs are joinable.

Knuth-Bendix Completion: Inference Rules

The completion procedure is presented as a set of inference rules working on a set of equations E and a set of rules R: $E_0, R_0 \vdash E_1, R_1 \vdash E_2, R_2 \vdash \ldots$

At the beginning, $E = E_0$ is the input set and $R = R_0$ is empty. At the end, E should be empty; then R is the result.

For each step $E, R \vdash E', R'$, the equational theories of $E \cup R$ and $E' \cup R'$ agree: $\approx_{E \cup R} = \approx_{E' \cup R'}$.

Notations:

The formula $s \mathrel{\dot{\approx}} t$ denotes either $s \approx t$ or $t \approx s$.

$\mathrm{CP}(R)$ denotes the set of all critical pairs between rules in R.

Orient:

$$\frac{E \cup \{s \mathrel{\dot{\approx}} t\}, \quad R}{E, \quad R \cup \{s \rightarrow t\}} \qquad \text{if } s \succ t$$

Note: There are equations $s \approx t$ that cannot be oriented, i. e., neither $s \succ t$ nor $t \succ s$.

Trivial equations cannot be oriented – but we don't need them anyway:

Delete:

$$\frac{E \cup \{s \approx s\}, \quad R}{E, \quad R}$$

Critical pairs between rules in R are turned into additional equations:

Deduce:

$$\frac{E, \quad R}{E \cup \{s \approx t\}, \quad R} \qquad \text{if } \langle s, t\rangle \in \mathrm{CP}(R).$$

Note: If $\langle s, t\rangle \in \mathrm{CP}(R)$ then $s \leftarrow_R u \rightarrow_R t$ and hence $R \models s \approx t$.

The following inference rules are not absolutely necessary, but very useful (e. g., to get rid of joinable critical pairs and to deal with equations that cannot be oriented):

Simplify-Eq:

$$\frac{E \cup \{s \mathrel{\dot{\approx}} t\}, \quad R}{E \cup \{u \approx t\}, \quad R} \qquad \text{if } s \rightarrow_R u.$$

Simplification of the right-hand side of a rule is unproblematic.

R-Simplify-Rule:

$$\frac{E, \quad R \cup \{s \rightarrow t\}}{E, \quad R \cup \{s \rightarrow u\}} \qquad \text{if } t \rightarrow_R u.$$

Simplification of the left-hand side may influence orientability and orientation. Therefore, it yields an *equation*:

L-Simplify-Rule:

$$\frac{E, \quad R \cup \{s \rightarrow t\}}{E \cup \{u \approx t\}, \quad R} \qquad \begin{array}{l}\text{if } s \rightarrow_R u \text{ using a rule } l \rightarrow r \in R \\ \text{such that } s \sqsupset l \text{ (see next slide).}\end{array}$$

For technical reasons, the lhs of $s \rightarrow t$ may only be simplified using a rule $l \rightarrow r$, if $l \rightarrow r$ *cannot* be simplified using $s \rightarrow t$, that is, if $s \sqsupset l$, where the *encompassment quasi-ordering* $\mathrel{\underset{\sim}{\sqsupset}}$ is defined by

$$s \mathrel{\underset{\sim}{\sqsupset}} l \;\text{ if }\; s/p = l\sigma \text{ for some } p \text{ and } \sigma$$

and $\sqsupset \,=\, \mathrel{\underset{\sim}{\sqsupset}} \setminus \mathrel{\underset{\sim}{\sqsubset}}$ is the strict part of $\mathrel{\underset{\sim}{\sqsupset}}$.

Lemma 3.38 $\sqsupset$ *is a well-founded strict partial ordering.*

Lemma 3.39 *If $E, R \vdash E', R'$, then $\approx_{E \cup R} \,=\, \approx_{E' \cup R'}$.*

Lemma 3.40 *If $E, R \vdash E', R'$ and $\rightarrow_R \subseteq \succ$, then $\rightarrow_{R'} \subseteq \succ$.*

Knuth-Bendix Completion: Correctness Proof

If we run the completion procedure on a set E of equations, different things can happen:

(1) We reach a state where no more inference rules are applicable and E is not empty.
$\Rightarrow$ Failure (try again with another ordering?)

(2) We reach a state where E is empty and all critical pairs between the rules in the current R have been checked.

(3) The procedure runs forever.

In order to treat these cases simultaneously, we need some definitions.

A (finite or infinite sequence) $E_0, R_0 \vdash E_1, R_1 \vdash E_2, R_2 \vdash \ldots$ with $R_0 = \emptyset$ is called a *run* of the completion procedure with input E_0 and $\succ$.

For a run, $E_\infty = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} E_i$ and $R_\infty = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} R_i$.

The sets of *persistent equations or rules* of the run are $E_* = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \bigcap_{j \geq i} E_j$ and $R_* = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \bigcap_{j \geq i} R_j$.

Note: If the run is finite and ends with E_n, R_n, then $E_* = E_n$ and $R_* = R_n$.

A run is called *fair*, if $CP(R_*) \subseteq E_\infty$ (i. e., if every critical pair between persisting rules is computed at some step of the derivation).

Goal:

Show: If a run is fair and E_* is empty, then R_* is convergent and equivalent to E_0.

In particular: If a run is fair and E_* is empty, then $\approx_{E_0} = \approx_{E_\infty \cup R_\infty} = \leftrightarrow^*_{E_\infty \cup R_\infty} = \downarrow_{R_*}$.

General assumptions from now on:

$E_0, R_0 \vdash E_1, R_1 \vdash E_2, R_2 \vdash \ldots$ is a fair run.

R_0 and E_* are empty.

A *proof* of $s \approx t$ in $E_\infty \cup R_\infty$ is a finite sequence $(s_0, \dots, s_n)$ such that $s = s_0$, $t = s_n$, and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$:

(1) $s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i$, or

(2) $s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s_i$, or

(3) $s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_\infty} s_i$.

The pairs (s_{i-1}, s_i) are called *proof steps.*

A proof is called a *rewrite proof in* R_*, if there is a $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_*} s_i$ for $1 \le i \le k$ and $s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_*} s_i$ for $k+1 \le i \le n$

Idea (Bachmair, Dershowitz, Hsiang):

Define a well-founded ordering on proofs, such that for every proof that is not a rewrite proof in R_* there is an equivalent smaller proof.

Consequence: For every proof there is an equivalent rewrite proof in R_*.

We associate a *cost* $c(s_{i-1}, s_i)$ with every proof step as follows:

(1) If $s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i$, then $c(s_{i-1}, s_i) = (\{s_{i-1}, s_i\}, -, -)$, where the first component is a multiset of terms and $-$ denotes an arbitrary (irrelevant) term.

(2) If $s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s_i$ using $l \rightarrow r$, then $c(s_{i-1}, s_i) = (\{s_{i-1}\}, l, s_i)$.

(3) If $s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_\infty} s_i$ using $l \rightarrow r$, then $c(s_{i-1}, s_i) = (\{s_i\}, l, s_{i-1})$.

Proof steps are compared using the lexicographic combination of the multiset extension of the reduction ordering $\succ$, the encompassment ordering $\sqsupset$, and the reduction ordering $\succ$.

The cost $c(P)$ of a proof P is the multiset of the costs of its proof steps.

The *proof ordering* $\succ_C$ compares the costs of proofs using the multiset extension of the proof step ordering.

Lemma 3.41 *$\succ_C$ is a well-founded ordering.*

Lemma 3.42 *Let P be a proof in $E_\infty \cup R_\infty$. If P is not a rewrite proof in R_*, then there exists an equivalent proof P' in $E_\infty \cup R_\infty$ such that $P \succ_C P'$.*

Proof. If P is not a rewrite proof in R_*, then it contains

(a) a proof step that is in E_∞, or
(b) a proof step that is in $R_\infty \setminus R_*$, or
(c) a subproof $s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_*} s_i \rightarrow_{R_*} s_{i+1}$ (peak).

We show that in all three cases the proof step or subproof can be replaced by a smaller subproof:

Case (a): A proof step using an equation $s \dot{\approx} t$ is in E_∞. This equation must be deleted during the run.

If $s \dot{\approx} t$ is deleted using *Orient*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i \ldots \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s_i \ldots$$

If $s \dot{\approx} t$ is deleted using *Delete*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_{i-1} \ldots \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \ldots$$

If $s \dot{\approx} t$ is deleted using *Simplify-Eq*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i \ldots \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s' \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i \ldots$$

Case (b): A proof step using a rule $s \rightarrow t$ is in $R_\infty \setminus R_*$. This rule must be deleted during the run.

If $s \rightarrow t$ is deleted using *R-Simplify-Rule*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s_i \ldots \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s' \leftarrow_{R_\infty} s_i \ldots$$

If $s \rightarrow t$ is deleted using *L-Simplify-Rule*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s_i \ldots \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_\infty} s' \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_i \ldots$$

Case (c): A subproof has the form $s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_*} s_i \rightarrow_{R_*} s_{i+1}$.

If there is no overlap or a non-critical overlap:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_*} s_i \rightarrow_{R_*} s_{i+1} \ldots \Longrightarrow \ldots s_{i-1} \rightarrow_{R_*}^* s' \leftarrow_{R_*}^* s_{i+1} \ldots$$

If there is a critical pair that has been added using *Deduce*:
$$\ldots s_{i-1} \leftarrow_{R_*} s_i \rightarrow_{R_*} s_{i+1} \ldots \Longrightarrow \quad \ldots s_{i-1} \leftrightarrow_{E_\infty} s_{i+1} \ldots$$

In all cases, checking that the replacement subproof is smaller than the replaced subproof is routine. $\square$

Theorem 3.43 *Let $E_0, R_0 \vdash E_1, R_1 \vdash E_2, R_2 \vdash \dots$ be a fair run and let R_0 and E_* be empty. Then*

(1) every proof in $E_\infty \cup R_\infty$ is equivalent to a rewrite proof in R_*,

(2) R_* is equivalent to E_0, and

(3) R_* is convergent.

Proof. (1) By well-founded induction on $\succ_C$ using the previous lemma.

(2) Clearly $\approx_{E_\infty \cup R_\infty} = \approx_{E_0}$. Since $R_* \subseteq R_\infty$, we get $\approx_{R_*} \subseteq \approx_{E_\infty \cup R_\infty}$. On the other hand, by (1), $\approx_{E_\infty \cup R_\infty} \subseteq \approx_{R_*}$.

(3) Since $\rightarrow_{R_*} \subseteq \succ$, R_* is terminating. By (1), R_* is confluent. $\square$

Knuth-Bendix Completion: Outlook

Classical completion:

Tries to transform a set E of equations into an equivalent convergent term rewrite system.

Fails, if an equation can neither be oriented nor deleted.

Unfailing completion:

Use an ordering $\succ$ that is total on ground terms.

If an equation cannot be oriented, use it in both directions for rewriting (except if that would yield a larger term). In other words, consider the relation $\leftrightarrow_E \cap \not\prec$.

Special case of superposition (see next chapter).