JOURNAL OF FORMALIZED MATHEMATICS
Volume 7, Released 1995, Published 2003
Inst. of Computer Science, Univ. of Białystok

Reduction Relations

Grzegorz Bancerek
Institute of Mathematics
Polish Academy of Sciences

Summary. The goal of the article is to start the formalization of Knuth-Bendix completion method (see [2], [10] or [1]; see also [11],[9]), i.e. to formalize the concept of the completion of a reduction relation. The completion of a reduction relation R is a complete reduction relation equivalent to R such that convertible elements have the same normal forms. The theory formalized in the article includes concepts and facts concerning normal forms, terminating reductions, Church-Rosser property, and equivalence of reduction relations.

MML Identifier: REWRITE1.

WWW: http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol7/rewrite1.html

The articles [12], [15], [14], [3], [6], [16], [4], [5], [13], [7], and [8] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

1. Forgetting concatenation and reduction sequence

Let p, q be finite sequences. The functor $p\,{}^{\$\frown}\,q$ yielding a finite sequence is defined by:

(Def. 1)(i) $p\,{}^{\$\frown}\,q = p \frown q$ if $p = \emptyset$ or $q = \emptyset$,

(ii) there exists a natural number i and there exists a finite sequence r such that $\operatorname{len} p = i+1$ and $r = p \restriction \operatorname{Seg} i$ and $p\,{}^{\$\frown}\,q = r \frown q$, otherwise.

In the sequel p, q denote finite sequences and x, y denote sets.

We now state several propositions:

(1) $\emptyset\,{}^{\$\frown}\,p = p$ and $p\,{}^{\$\frown}\,\emptyset = p$.

(2) If $q \neq \emptyset$, then $(p \frown \langle x \rangle)\,{}^{\$\frown}\,q = p \frown q$.

(3) $(p \frown \langle x \rangle)\,{}^{\$\frown}\,(\langle y \rangle \frown q) = p \frown \langle y \rangle \frown q$.

(4) If $q \neq \emptyset$, then $\langle x \rangle\,{}^{\$\frown}\,q = q$.

(5) If $p \neq \emptyset$, then there exist x, q such that $p = \langle x \rangle \frown q$ and $\operatorname{len} p = \operatorname{len} q + 1$.

The scheme *PathCatenation* deals with finite sequences $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ and a binary predicate $\mathcal{P}$, and states that:

Let i be a natural number. Suppose $i \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{A}\,{}^{\$\frown}\,\mathcal{B})$ and $i+1 \in \operatorname{dom}(\mathcal{A}\,{}^{\$\frown}\,\mathcal{B})$. Let x, y be sets. If $x = (\mathcal{A}\,{}^{\$\frown}\,\mathcal{B})(i)$ and $y = (\mathcal{A}\,{}^{\$\frown}\,\mathcal{B})(i+1)$, then $\mathcal{P}[x,y]$

provided the parameters meet the following requirements:

- For every natural number i such that $i \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{A}$ and $i+1 \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{A}$ holds $\mathcal{P}[\mathcal{A}(i), \mathcal{A}(i+1)]$,

- For every natural number i such that $i \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{B}$ and $i+1 \in \operatorname{dom} \mathcal{B}$ holds $\mathcal{P}[\mathcal{B}(i), \mathcal{B}(i+1)]$, and
- $\operatorname{len} \mathcal{A} > 0$ and $\operatorname{len} \mathcal{B} > 0$ and $\mathcal{A}(\operatorname{len} \mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{B}(1)$.

Let R be a binary relation. A finite sequence is called a reduction sequence w.r.t. R if:

(Def. 2) $\operatorname{len} \mathrm{it} > 0$ and for every natural number i such that $i \in \operatorname{dom} \mathrm{it}$ and $i+1 \in \operatorname{dom} \mathrm{it}$ holds $\langle \mathrm{it}(i), \mathrm{it}(i+1) \rangle \in R$.

Let R be a binary relation. One can verify that every reduction sequence w.r.t. R is non empty.
Next we state several propositions:

(7)[1] For every binary relation R and for every set a holds $\langle a \rangle$ is a reduction sequence w.r.t. R.

(8) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ holds $\langle a, b \rangle$ is a reduction sequence w.r.t. R.

(9) Let R be a binary relation and p, q be reduction sequences w.r.t. R. If $p(\operatorname{len} p) = q(1)$, then $p \,^{\$\frown}\, q$ is a reduction sequence w.r.t. R.

(10) Let R be a binary relation and p be a reduction sequence w.r.t. R. Then $\operatorname{Rev}(p)$ is a reduction sequence w.r.t. $R^{\smile}$.

(11) For all binary relations R, Q such that $R \subseteq Q$ holds every reduction sequence w.r.t. R is a reduction sequence w.r.t. Q.

2. Reducibility, convertibility and normal forms

Let R be a binary relation and let a, b be sets. We say that R reduces a to b if and only if:

(Def. 3) There exists a reduction sequence p w.r.t. R such that $p(1) = a$ and $p(\operatorname{len} p) = b$.

Let R be a binary relation and let a, b be sets. We say that a and b are convertible w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 4) $R \cup R^{\smile}$ reduces a to b.

One can prove the following propositions:

(12) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Then R reduces a to b if and only if there exists a finite sequence p such that $\operatorname{len} p > 0$ and $p(1) = a$ and $p(\operatorname{len} p) = b$ and for every natural number i such that $i \in \operatorname{dom} p$ and $i+1 \in \operatorname{dom} p$ holds $\langle p(i), p(i+1) \rangle \in R$.

(13) For every binary relation R and for every set a holds R reduces a to a.

(14) For all sets a, b such that $\emptyset$ reduces a to b holds $a = b$.

(15) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that R reduces a to b and $a \notin \operatorname{field} R$ holds $a = b$.

(16) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that $\langle a, b \rangle \in R$ holds R reduces a to b.

(17) Let R be a binary relation and a, b, c be sets. Suppose R reduces a to b and R reduces b to c. Then R reduces a to c.

(18) Let R be a binary relation, p be a reduction sequence w.r.t. R, and i, j be natural numbers. If $i \in \operatorname{dom} p$ and $j \in \operatorname{dom} p$ and $i \leq j$, then R reduces $p(i)$ to $p(j)$.

(19) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that R reduces a to b and $a \neq b$ holds $a \in \operatorname{field} R$ and $b \in \operatorname{field} R$.

[1] The proposition (6) has been removed.

(20) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that R reduces a to b holds $a \in \operatorname{field} R$ iff $b \in \operatorname{field} R$.

(21) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b holds R reduces a to b iff $a = b$ or $\langle a, b\rangle \in R^*$.

(22) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b holds R reduces a to b iff R^* reduces a to b.

(23) Let R, Q be binary relations. Suppose $R \subseteq Q$. Let a, b be sets. If R reduces a to b, then Q reduces a to b.

(24) Let R be a binary relation, X be a set, and a, b be sets. Then R reduces a to b if and only if $R \cup \mathrm{id}_X$ reduces a to b.

(25) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that R reduces a to b holds $R^{\smile}$ reduces b to a.

(26) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose R reduces a to b. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R and b and a are convertible w.r.t. R.

(27) For every binary relation R and for every set a holds a and a are convertible w.r.t. R.

(28) For all sets a, b such that a and b are convertible w.r.t. $\emptyset$ holds $a = b$.

(29) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. If a and b are convertible w.r.t. R and $a \notin \operatorname{field} R$, then $a = b$.

(30) For every binary relation R and for all sets a, b such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$ holds a and b are convertible w.r.t. R.

(31) Let R be a binary relation and a, b, c be sets. Suppose a and b are convertible w.r.t. R and b and c are convertible w.r.t. R. Then a and c are convertible w.r.t. R.

(32) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are convertible w.r.t. R. Then b and a are convertible w.r.t. R.

(33) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. If a and b are convertible w.r.t. R and $a \neq b$, then $a \in \operatorname{field} R$ and $b \in \operatorname{field} R$.

Let R be a binary relation and let a be a set. We say that a is a normal form w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 5) It is not true that there exists a set b such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$.

We now state two propositions:

(34) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. If a is a normal form w.r.t. R and R reduces a to b, then $a = b$.

(35) For every binary relation R and for every set a such that $a \notin \operatorname{field} R$ holds a is a normal form w.r.t. R.

Let R be a binary relation and let a, b be sets. We say that b is a normal form of a w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 6) b is a normal form w.r.t. R and R reduces a to b.

We say that a and b are convergent w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 7) There exists a set c such that R reduces a to c and R reduces b to c.

We say that a and b are divergent w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 8) There exists a set c such that R reduces c to a and R reduces c to b.

We say that a and b are convergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 9) There exists a set c such that $\langle a, c\rangle \in R$ or $a = c$ but $\langle b, c\rangle \in R$ or $b = c$.

We say that a and b are divergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 10) There exists a set c such that $\langle c, a\rangle \in R$ or $a = c$ but $\langle c, b\rangle \in R$ or $b = c$.

The following propositions are true:

(36) For every binary relation R and for every set a such that $a \notin \operatorname{field} R$ holds a is a normal form of a w.r.t. R.

(37) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose R reduces a to b. Then

(i) a and b are convergent w.r.t. R,

(ii) a and b are divergent w.r.t. R,

(iii) b and a are convergent w.r.t. R, and

(iv) b and a are divergent w.r.t. R.

(38) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are convergent w.r.t. R or a and b are divergent w.r.t. R. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R.

(39) Let R be a binary relation and a be a set. Then a and a are convergent w.r.t. R and a and a are divergent w.r.t. R.

(40) For all sets a, b such that a and b are convergent w.r.t. $\emptyset$ or a and b are divergent w.r.t. $\emptyset$ holds $a = b$.

(41) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are convergent w.r.t. R. Then b and a are convergent w.r.t. R.

(42) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are divergent w.r.t. R. Then b and a are divergent w.r.t. R.

(43) Let R be a binary relation and a, b, c be sets. Suppose that

(i) R reduces a to b and b and c are convergent w.r.t. R, or

(ii) a and b are convergent w.r.t. R and R reduces c to b.

Then a and c are convergent w.r.t. R.

(44) Let R be a binary relation and a, b, c be sets. Suppose that

(i) R reduces b to a and b and c are divergent w.r.t. R, or

(ii) a and b are divergent w.r.t. R and R reduces b to c.

Then a and c are divergent w.r.t. R.

(45) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are convergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R. Then a and b are convergent w.r.t. R.

(46) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are divergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R. Then a and b are divergent w.r.t. R.

Let R be a binary relation and let a be a set. We say that a has a normal form w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 11) There exists a set which is a normal form of a w.r.t. R.

The following proposition is true

(47) For every binary relation R and for every set a such that $a \notin \operatorname{field} R$ holds a has a normal form w.r.t. R.

Let R be a binary relation and let a be a set. Let us assume that a has a normal form w.r.t. R and for all sets b, c such that b is a normal form of a w.r.t. R and c is a normal form of a w.r.t. R holds $b = c$. The functor $\mathrm{nf}_R(a)$ is defined by:

(Def. 12) $\mathrm{nf}_R(a)$ is a normal form of a w.r.t. R.

3. TERMINATING REDUCTIONS

Let R be a binary relation. We say that R is reversely well founded if and only if:

(Def. 13) $R^{\smile}$ is well founded.

We say that R is weakly-normalizing if and only if:

(Def. 14) For every set a such that $a \in \operatorname{field} R$ holds a has a normal form w.r.t. R.

We say that R is strongly-normalizing if and only if:

(Def. 15) For every many sorted set f indexed by $\mathbb{N}$ there exists a natural number i such that $\langle f(i), f(i+1)\rangle \notin R$.

Let R be a binary relation. Let us observe that R is reversely well founded if and only if the condition (Def. 16) is satisfied.

(Def. 16) Let Y be a set. Suppose $Y \subseteq \operatorname{field} R$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists a set a such that $a \in Y$ and for every set b such that $b \in Y$ and $a \neq b$ holds $\langle a, b\rangle \notin R$.

The scheme *coNoetherianInduction* deals with a binary relation $\mathcal{A}$ and a unary predicate $\mathcal{P}$, and states that:

For every set a such that $a \in \operatorname{field} \mathcal{A}$ holds $\mathcal{P}[a]$

provided the following conditions are met:

- $\mathcal{A}$ is reversely well founded, and
- For every set a such that for every set b such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in \mathcal{A}$ and $a \neq b$ holds $\mathcal{P}[b]$ holds $\mathcal{P}[a]$.

Let us note that every binary relation which is strongly-normalizing is also irreflexive and reversely well founded and every binary relation which is reversely well founded and irreflexive is also strongly-normalizing.

Let us observe that every binary relation which is empty is also weakly-normalizing and strongly-normalizing.

Let us note that there exists a binary relation which is empty.

Next we state the proposition

(48) Let Q be a reversely well founded binary relation and R be a binary relation. If $R \subseteq Q$, then R is reversely well founded.

Let us note that every binary relation which is strongly-normalizing is also weakly-normalizing.

4. CHURCH-ROSSER PROPERTY

Let R, Q be binary relations. We say that R commutes-weakly with Q if and only if the condition (Def. 17) is satisfied.

(Def. 17) Let a, b, c be sets. Suppose $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$ and $\langle a, c\rangle \in Q$. Then there exists a set d such that Q reduces b to d and R reduces c to d.

Let us note that the predicate R commutes-weakly with Q is symmetric. We say that R commutes with Q if and only if the condition (Def. 18) is satisfied.

(Def. 18) Let a, b, c be sets. Suppose R reduces a to b and Q reduces a to c. Then there exists a set d such that Q reduces b to d and R reduces c to d.

Let us note that the predicate R commutes with Q is symmetric.

Next we state the proposition

(49) For all binary relations R, Q such that R commutes with Q holds R commutes-weakly with Q.

Let R be a binary relation. We say that R has unique normal form property if and only if the condition (Def. 19) is satisfied.

(Def. 19) Let a, b be sets. Suppose a is a normal form w.r.t. R and b is a normal form w.r.t. R and a and b are convertible w.r.t. R. Then $a = b$.

We say that R has normal form property if and only if the condition (Def. 20) is satisfied.

(Def. 20) Let a, b be sets. Suppose a is a normal form w.r.t. R and a and b are convertible w.r.t. R. Then R reduces b to a.

We say that R is subcommutative if and only if:

(Def. 21) For all sets a, b, c such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$ and $\langle a, c\rangle \in R$ holds b and c are convergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R.

We introduce R has diamond property as a synonym of R is subcommutative. We say that R is confluent if and only if:

(Def. 22) For all sets a, b such that a and b are divergent w.r.t. R holds a and b are convergent w.r.t. R.

We say that R has Church-Rosser property if and only if:

(Def. 23) For all sets a, b such that a and b are convertible w.r.t. R holds a and b are convergent w.r.t. R.

We say that R is locally-confluent if and only if:

(Def. 24) For all sets a, b, c such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$ and $\langle a, c\rangle \in R$ holds b and c are convergent w.r.t. R.

We introduce R has weak Church-Rosser property as a synonym of R is locally-confluent.

The following four propositions are true:

(50) Let R be a binary relation. Suppose R is subcommutative. Let a, b, c be sets. Suppose R reduces a to b and $\langle a, c\rangle \in R$. Then b and c are convergent w.r.t. R.

(51) For every binary relation R holds R is confluent iff R commutes with R.

(52) Let R be a binary relation. Then R is confluent if and only if for all sets a, b, c such that R reduces a to b and $\langle a, c\rangle \in R$ holds b and c are convergent w.r.t. R.

(53) For every binary relation R holds R is locally-confluent iff R commutes-weakly with R.

One can verify the following observations:

* every binary relation which has Church-Rosser property is also confluent,
* every binary relation which is confluent is also locally-confluent and has Church-Rosser property,
* every binary relation which is subcommutative is also confluent,
* every binary relation which has Church-Rosser property has also normal form property,
* every binary relation which has normal form property has also unique normal form property, and
* every binary relation which is weakly-normalizing and has unique normal form property has also Church-Rosser property.

One can verify that every binary relation which is empty is also subcommutative.

Let us mention that there exists a binary relation which is empty.

Next we state three propositions:

(54) Let R be a binary relation with unique normal form property and a, b, c be sets. Suppose b is a normal form of a w.r.t. R and c is a normal form of a w.r.t. R. Then $b = c$.

(55) Let R be a weakly-normalizing binary relation with unique normal form property and a be a set. Then $\mathrm{nf}_R(a)$ is a normal form of a w.r.t. R.

(56) Let R be a weakly-normalizing binary relation with unique normal form property and a, b be sets. If a and b are convertible w.r.t. R, then $\mathrm{nf}_R(a) = \mathrm{nf}_R(b)$.

Let us mention that every binary relation which is strongly-normalizing and locally-confluent is also confluent.

Let R be a binary relation. We say that R is complete if and only if:

(Def. 25) R is confluent and strongly-normalizing.

Let us mention that every binary relation which is complete is also confluent and strongly-normalizing and every binary relation which is confluent and strongly-normalizing is also complete.

Let us observe that there exists a binary relation which is empty.

Let us note that there exists a non empty binary relation which is complete.

The following three propositions are true:

(57) Let R, Q be binary relations with Church-Rosser property. If R commutes with Q, then $R \cup Q$ has Church-Rosser property.

(58) For every binary relation R holds R is confluent iff R^* has weak Church-Rosser property.

(59) For every binary relation R holds R is confluent iff R^* is subcommutative.

5. Completion method

Let R, Q be binary relations. We say that R and Q are equivalent if and only if the condition (Def. 26) is satisfied.

(Def. 26) Let a, b be sets. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R if and only if a and b are convertible w.r.t. Q.

Let us note that the predicate R and Q are equivalent is symmetric.

Let R be a binary relation and let a, b be sets. We say that a and b are critical w.r.t. R if and only if:

(Def. 27) a and b are divergent at most in 1 step w.r.t. R and a and b are not convergent w.r.t. R.

The following propositions are true:

(60) Let R be a binary relation and a, b be sets. Suppose a and b are critical w.r.t. R. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R.

(61) Let R be a binary relation. Suppose that it is not true that there exist sets a, b such that a and b are critical w.r.t. R. Then R is locally-confluent.

(62) Let R, Q be binary relations. Suppose that for all sets a, b such that $\langle a, b\rangle \in Q$ holds a and b are critical w.r.t. R. Then R and $R \cup Q$ are equivalent.

(63) Let R be a binary relation. Then there exists a complete binary relation Q such that

(i) $\mathrm{field}\, Q \subseteq \mathrm{field}\, R$, and

(ii) for all sets a, b holds a and b are convertible w.r.t. R iff a and b are convergent w.r.t. Q.

Let R be a binary relation. A complete binary relation is said to be a completion of R if it satisfies the condition (Def. 28).

(Def. 28) Let a, b be sets. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R if and only if a and b are convergent w.r.t. it.

We now state three propositions:

(64) For every binary relation R and for every completion C of R holds R and C are equivalent.

(65) Let R be a binary relation and Q be a complete binary relation. If R and Q are equivalent, then Q is a completion of R.

(66) Let R be a binary relation, C be a completion of R, and a, b be sets. Then a and b are convertible w.r.t. R if and only if $\mathrm{nf}_C(a) = \mathrm{nf}_C(b)$.

REFERENCES

[1] S. Abramsky, D. M. Gabbay, and S. E. Maibaum, editors. *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science, vol. 2: Computational structures*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992.

[2] Leo Bachmair and Nachum Dershowitz. Critical pair criteria for completion. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 6(1):1–18, 1988.

[3] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/nat_1.html.

[4] Grzegorz Bancerek. The well ordering relations. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/wellord1.html.

[5] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finseq_1.html.

[6] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_1.html.

[7] Czesław Byliński. Some properties of restrictions of finite sequences. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 7, 1995. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol7/finseq_5.html.

[8] Patricia L. Carlson and Grzegorz Bancerek. Context-free grammar — part I. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 4, 1992. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol4/lang1.html.

[9] Gerard Huet. A complete proof of correctness of the Knuth-Bendix completion. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 23(1):3–57, 1981.

[10] Jan Willem Klop and Aart Middeldorp. An introduction to Knuth-Bendix completion. *CWI Quarterly*, 1(3):31–52, 1988.

[11] Donald E. Knuth and Peter B. Bendix. Simple word problems in universal algebras. In J. Leech, editor, *Computational Problems in Abstract Algebras*, pages 263–297, Oxford, 1970. Pergamon.

[12] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html.

[13] Andrzej Trybulec. Many-sorted sets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/pboole.html.

[14] Andrzej Trybulec. Subsets of real numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Addenda, 2003. http://mizar.org/JFM/Addenda/numbers.html.

[15] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/subset_1.html.

[16] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_1.html.

Received November 14, 1995

Published January 2, 2004