# Logic and Mechanized Reasoning Unification

Marijn J.H. Heule

**Carnegie**<br>Mellon **University** 

[Introduction](#page-2-0)

[Generality of Unifiers](#page-20-0)

[Unification Function](#page-30-0)

**[Termination](#page-55-0)** 

## <span id="page-2-0"></span>[Introduction](#page-2-0)

[Generality of Unifiers](#page-20-0)

[Unification Function](#page-30-0)

**[Termination](#page-55-0)** 

Letters early in the alphabet refer to constants, e.g. *a*, *b*, *c*  $\triangleright$  Constants can be seen as 0-arity functions

Small letters starting with *f* refer to functions, e.g. *f*, *g*, *h*

Letters late in the alphabet refer to variables, e.g. *x*, *y*, *z*

Capital letters refer to relations, e.g. *P*, *Q*, *R*

## **Motivation**

Given a language with the following proven sentence:

$$
\forall x, y, z. \ x < y \rightarrow x + z < y + z
$$

and we try to prove

$$
ab+7
$$

How to proceed? How can be combine them?

## **Motivation**

Given a language with the following proven sentence:

$$
\forall x, y, z. \ x < y \rightarrow x + z < y + z
$$

and we try to prove

$$
ab+7
$$

How to proceed? How can be combine them?

Substitute *ab* for *x*, *c* for *y*, and 7 for *z*

## **Motivation**

Given a language with the following proven sentence:

$$
\forall x, y, z. \ x < y \rightarrow x + z < y + z
$$

and we try to prove

$$
ab+7
$$

How to proceed? How can be combine them?

Substitute *ab* for *x*, *c* for *y*, and 7 for *z*

Note that Lean has to do this anytime you use rw or apply

Matching: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = t_i$ 

Matching: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = t_i$ 

Unification: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = \sigma t_i$ 

Matching: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = t_i$ 

Unification: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = \sigma t_i$ 

#### Example

Consider the following two expressions

$$
f(x, f(x, a)) < z \quad f(b, y) < c
$$

How to unify them?

Matching: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = t_i$ 

Unification: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = \sigma t_i$ 

#### Example

Consider the following two expressions

$$
f(x, f(x, a)) < z \quad f(b, y) < c
$$

How to unify them?  $x \mapsto b$ ,  $y \mapsto f(b, a)$  and  $z \mapsto c$ 

Matching: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = t_i$ 

Unification: Given *n* pairs of terms  $(s_1, t_1)$ ,  $(s_2, t_2)$ , ...,  $(s_n, t_n)$ , find a substitution  $\sigma$  such that for every *i*:  $\sigma s_i = \sigma t_i$ 

#### Example

Consider the following two expressions

$$
f(x, f(x, a)) < z \quad f(b, y) < c
$$

How to unify them?  $x \mapsto b$ ,  $y \mapsto f(b, a)$  and  $z \mapsto c$ 

$$
f(b,f(b,a)) < c
$$

## Prove Contradiction

#### Example

Consider the following formula

∀*x*, *z*. *R*(*f*(*x*, *f*(*x*, *a*)), *z*) ∧ ∀*y*. ¬*R*(*f*(*b*, *y*), *c*)

Is this sentence satisfiable?

## Prove Contradiction

#### Example

Consider the following formula

∀*x*, *z*. *R*(*f*(*x*, *f*(*x*, *a*)), *z*) ∧ ∀*y*. ¬*R*(*f*(*b*, *y*), *c*)

Is this sentence satisfiable?

Apply substitution  $x \mapsto b$ ,  $y \mapsto f(b, a)$  and  $z \mapsto c$ 

 $R(f(b, f(b, a)), c) \wedge \neg R(f(b, f(b, a)), c)$ 

The above is a contradiction

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- $\triangleright$  *x* and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible):  $\blacktriangleright$   $f(x, a)$  and  $f(b, y)$ 

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- $\triangleright$  *x* and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible): ▶  $f(x, a)$  and  $f(b, y)$   $x \mapsto b$  and  $y \mapsto a$  $\blacktriangleright$   $f(x, y)$  and  $f(y, x)$ 

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- ▶  $x$  and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible):

\n
$$
\begin{array}{ll}\n\blacktriangleright & f(x, a) \text{ and } f(b, y) & x \mapsto b \text{ and } y \mapsto a \\
\blacktriangleright & f(x, y) \text{ and } f(y, x) & y \mapsto x \\
\blacktriangleright & f(x, x) \text{ and } f(y, g(y))\n\end{array}
$$

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- ▶  $x$  and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible):

\n
$$
\blacktriangleright f(x, a) \text{ and } f(b, y) \qquad x \mapsto b \text{ and } y \mapsto a
$$
\n
$$
\blacktriangleright f(x, y) \text{ and } f(y, x) \qquad y \mapsto x
$$
\n
$$
\blacktriangleright f(x, x) \text{ and } f(y, g(y)) \qquad y \text{ and } g(y) \text{ can't be unified}
$$
\n
$$
\blacktriangleright f(a, x) \text{ and } f(y, g(y))
$$

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- ▶  $x$  and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible):

\n
$$
\blacktriangleright f(x, a)
$$
 and  $f(b, y)$   $x \mapsto b$  and  $y \mapsto a$ 

\n $\blacktriangleright f(x, y)$  and  $f(y, x)$   $y \mapsto x$ 

\n $\blacktriangleright f(x, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$   $y$  and  $g(y)$  can't be unified

\n $\blacktriangleright f(a, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$   $x \mapsto g(a)$  and  $y \mapsto a$ 

\n $\blacktriangleright f(a, x)$  and  $f(x, b)$ 

Hints:

- ▶ *a* and *b* can't be unified
- $\triangleright$  *x* and  $f(x)$  can't be unified

Unify the following terms (if possible): ▶  $f(x, a)$  and  $f(b, y)$   $x \mapsto b$  and  $y \mapsto a$ <br>▶  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(y, x)$   $y \mapsto x$ ▶  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(y, x)$ <br>▶  $f(x, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{y})$  can't be unified ▶  $f(a, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$   $x \mapsto g(a)$  and  $y \mapsto a$ <br>▶  $f(a, x)$  and  $f(x, b)$  *x* cannot map to *a* and *b*  $\blacktriangleright$  *f*(*a*, *x*) and *f*(*x*, *b*)

### <span id="page-20-0"></span>**[Introduction](#page-2-0)**

# [Generality of Unifiers](#page-20-0)

# [Unification Function](#page-30-0)

## **[Termination](#page-55-0)**

# Many Unifiers

### Example Can  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(a, z)$  be unified?

# Many Unifiers

# Example Can  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(a, z)$  be unified? ▶  $x \mapsto a$ ,  $y \mapsto a$ , and  $z \mapsto a$  $\blacktriangleright$  *x*  $\mapsto$  *a* and *y*  $\mapsto$  *z* ▶  $x \mapsto a$ ,  $y \mapsto g(a)$ , and  $z \mapsto g(a)$

## Many Unifiers

Example

\nCan 
$$
f(x, y)
$$
 and  $f(a, z)$  be unified?

\nFor  $x \mapsto a$ ,  $y \mapsto a$ , and  $z \mapsto a$ .

\nFor  $x \mapsto a$  and  $y \mapsto z$ .

\nFor  $x \mapsto a$ ,  $y \mapsto g(a)$ , and  $z \mapsto g(a)$ .

Some unifiers are more useful that others  $\blacktriangleright$   $f(a, z)$  is more general than  $f(a, a)$ 

## Composing Substitutions

To explain what it means for one unifier to be better than another, we analyze the composition of substitutions

Composition of two substitutions *σ* and *δ* is written *σδ*

#### Example

To unify  $f(x, z)$  and  $f(g(y), z)$ , consider the substitutions  $\triangleright \sigma = \{x \mapsto g(y)\}\$  $\triangleright$   $\delta = {\mathfrak y} \mapsto a, z \mapsto b$  $\triangleright \sigma\delta = \{x \mapsto g(a), z \mapsto b\}$  $\blacktriangleright$   $\sigma$  and  $\sigma\delta$  are unifiers

## Generality of Unifiers

- $\triangleright$  We prefer unifiers that are as general as possible.
- $\blacktriangleright$  A unifier  $\sigma$  is at least as general as unifier  $\tau$  if there exists another substitution  $\delta$  such that  $\sigma \delta = \tau$
- ▶ *<sup>σ</sup>* is more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>σ</sup>* is at least as general as *<sup>τ</sup>* but not the other way around
- ▶ Intuition: *<sup>σ</sup>* more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>τ</sup>* can be obtained from through another substitution

## Generality of Unifiers

- $\triangleright$  We prefer unifiers that are as general as possible.
- $\blacktriangleright$  A unifier  $\sigma$  is at least as general as unifier  $\tau$  if there exists another substitution  $\delta$  such that  $\sigma \delta = \tau$
- ▶ *<sup>σ</sup>* is more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>σ</sup>* is at least as general as *<sup>τ</sup>* but not the other way around
- ▶ Intuition: *<sup>σ</sup>* more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>τ</sup>* can be obtained from through another substitution

#### Example

Recall that  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(a, z)$  have (infinitely) many unifiers.

$$
\blacktriangleright \sigma = \{x \mapsto a, y \mapsto z\}
$$

$$
\blacktriangleright \tau = \{x \mapsto a, y \mapsto a, z \mapsto a\}
$$

 $\triangleright$  Which is more general?

## Generality of Unifiers

- $\triangleright$  We prefer unifiers that are as general as possible.
- $\blacktriangleright$  A unifier  $\sigma$  is at least as general as unifier  $\tau$  if there exists another substitution  $\delta$  such that  $\sigma \delta = \tau$
- ▶ *<sup>σ</sup>* is more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>σ</sup>* is at least as general as *<sup>τ</sup>* but not the other way around
- ▶ Intuition: *<sup>σ</sup>* more general than *<sup>τ</sup>* if *<sup>τ</sup>* can be obtained from through another substitution

#### Example

Recall that  $f(x, y)$  and  $f(a, z)$  have (infinitely) many unifiers.

$$
\triangleright \sigma = \{x \mapsto a, y \mapsto z\}
$$

$$
\blacktriangleright \tau = \{x \mapsto a, y \mapsto a, z \mapsto a\}
$$

 $\triangleright$  Which is more general?

Let 
$$
\delta = \{y \mapsto a, z \mapsto a\}
$$
, then  $\sigma \delta = \tau$ 

## Introduction: Most General Unifier

For every unification problem, there exists either

- ▶ a unique most general unifier (modulo renaming)
- $\blacktriangleright$  no unifier

The most general unifier can be computed in linear time

## Introduction: Most General Unifier

For every unification problem, there exists either

- ▶ a unique most general unifier (modulo renaming)
- $\blacktriangleright$  no unifier

The most general unifier can be computed in linear time

We present an algorithm with a Lean implementation from the Handbook of Practical Logic and Automated Reasoning

- $\blacktriangleright$  env is the (partial) substitution
- $\triangleright$  eqs is a set of pairs to unify
- ▶ unify? env eqs with env initially emtpy

<span id="page-30-0"></span>**[Introduction](#page-2-0)** 

[Generality of Unifiers](#page-20-0)

[Unification Function](#page-30-0)

**[Termination](#page-55-0)** 

## Extending a Cycle-Free Association List

Given a cycle-free association list env mapping variables to terms can we add the  $(x \mapsto t)$  without creating a cycle?

A cycle is:

$$
x_0 \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow x_p \longrightarrow x_0
$$

It is sufficient to ensure the following:

- 1. There is no assignment  $x \mapsto s$  in env
- 2. There is no  $y \in var(t)$  such that  $y \longrightarrow^* x$

## Extending a Cycle-Free Association List

Given a cycle-free association list env mapping variables to terms can we add the  $(x \mapsto t)$  without creating a cycle?

A cycle is:

$$
x_0 \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow x_p \longrightarrow x_0
$$

It is sufficient to ensure the following:

- 1. There is no assignment  $x \mapsto s$  in env
- 2. There is no  $y \in var(t)$  such that  $y \longrightarrow^* x$

Proof sketch: Assume  $(x \mapsto t)$  creates the cycle  $z \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x \longrightarrow' y \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow x_p \longrightarrow z$ , then there existed a path  $y \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow x_p \longrightarrow z \longrightarrow x_1 \longrightarrow x$ , which contradicts 2.

### Trivial Check

We can add the  $(x \mapsto t)$  without creating a cycle by ensuring:

- 1. There is no assignment  $x \mapsto s$  in env
- 2. There is no  $y \in var(t)$  such that  $y \longrightarrow^* x$

Helper procedure to determine whether to add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  Return true:  $t = x$  in env (trivial)
- ▶ Return false: no cycle will be created
- ▶ Return none: unification not possible

## Trivial Check

We can add the  $(x \mapsto t)$  without creating a cycle by ensuring:

- 1. There is no assignment  $x \mapsto s$  in env
- 2. There is no  $y \in var(t)$  such that  $y \longrightarrow^* x$

Helper procedure to determine whether to add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 

- $\blacktriangleright$  Return true:  $t = x$  in env (trivial)
- ▶ Return false: no cycle will be created
- ▶ Return none: unification not possible

Lean: isTriv?

Given eqs, a list of pairs to unify, determine if unification succeeds and produce an association list env if possible

- ▶ Tail-recursive algorithm
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(x, t)$ 
	- ▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  creates a cycle, return failed
	- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$

Given eqs, a list of pairs to unify, determine if unification succeeds and produce an association list env if possible

- ▶ Tail-recursive algorithm
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(x, t)$ 
	- ▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  creates a cycle, return failed
	- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$

 $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$ 

Given eqs, a list of pairs to unify, determine if unification succeeds and produce an association list env if possible

- $\blacktriangleright$  Tail-recursive algorithm
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(x, t)$ 
	- ▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  creates a cycle, return failed
	- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(s, t)$ , if both  $s$  and  $t$  are the same functions with the same number of arguments, add for each argument a pairs (*s<sup>i</sup>* , *ti*) to eqs

Given eqs, a list of pairs to unify, determine if unification succeeds and produce an association list env if possible

- $\blacktriangleright$  Tail-recursive algorithm
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(x, t)$ 
	- ▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  creates a cycle, return failed
	- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(s, t)$ , if both  $s$  and  $t$  are the same functions with the same number of arguments, add for each argument a pairs (*s<sup>i</sup>* , *ti*) to eqs

```
Lean: unify?
```
## Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ }

# Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ } ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(g(x), y)$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ }

# Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ } ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(g(x), y)$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } • env = {}, eqs = { $(y, g(x))$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ }

# Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ }  $\triangleright$  env = {}, eqs = { $(g(x), y)$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } • env = {}, eqs = { $(y, g(x))$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } ▶ env = { $y \mapsto g(x)$ }, eqs = { $(g(x), g(a))$ }

# Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ }  $\triangleright$  env = {}, eqs = { $(g(x), y)$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } • env = {}, eqs = { $(y, g(x))$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } ▶ env = { $y \mapsto g(x)$ }, eqs = { $(g(x), g(a))$ } ▶ env = { $y \mapsto g(x)$ }, eqs = { $(x, a)$ }

# Example Unify  $f(g(x), g(x))$  and  $f(y, g(a))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(g(x), g(x)), f(y, g(a)))$ }  $\triangleright$  env = {}, eqs = { $(g(x), y)$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ }  $\triangleright$  env = {}, eqs = { $(y, g(x))$ ,  $(g(x), g(a))$ } ▶ env = { $y \mapsto g(x)$ }, eqs = { $(g(x), g(a))$ } ▶ env = { $\nu \mapsto g(x)$ }, eqs = { $(x, a)$ }  $\bullet$  env = { $y \mapsto g(x)$ ,  $x \mapsto a$ }, eqs = {}

## Example Unify  $f(x, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(x, x), f(y, g(y)))$ }

## Example Unify  $f(x, x)$  and  $f(y, g(y))$ ▶ env = {}, eqs = { $(f(x, x), f(y, g(y)))$ }  $\triangleright$  env = {}, eqs = { $(x, y)$ ,  $(x, g(y))$ }

Example

\nUnify 
$$
f(x, x)
$$
 and  $f(y, g(y))$ 

\n• env = {}, eqs = { $f(x, x), f(y, g(y))$ 

\n• env = {}, eqs = { $(x, y), (x, g(y))$ 

\n• env = { $x \mapsto y$ }, eqs = { $(x, g(y))$ 

Example

\nUnify 
$$
f(x, x)
$$
 and  $f(y, g(y))$ 

\n• env = {}, eqs = { $(f(x, x), f(y, g(y))$ 

\n• env = {}, eqs = { $(x, y), (x, g(y))$ 

\n• env = { $x \mapsto y$ , eqs = { $(x, g(y))$ 

\n• env = { $x \mapsto y$ , eqs = { $(y, g(y))$ 

Example

\nUnify 
$$
f(x, x)
$$
 and  $f(y, g(y))$ 

\n• env =  $\{$ , eqs =  $\{(f(x, x), f(y, g(y))\}$ 

\n• env =  $\{$ , eqs =  $\{(x, y), (x, g(y))\}$ 

\n• env =  $\{x \mapsto y\}$ , eqs =  $\{(x, g(y))\}$ 

\n• env =  $\{x \mapsto y\}$ , eqs =  $\{(y, g(y))\}$ 

\n• is Triv? or use returns none, indicating for the following expression.

▶ isTriv? env eqs returns none, indicating failure

Successful termination shows that there exists a unifier

For example, the algorithm may return:

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto y, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto w\}
$$

▶ How to turn this in the most general unifier?

Successful termination shows that there exists a unifier

For example, the algorithm may return:

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto y, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto w\}
$$

▶ How to turn this in the most general unifier?

 $\blacktriangleright$  Apply the map until fixpoint

$$
\blacktriangleright \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto w, y \mapsto w, z \mapsto w\}
$$

### What is the complexity of computing the fixpoint?

Successful termination shows that there exists a unifier

For example, the algorithm may return:

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto y, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto w\}
$$

▶ How to turn this in the most general unifier?

 $\blacktriangleright$  Apply the map until fixpoint

$$
\blacktriangleright \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto w, y \mapsto w, z \mapsto w\}
$$

What is the complexity of computing the fixpoint?

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_1), x_1 \mapsto f(x_2, x_2), x_2 \mapsto f(x_3, x_3)\}
$$

Successful termination shows that there exists a unifier

For example, the algorithm may return:

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto y, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto w\}
$$

▶ How to turn this in the most general unifier?

$$
\blacktriangleright
$$
 Apply the map until fixpoint

$$
\blacktriangleright \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto w, y \mapsto w, z \mapsto w\}
$$

What is the complexity of computing the fixpoint?

$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\bullet \text{ env} = \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_1), x_1 \mapsto f(x_2, x_2), x_2 \mapsto f(x_3, x_3)\} \\
&\bullet x_0 \mapsto f(f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3)), f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3))) \\
&\bullet x_1 \mapsto f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3)) \\
&\bullet x_2 \mapsto f(x_3, x_3)\n\end{aligned}
$$

Successful termination shows that there exists a unifier

For example, the algorithm may return:

$$
\bullet \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto y, y \mapsto z, z \mapsto w\}
$$

▶ How to turn this in the most general unifier?

$$
\blacktriangleright
$$
 Apply the map until fixpoint

$$
\blacktriangleright \text{ env} = \{x \mapsto w, y \mapsto w, z \mapsto w\}
$$

What is the complexity of computing the fixpoint?

$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\bullet \text{ env} = \{x_0 \mapsto f(x_1, x_1), x_1 \mapsto f(x_2, x_2), x_2 \mapsto f(x_3, x_3)\} \\
&\bullet x_0 \mapsto f(f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3)), f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3))) \\
&\bullet x_1 \mapsto f(f(x_3, x_3), f(x_3, x_3)) \\
&\bullet x_2 \mapsto f(x_3, x_3)\n\end{aligned}
$$

Lean: usolve

## <span id="page-55-0"></span>[Introduction](#page-2-0)

[Generality of Unifiers](#page-20-0)

[Unification Function](#page-30-0)

## **[Termination](#page-55-0)**

Why does the unification algorithm terminate?

Why does the unification algorithm terminate? Key observation: The number of additions to env is at most the number of variables in eqs that are not in env

Size of eqs:

▶ Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$  with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Why does the unification algorithm terminate? Key observation: The number of additions to env is at most the number of variables in eqs that are not in env

Size of eqs:

- ▶ Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$  with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env
- $\triangleright$  Each step in the algorithm either decreases the size of eqs or can be applied finitely many times

Why does the unification algorithm terminate? Key observation: The number of additions to env is at most the number of variables in eqs that are not in env

Size of eqs:

- ▶ Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$  with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env
- $\blacktriangleright$  Each step in the algorithm either decreases the size of eqs or can be applied finitely many times
- $\blacktriangleright$  The only exception is an addition step to env

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

▶ Same size, but limited as env is cycle-free  $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

▶ Same size, but limited as env is cycle-free  $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue

▶ Reduces eqs

▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

▶ Same size, but limited as env is cycle-free

- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- ▶ Reduces eqs
- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 
	- ▶ Only increasing step, but limited
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

▶ Same size, but limited as env is cycle-free

- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- ▶ Reduces eqs
- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 
	- ▶ Only increasing step, but limited
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$

▶ Cannot be repeated twice

 $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(s, t)$ , add the pairs  $(s_i, t_i)$  to eqs

Size: Total number of variables and functions in  $(\sigma s_i, \sigma t_i)$ with  $(s_i, t_i) \in$  eqs with  $\sigma$  being the fixpoint of env

Steps in the function:

▶ If  $x \mapsto s$  in env replace  $(x, t)$  by  $(s, t)$ 

▶ Same size, but limited as env is cycle-free

- $\blacktriangleright$  If  $(x, t)$  is trivial, skip it and continue
	- ▶ Reduces eqs
- ▶ Otherwise add  $(x \mapsto t)$ 
	- ▶ Only increasing step, but limited
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(t, x)$ , replace by  $(x, t)$ 
	- ▶ Cannot be repeated twice
- $\blacktriangleright$  Front pair  $(s, t)$ , add the pairs  $(s_i, t_i)$  to eqs
	- ▶ Reduce size (removes two functions)