

Lecture 15

Pete Manolios
Northeastern

Unification Basics

- ▶ **Unification Problem:** Given a set of pairs of terms $S = \{(s_1, t_1), \dots, (s_n, t_n)\}$ a *unifier* of S is a substitution σ such that $s_i|_{\sigma} = t_i|_{\sigma}$ (we'll write $s_i\sigma = t_i\sigma$)
- ▶ $U(S)$ is the set of all unifiers of S ; notice that if σ is a unifier, so is $\tau \circ \sigma$
- ▶ σ is *more general* than τ , $\sigma \leq \tau$, iff $\tau = \delta\sigma$ ($\delta \circ \sigma$) for some substitution δ
- ▶ \leq is a preorder; let δ be the identify for reflexivity
 - ▶ transitivity: if $\sigma \leq \tau$, $\tau \leq \theta$ then $\tau = \delta\sigma$, $\theta = \gamma\tau = \gamma(\delta\sigma) = (\gamma\delta)\sigma$
 - ▶ $\sigma \sim \tau$ iff $\sigma \leq \tau$, $\tau \leq \sigma$. Notice that if $\sigma = x \leftarrow y$, $\tau = y \leftarrow x$, then $\sigma \sim \tau$
 - ▶ $\sigma \sim \tau$ iff there is a *renaming* (bijection on Vars) θ s.t. $\sigma = \theta\tau$
- ▶ A **most general unifier (mgu)** is $\sigma \in U(S)$ s.t. for all $\tau \in U(S)$, $\sigma \leq \tau$
 - ▶ What is an mgu for $x=y$? $x \leftarrow y$? $y \leftarrow x$? $x \leftarrow z$, $y \leftarrow z$? $x \leftarrow y$, $z \leftarrow w$, $w \leftarrow z$?
- ▶ A substitution is **idempotent** if $\sigma\sigma = \sigma$ (rules out last case above)
 - ▶ σ is idempotent iff $\text{Domain}(\sigma)$ is disjoint from $\text{Vars}(\text{Range}(\sigma))$
- ▶ If a unification problem has a solution, then it has an idempotent mgu
- ▶ We want an algorithm that finds an mgu, if a unifier exists

Unification Algorithm

- ▶ $S = \{(x_1, t_1), \dots, (x_n, t_n)\}$ is in **solved form** if the x_i are distinct variables and don't occur in any of the t_i . Then $S \downarrow = \{x_1 \leftarrow t_1, \dots, x_n \leftarrow t_n\}$
- ▶ If S is in solved form and $\sigma \in U(S)$, then $\sigma = \sigma S \downarrow$ ($\sigma, \sigma S \downarrow$ agree on all vars)
- ▶ If S is in solved form, then $S \downarrow$ is an idempotent mgu
- ▶ Algorithm: *Nondeterministic transition system* based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \uplus S \implies S$ **useful way of thinking about algorithms: SMT/IMT**
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \uplus S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \uplus S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \uplus S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S \setminus x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
- ▶ **Unify(S)** = apply rules nondeterministically; if solved return $S \downarrow$, else fail
- ▶ Try it with: $\{x=f(a), g(x,x)=g(x,y)\}$

Unification Algorithm

► Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules

► Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \Rightarrow S$

► Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \Rightarrow \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$

► Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \Rightarrow \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable

► Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \Rightarrow \{x=t\} \cup S|x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$

$x=f(a), g(x,x)=g(x,y) \Rightarrow$ decompose **what other rules can I use?**

$x=f(a), x=x, x=y \Rightarrow$ delete

can't use eliminate on $x=x$; why?

$x=f(a), x=y \Rightarrow$ eliminate x

can't use orient on $x=y$; why?

$y=f(a), x=y \Rightarrow$ eliminate y

can eliminate using $x=f(a)$

$y=f(a), x=f(a) \Rightarrow$ return $S \downarrow$

► Try it with: $\{(x, f(y)), (y, g(x))\}$

► Try it with: $\{(P(f(w), f(y)), P(x, f(g(u))), (P(x,u), P(v,g(v)))\}$

► Try it with: $\{(f(a,b,g(x,x),g(y,y),z), f(g(v,v),g(a,a),y,z,b))\}$

Unification Algorithm Termination

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S \setminus x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
- ▶ Termination: our measure function will be on ordinals (infinite numbers)
 - ▶ $0, 1, 2, \dots, \omega$ the first infinite ordinal (why stop with the naturals?)
 - ▶ Keep going: $\omega+1, \omega+2, \dots, \omega+\omega = \omega^2, \omega^2+1, \dots, \omega^3, \dots, \omega\omega = \omega^2, \dots, \omega^3, \dots, \omega^\omega, \dots, \omega^{\omega^{\omega^{\dots}}} = \epsilon_0$ **ACL2s measures can use ordinals**
 - ▶ Lexicographic ordering on tuples of natural numbers is $\approx \omega^\omega$
 - ▶ $\langle X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}, X_n \rangle \mapsto \omega^n X_0 + \dots + \omega X_{n-1} + X_n$
 - ▶ There is an order-preserving bijection from $n+1$ -tuples of Nats to ω^n
 - ▶ There is a theorem of this in the ACL2 ordinals books; you can define a relation, prove it is well-founded and use it in termination proofs

Unification Algorithm Termination

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S|x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
- ▶ Termination: our measure function will be on ordinals (infinite numbers)
 - ▶ x is solved in S iff $x=t \in S$ and x only appears once in S
 - ▶ Measure: $\langle \text{vars in } S \text{ not solved, size of } S, \# \text{ of equations } t=x \text{ in } S \rangle$
 - ▶ Delete \leq why not =? $<$ Maybe $x \in t, x \notin S$
 - ▶ Decompose \leq $<$
 - ▶ Orient \leq $=$ $<$
 - ▶ Eliminate $<$

for every rule we have $(\leq | =)^* <$, so the lexicographic order is decreasing (and well-founded), i.e., any algorithm based on these rules terminates

Unification Algorithm Soundness

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S|x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
- ▶ If $V \implies T$ then $U(V)=U(T)$: Easy: delete, decompose, orient; for eliminate:
 - ▶ let $\sigma \in U(V)$, $\theta = x \leftarrow t$. By lemma, $\sigma = \sigma\theta$ if $x\sigma = t\sigma$, since $x=t$ is in solved form
 - ▶ lemma: If X is in solved form then $\sigma = \sigma X \downarrow$ for all $\sigma \in U(X)$
 - ▶ Proof: $\sigma, \sigma X \downarrow$ agree on all vars by case analysis on $y \in \text{Domain}(X \downarrow)$
 - ▶ $\sigma \in U(\{x=t\} \cup S)$ iff $x\sigma = t\sigma \wedge \sigma \in U(S)$ iff $x\sigma = t\sigma \wedge \sigma\theta \in U(S)$ iff $x\sigma = t\sigma \wedge \sigma \in U(S\theta)$ iff $\sigma \in U(\{x=t\} \cup S\theta)$
- ▶ Soundness: If Unify returns σ , then σ is an idempotent mgu of S

Unification Algorithm Completeness

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S|x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
- ▶ Completeness: If S is solvable, then $\text{Unify}(S)$ does not fail
 - ▶ Lemmas
 - ▶ $f(\dots) = g(\dots)$ has no solution if $f \neq g$
 - ▶ $x=t$, where $x \neq t$ and $x \in \text{Vars}(t)$ has no solution ($|x\sigma| < |t\sigma|$ for all σ)
- ▶ Proof: If S is solvable and in normal form wrt \implies , then S is in solved form. S cannot contain pairs of form $f(\dots) = f(\dots)$ (decompose) or $f(\dots) = g(\dots)$ (lemma) or $x=x$ (delete) or $t=x$ where t is not a var (orient), so all equations are of form $x=t$ where $x \notin \text{Vars}(t)$ (lemma). Also x cannot occur twice in S (eliminate), so S is in solved form.

Unification Algorithm Improvements

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, t_n=s_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S \mid x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
 - ▶ Clash $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = g(s_1, \dots, s_m)\} \cup S \implies \perp$ if $f \neq g$
 - ▶ Occurs-Check $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \perp$ if $x \in \text{Vars}(t) \wedge x \neq t$
- ▶ This is justified by the lemmas used for completeness
 - ▶ $f(\dots) = g(\dots)$ has no solution if $f \neq g$
 - ▶ $x=t$, where $x \neq t$ and $x \in \text{Vars}(t)$ has no solution ($|x\sigma| < |t\sigma|$ for all σ)
- ▶ Early termination when \exists no solution, saving (how much?) time

Complexity of Unification

- ▶ Algorithm: Nondeterministic transition system based on the following rules
 - ▶ Delete $\{t=t\} \cup S \implies S$
 - ▶ Decompose $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)\} \cup S \implies \{t_1=s_1, \dots, s_n=t_n\} \cup S$
 - ▶ Orient $\{t=x\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S$, if t is not a variable
 - ▶ Eliminate $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \{x=t\} \cup S|x \leftarrow t$, if $x \in \text{Vars}(S) - \text{Vars}(t)$
 - ▶ Clash $\{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) = g(s_1, \dots, s_m)\} \cup S \implies \perp$ if $f \neq g$
 - ▶ Occurs-Check $\{x=t\} \cup S \implies \perp$ if $x \in \text{Vars}(t) \wedge x \neq t$
- ▶ Exponential blow up: $\{(x_1=f(x_0,x_0)), x_2=f(x_1,x_1), x_3=f(x_2,x_2), \dots, x_n=f(x_{n-1},x_{n-1})\}$
- ▶ Notice that the output is exponential
- ▶ Can we do better?
 - ▶ Yes, by using a dag to represent terms and returning a dag
 - ▶ General idea: operate on a concise representation of problem
 - ▶ BDDs are concise representations of truth tables, decision trees, etc
 - ▶ Model checking searches an implicitly given graph (transition system)

History of Unification

- ▶ What we have studied is *syntactic, first-order* unification
 - ▶ syntactic: substitutions should make terms syntactically equal
 - ▶ equational unification: unification modulo an equational theory
 - ▶ eg for commutative f , $f(x, f(x, x)) = f(f(x, x), x)$ is E-unifiable not syntactically unifiable
 - ▶ first-order: no higher-order variables (no variables ranging over functions)
- ▶ Herbrand gave a nondeterministic algorithm in his 1930 thesis
- ▶ Robinson (1965) introduced FO theorem proving using resolution, unification
 - ▶ Required exponential time & space
- ▶ Robinson (1971) & Boyer-Moore (1972): structure sharing algorithms that were space efficient, but required exponential time
- ▶ Venturini-Zilli (1975): reduction to quadratic time using marking scheme
- ▶ Huet (1976) worked on higher-order unification led to $n\alpha(n)$ time: almost linear
Robinson also discovered this algorithm
- ▶ Paterson and Wegman (1976) linear time algorithm
- ▶ Martelli and Montanari (1976) linear time algorithm based on Boyer-Moore

Unification Applications

- ▶ First-order theorem proving
 - ▶ Matching (ACL2) is a special case: given s, t find σ s.t. $s\sigma = t$
- ▶ Prolog (logic programming)
- ▶ Higher-order theorem proving
 - ▶ Undecidable for third-order logic (Huet 1973)
 - ▶ Undecidable for second-order logic (Goldfarb 1981)
- ▶ Natural language processing
- ▶ Unification-based grammars
- ▶ Equational theories
 - ▶ Commutative, Associative, Distributive, etc
 - ▶ Term rewrite systems
- ▶ Type inference (eg ML, Haskell, etc)
- ▶ Logic programming
- ▶ Machine learning: generalization is a dual of unification

Schedule

- ▶ 11/8: FOL/SMT
- ▶ ~~11/11: Temporal Logic/ Safety & Liveness/ Buchi (Veteran's Day)~~
- ▶ 11/15: Refinement
- ▶ 11/18: Paper Presentations
- ▶ 11/22: Paper Presentations
- ▶ 11/29: Term Rewriting
- ▶ 12/2: Projects, Exam 2 (Take home)
- ▶ 12/6: Projects

Projects & Presentations

- ▶ 3 Minute Pitch, discussion