

WELL-FOUNDED UNIONS

JEREMY DAWSON, NACHUM DERSHOWITZ, AND RAJEEV GORÉ

ABSTRACT. Given two or more well-founded (terminating) binary relations, when can one be sure that their union is likewise well-founded? We suggest new conditions for an arbitrary number of relations, generalising known conditions for two relations. We also provide counterexamples to several potential weakenings. All proofs have been machine checked.

Although we are not to decide whether the reasons against the union are well founded, yet, far short of that, in such a question there may be fair grounds of objection.

Leading ecclesiastical cases decided in the Court of session, 1849-1874 (Scotland law reports [1878])

1. INTRODUCTION

A binary relation R (which need not be an ordering) over some underlying set is *well-founded* (or *terminating*) if there is no infinite *descending* chain $x_0Rx_1R\cdots Rx_{n-1}Rx_nR\cdots$.¹ Given well-founded binary relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n over some common (fixed) underlying set X , under what conditions is their union $R_0 \cup R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_n$ is also well-founded?

For two well-founded relations A and B , their union $A \cup B$ is well-founded (Corollary 2.3 below) if the following relatively powerful condition holds [11]: see also [12]. It is called *Jumping* in [7]:

$$BA \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B. \quad (*)$$

Juxtaposition is being used for composition ($xBAz$ iff there's a y such that xBy and yAz) and the asterisk for the reflexive-transitive closure (xB^*z iff there are y_0, y_1, \dots, y_n , $n \geq 0$, such that $x = y_0By_1B\cdots By_n = z$).

Jumping (*) generalises simpler ways of showing well-foundedness of the union of two relations. Eliding the rightmost B possibility gives *quasi-commutation* [2], which is relevant to many rewriting situations (e.g. [14, 5, 2, 6]):

$$BA \subseteq A(A \cup B)^*. \quad (1)$$

Date: February 6, 2018.

¹We choose to view the forward direction as descent.

Likewise, the simple A option also suffices for the well-foundedness of the union:

$$BA \subseteq A \cup B. \quad (2)$$

To gain purchase on the manner of reasoning, let $R = A \cup B$ and imagine a minimal infinite descending chain in R : $x_0 R x_1 R \cdots R x_{n-1} R x_n R \cdots$. By “minimal” we mean that its elements are as small as possible vis-à-vis A , which – as it is well-founded – always enjoys minimal elements. Thus x_0 is the smallest element in the underlying set from which an infinite chain in R ensues. By the same token, x_1 is the smallest possible y such that $x_0 R y R \cdots$. And so on. By the well-foundedness of both A and B , any such chain must have (indeed, must have infinitely many) adjacent BA -steps: $\cdots x B x' A x'' R \cdots$. Now, if (2) holds, we could have taken a giant step $x R x''$, instead, before continuing down the infinite path from x'' . But this would imply that the chain is not actually minimal because x'' is less than x' with respect to A , and should have been next after x .

Similarly, to show that (1) suffices, we choose a “preferred” infinite counter-example, in the sense that an A -step is always better than a B -step, given the choice. Again, an infinite chain containing a pair of steps $x B x' A x''$ could not be right since there is a preferred alternative, $x A y R \cdots R x'' R \cdots$, dictated by (1).

Combining these two arguments gives the sufficiency of the combined jumping condition (*). Among preferred counter-examples, always choose B -steps, $x B x'$, having minimal x' with respect to A . Preference precludes taking an A -first detour instead of a BA pair $x B x' A x''$, while minimality precludes a B -shortcut $x B x''$.

To garner further insight, we first tackle – in the next two sections – the easier case of just three relations. Then, in Section 4, we extend the tripartite results and describe the general pattern for an arbitrary number of relations. We also show in Section 5 that under the same conditions any chain in the union can be rearranged so that the individual relations appear contiguously. This is followed in Section 6 by an example of the use of Preferential Commutation for four relations involved in the dependency-pair method [1].

Letting $R_{i:n} = \bigcup_{j=i}^n R_j$ be the union of well-founded relations R_i, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_n , and letting R_i^+ be the transitive closure of R_i , our efforts culminate in Section 7 with the following sufficient condition (Theorem 7.1) for the well-foundedness and rearrangeability of $R_{0:n}$: There is some k , $0 \leq k \leq n$, such that

$$R_{i+1:n} R_i \subseteq R_0 R_{0:n}^* \cup R_i^+ \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for } i = 0 \dots k - 1 \quad (**)$$

$$R_{i+1:n} R_i \subseteq R_i R_{i:n}^* \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for } i = k \dots n - 1. \quad (***)$$

In the quadripartite case ($n = 3$), with $k = 2$, this amounts to the following:

$$(B \cup C \cup D)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B \cup C \cup D \quad (3a)$$

$$(C \cup D)B \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B^+ \cup C \cup D \quad (3b)$$

$$DC \subseteq C(C \cup D)^* \cup D. \quad (3c)$$

All proofs have been machine-checked using Isabelle/HOL; see Section 8.

We conclude with an open quadripartite problem and ideas for future work.

2. TRICOLOUR UNIONS

We now study the three-relation case $n = 2$. We will refer to the relations A , B , and C as “colours”. Ramsey’s Theorem may be applied in the following manner:

Theorem 2.1 (Ramsey). *The union $A \cup B \cup C$ of well-founded relations A , B , and C is well-founded if it is transitive:*

$$(A \cup B \cup C)(A \cup B \cup C) \subseteq A \cup B \cup C. \quad (4)$$

Proof. The infinite version of Ramsey’s Theorem applies when the union is transitive, so that every two (distinct) nodes within an infinite chain in the union of the colours have a (directed) edge that is coloured in one of the three colours. Then, there must lie an infinite monochromatic subchain within any infinite chain, contradicting the well-foundedness of each colour alone. \square

The suggestion to use Ramsey’s Theorem for such a purpose is due to Franz Baader in 1989 [15, items 38–41]; see [13, Section 3.1]. Its use in a termination prover was pioneered in the TerMiLog system [10]; see [3].

Only three of the nine cases implicit in the left-hand side of (4) are actually needed for the limited outcome that we are seeking, an infinite monochromatic path, rather than a clique as in Ramsey’s Theorem – as we observe next.

Theorem 2.2. *The union $A \cup B \cup C$ of well-founded relations A , B , and C is well-founded if*

$$BA \cup CA \cup CB \subseteq A \cup B \cup C. \quad (5)$$

Proof. When the union is not well-founded, there are infinite chains $Y = \{x_i\}_i$ with each relation connecting x_i to x_{i+1} being one of A , B , or C . Extract a maximal subsequence $Z = \{x_{i_j}\}_j$ of Y such that $x_{i_j} A x_{i_{j+1}}$ for each j . If it’s finite, then repeat at the first opportunity in the tail, and add the intervening steps to Z . If any such subsequence is infinite, we have our contradiction. If they’re all finite, then consider the first occurrence of $x(B \cup C)yAz$ in Z . Since we could not take an A -step from x or else we would have, the conditions tell us that $x(B \cup C)z$. Swallowing up all such (non-initial) A -steps in this way, we are left with an infinite chain

in $B \cup C$, for which we also know that no A -steps are possible anywhere. Now extract maximal B -chains in the same fashion and then erase them, replacing $xCyBz$ with xCz (A - and B -steps having been precluded), leaving an infinite chain coloured purely C . \square

Condition (5) above is better than what we get by just iterating the simple condition (2) as shown below, with the difference being the option $BA \subseteq C$:

$$\begin{aligned} BA &\subseteq A \cup B \\ CA \cup CB &\subseteq A \cup B \cup C. \end{aligned}$$

To guarantee an infinite clique, not just well-foundedness, instead of (4), one can insist on the three transitivity cases ($AA \subseteq A$, $BB \subseteq B$, $CC \subseteq C$), too:

Corollary 2.1. *If A , B , and C are transitive relations and*

$$BA \cup CA \cup CB \subseteq A \cup B \cup C, \quad (5)$$

then, whenever there is an infinite path in the union $A \cup B \cup C$, there is an infinite monochromatic clique.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, (at least) one of A , B , C is not well-founded. By transitivity, the elements of any infinite chain in that non-well-founded colour form an infinite clique in the underlying undirected graph. \square

Let's refer to the elements in any infinite descending chain in the union $A \cup B \cup C$ as *immortal*.

It turns out that we can do considerably better than the previous theorem:

Theorem 2.3 (Tripartite). *The union $A \cup B \cup C$ of well-founded relations A , B , and C is well-founded if*

$$(B \cup C)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B \cup C \quad (5a)$$

$$CB \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B^+ \cup C. \quad (5b)$$

Proof sketch. First construct an infinite chain $Y = \{x_i\}_i$, in which an A -step is always preferred over B or C , as long as immortality is maintained. To do this, start with an immortal element x_0 in the underlying set. At each stage, if the chain so far ends in x_i , check if there is any y such that x_iAy and from which proceeds some infinite chain in the union, in which case y is chosen to be x_{i+1} . Otherwise, x_{i+1} is any immortal element z such that x_iBz or x_iCz .

If there are infinitely many B 's and/or C 's in Y , use them – by means of the first condition – to remove all subsequent A -steps, leaving only B - and C -steps, which go out of points from which A leads of necessity to mortality. From what remains, if there is any C -step at a point where one could take one or more B -steps to any place later in the chain, take the latter route instead. What remains now are C -steps at points where B^+ detours are also precluded. If there are infinitely many such C -steps, then applying the

condition for CB will result in a pure C -chain, because neither $A(A \cup B \cup C)^*$ nor B^+ are options. \square

Dropping C from the conditions of the previous theorem, one gets the Jumping criterion, which we explored in the introduction:

Definition 2.2 (Jumping criterion [11, 12]). *Binary relation A jumps over binary relation B if*

$$BA \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B. \quad (*)$$

Clearly, then,

Corollary 2.3 (Jumping [11, 12]). *The union $A \cup B$ of well-founded relations A and B is well-founded whenever A jumps over B .*

Applying this Jumping criterion twice, one gets somewhat different (incomparable) conditions for well-foundedness of the union of three relations.

Theorem 2.4 (Jumping I). *The union $A \cup B \cup C$ of well-founded relations A , B , and C is well-founded if*

$$BA \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B \quad (6a)$$

$$C(A \cup B) \subseteq (A \cup B)(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup C. \quad (6b)$$

Proof. The first inequality is the Jumping criterion (*). The second is the same with C for B and $A \cup B$ in place of A . \square

For two relations, Jumping provides a substantially weaker well-foundedness criterion than does Ramsey. For three, whereas Jumping allows more than one step in lieu of BA (in essence, AA^*B^*), it doesn't allow for C , as does Ramsey.

Switching rôles, start with Jumping for $B \cup C$ before combining with A , we get slightly different conditions yet:

Theorem 2.5 (Jumping II). *The union $A \cup B \cup C$ of well-founded relations A , B , and C is well-founded if*

$$(B \cup C)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B \cup C \quad (7a)$$

$$CB \subseteq B(B \cup C)^* \cup C. \quad (7b)$$

Both this version of Jumping and our tripartite condition allow

$$(B \cup C)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B \cup C \quad (5a, 7a)$$


$$CB \subseteq B^+ \cup C. \quad (\text{cf. } 5b, 7b)$$

They differ in that Jumping also allows the condition shown below on the left whereas tripartite has the one shown on the right instead:


$$\begin{array}{l} \text{jumping allows} \\ CB \subseteq B(B \cup C)^* \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{tripartite allows} \\ CB \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \end{array}$$


Example 2.4. (a) *Sadly, we cannot have the best of both worlds. Let's colour edges A , B , and C with (solid) azure, (dashed) black, and (dotted) crimson ink, respectively. The graph below only has multicoloured loops despite satisfying the inclusions below.*



(b) Even the conditions shown below are insufficient. To wit, the double loop in the graph below harbours no monochromatic subchain:



(c) By the same token, the putative hypothesis that the conditions shown below suffice is countered by the graph at its side:



3. TRIPARTITE PROOF

In preparation for the general case, we decompose the proof of the Tripartite Theorem 2.3 of the previous section into a sequence of notions and lemmata.

Definition 3.1 (Immortality [7]). *Let $R \subseteq X \times X$ be a binary relation over some underlying set X . The set $R^\infty \subseteq X$ of R -immortal elements are those elements $x_0 \in X$ that head infinite (descending) R -chains, $x_0 R x_1 R \dots$.*

So, a relation R is well-founded if and only if every element of the underlying set is mortal ($R^\infty = \emptyset$).

Two trivial observations, first.

Proposition 3.2. *If $R \subseteq S^+$, for binary relations R and S , then perforce $R^\infty \subseteq S^\infty$, that is, every R -immortal is also S -immortal.*

It follows that

Proposition 3.3. *Binary relation R is well-founded if it is contained in a well-founded relation S , and, more generally, if $R \subseteq S^+$.*

As usual, the (forward) image $Q[Y]$ of a set Y under relation Q consists of those z such that yQz for some $y \in Y$, and the inverse (or pre-) image $Q^{-1}[Y]$ of Y under Q are those y such that yQz for some $z \in Y$.

If yRz for (R -)immortal z , then y is also immortal:

Proposition 3.4. *The inverse image of immortals is immortal: $R^{-1}[R^\infty] = R^\infty$.*

We will make repeated use of the Jumping criterion (*), $BA \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B$. By induction (on the number of A 's), Jumping extends to the transitive closure:

Lemma 3.5. *If binary relation A jumps over relation B , then*

$$BA^* \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B. \quad (8)$$

A central tool will be the following concept:

Definition 3.6 (Constriction). *The constriction B^\sharp of binary relation B over X (with respect to relation A) excludes from B all steps of the form zBw for which there is an $A \cup B$ -immortal y such that zAy :*

$$B^\sharp = B \setminus \{(z, w) \mid z \in A^{-1}[(A \cup B)^\infty], w \in X\}.$$

The idea of constriction is inspired by its use by Plaisted [16] with respect to subterms.

Lemma 3.7. *The union $A \cup B$ of binary relations A and B is well-founded whenever $A \cup B^\sharp$ is.*

Proof. Construct an infinite descending $A \cup B$ -chain, using A when it leads to immortality, and using B only when needed (making it a constricted step). \square

Lemma 3.8. *If binary relation A jumps over relation B and both A and B^\sharp are well-founded, then $A \cup B^\sharp$ is well-founded.*

Proof. Consider any infinite descending $A \cup B^\sharp$ -chain. As A is well-founded, it must contain infinitely many B^\sharp -steps. As A jumps over B , Lemma 3.5 tells us that $B^\sharp A^* \subseteq A(A \cup B)^* \cup B^\sharp$. We have B^\sharp on the right, because that position is constricting on the left. But in any infinite $A \cup B^\sharp$ -chain, we cannot replace $B^\sharp A^*$ by $A(A \cup B)^*$ since that would mean that A leads to immortality, violating constriction. Hence, all (non-initial) A -steps may be removed from the chain, leaving an impossible infinite B^\sharp -chain. \square

Combining the previous two lemmata, we can improve on Lemma 2.3.

Corollary 3.9. *If binary relation A jumps over relation B and both A and B^\sharp are well-founded, then $A \cup B$ is well-founded.*

When there are more than three relations, as in the next section, we will need to revise the following lemma with a more flexible notion of constriction. For now, let C^\flat be like C^\sharp except that B -steps may be needed for immortality. Thus C^\flat excludes all C -steps zCw with an $A \cup B \cup C$ -immortal y such that zAy .

Lemma 3.10. *The union $B \cup C^\flat$ is well-founded if well-founded binary relations B and C^\flat satisfy*

$$CB \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B^+ \cup C, \quad (5b)$$

Proof. Suppose that B and C^b are well-founded, but $B \cup C^b$ is not. So there exist $B \cup C^b$ -immortal elements. Choose z to be a B -minimal such element, and also to be C^b -minimal among all possible B -minimal choices.

As z is B -minimal, the first step of an infinite $B \cup C^b$ -chain must be $zC^b y$, for some y . Considering that B is well-founded, let y be B -minimal among possible choices for y . Then, by the C^b -minimality of z , although y is $B \cup C^b$ -immortal, it is not B -minimal among $B \cup C^b$ -immortals. So we have yBx , where x is $B \cup C^b$ -immortal.

Relying on (5b), we could replace $zC^b yBx$ in the putative infinite chain by any one of the following:

- $zAy'(A \cup B \cup C)^*x$, for some y' – but x is $B \cup C^b$ -immortal, and so it heads an infinite descending $B \cup C$ -chain, contradicting the constriction of $zC^b y$; or
- zB^+x , which would contradict our choice of z to be B -minimal; or
- zCx , and so $zC^b x$, which would contradict our choice of y to be B -minimal, since yBx and x could have been chosen in place of y .

Since each alternative leads to a contradiction, $B \cup C^b$ must be well-founded. \square

Everything is in place now for a modular proof of the Tripartite Theorem.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Since A jumps over $B \cup C$ (5a), by Corollary 3.9, it is enough to show that $(B \cup C)^\sharp$ is well-founded. Given (5b), by Lemma 3.10, we have that $B \cup C^b$ is well-founded. Clearly $(B \cup C)^\sharp \subseteq B \cup C^b$, because constricted B is in B and C is constricted to the same degree in both $(B \cup C)^\sharp$ and $B \cup C^b$, namely that A does not lead to immortality in the full union. By Proposition 3.3, the required well-foundedness of $(B \cup C)^\sharp$ follows. \square

4. PREFERENTIAL COMMUTATION

The two three-relation conditions, Jumping I and Jumping II, can each be straightforwardly extended by induction to arbitrarily many relations.

Corollary 4.1 (Jumping I). *The union $R_{0:n}$ of well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n is well-founded if*

$$R_{i+1}R_{0:i} \subseteq R_{0:i}R_{0:i+1}^* \cup R_{i+1} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots n - 1 .$$

Proof. Since $B = R_{i+1}$ is well-founded, assume $A = R_{0:i}$ is well-founded by induction. Jumping (Corollary 3.9) then implies that so is $A \cup B = R_{0:i+1}$. \square

Similarly,

Corollary 4.2 (Jumping II). *The union $R_{0:n}$ of well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n is well-founded if*

$$R_{i+1:n}R_i \subseteq R_iR_{i:n}^* \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots n - 1 . \quad (9)$$

Proof. Let $A = R_i$ and $B = R_{i+1:n}$ in Corollary 3.9, and reason by induction. \square

We next extend Theorem 2.3 to an arbitrary number of relations and show the sufficiency of what we call *Preferential Commutation*.

Theorem 4.1 (Preferential Commutation). *The union $R_{0:n}$ of well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n is well-founded if it satisfies the following Preferential Commutation Condition:*

$$R_{i+1:n}R_i \subseteq R_0R_{0:n}^* \cup R_i^+ \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots n-1. \quad (10)$$

Preferential Commutation (10) specializes to the two conditions (5a,5b) of Theorem 2.3 in the tripartite case. In the quadripartite case ($n = 3$), it asserts that $A \cup B \cup C \cup D$ is well-founded if

$$(B \cup C \cup D)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B \cup C \cup D \quad (10a)$$

$$(C \cup D)B \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B^+ \cup C \cup D \quad (10b)$$

$$DC \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup C^+ \cup D. \quad (10c)$$

Notice the inclusion of the options B^+ and C^+ in (10b) and (10c), respectively, when compared with the Jumping criteria. The A^+ has been omitted from (10a) on account of its inclusion in $A(A \cup \dots)^*$.

We give an example of the application of Preferential Commutation to four relations in the next section.

Foremost to the argument for the above theorem is a general “detour” condition given below: replacing R_0 in Preferential Commutation with arbitrary P and $R_{0:n}$ with any S . Consider conditions (10a–10c) on A, B, C, D in the case of four relations. The point is that we require the union of B, C, D to be well-founded so as to apply Jumping in conjunction with A , but were we to simply use the same method of jumping to establish that, we would not be allowed to introduce any A -steps in the inclusions for compositions of pairs from B, C, D .

We first generalise the notion of constriction (Definition 3.6) of the previous section.

Definition 4.3 (Constriction). *For arbitrary binary relation S , the S -constriction $B^{Q\sharp S}$ of binary relation B over X , with respect to Q , excludes from B all steps of the form zBw where there exists some S -immortal element in the Q -image of z :*

$$B^{Q\sharp S} = B \setminus (Q^{-1}[S^\infty] \times X)$$

Think of this as B minus cases where Q could have granted S -immortality.

The basic constriction B^\sharp of Definition 3.6 in the previous section is $B^{A\sharp A \cup B}$, while C^\flat of Lemma 3.10 is $C^{A\sharp A \cup B \cup C}$.

Just for completeness, we note that it follows from the above definition that

Proposition 4.4. *For all binary relations B, C, P, Q, R, S :*

$$B \subseteq C \ \& \ Q \subseteq PR^* \ \& \ S \subseteq R^+ \quad \text{imply} \quad B^{P\#R} \subseteq C^{Q\#S} .$$

Proof. By definition, we need to show that

$$B \setminus P^{-1}[R^\infty] \times X \subseteq C \setminus Q^{-1}[S^\infty] \times X .$$

Since $B \subseteq C$, it suffices to show that no less is excluded on the left than on the right, that is, $Q^{-1}[S^\infty] \subseteq P^{-1}[R^\infty]$. Consider any S -immortal z such that xQz . By Proposition 3.2, z is also R -immortal. By assumption, we have $xPz'R^*z$, for some z' . By Proposition 3.4, z' is also R -immortal. \square

Definition 4.5 (Detour). *Binary relations A, B, P, S satisfy the detour condition $\Delta_{B;A}^{P\#S}$ if*

$$BA \subseteq PS^* \cup A^+ \cup B . \tag{11}$$

Our central lemma is next; it generalises Lemma 3.10 of the previous section. Though it does have a proof very similar to the latter, we give here an alternative, distinct argument, one we find quite interesting. Contrary to earlier proofs, here we modify relations to include *only immortal* points – if any!

Lemma 4.6. *For all binary relations A, B, P, S , such that $A \cup B \subseteq S^+$ and both A and $B^{P\#S}$ are well-founded, if the detour condition $\Delta_{B;A}^{P\#S}$ holds, then the union $A \cup B^{P\#S}$ is well-founded, as is the more constricted union $(A \cup B)^{P\#S}$.*

Proof. Let \underline{A} and \underline{B} be relations A and B , respectively, restricted to those pairs (x, y) for which y is an $A \cup B$ -immortal element (of X). Assuming A and $B^{P\#S}$ are well-founded, so are \underline{A} and $\underline{B}^{P\#S}$. Consider any pair of adjacent steps

$$x \underline{B}^{P\#S} y \underline{A} z .$$

By constriction, the detour $xPy'S^*z$ allowed by (11) in place of $x\underline{B}\underline{A}z$ is not a viable option, since z is immortal in $A \cup B \subseteq S^+$, and hence y' is immortal in S . Thus, xBy would not actually be constricting with respect to P . So, we always have the following special case of the Jumping criterion (*):

$$\underline{B}^{P\#S} \underline{A} \subseteq \underline{A}^+ \cup \underline{B}^{P\#S} .$$

Note that the B -step on the right is constricting because it is on the left. By Lemma 2.3, $\underline{A} \cup \underline{B}^{P\#S}$ is well-founded, and so is $A \cup B^{P\#S}$, as claimed, since it surely terminates for the excluded mortal elements of $A \cup B$.

Finally, $(A \cup B)^{P\#S} = A^{P\#S} \cup B^{P\#S} \subseteq A \cup B^{P\#S}$, so, a fortiori, $(A \cup B)^{P\#S}$ is well-founded (per Proposition 3.3). \square

For binary relations R_0, \dots, R_n , let $R = R_{0:n}$, and let $\Delta_j = \Delta_{R_{j+1:n}; R_j}^{R_{0:j} \# R}$ be the detour $R_{j+1:n} R_j \subseteq R_{0:j} R^* \cup R_j^+ \cup R_{j+1:n}$. Preferential Commutation (10) is:

$$\Delta_0 \wedge \Delta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \Delta_{n-1} . \tag{10}$$

Lemma 4.7. *The constricted unions $R_{j:n}^{R_0\sharp R}$, $j = 0 \dots n$, of preferentially-commuting well-founded binary relations R_0, \dots, R_n are all well-founded.*

Proof. By induction, starting with $j = n$ (when the conclusion holds by assumption) and working our way to $j = 0$. For the inductive step, given Δ_j and the well-foundedness of $R_{j+1:n}^{R_0\sharp R}$, and substituting $A = R_j$, $B = R_{j+1:n}$, $P = R_0$, and $S = R$ in the previous lemma, we obtain that $(R_j \cup R_{j+1:n})^{R_0\sharp R} = R_{j:n}^{R_0\sharp R}$ is likewise well-founded. The side condition $A \cup B \subseteq S^+$ of the lemma is satisfied by all the detours, as $R_j \cup R_{j+1:n} \subseteq R^+$ for all j . \square

We are ready for our main result, namely that the union R of well-founded R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n is well-founded when the detour conditions (10) hold for them.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $A = R_0$ and $B = R_{1:n}$. Lemma 4.7 tells us in particular ($j = 1$) that $R_{1:n}^{R_0\sharp R} = B^\sharp$ is well-founded. Since Δ_0 means precisely that A jumps over B , Corollary 3.9 gives the well-foundedness of $A \cup B = R$. \square

5. PREFERENTIAL REARRANGEMENT

As with Jumping with two relations [7, Thm. 54], Preferential Commutation also means that any chain in the union can be rearranged from “a to z”, so to speak.

Theorem 5.1 (Preferential Rearrangement). *If well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n satisfy*

$$R_{i+1:n}R_i \subseteq R_0R_{0:n}^* \cup R_i^+ \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots n-1. \quad (10)$$

then finite chains can always be rearranged:

$$R_{0:n}^* \subseteq R_0^*R_1^* \cdots R_n^*. \quad (12)$$

Proof. By our main theorem (Theorem 4.1), the union $R = R_{0:n}$ is well-founded, so we can argue by induction on it. Were this theorem false, there would be counterexamples xR^+t containing an inversion $xR^*R_jR_iR^*t$ with $j > i$, and such that no alternative properly ordered chain $xR_0^*R_1^* \cdots R_n^*t$ would be possible. Now, let $xRyR^*t$ be a *minimal* counterexample, in the sense that each element in the chain is minimal vis-à-vis R : there is no smaller head than x for any counterexample; y is minimal among chains with irreparable inversions that begin with x ; and so on.

The counterexample must possess an inversion, hence must comprise at least two steps xR_jyR^*t . By minimality, x being larger than y , the lesser chain yR^+t must be rearrangeable, so there is a chain $xR_jyR_izR_i^*R_{i+1}^* \cdots R_n^*t$ for some particular i and j ($y \neq t$ for sure). If $j \leq i$, all is fine and dandy, meaning that the example was not in fact a counterexample. Otherwise, $j > i$, and by (10) one of the following should

hold true: (i) xR_0vR^*z ; (ii) xR_i^+z ; or (iii) $xR_{i+1:n}z$. But (i) is impossible, because vR^*zR^*t itself would of necessity be a better counterexample, as were it resolvable, so too would be the original example, starting with xR_0v . Also, (ii) is impossible, because $xR_i^+zR_{i:n}^*t$ is a perfectly good rearrangement. Lastly, (iii) is impossible, since goodness (no inversions) of $xR_{i+1:n}zR_i^* \cdots R_n^*t$ would provide a viable rearrangement, while badness of $xR_{i+1:n}zR_i^* \cdots R_n^*t$ would make it a smaller counterexample than xR_jyR^*t , z being less than y in R . \square

Well-foundedness is necessary [7, Note 43].

It follows that Preferential Commuting (10) of well founded-relations is equivalent to an ordered version of the condition:

$$R_{i+1:n}R_i \subseteq R_0^+R_1^* \cdots R_n^* \cup R_i^+ \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for all } i = 0 \dots n-1. \quad (10')$$

6. EXAMPLE: PREFERENTIAL DEPENDENCIES

Term-rewriting systems (see [9]) compute by applying equations to terms left-to-right, replacing arbitrary subterms when they match the left-hand side of an equation. If $\ell = r$ is such an oriented equation, it is used to rewrite a term s by replacing a subterm of s that is an instance $\ell\sigma$ of ℓ with the corresponding right-hand side $r\sigma$, resulting in some new term t . We write $s \rightarrow t$.

Termination of the rewriting relation \rightarrow of a given system is normally established by showing that each such rewrite results in a decrease in some well-founded term ordering, or, in other words, that $\rightarrow \subseteq >$ for some well-founded relation $>$. A popular method [1] extends the given system of equations with additional replacement rules, called *dependency pairs*, in a way that can make the overall proof easier. Strict decrease in $>$ is only required for top-level applications of rules or their extensions. But only a “quasi-decrease” is needed for applications of (original) rules at *proper* subterms, for some quasi-ordering \gtrsim that is *compatible* with $>$ in the sense that $>\gtrsim \subseteq >$ and $\gtrsim > \subseteq >$. (See the version in [?].) We very briefly sketch the use of Preferential Commuting to justify variants of this approach.

Given a rewriting system, we deal with four relations: instances $D = \{(\ell\sigma, r\sigma) \mid \ell = r \text{ is a rule, } \sigma \text{ is a substitution}\}$ of original and extended rules; the immediate subterm relation $\triangleright [f(\dots s \dots) \triangleright s]$; the intersection $>$ of \rightarrow^+ (for the original rules) with some well-founded partial order (think of it as “decreasing rewriting”); and inner-rewriting \Rightarrow , which is \rightarrow applied to a *proper* (not necessarily immediate) subterm $[f(\dots s \dots) \Rightarrow f(\dots t \dots)]$ if $s \rightarrow t$. It can be seen without difficulty that if there exists any infinite rewrite chain with \rightarrow , then there also is an infinite $(D \cup \triangleright \cup \Rightarrow)$ -chain, wherein D occurs infinitely often.

Preferred Commutation for the union E of $A: \Rightarrow$, $B: >$, $C: \triangleright$, and D is achieved by ensuring the following detours:

$$\begin{aligned}
> \Rightarrow \underline{\subseteq} \Rightarrow^+ >^* \cup > \quad \triangleright \Rightarrow \underline{\subseteq} \Rightarrow \triangleright \quad D \Rightarrow \underline{\subseteq} \Rightarrow E^* \cup > \quad (\text{ba/ca/da}) \\
\triangleright > \underline{\subseteq} \Rightarrow^+ \triangleright \quad D > \underline{\subseteq} > \quad (\text{cb/db}) \\
D \triangleright \underline{\subseteq} \Rightarrow^* \triangleright^+ \cup D. \quad (\text{dc})
\end{aligned}$$

Conditions (ba) and (db) are usually guaranteed by showing that applying a rule can, if anything, only cause a decrease with respect to $>$ (because $D \subseteq \succsim$ and $\Rightarrow \subseteq \succsim$, for example). Condition (ba) holds automatically when $>$ is on account of an inner step. Conditions (ca) and (cb) hold by the nature of rewriting (recalling that $> \subseteq \rightarrow^+$). For (da) we require a strict decrease in $>$ for each extended rule ($D \subseteq >$), except perhaps for some instances that allow inner rewriting) and then rely on (ba) for an overall decrease. Condition (dc) is what guides the addition of rules: if there is a directed equation $\ell = r \in D$ and $r \triangleright s$, but s is not also a subterm of ℓ ($\ell \not\triangleright^+ s$), or of an inner reduct of ℓ (after some \Rightarrow steps), then include $\ell = s$ as an extended rule in D . For each extended rule, a strict decrease in the ordering $>$ ensures (da) and (db). Extended rules may engender additional extended rules, per (dc).

Since $>$ and \triangleright are well-founded, and \Rightarrow may be assumed well-founded by an inductive argument, all that remains to be shown is that D on its own is well-founded, which it is if $D \subseteq >$.

7. PREFERENTIAL JUMPING

Preferential Commutation (10) generalises the conjunction of conditions (5a,5b) of the Tripartite Theorem 2.3. Its beauty lies in that it allows initial “preferred” R_0 -steps and multiple R_i -steps. It does not, however, generalise condition condition (7b) of Jumping II (Theorem 2.5).

We can, however, extend Theorem 4.1 to allow a mix of Preferential Commutation and Jumping, with Jumping taking over from Commuting at some point.

Theorem 7.1 (Preferential Jumping). *The union $R_{0:n}$ of well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n is well-founded if, for some k , $0 \leq k \leq n$,*

$$R_{i+1:n} R_i \subseteq R_0 R_{0:n}^* \cup R_i^+ \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for } i = 0 \dots k-1 \quad (**)$$

$$R_{i+1:n} R_i \subseteq R_i R_{i:n}^* \cup R_{i+1:n} \quad \text{for } i = k \dots n-1. \quad (***)$$

When $k = n$ this leaves only (**), which is pure Preferential Commutation (Theorem 4.1); when $k = 0$ this leaves (***), which is Jumping II (Corollary 4.2).

Proof. By (***) and Jumping II, $R_{k:n}$ is well-founded. Taking that into account, by (**) and Preferential Commuting, $R_{1:n}$ is. \square

By iterating the similar result for Jumping for two relations [7, Thm. 54], we get a rearrangement theorem with conditions as for Corollary 4.2, that

is, (***) for $k = 0$. Interestingly, this seems to require an inductive proof, unlike Theorem 5.1. Then, combining that with Theorem 5.1, we get the following result.

Theorem 7.2. *Well-founded relations R_0, R_1, \dots, R_n satisfying the Preferential Jumping conditions (**, ***) for some k have re-arrangeable finite chains:*

$$R_{0:n}^* \subseteq R_0^* R_1^* \cdots R_n^* . \quad (12)$$

8. FORMALISING THE PROOF

All the results of the preceding sections have been verified using Isabelle/HOL 2005. Instructions on how to run the proofs are located at <http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~jeremy/isabelle/2005/gen/tripartite-README>.

When formalising this work in Isabelle, we faced a problem in defining “well-foundedness” and “relational composition” since these are defined in exactly opposite ways in the term-rewriting and interactive theorem-proving communities. Fortunately, the two notions are almost always used together, meaning that the two effects cancel each other out, as we explain next.

In Isabelle, the well-foundedness and composition of relations are as follows: *Relation R is well-founded if there is no infinite descending chain* where $x <_R y$ means $(x, y) \in R$, and descent goes to the left:

$$\cdots <_R x_n <_R x_{n-1} <_R \cdots <_R x_1 <_R x_0 .$$

The Isabelle definition below is the positive form: a relation R is well-founded iff the principle of well-founded induction over R holds for all properties P :

```
wf ?R == ALL P.
  (ALL x. (ALL y. (y, x) : ?R --> P y) --> P x)
  --> (ALL x. P x)
```

We display Isabelle code explicitly so that readers can make a visual connection with our repository. In this definition, the question mark symbol $?$ indicates implicit universal quantification and so $?R$ is a free variable (parameter) that is instantiated. The explicit quantifiers are **ALL** and **EX**.

Next, we give its equivalent, which says that a relation R is well-founded if every non-empty set Y has an R -minimal member:

```
wf ?R = (ALL Y x. x : Y --> (EX z:Y. ALL y. (y, z) : ?R --> y ~: Y))
```

Then the Isabelle expression that states precisely that **wf** R iff there are no infinite descending chains is as follows, where **Suc** signifies successor in the naturals:

```
wf ?R = (~ (EX f. ALL i. (f (Suc i), f i) : ?R))
```

The symbol \sim encodes classical negation and infix $:$ encodes \in , so $\sim :$ encodes \notin .

In Isabelle, the *composition* of relations R and S (denoted \circ) is defined by

$$\text{?R } \circ \text{ ?S} == \{(x, z). \text{EX } y. (x, y) : \text{?S} \ \& \ (y, z) : \text{?R}\}$$

that is,

$$R \circ S = \{(x, z) \mid \exists y. (x, y) \in S \ \& \ (y, z) \in R\}.$$

Our notation RS from Section 2 and the Isabelle notation $R \circ S$ for “relational composition” are inverses, obeying $RS = (R^{-1} \circ S^{-1})^{-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} RS &= S \circ R = \{(a, c) \mid \exists b. (a, b) \in R \ \& \ (b, c) \in S\} \\ (RS)^{-1} &= R^{-1} \circ S^{-1} = \{(c, a) \mid \exists b. (c, b) \in S^{-1} \ \& \ (b, a) \in R^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the definition of composition \circ and the definition wf of well-founded used in Isabelle are *both* mirror images of those used in the previous sections, the theorems in our Isabelle repository and this paper are exact correspondents. (Were only one different, we would have to reverse the order of relation composition to make the two notions coincide.)

For example, the Jumping theorem for two relations of [11] appears in our repository as

$$\begin{aligned} [\mid \text{?S } \circ \text{ ?R} <= (\text{?R } \circ (\text{?R } \text{Un } \text{?S})^{\sim*}) \text{Un } \text{?S}; \text{wf } \text{?R}; \text{wf } \text{?S} \mid] \\ ==> \text{wf } (\text{?R } \text{Un } \text{?S}) \end{aligned}$$

where binary Un denotes union (\cup) and postfix \sim^* signifies transitive closure.

Using the positive definition of well-foundedness leads to Isabelle proofs rather different from our original pen-and-paper proofs. Consider, on the one hand, the arguments given in Section 1 and in the proof of Theorem 2.3, involving infinite sequences in which A is preferred, and in which members are A -minimal, with – on the other hand – the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.10, which chooses a C^b -minimal B -minimal immortal element. This latter proof reflects much better the flavour of the arguments used in the Isabelle proofs.

We have formulated in Isabelle two distinct proofs of the crucial Lemma 4.6, one along the lines of that of Lemma 3.10 and another that follows the proof in Section 4, with relations restricted to immortal elements.

9. CONCLUSION AND PROSPECTS

Whereas previous work has provided sufficient conditions for the union of two well-founded orderings to be well-founded, we discovered a corresponding result for the union of three well-founded orderings. We discussed how our sufficient conditions differ from those that result merely from the repeated application of the result for two orderings.

We then repackaged the proof of this result for three orderings so as to extend it to the union of any number of well-founded orderings – in a condition called Preferential Commutation. We also showed that whenever there is a finite chain in the union, then there is also one between its two endpoints that takes steps from the relations one after the other, in order. And we gave an example of its use in proofs of termination of rewriting. Finally, we combined Jumping with Preferential Commutation. Our expectation is that these results can have significant and varied applications, just like binary Jumping has proven itself to be quite versatile.

Usually, when formalising a result, the pen-and-paper proofs have been completed, but in our case, the situation is the opposite. We actually found some proofs using Isabelle and have reworded them for presentation. The proofs in Isabelle all use “positive” notions (\mathbf{wf}) rather than “negative” notions (“no infinite chains”). In this case, formalising Theorem 2.3 involved splitting the proof up into lemmas, which in fact led us to Lemmas 3.10 and 4.6, and thence to formulating and proving Theorem 4.1. As always, formalising a proof confirms that no details have been overlooked or other errors made.

The answer to the question whether the following conditions suffice in the quadripartite case has so far eluded us:

$$(B \cup C \cup D)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B \cup C \cup D \quad (10a,3a)$$

$$(C \cup D)B \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup B^+ \cup C \cup D \quad (10b,3b)$$

$$DC \subseteq B(B \cup C \cup D)^* \cup C^+ \cup D. \quad (\text{cf. } 10c,3c)$$

So far, all we can say is the following about any counterexample (that is, a case where these conditions hold, the individual relations are well-founded, but their union is not):

- $A \cup B$ is not well-founded; for, were it, then Theorem 2.3 (for relations $A \cup B$, C and D) would give us well-foundedness of the union.
- $(C \cup D)^{A\#A \cup B \cup (C \cup D)}$ is not well-founded; for, if it were, then $(B \cup (C \cup D))^{A\#A \cup B \cup (C \cup D)} = (B \cup C \cup D)^\#$ would also be well-founded by Lemma 4.6, whence the union would also be by Corollary 3.9.

Unfortunately, these considerations have not yielded a counterexample.

Further matters to be explored include:

- What effect would transitivity of the individual relations have on the conditions for well-foundedness? It is known to allow weakening of the Jumping criterion [7]. This suggests a weakening of the first Tripartite condition (5a):

$$(B \cup C)A \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup (B \cup C)^+. \quad (5a^+)$$

- Can we obtain a better understanding of the detour condition Δ that might allow the results reported here to be extended even further? For example, can we exploit the fact that the proof of the crucial Lemma 4.6 holds with $A(A \cup B^{P\#S})^*$ on the right of Eq. (11), not just

A^+ ? This has the effect of weakening the second Tripartite condition (5b) to

$$CB \subseteq A(A \cup B \cup C)^* \cup B(B \cup C^b)^* \cup C, \quad (5b^b)$$

which is why, in Example 2.4(a), there had to be an immortalising A -step out of what would otherwise have been a perfectly nice BC^bBB detour in place of the offending CB cycle, and not the unacceptable $BCBB$ cycling detour.

- Can one “extract” any code (semi-) automatically? For example, if we express results in the contrapositive, then given an infinite descending chain in one relation, can we derive an infinite descending chain in another, as in the manual proof of Lemma 3.7?
- Focussing on the infinite descending chains, do these results have applications in terms of liveness?
- One of the motivations for this work is the search for novel termination orderings, particularly for term rewriting. The conditions herein may be applicable to a path ordering based on Takeuti’s ordinal diagrams [17], for which ramified jumping conditions play a rôle.

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Arts and Jürgen Giesl. Termination of term rewriting using dependency pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 236:133–178, 2000. Preliminary version available at <http://verify.rwth-aachen.de/giesl/papers/ibn-97-46.ps>.
- [2] Leo Bachmair and Nachum Dershowitz. Commutation, transformation, and termination. In J. H. Siekmann, editor, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Automated Deduction (Oxford, England)*, volume 230 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 5–20, Berlin, July 1986. Springer-Verlag. Available at <http://nachum.org/papers/CommutationTermination.pdf>.
- [3] Maurice Bruynooghe, Michael Codish, John P. Gallagher, Samir Genaim, and Wim Vanhoof. Termination analysis of logic programs through combination of type-based norms. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 29(2), April 2007.
- [4] Jeremy Dawson and Rajeev Goré. Proving results from the paper Nachum Dershowitz: Tripartite unions. Technical report, Australian National University, January 2016. <http://users.cecs.anu.edu.au/~rpg/tripartite-unions.pdf>.
- [5] Nachum Dershowitz. Termination of linear rewriting systems (Preliminary version). In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (Acre, Israel)*, volume 115 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 448–458, Berlin, July 1981. European Association of Theoretical Computer Science, Springer-Verlag. Available at <http://nachum.org/papers/Linear.pdf>.
- [6] Nachum Dershowitz. Hierarchical termination. In N. Dershowitz and N. Lindenstrauss, editors, *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Conditional and Typed Rewriting Systems (Jerusalem, Israel, July 1994)*, volume 968 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 89–105, Berlin, 1995. Springer-Verlag. Available at <http://nachum.org/papers/hierarchy-new.pdf>.
- [7] Nachum Dershowitz. Jumping and escaping: Modular termination and the abstract path ordering. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 464:35–47, 2012. Available at <http://nachum.org/papers/Toyama.pdf>.

- [8] Nachum Dershowitz. Tripartite unions. arXiv 1606.01148 [cs.LO], informal, June 2016. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1606.01148.pdf>.
- [9] Nachum Dershowitz and Jean-Pierre Jouannaud. Rewrite systems. In Jan van Leeuwen, editor, *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, volume B: Formal Methods and Semantics, chapter 6, pages 243–320. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990. Draft available at <http://nachum.org/papers/survey-draft.pdf>.
- [10] Nachum Dershowitz, Naomi Lindenstrauss, Yehoshua Sagiv, and Alexander Serebrenik. A general framework for automatic termination analysis of logic programs. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing*, 12(1/2):117–156, 2001. Available at <http://nachum.org/papers/aaecc.pdf>.
- [11] Henk Doornbos, Roland Backhouse, and Jaap van der Woude. A calculational approach to mathematical induction. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 179(1–2):103–135, June 1997. <http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~rcb/MPC/MadeCalculational.ps.gz>.
- [12] Henk Doornbos and Burghard von Karger. On the union of well-founded relations. *Logic J. of the IGPL*, pages 195–201, 1998.
- [13] Alfons Geser. *Relative Termination*. PhD thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik, Universität Passau, Germany, 1990. Available at http://homepage.cs.uiowa.edu/~astump/papers/geser_dissertation.pdf.
- [14] Jan Willem Klop. *Combinatory Reduction Systems*. CWI, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1980. Mathematical Centre Tracts 127.
- [15] Pierre Lescanne. Rewriting list contributions. <http://www.ens-lyon.fr/LIP/REWRITING/CONTRIBUTIONS>, 1989.
- [16] David A. Plaisted. Polynomial time termination and constraint satisfaction tests. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications (Montreal, Canada)*, volume 690 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 405–420, Berlin, June 1993. Springer-Verlag.
- [17] Gaisi Takeuti. Ordinal diagrams. II. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 12:385–391, 1960.

RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY