

BILINGUAL ANALOGICAL PROPORTIONS VIA HEDGES

CHRISTIAN ANTIĆ

christian.antic@icloud.com
Vienna University of Technology
Vienna, Austria

ABSTRACT. Analogical proportions are expressions of the form “ a is to b what c is to d ” at the core of analogical reasoning which itself is at the core of human and artificial intelligence. The author has recently introduced *from first principles* an abstract algebro-logical framework of analogical proportions within the general setting of universal algebra and first-order logic. In that framework, the source and target algebras have the *same* underlying language. The purpose of this paper is to generalize his unilingual framework to a bilingual one where the underlying languages may differ. This is achieved by using hedges in justifications of proportions. The outcome is a major generalization vastly extending the applicability of the underlying framework. In a broader sense, this paper is a further step towards a mathematical theory of analogical reasoning.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

Analogical proportions are expressions of the form “ a is to b what c is to d ” at the core of analogical reasoning which itself is at the core of human and artificial intelligence with applications to such diverse tasks as proving mathematical theorems and building mathematical theories, commonsense reasoning, learning, language acquisition, and story telling (e.g. Barbot et al., 2019; Boden, 1998; Gust et al., 2008; Hofstadter, 2001; Hofstadter & Sander, 2013; Krieger, 2003; Miclet & Prade, 2009; Pólya, 1954; Prade & Richard, 2018, 2021; Schmidt et al., 2014; Stroppa & Yvon, 2006; Winston, 1980).

Antić (2022, 2023a, 2023c) has recently introduced *from first principles* an abstract algebro-logical framework of analogical proportions within the general setting of universal algebra and first-order logic. It is a promising novel model of analogical proportions with appealing mathematical properties (cf. Antić, 2023b; ?).

Antić’s framework is unilingual in the sense that the underlying languages (or similarity types) of the source and target algebras are identical. This means that for example analogical proportions over the source algebra (\mathbb{N}, S) — here S is the unary successor function — and the target algebra $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ cannot be formulated since S and $+$ have different ranks. In this paper, we shall generalize the framework by allowing the underlying languages to differ (see Example 4). This vastly extends the applicability of the framework. Technically, we replace terms in justifications by (restricted) hedges (cf. Yamamoto, Ito, Ishino, & Arimura, 2001; Kutsia, Levy, & Villaret, 2014).

In Section 3, we obtain bilingual generalizations of the Uniqueness Lemma (see Lemma 8) and the Functional Proportion Theorem (see Theorem 9). Moreover, in Theorem 11 we observe that the generalized bilingual framework of this paper preserves all desired properties listed in Antić (2022, §4.3) which is further evidence for the robustness of the underlying framework.

Finally, Section 4 lists some problems which remained unsolved in this paper and appear to be interesting lines of future research.

In a broader sense, this paper is a further step towards a mathematical theory of analogical reasoning.

Preliminaries. We assume the reader to be fluent in basic universal algebra as it is presented for example in Burris and Sankappanavar (2000, §II).

A language \mathcal{L} of algebras consists of a set of ranked *function symbols* together with an associated *rank function* $r_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ (often simply denoted by r), and a denumerable set $\mathcal{Z} = \{z, z_1, z_2, \dots\}$ of \mathcal{Z} -variables. The sets \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{Z} are pairwise disjoint. We denote the set of function symbols of rank n by \mathcal{L}_n so that \mathcal{L}_0 denotes the *constant symbols*. The set $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$ of \mathcal{L} -terms with variables among $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Z}$ is defined as usual. We denote the set of \mathcal{Z} -variables occurring in a term s by $\mathcal{Z}(s)$. We say that a term s has *rank* n iff $\mathcal{Z}(s) = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$. A term is *ground* iff it contains no constant symbols. Terms can be interpreted as “generalized elements” containing variables as placeholders for concrete elements.

Convention 1 (Dot convention). We add a dot to formal symbols to distinguish them from the objects that they are intended to denote — for example, \dot{f} is a function symbol which stands for a function f .

An \mathcal{L} -algebra \mathfrak{A} consists of:

- a non-empty set A , the *universe* of \mathfrak{A} ;
- for each $\dot{f} \in \mathcal{L}$ a function $f^{\mathfrak{A}} : A^{r_{\mathcal{L}}(\dot{f})} \rightarrow A$, the *functions* of \mathfrak{A} ;
- for each constant symbol $\dot{c} \in \mathcal{L}_0$, an element $c^{\mathfrak{A}} \in A$, the *distinguished elements* of \mathfrak{A} .

An \mathfrak{A} -assignment is a function $\alpha : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow A$ mapping \mathcal{Z} -variables to elements of A . In what follows, we always write the application of an assignment in postfix notation. Relative to an \mathfrak{A} -assignment α , we define the denotation $s^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha$ of an \mathcal{L} -term s in \mathfrak{A} with respect to α inductively as follows:

- for a variable $z \in \mathcal{Z}$, $z^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha := \alpha(z)$;
- for a constant symbol $\dot{c} \in \mathcal{L}_0$, $\dot{c}^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha := c^{\mathfrak{A}}$;
- for a function symbol $\dot{f} \in \mathcal{L}$ and \mathcal{L} -terms $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{Z})$,

$$(\dot{f}(s_1, \dots, s_{r(\dot{f})}))^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha := f^{\mathfrak{A}}(s_1^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha, \dots, s_{r(\dot{f})}^{\mathfrak{A}}\alpha).$$

Notice that $s^{\mathfrak{A}}$ induces a function, which we again denote by $s^{\mathfrak{A}}$, given by

$$s^{\mathfrak{A}}(z_1, \dots, z_{r(s)}) : A^{r(s)} \rightarrow A : (a_1, \dots, a_{r(s)}) \mapsto s^{\mathfrak{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_{r(s)}) := s^{\mathfrak{A}}\{z_1/a_1, \dots, z_{r(s)}/a_{r(s)}\}.$$

We call a term s *injective* in \mathfrak{A} iff $s^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is an injective function. Moreover, we call s *constant* in \mathfrak{A} iff $s^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is a constant function — notice that ground terms induce constant functions which can be identified with elements of A .

2. BILINGUAL ANALOGICAL PROPORTIONS

This is the main section of the paper. Here we shall generalize Antić’s (2022, 2023a) abstract algebraic framework of analogical proportions from an unilingual to a bilingual setting where the underlying languages may differ.

For this, let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be algebras over languages of algebras $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, respectively, where we require $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}| = |\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}|$. That is, we assume that both languages are indexed by the same index set I such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} = \{\dot{f}_i \mid i \in I\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}} = \{\dot{g}_i \mid i \in I\},$$

and thus

$$\mathfrak{A} = \left(A, \{f_i^{\mathfrak{A}} \mid i \in I\} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{B} = \left(B, \{g_i^{\mathfrak{B}} \mid i \in I\} \right).$$

This is not a serious restriction since we can always add copies of a function — for example, (\mathbb{N}, S_1, S_2) contains two copies of the same successor function and has the same index set as $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot)$.


Now let \mathcal{L} be a language generalizing $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ in the sense that it contains a function symbol h_i for each $f_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $g_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$, $i \in I$, where we define the rank function of \mathcal{L} by

$$r_{\mathcal{L}}(h_i) := \max\{r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(f_i), r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}(g_i)\}, \quad i \in I.$$

Moreover, we assume a set of *hedge variables*¹ $\mathcal{Z} := \{Z, Z_1, Z_2, \dots\}$ which may be replaced by the *empty hedge* λ and which we will use to formally reduce the rank of a term — for example, $h(\dot{a}, \lambda)$ will stand for $h(\dot{a})$. The use of hedge variables will be necessary in cases where function symbols of different ranks are to be generalized. In addition, we assume a set $\mathcal{X} = \{x, x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ of \mathcal{X} -variables as placeholders for constant symbols (see Antić, 2023a). An \mathcal{L} -*hedge* (cf. Yamamoto et al., 2001; Kutsia et al., 2014) is an \mathcal{L} -term possibly containing variables from

$$\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Z} \cup \mathcal{Z},$$

and we will use the notation $\bar{s}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})$ for \mathcal{L} -hedges. This situation can be depicted as follows:



We denote the set of all \mathcal{L} -hedges with variables from \mathcal{V} by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V})$. An *abstract* \mathcal{L} -hedge contains no constant symbols. We will use the language \mathcal{L} to express \mathcal{L} -justifications of analogical proportions below.

An $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ -*substitution* is a function

$$\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} : \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \{\lambda\}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z})$$

with signatures

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{L}) : \mathcal{L} &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} : h_i \mapsto f_i, \quad i \in I, \\ (\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X}) : \mathcal{X} &\rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}, 0}, \\ (\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{Z}) : \mathcal{Z} &\rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}), \\ (\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{Z}) : \mathcal{Z} &\rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \{\lambda\}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

which is the identity almost everywhere, extended to hedges inductively in the usual way. Notice that $\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is *fixed* on \mathcal{L} and maps each function (and constant) symbol h_i to f_i , for every $i \in I$. For example, we will write $\{h_i/f_i, x/\dot{a}, z/f(\dot{a}), Z/\lambda\}$ for the substitution that is the identity on every variable except for h_i, x, z , and Z which are mapped respectively to $f_i, \dot{a}, f(\dot{a})$, and λ . A substitution is *ground* iff it has the signature

$$\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cup \{\lambda\}}(\emptyset).$$

We denote the set of all ground $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ -substitutions by $g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$. The application of an $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ -substitution $\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}}$ to an \mathcal{L} -hedge \bar{s} is written in postfix notation $\bar{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and is defined inductively as usual.

¹See Yamamoto et al. (2001) and Kutsia et al. (2014).

Example 2. Preparatory to Example 4, consider the algebras

$$\mathfrak{N} := (\mathbb{N}, S, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{M} := (\mathbb{N}, +, 1),$$

where $S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the unary *successor function* $S(a) := a + 1$, for every $a \in \mathbb{N}$, and let (here “ $_$ ” is a dummy constant symbol)²

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}} := \{\dot{S}, \dot{0}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{M}} := \{\dot{+}, \dot{1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L} := \{\dot{h}, \dot{_}\}$$

with ranks

$$\begin{aligned} r(\dot{S}) &:= 1 \\ r(\dot{0}) &:= 0 \\ r(\dot{+}) &:= 2 \\ r(\dot{1}) &:= 0, \\ r(\dot{h}) &= \max\{r(\dot{S}), r(\dot{+})\} = 2 \\ r(\dot{_}) &= \max\{r(\dot{0}), r(\dot{1})\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{X} := \emptyset$, $\mathcal{Z} := \{z\}$, and $\mathcal{Z} := \{Z\}$. Then the hedge $h(z, Z)$ generalizes both ground terms $\dot{S}(\dot{0})$ and $\dot{1} + \dot{1}$ via

$$\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}} := \{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{0}, Z/\dot{_}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} := \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{1}, Z/\dot{1}\},$$

where $+$ is written in infix notation for readability, and $\dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)$ generalizes $\dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0}))$ and $(\dot{1} + \dot{1}) + \dot{1}$ again via $\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}}$. Formally, we obtain

$$h(z, Z)\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}} = \dot{S}(\dot{0}, \dot{_}) = \dot{S}(\dot{0}) \quad \text{and} \quad h(z, Z)\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} = \dot{+}(\dot{1}, \dot{1})$$

and

$$h(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}} = \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0}, \dot{_}), \dot{_}) = \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0})) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} = \dot{+}(\dot{+}(\dot{1}, \dot{1}), \dot{1}).$$

Convention 3. We make the convention that in case $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}} = r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}$ then $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ turning \mathcal{L} into a ranked language with $r_{\mathcal{L}} = r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}} = r_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}$. This guarantees that our bilingual framework of this paper coincides with the unilingual one in Antić (2022, 2023a) in case the underlying languages are identical.

An \mathcal{L} -justification with variables among \mathcal{V} is an expression of the form

$$\tilde{s}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})$$

consisting of two abstract \mathcal{L} -hedges \tilde{s} and \tilde{t} with \mathcal{X} -variables \mathbf{x} , \mathcal{Z} -variables \mathbf{z} , hedge \mathcal{Z} -variables \mathbf{Z} , and an arrow \rightarrow which by convention binds weaker than any other function symbol, where we require that every \mathcal{Z} -variable in \tilde{t} occurs in \tilde{s} , that is, $\mathcal{Z}(\tilde{t}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\tilde{s})$. We denote the set of all such \mathcal{L} -justifications by $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V})$.

We are now ready to introduce the main notion of the paper by following the lines of Antić (2022, 2023a). Let $a, b \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}}(\emptyset)$ and $c, d \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\emptyset)$ be ground terms standing for elements in \mathfrak{N} and \mathfrak{B} , respectively. We define the *analogical proportion relation* in two steps:

(1) Define the *set of \mathcal{L} -justifications* of an arrow $a \rightarrow b$ by

$$\text{Jus}_{\mathfrak{N}}(a \rightarrow b) := \left\{ \tilde{s}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V}) \mid \begin{array}{l} a^{\mathfrak{N}} \rightarrow b^{\mathfrak{N}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}})^{\mathfrak{N}} \rightarrow (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{N}})^{\mathfrak{N}} \\ \sigma_{\mathfrak{N}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{N}}) \end{array} \right\}$$

²The algebras \mathfrak{N} and \mathfrak{M} will be defined in Example 4.

extended to an *arrow proportion* $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ by

$$Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \tilde{s}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \\ \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{V}) \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{l} a^{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow b^{\mathfrak{A}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}})^{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}})^{\mathfrak{A}} \\ c^{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow d^{\mathfrak{A}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}} \rightarrow (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}} \\ \sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \\ \sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}) \\ (\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X}) = (\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

We call an \mathcal{L} -justification *trivial in* \mathfrak{A} iff it is contained in *every* $Jus_{\mathfrak{A}}(a \rightarrow b)$, for all $a, b \in A$; moreover, we call an \mathcal{L} -justification *trivial in* $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$ iff it is trivial in \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} ,³ and we say that J is a *trivial set of* \mathcal{L} -justifications in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$ iff every \mathcal{L} -justification in J is trivial in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$. We say that $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ *holds* in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$ — in symbols,

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d,$$

iff

- (a) either $Jus_{\mathfrak{A}}(a \rightarrow b) \cup Jus_{\mathfrak{B}}(c \rightarrow d)$ consists only of trivial \mathcal{L} -justifications, in which case there is neither a non-trivial transformation of a into b in \mathfrak{A} nor of c into d in \mathfrak{B} ; or
- (b) $Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d)$ is maximal with respect to subset inclusion among the sets $Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d')$, $d' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\emptyset)$ with $d'^{\mathfrak{B}} \neq d^{\mathfrak{B}}$, containing at least one non-trivial \mathcal{L} -justification, that is, for any such ground term d' ,⁴

$$\emptyset \subsetneq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d) \subseteq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d')$$

implies

$$\emptyset \subsetneq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d') \subseteq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d).$$

We abbreviate the above definition by simply saying that $Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d)$ is *d-maximal*.

- (2) Finally, the analogical proportion relation is most succinctly defined by the following derivation:

$$\frac{a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d \quad b \rightarrow a : \cdot d \rightarrow c \quad c \rightarrow d : \cdot a \rightarrow b \quad d \rightarrow c : \cdot b \rightarrow a}{a : b :: c : d}.$$

This means that in order to prove $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a : b :: c : d$, we need to check the four relations in the first line with respect to \models in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$. The set of all analogical proportions which hold in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$ is denoted by $AP(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$, that is,

$$AP(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) := \{a : b :: c : d \mid (\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a : b :: c : d\}.$$

We will always write \mathfrak{A} instead of $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{A})$.

Example 4. This example is a continuation of Example 2. The arrow proportion

$$\dot{S}(\dot{0}) \rightarrow \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0})) : \cdot \dot{1} + \dot{1} \rightarrow \dot{1} + \dot{1} + \dot{1}$$

³For example, $z \rightarrow x$ and $x_1 \rightarrow x_2$ are trivial in every pair of algebras.

⁴In what follows, we will usually omit trivial \mathcal{L} -justifications from notation. So, for example, we will write $Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d) = \emptyset$ instead of $Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d) = \{\text{trivial } \mathcal{L}\text{-justifications}\}$ in case $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ has only trivial \mathcal{L} -justifications in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$, et cetera. The empty set is always a trivial set of \mathcal{L} -justifications. Every \mathcal{L} -justification is meant to be non-trivial unless stated otherwise. Moreover, we will always write sets of \mathcal{L} -justifications modulo renaming of variables, that is, we will write $\{z \rightarrow z\}$ instead of $\{z \rightarrow z \mid z \in Z\}$ et cetera.

stands for

$$1 \rightarrow 2 : \cdot 2 \rightarrow 3$$

and has the justification

$$\dot{h}(z, Z) \rightarrow \dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)$$

in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{M})$ since

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \rightarrow 2 &= (\dot{h}(z, Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{O}, Z/\lambda\})^{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow (\dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{O}, Z/\lambda\})^{\mathfrak{M}}, \\ 2 \rightarrow 3 &= (\dot{h}(z, Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{I}, Z/\dot{I}\})^{\mathfrak{M}} \rightarrow (\dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{I}, Z/\dot{I}\})^{\mathfrak{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

This can be depicted as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z) \\ \begin{array}{ccc} \{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{O}, Z/\lambda\} & & \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{I}, Z/\dot{I}\} \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ \dot{S}(\dot{O}) & \rightarrow & \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{O})) \quad \vdots \quad \dot{I} + \dot{I} & \rightarrow & (\dot{I} + \dot{I}) + \dot{I}. \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ \{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{O}, Z/\lambda\} & & \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{I}, Z/\dot{I}\} \\ & & \dot{h}(z, Z) \end{array} \end{array}$$

In Example 7, we will see that this justification is in fact a “characteristic” one thus yielding

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{M}) \models \dot{S}(\dot{O}) \rightarrow \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{O})) : \cdot \dot{I} + \dot{I} \rightarrow \dot{I} + \dot{I} + \dot{I}.$$

Of course, this arrow proportion cannot be entailed in the unilingual framework since S and $+$ have different ranks!

3. PROPERTIES

Recall that the *clone* of an \mathcal{L} -algebra \mathfrak{A} is given by

$$Clo(\mathfrak{A}) := \{s^{\mathfrak{A}} \mid s \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{Z})\}.$$

The following observation follows immediately from definitions, and it says that the framework is invariant under identical clones:

Fact 5. *We have the following implication:*

$$\frac{Clo(\mathfrak{A}) = Clo(\mathfrak{A}') \quad Clo(\mathfrak{B}) = Clo(\mathfrak{B}')}{AP(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) = AP(\mathfrak{A}', \mathfrak{B}')}.$$

Moreover, the framework is invariant with respect to semantic equivalence of ground terms:

Fact 6. *Given ground terms $a, b, a', b' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\emptyset)$ and $c, d, c', d' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\emptyset)$ satisfying*

$$a^{\mathfrak{A}} = a'^{\mathfrak{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad b^{\mathfrak{A}} = b'^{\mathfrak{A}} \quad \text{and} \quad c^{\mathfrak{B}} = c'^{\mathfrak{B}} \quad \text{and} \quad d^{\mathfrak{B}} = d'^{\mathfrak{B}},$$

then

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a : b :: c : d \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a' : b' :: c' : d'.$$

Characteristic justifications. Computing all \mathcal{L} -justifications of an arrow proportion is difficult in general, which fortunately can be omitted in many cases. The following definition is essentially the same as Antić's (2022, Definition 20). We call a set J of \mathcal{L} -justifications a *characteristic set of \mathcal{L} -justifications* of $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$ iff J is a sufficient set of \mathcal{L} -justifications of $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$, that is, iff

- (1) $J \subseteq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d)$, and
- (2) $J \subseteq Jus_{(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})}(a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d')$ implies $d' = d$, for each $d' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\emptyset)$.

In case $J = \{\tilde{s} \rightarrow \tilde{t}\}$ is a singleton set satisfying both conditions, we call $\tilde{s} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$ a *characteristic \mathcal{L} -justification* of $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$.

Example 7. Recall the situation in Example 4. Since $\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} = \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{1}, Z/\dot{1}\}$ is the *unique* substitution yielding

$$\dot{h}(z, Z)\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} = \dot{1} \dot{+} \dot{1},$$

we deduce that

$$\dot{h}(z, Z) \rightarrow \dot{h}(\dot{h}(z, Z), Z)$$

is indeed a *characteristic justification* of

$$\dot{S}(\dot{0}) \rightarrow \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0})) : \cdot \dot{1} \dot{+} \dot{1} \rightarrow \dot{1} \dot{+} \dot{1} \dot{+} \dot{1}$$

in $(\mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{M})$.

The following result provides a sufficient condition of characteristic \mathcal{L} -justifications. It is a generalization of the Extended Uniqueness Lemma in Antić (2023a) to the bilingual setting — it is almost identical to the original characterization which demonstrates the robustness of the underlying framework!

Lemma 8 (Bilingual Uniqueness Lemma). *Let $\tilde{s}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{Z})$ be a non-trivial \mathcal{L} -justification of $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$.*

(1) *If*

$$(1) \quad c^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}} \quad \text{implies} \quad d^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}},$$

for all $\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, then $\tilde{s} \rightarrow \tilde{t}$ is a characteristic \mathcal{L} -justification of $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$, that is,

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d.$$

(2) *Consequently, if*

$$c^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}},$$

for all $\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, and every \mathcal{Z} -variable in \tilde{s} occurs in \tilde{t} (recall that every \mathcal{Z} -variable in \tilde{t} occurs in \tilde{s} by assumption), then

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models b \rightarrow a : \cdot d \rightarrow c.$$

(3) *Consequently, if*

$$\begin{aligned} a^{\mathfrak{A}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}})^{\mathfrak{A}} &\quad \Leftrightarrow \quad b^{\mathfrak{A}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}})^{\mathfrak{A}}, \\ c^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{s}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}} &\quad \Leftrightarrow \quad d^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}})^{\mathfrak{B}}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, and every \mathcal{Z} -variable in \tilde{s} occurs in \tilde{t} (recall that every \mathcal{Z} -variable in \tilde{t} occurs in \tilde{s} by assumption), then

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a : b :: c : d.$$

Proof. The implication in (1) guarantees that $\tilde{s}[\mathbf{x}](z, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](z, \mathbf{Z})$ only justifies the arrow proportion $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d$ and no other arrow proportion $a \rightarrow b : \cdot c \rightarrow d'$, for some ground term $d' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\emptyset)$ with $d'^{\mathfrak{B}} \neq d^{\mathfrak{B}}$, in $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$. All the other statements are immediate consequences of the first. \square

The next theorem studies functional proportions of the form $a : t(a) :: c : t(c)$ for some “transformation” t and it is a generalization of the Functional Proportion Theorem of Antić (2022, 2023a).

Theorem 9 (Bilingual Functional Proportion Theorem). *Let $\tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](z, \mathbf{Z})$ be an abstract \mathcal{L} -hedge containing the single \mathcal{Z} -variable z , and let $a \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\emptyset)$ and $c \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}}}(\emptyset)$ be ground terms. If*

$$(\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c})^{\mathfrak{B}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma'_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c})^{\mathfrak{B}},$$

for all $\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c}, \sigma'_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$, then the \mathcal{L} -justification

$$z \rightarrow \tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](z, \mathbf{Z})$$

characteristically justifies

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a \rightarrow \tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}, z \mapsto a} : \cdot c \rightarrow \tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c},$$

for all $\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}, z \mapsto a} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ and $\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}, z \mapsto c} \in g\text{-Sub}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{B}})$ with $(\sigma_{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X}) = (\sigma_{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X})$.

Proof. A direct consequence of the Bilingual Uniqueness Lemma 8. \square

Example 10. Reconsider the arrow proportion

$$\dot{S}(\dot{0}) \rightarrow \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0})) : \cdot \dot{1} + \dot{1} \rightarrow \dot{1} + \dot{1} + \dot{1}$$

of Example 4. Let

$$\tilde{t}[\mathbf{x}](z, \mathbf{Z}) := \dot{h}(z, Z)$$

be an abstract \mathcal{L} -hedge not containing \mathcal{X} -variables. Since

$$\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}} = \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{1} + \dot{1}, Z/\dot{1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma'_{\mathfrak{M}} = \{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{1}, Z/\dot{1} + \dot{1}\}$$

are (modulo semantic equivalence in \mathfrak{M}) the only $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{M}})$ -substitutions satisfying

$$(\dot{1} + \dot{1} + \dot{1})^{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma_{\mathfrak{M}})^{\mathfrak{M}} = (\tilde{t}\sigma'_{\mathfrak{M}})^{\mathfrak{M}},$$

the Bilingual Functional Proportion Theorem 9 yields

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{M}) \models \dot{S}(\dot{0}) \rightarrow \dot{h}(z, Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{S}, z/\dot{0}, Z/\dot{\lambda}\} : \cdot \dot{1} + \dot{1} \rightarrow \dot{h}(z, Z)\{\dot{h}/\dot{+}, z/\dot{1} + \dot{1}, Z/\dot{1}\},$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{M}) \models \dot{S}(\dot{0}) \rightarrow \dot{S}(\dot{S}(\dot{0})) : \cdot \dot{1} + \dot{1} \rightarrow \dot{1} + \dot{1} + \dot{1}.$$

Theorem 11. *The bilingual framework of this paper satisfies the same set of proportional axioms as in Antić (2022, Theorem 28).*

Proof. An immediate consequence of the fact that the unilingual framework is a special case of the bilingual one (Convention 3) which means that all counterexamples in the proof of Antić (2022, Theorem 28) can be transferred. \square

4. PROBLEMS

This section lists problems which remained unsolved in this paper and appear to be interesting lines of future research (and see Antić, 2022, §8).

Problem 1. Generalize the concepts and results of this paper from universal algebra to full first-order logic in the same way as Antić (2022, 2023a) has been generalized to (Antić, 2023c) thus giving raise to bilingual *first-order* analogical proportions. For this, it will be necessary to consider formulas over hedges as \mathcal{L} -justifications instead of ordinary formulas.

Problem 2. ? (?) has recently introduced a notion of bilingual homomorphism and isomorphism. Prove generalizations of the First and Second Isomorphism Theorems from Antić (2022, 2023a) in the bilingual setting.

Problem 3. From a practical point of view, it is important to develop algorithms for the computation of sets of characteristic \mathcal{L} -justifications in abstract and concrete algebras.

Problem 4. A *proportional functor* (Antić, 2023d) is a mapping $F : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ satisfying

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}) \models a : b :: \overbrace{Fa^{\mathfrak{A}}} : \overbrace{Fb^{\mathfrak{A}}}$$

for all ground terms $a, b \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{A}}}(\emptyset)$. Proportional functors are mappings preserving the analogical proportion relation and play thus a fundamental role — therefore study proportional functors in the bilingual setting.

Problem 5. Clarify the role of anti-unification in our framework (cf. Cerna & Kutsia, 2023).

5. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to generalize Antić's abstract algebraic framework of analogical proportions from a unilingual to a bilingual setting where the underlying languages of the source and target algebras may differ. This is a major generalization vastly extending the applicability of the underlying framework. In a broader sense, this paper is a further step towards a mathematical theory of analogical reasoning.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The manuscript has no data associated.

REFERENCES

- Antić, C. (2022). Analogical proportions. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 90(6), 595–644. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10472-022-09798-y>.
- Antić, C. (2023a). Analogical proportions via abstract justifications. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03879901/document>.
- Antić, C. (2023b). Boolean proportions. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2109.00388.pdf>.
- Antić, C. (2023c). Logic-based analogical proportions. <https://hal.science/hal-04005139>.
- Antić, C. (2023d). Proportional algebras. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2210.01751.pdf>.

- Barbot, N., Miclet, L., & Prade, H. (2019). Analogy between concepts. *Artificial Intelligence*, 275, 487–539.
- Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, 103(1-2), 347–356.
- Burris, S., & Sankappanavar, H. (2000). *A Course in Universal Algebra*. <http://www.math.hawaii.edu/~ralph/Classes/619/univ-algebra.pdf>.
- Cerna, D. M., & Kutsia, T. (2023). Anti-unification and generalization: a survey. In *IJCAI 2023*, pp. 6563–6573.
- Gust, H., Krumnack, U., Kühnberger, K.-U., & Schwering, A. (2008). Analogical reasoning: a core of cognition. *Künstliche Intelligenz*, 22(1), 8–12.
- Hofstadter, D. (2001). Analogy as the core of cognition. In Gentner, D., Holyoak, K. J., & Kokinov, B. K. (Eds.), *The Analogical Mind: Perspectives from Cognitive Science*, pp. 499–538. MIT Press/Bradford Book, Cambridge MA.
- Hofstadter, D., & Sander, E. (2013). *Surfaces and Essences. Analogy as the Fuel and Fire of Thinking*. Basic Books, New York.
- Krieger, M. H. (2003). *Doing Mathematics: Convention, Subject, Calculation, Analogy*. World Scientific, New Jersey.
- Kutsia, T., Levy, J., & Villaret, M. (2014). Anti-unification for unranked terms and hedges. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 52, 155–190.
- Miclet, L., & Prade, H. (2009). Handling analogical proportions in classical logic and fuzzy logics settings. In Sossai, C., & Chemello, G. (Eds.), *ECSQARU 2009, LNAI 5590*, pp. 638–650. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg.
- Pólya, G. (1954). *Induction and Analogy in Mathematics*, Vol. 1 of *Mathematics and Plausible Reasoning*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
- Prade, H., & Richard, G. (2018). Homogenous and heterogenous logical proportions: an introduction. In Gabbay, D. M., & Guenther, F. (Eds.), *Handbook of Philosophical Logic*. Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
- Prade, H., & Richard, G. (2021). Analogical proportions: why they are useful in AI. In Zhou, Z.-H. (Ed.), *IJCAI 2021*, pp. 4568–4576.
- Schmidt, M., Krumnack, U., Gust, H., & Kühnberger, K.-U. (2014). Heuristic-driven theory projection: an overview. In Prade, H., & Richard, G. (Eds.), *Computational Approaches to Analogical Reasoning: Current Trends*, Vol. 548 of *Studies in Computational Intelligence*, pp. 163–194. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg.
- Stroppa, N., & Yvon, F. (2006). Formal models of analogical proportions. Technical Report D008, Telecom ParisTech - École Nationale Supérieure de Télécommunications, Télécom Paris.
- Winston, P. H. (1980). Learning and reasoning by analogy. *Communications of the ACM*, 23(12), 689–703.
- Yamamoto, A., Ito, K., Ishino, A., & Arimura, H. (2001). Modelling semi-structured documents with hedges for deduction and induction. In Rouveirol, C., & Sebag, M. (Eds.), *ILP 2001, LNAI 2157*, pp. 240–247. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.