

Dependently typed superposition in Lean

Gabriel Ebner

Matryoshka 2018

2018-06-27

TU Wien

Introduction

Calculus

Implementation

Conclusion

- Proof assistant based on dependent type theory
 - terms, types, formulas, proofs are all expressions
 - small kernel (unlike Coq)
- uses axiom of choice and classical logic
 - but avoided outside of proofs
- Tactics/metaprograms are defined in the object language

```
c          -- constants
x          -- variables
t s
λ x : t, s
Π x : t, s  -- often written  $\forall$  or  $\rightarrow$ 
Sort u     -- Prop, Type
```

- e.g.

```
∀ α : Type, ∀ β : Type, ∀ r : ring α,
  ∀ m : module α β r, ∀ x : β,
  1 · x = x
```

```
c          -- constants
x          -- variables
t s
λ x : t, s
Π x : t, s  -- often written ∀ or →
Sort u     -- Prop, Type
```

- e.g.

```
∀ α : Type, ∀ β : Type, ∀ r : ring α,
∀ m : module α β r, ∀ x : β,
smul α β r m (one α r) x = x
```

- Superposition prover
- Implemented 100% in Lean
 - First “large” metaprogram
- Uses Lean expressions, unification, proofs
- 2200 lines of code
 - (including toy SAT solver)
- Think of metis in Isabelle

Intended logic

- Complete for first-order logic with equality
- Higher-order not a focus
 - but don't fail on lambdas
 - no encoding for applicative FOL
- Some inferences for inductive data types

Introduction

Calculus

Implementation

Conclusion

- How to represent a clause $a, b \vdash c, d$?

1. $\neg a \vee \neg b \vee c \vee d$

2. $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \vee d$

3. $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow \neg c \rightarrow \neg d \rightarrow \text{false}$

- also used in Coq by Bezem, Hendriks, de Nivelle 2002

Intuitionistic reasoning

- Actually: $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow (c \rightarrow F) \rightarrow (d \rightarrow F) \rightarrow F$
 - (F is a definition for the original goal)

→ often intuitionistic proofs

- e.g. for assumptions like $\forall \bar{x}, \bigwedge A \rightarrow \bigvee B$
- want to avoid classical reasoning on types

- also makes use of decidable instances

Quantifiers

```
∀ α, ∀ β, ∀ r : ring α,  
∀ m : module α β r, ∀ x : β,  
(smul α β r m (one α r) x = x → F) → F
```

- only perform inferences on non-dependent literals
- when literals are resolved away,
we get new non-dependent literals

Quantifiers

$\forall \alpha, \forall \beta, \forall r : \text{ring } \alpha,$
module $\alpha \beta r \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow F$

- only perform inferences on non-dependent literals
- when literals are resolved away,
we get new non-dependent literals

Quantifiers

$\forall \alpha, \forall \beta,$
ring $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \rightarrow F$

- only perform inferences on non-dependent literals
- when literals are resolved away,
we get new non-dependent literals

- Skolemization not sound in general
 - requires non-empty domain
- add extra (implicit) argument to Skolem function
 - $\forall x, P \rightarrow \exists y : \alpha, Q x y$ becomes
 $\forall x, \forall z : \alpha, P \rightarrow \forall x, Q x (fzx)$
- automatically discharged for nonempty instances

Refinements

- Subsumption
- Term ordering
- Literal selection
- Demodulation
- Splitting (Avatar)

Term ordering

- Standard lexicographic path order
- Curried applications fab are treated as $f(a, b, c)$
- Type parameters, type-class instances are also arguments!
 - does not seem to be a performance problem
- λ and Π expressions are treated as (unknown) variables

Avatar-style splitting

- Splits clause into variable-disjoint components

$$\frac{\vdash Px, Qy}{\vdash Px} \quad \frac{\vdash Px, Qy}{\vdash Qy}$$

Avatar-style splitting

- Splits clause into variable-disjoint components

$$\frac{\vdash Px, Qy}{s_1 \vdash Px} \quad \frac{\vdash Px, Qy}{s_2 \vdash Qy} \quad \frac{}{\vdash s_1, s_2}$$

- $s_1 := \forall x Px$

- $s_2 := \forall y Qy$

- No inferences are performed on these splitting atoms

→ sent to SAT solver instead

$$\frac{A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{ if } A \text{ has a type-class instance}$$

- such as `inhabited`, `is_associative`, ...

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, \text{cons } a \ b = \text{cons } c \ d}{\Gamma \vdash \Delta, a = c \wedge b = d} \quad \text{cons } a \ b = \text{nil}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$$

Introduction

Calculus

Implementation

Conclusion

General approach

- reuse built-in data structures
 - expressions
 - proofs
 - unifier
- Lean's unifier essentially does:
 - pattern unification
 - definitional reduction
 - some heuristics
- rewriting only at first-order argument positions

Proof construction

- unification, type inference only work with local context

→ clauses are stored in the local context:

`cls_0: A → (B → F) → F`

`cls_1: (A → F) → F`

`cls_2: B → F`

$\vdash F$

⚠ does not work with universe polymorphism

Proof construction

- unification, type inference only work with local context

→ clauses are stored in the local context:

`cls_0: A → (B → F) → F`

`cls_1: (A → F) → F`

`cls_2: B → F`

`cls_3: (B → F) → F`

$\vdash F$

⚠ does not work with universe polymorphism

Proof construction

- unification, type inference only work with local context

→ clauses are stored in the local context:

`cls_0: A → (B → F) → F`

`cls_1: (A → F) → F`

`cls_2: B → F`

`cls_3: (B → F) → F`

`cls_4: F`

`⊢ F`

⚠ does not work with universe polymorphism

Proof construction

- unification, type inference only work with local context

→ clauses are stored in the local context:

`cls_0: A → (B → F) → F`

`cls_1: (A → F) → F`

`cls_2: B → F`

`cls_3: (B → F) → F`

`cls_4: F`

`⊢ F`

- avoids exponential blowup
- post-processing step to remove unused subproofs

⚠ does not work with universe polymorphism

SAT proof construction

- For each literal on the trail, store proof of:

$$A \quad A \rightarrow F \quad (A \rightarrow F) \rightarrow F$$

- decision literals have fresh local constants
 - propagated literals have actual proofs
- on conflict, add lambdas for the decision literals
- produces intuitionistic proofs

State transformer

```
meta structure prover_state :=
  (active : rb_map clause_id derived_clause)
  (passive : rb_map clause_id derived_clause)
  (newly_derived : list derived_clause)
  (prec : list expr)
  -- ...

meta def prover := state_t prover_state tactic
```

Introduction

Calculus

Implementation

Conclusion

Universe polymorphism

- Hypothesis in the local context cannot be universe polymorphic
 - You can't even have $\forall x, x ++ [] = x$ for all types
- Possible workaround: create a new environment
 - extra type-checking
 - not intended use (errors and warnings are printed directly)

→ manually implement proof handling

Performance: metavariables

- For unification, we instantiate $\forall x Px \rightarrow F$ as $P?m_1 \rightarrow F$
 - built-in unification uses metavariables
 - Afterwards, we quantify over the free metavariables
 - Pretty slow
- Lean 4 will expose temporary metavariables

Performance: unifier

- unpredictable performance
 - performance problem even with few clauses
- do some prefiltering
- implement term indexing
- non-trivial, idiomatic code relies on definitional equality

Other future work

- Simplifier integration
 - different term order for $x \cdot y = y \cdot x$
- AC redundancy checks
- Heterogeneous equality, congruence lemmas

Conclusion

- Not yet production-ready
 - performance subpar
 - missing support for universe polymorphism
- Lean 4 should bring useful APIs
 - temporary metavariables
- long term: proof reconstruction for “leanhammer”