



Proof-Relevant Rewriting Strategies (WIP)

Matthieu Sozeau – Inria Paris & PPS

TYPES 2014
May 13th 2014
Paris, France

- ▶ **Equational reasoning** $x = y \mid - x + 1 \implies y + 1$
- ▶ **Logical reasoning** $x \leftrightarrow y \mid - (x \wedge y) \implies (x \wedge x)$
- ▶ **Rewriting** $y \rightsquigarrow z \mid - x \rightsquigarrow y \implies x \rightsquigarrow z$
- ▶ **Abstract data types, quotients/setoids**
 $s, t : \text{list}, x =_{\text{set}} y \mid - \text{union } x \ y =_{\text{set}} x$
 $\implies \text{union } x \ x =_{\text{set}} x$

Moving from substitution to congruence.

- ▶ Built-in substitution: Leibniz equality.

$\Pi A (P : A \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}) (x\ y : A), P\ x \rightarrow x = y \rightarrow P\ y.$

- ✓ Applies to any context
- ✗ Large proof term: repeats the context that depends on x
- ✗ Restricted to equality, one rewrite at a time

Moving from substitution to congruence.

- ▶ Built-in substitution: Leibniz equality.

$\Pi A (P : A \rightarrow \text{Type}) (x\ y : A), P\ x \rightarrow x = y \rightarrow P\ y.$

- ✓ Applies to any context
- ✗ Large proof term: repeats the context that depends on x
- ✗ Restricted to equality, one rewrite at a time

- ▶ Congruence.

$\Pi A\ B (f : A \rightarrow B) (x\ y : A), x = y \rightarrow f\ x = f\ y$

- ✗ Applies at the toplevel only
- ✓ Small proof term: mentions the changed terms only
- ✓ Generalizes to n-ary, parallel rewriting
- ✗ Still restricted to equality

Moving from substitution to congruence.

- ▶ Built-in substitution: Leibniz equality.

$\Pi A (P : A \rightarrow \text{Type}) (x\ y : A), P\ x \rightarrow x = y \rightarrow P\ y.$

- ✓ Applies to any context
- ✗ Large proof term: repeats the context that depends on x
- ✗ Restricted to equality, one rewrite at a time

- ▶ Congruence.

$\Pi A\ B (f : A \rightarrow B) (x\ y : A), x = y \rightarrow f\ x = f\ y$

- ✗ Applies at the toplevel only
- ✓ Small proof term: mentions the changed terms only
- ✓ Generalizes to n-ary, parallel rewriting
- ✗ Still restricted to equality

One can build a set of combinators to rewrite in depth: HOL conversions [Paulson 83].

Basin [NUPRL, 94], Sacerdoti Coen [COQ, 04]

- ▶ Generalized to **any** relation

Proper (**iff** \leftrightarrow **iff**) **not** $\triangleq \Pi P Q, P \leftrightarrow Q \rightarrow \neg P \leftrightarrow \neg Q$

- ▶ Multiple signatures for a given constant

Proper (**impl** \rightarrow **impl**) **not**

Basin [NUPRL, 94], Sacerdoti Coen [COQ, 04]

- ▶ Generalized to **any** relation

Proper (iff \leftrightarrow iff) not $\triangleq \Pi P Q, P \leftrightarrow Q \rightarrow \neg P \leftrightarrow \neg Q$

- ▶ Multiple signatures for a given constant

Proper (impl \rightarrow impl) not

Requires **proof search**:

- ▶ Heuristic in NUPRL based on subrelations (impl \subset iff)
- ▶ Complete procedure in COQ.

Both are monolithic algorithms with a primitive notion of signature: a list of atomic relations (with variance).

A New Look at Generalized Rewriting

Sozeau [JFR 2009]

- ▶ Extensible signatures (shallow embedding)

`all` : $\forall A : \text{Type}, (A \rightarrow \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\Pi A, \text{Proper} (\text{pointwise_relation } A \text{ iff } ++> \text{ iff}) (\text{@all } A)$

A New Look at Generalized Rewriting

Sozeau [JFR 2009]

- ▶ Extensible signatures (shallow embedding)

$\text{all} : \forall A : \text{Type}, (A \rightarrow \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\Pi A, \text{Proper} (\text{pointwise_relation } A \text{ iff } ++> \text{ iff}) (\text{@all } A)$

- ▶ An algebraic presentation, supporting higher-order functions (rewriting under binders) and polymorphism:

$\Pi A B C R_0 R_1 R_2,$

$\text{Proper} ((R_1 ++> R_2) ++> (R_0 ++> R_1) ++> (R_0 ++> R_2))$
 $(\text{@compose } A B C)$

A New Look at Generalized Rewriting

Sozeau [JFR 2009]

- ▶ Extensible signatures (shallow embedding)

$\text{all} : \forall A : \text{Type}, (A \rightarrow \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\Pi A, \text{Proper} (\text{pointwise_relation } A \text{ iff } ++> \text{ iff}) (\text{@all } A)$

- ▶ An algebraic presentation, supporting higher-order functions (rewriting under binders) and polymorphism:

$\Pi A B C R_0 R_1 R_2,$

$\text{Proper} ((R_1 ++> R_2) ++> (R_0 ++> R_1) ++> (R_0 ++> R_2))$
 $(\text{@compose } A B C)$

- ▶ Generic morphism declarations.

A New Look at Generalized Rewriting

Sozeau [JFR 2009]

- ▶ Extensible signatures (shallow embedding)

$\text{all} : \forall A : \text{Type}, (A \rightarrow \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\Pi A, \text{Proper} (\text{pointwise_relation } A \text{ iff } ++> \text{ iff}) (\text{@all } A)$

- ▶ An algebraic presentation, supporting higher-order functions (rewriting under binders) and polymorphism:

$\Pi A B C R_0 R_1 R_2,$

$\text{Proper} ((R_1 ++> R_2) ++> (R_0 ++> R_1) ++> (R_0 ++> R_2))$
 $(\text{@compose } A B C)$

- ▶ Generic morphism declarations.
- ▶ Support for subrelations, quotienting the signatures.

A New Look at Generalized Rewriting

Sozeau [JFR 2009]

- ▶ Extensible signatures (shallow embedding)

$\text{all} : \forall A : \text{Type}, (A \rightarrow \text{Prop}) \rightarrow \text{Prop}$

$\Pi A, \text{Proper} (\text{pointwise_relation } A \text{ iff } ++> \text{ iff}) (\text{@all } A)$

- ▶ An algebraic presentation, supporting higher-order functions (rewriting under binders) and polymorphism:

$\Pi A B C R_0 R_1 R_2,$

$\text{Proper} ((R_1 ++> R_2) ++> (R_0 ++> R_1) ++> (R_0 ++> R_2))$
 $(\text{@compose } A B C)$

- ▶ Generic morphism declarations.
- ▶ Support for subrelations, quotienting the signatures.
- ▶ Rewriting on operators/functions, parallel rewrites. . .

```
Class Proper {A} (R : relation A) (m : A) : Prop :=  
  proper : R m m.
```

```
Instance reflexive_proper '(Reflexive A R) (x : A) : Proper R x.
```

```
Class Proper {A} (R : relation A) (m : A) : Prop :=  
  proper : R m m.
```

```
Instance reflexive_proper '(Reflexive A R) (x : A) : Proper R x.
```

```
Definition respectful {A B : Type}  
  (R : relation A) (R' : relation B) : relation (A → B) :=  
  fun f g => ∀ x y, R x y → R' (f x) (g y).
```

```
Class Proper {A} (R : relation A) (m : A) : Prop :=  
  proper : R m m.
```

```
Instance reflexive_proper '(Reflexive A R) (x : A) : Proper R x.
```

```
Definition respectful {A B : Type}  
  (R : relation A) (R' : relation B) : relation (A → B) :=  
  fun f g => ∀ x y, R x y → R' (f x) (g y).
```

```
Notation " R ++> R' " := (respectful R R') (right associativity).
```

```
Notation " R → R' " := (R-1 ++> R') (right associativity).
```

```
Class Proper {A} (R : relation A) (m : A) : Prop :=  
  proper : R m m.
```

```
Instance reflexive_proper '(Reflexive A R) (x : A) : Proper R x.
```

```
Definition respectful {A B : Type}  
  (R : relation A) (R' : relation B) : relation (A → B) :=  
  fun f g => ∀ x y, R x y → R' (f x) (g y).
```

```
Notation " R ++> R' " := (respectful R R') (right associativity).
```

```
Notation " R → R' " := (R-1 ++> R') (right associativity).
```

```
Instance not_P : Proper (iff ++> iff) not.
```


- 1 Generalized Rewriting in Type Theory
- 2 Proof-relevant relations
- 3 Rewriting Strategies

All fine with relations in **Prop**, how about **Type**-valued relations?

Proper : $\Pi A : \mathbf{Type}_i, (A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}_j) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}_j$.

Need to show, under $A : \mathbf{Type}_i$:

Proper $((A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}_j) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \mathbf{Type}_j)$
 $(\mathbf{iso_rel} A \rightarrow \mathbf{eq} A \rightarrow \mathbf{iso})$
 $(\mathbf{Proper} A)$

Inconsistency: $\mathbf{Type}_{\max(i,j+1)} \not\leq \mathbf{Type}_i$

With full universe polymorphism (Sozeau & Tabareau [ITP'14]):

$$\text{Proper}_{i,j} : \Pi A : \text{Type}_i, (A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Type}_j) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Type}_j$$

We can show, under $A : \text{Type}_i$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proper}_{i',j'} & \left((A \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Type}_j) \rightarrow A \rightarrow \text{Type}_j \right) \\ & \left(\text{iso_rel } A \longrightarrow \text{eq } A \longrightarrow \text{iso} \right) \\ & \left(\text{Proper}_{i,j} A \right) \end{aligned}$$

With constraint: $\max(i, j + 1) \leq i'$.

Actually, a non-polymorphic $\text{crelation}(A : \text{Type}_i) := A \rightarrow \rightarrow \text{Type}_j$ is already problematic: no relation equivalence or subrelation definition possible.

Generalized rewriting now handles:

- ▶ The function space “relation”: rewrite x to y in $\mathbb{C} = ? : \mathbb{C}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[y]$
- ▶ Isomorphism of types
- ▶ Computationally relevant relations, e.g. CoRN’s appartness relation on reals.
- ▶ Hom-types of categories which are not **Prop**-based setoids, e.g. groupoids.

- 1 Generalized Rewriting in Type Theory
- 2 Proof-relevant relations
- 3 Rewriting Strategies

An efficiency concern: autorewrite does repeat rewrite.

- ▶ Crawls through the whole goal each time.
- ▶ Applies transitivity of rewriting at the top-level only, resulting in large proof-terms.

We want to allow the specification of precise rewriting strategies (e.g. bottomup, innermost, repeated...) that avoid this.

- ▶ Traversal of the goal specified by the user.
- ▶ Applies transitivity of rewriting at inner points of the term, resulting in shorter proof-terms.

- ▶ Based on ELAN's rewriting strategies
- ▶ Implemented using the LogicT monad (failure/success continuations) for efficient backtracking and clear semantics.
- ▶ Using the existing generalized rewriting framework to produce **Proper** constraints and build the rewriting proofs.

Interface: `rewrite_strat strategy (in t)?`

Rewriting strategies

$s, t, u ::=$	$(\leftarrow)? c$	(right to left?) lemma
	fail id	failure identity
	refl	reflexivity
	progress s	progress
	try s	failure catch
	$s ; u$	composition
	$s t$	left-biased choice
	repeat s	iteration (+)
	subterm(s)? s	one or all subterms
	innermost s	innermost first
	hints $hintdb$	apply first matching hint
	eval $redexpr$	apply reduction
	fold c	fold expression
	pattern p	pattern matching


```
try s           = s || id
any s           = fix u.try (s ; u)
repeat s        = s ; any s
bottomup s      = fix bu.((progress (subterms bu)) || s) ; try bu
topdown s       = fix td.(s || (progress (subterms td))) ; try td
innermost s     = fix i.((subterm i) || s)
outermost s     = fix o.(s || (subterm o))
```

Suppose the theory of monoids on T .

A goal: $x \ y : T \vdash x \bullet ((\epsilon \bullet y) \bullet \epsilon)$.

- ▶ `autorewrite with monoids` will do two rewrites with both unit laws, the proof term will be roughly twice the goal size.
- ▶ `rewrite_strat (topdown (repeat (hints monoids)))` will first rewrite $\epsilon \bullet y$ to y and directly after, $y \bullet \epsilon$ to y , resulting in a proof term of size roughly that of the initial goal, and will be twice as fast as well.

- ▶ Improved performance by replacing autorewrite tactic used in Ring with: `topdown (hints Esimp1)`
- ▶ Avoid mixing of rewrite with Ltac constructs, e.g.:
`(rewrite l_1 || ... || progress rewrite l_n)` becomes
`rewrite_strat (l_1 || ... || progress l_n)` which traverses the term just once.
- ▶ Another common pattern:

```
match goal with
```

```
|- context [t] => rewrite l
```

```
end
```

=

```
rewrite_strat (topdown (pattern t; term l))
```

- ▶ Debug & release
- ▶ Benchmarks

