

Manifest Termination

Assia Mahboubi Guillaume Melquiond

Inria

June 15, 2023

Helfgott's proof of the ternary Goldbach conjecture

Every odd number greater than 5 is the sum of three primes.

(250+ pages of proofs, 1000+ hours of computations)

Helfgott's proof of the ternary Goldbach conjecture

Every odd number greater than 5 is the sum of three primes.
(250+ pages of proofs, 1000+ hours of computations)

Long-term goal: get mathematicians to do formal proofs

Intermediate steps:

- get them to use a proof assistant,
 - let them perform computations inside a proof assistant,
 - let them write their programs inside a proof assistant.

Helfgott's proof of the ternary Goldbach conjecture

Every odd number greater than 5 is the sum of three primes.
(250+ pages of proofs, 1000+ hours of computations)

Long-term goal: get mathematicians to do formal proofs

Intermediate steps:

- get them to use a proof assistant,
 - let them perform computations inside a proof assistant,
 - let them write their programs inside a proof assistant.

What about non-termination?

If an evaluation actually terminates,
why do we still need to prove that it terminates?

Example: Factorial

Factorial over $\mathbb{N} = 1 + \mathbb{N}$

```
Fixpoint fact (n: nat): nat :=  
  match n with  
  | 0 => 1  
  | S n' => n * fact n'  
end.
```

Termination

Reason: recursive calls on a structurally decreasing argument.

Example: Factorial

Factorial over $\mathbb{N} = 1 + \mathbb{N}$

```
Fixpoint fact (n: nat): nat :=  
  match n with  
  | 0 => 1  
  | S n' => n * fact n'  
end.
```

Termination

Reason: recursive calls on a structurally decreasing argument.

Computations

```
Goal fact 15 = 1307674368000.  
Proof. reflexivity. Qed.
```

Does not terminate in practice!

Factorial, Faster

Factorial over $\mathbb{Z} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$

```
Fixpoint factZ (n: Z): Z :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (factZ (Z.pred n)).
```

No longer structurally decreasing. (Not even terminating in general.)
But factZ 15 would terminate!

Factorial, Faster

Factorial over $\mathbb{Z} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$

```
Fixpoint factZ (n: Z): Z :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (factZ (Z.pred n)).
```

No longer structurally decreasing. (Not even terminating in general.)
But factZ 15 would terminate!

Usual solution: provide some structurally decreasing fuel

- Variant 1: prove beforehand that there is enough fuel, e.g., provide a well-founded relation and an accessibility proof.
- Variant 2: deal with a possibly stuck computation, e.g., use the option monad.

Factorial, the Hard Way

```
Lemma fact2_aux1 n: (0 <= n)%Z -> Z.eqb n 0 = false ->
  (0 <= Z.pred n)%Z.
```

```
Proof. case Z.eqb_spec ; [easy|lia]. Qed.
```

```
Lemma fact2_aux2 n: (0 <= n)%Z -> Zwf 0 (Z.pred n) n.
```

```
Proof. unfold Zwf. lia. Qed.
```

```
Fixpoint factZ_aux (n: Z) (H: Z.le 0 n)
  (W: Acc (Zwf 0) n): Z :=
  ( if Z.eqb n 0 as b return Z.eqb n 0 = b -> Z
    then fun _ => 1%Z
    else fun Hn =>
      match W with
      | Acc_intro _ W' =>
        Z.mul n (factZ_aux (Z.pred n)
          (fact2_aux1 n H Hn) (W' _ (fact2_aux2 n H)))
      end
    ) eq_refl.
```

```
Definition factZ n (H: Z.le 0 n) :=
  factZ_aux n H (Acc_intro_generator 20 (
    Zwf_well_founded 0) n).
```

```
Eval compute in factZ 15 _.
```

Open Recursion and Computations

Open factorial over $\mathbb{Z} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$

```
Definition factZ (k:  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ) (n:  $\mathbb{Z}$ ):  $\mathbb{Z}$  :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (k (Z.pred n)).
```

factZ has type $(\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$.

(More generally, $F : (T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow U)$.)

We want to compute “ $F^* x$ ”, i.e., “ $(F \circ \dots \circ F \circ \dots) x$ ”.

Open Recursion and Computations

Open factorial over $\mathbb{Z} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$, $\mathbb{P} = 1 + 2\mathbb{P}$

```
Definition factZ (k: Z -> Z) (n: Z): Z :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (k (Z.pred n)).
```

factZ has type $(\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z})$.

(More generally, $F : (T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow U)$.)

We want to compute “ $F^* x$ ”, i.e., “ $(F \circ \dots \circ F \circ \dots) x$ ”.

Bounded computations

```
Goal forall k, iter 100 factZ k 15 = 1307674368000%Z.  
Proof. reflexivity. Qed.
```

Next Step: Proving Something Interesting

Knowing “ $\forall k, F^n k \ x = y$ ”, can we prove anything about y ?

Example: $(0 \leq x \Rightarrow y = x!)$ for `factZ`.

Next Step: Proving Something Interesting

Knowing “ $\forall k, F^n k x = y$ ”, can we prove anything about y ?

Example: $(0 \leq x \Rightarrow y = x!)$ for `factZ`.

```
Lemma nat_spec {T U} (F:(T->U)->T->U) (P:T->U->Prop):  
  ( $\exists f, \forall x, P\ x\ (f\ x)$ ) -> (*1*)  
  ( $\forall k\ x, (\forall y, P\ y\ (k\ y)) \rightarrow P\ x\ (F\ k\ x)$ ) -> (*2*)  
   $\forall n\ x\ y, (\forall h, \text{Nat.iter } n\ F\ h\ x = y) \rightarrow$  (*3*)  
   $P\ x\ y.$ 
```

Requirements

- 1 Some function satisfies the specification P .
- 2 P is an invariant of F .
- 3 The computation $F^* x$ terminates.

Back to factorial

```
Definition factZ (k: Z -> Z) (n: Z): Z :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (k (Z.pred n)).
```

```
Goal Z.of_nat (fact 15) = 1307674368000%Z.
```

```
Proof.
```

```
apply nat_spec with (F := factZ) (n := 20)  
  (P x y := Z.le 0 x -> Z.of_nat(fact(Z.to_nat x))=y).  
- eexists; reflexivity.  
- ... (* Z.of_nat is a morphism *)  
- reflexivity.  
Qed. (* axiom-free *)
```

Manifest Termination

Back to factorial

```
Definition factZ (k: Z -> Z) (n: Z): Z :=  
  if Z.eqb n 0 then 1%Z  
  else Z.mul n (k (Z.pred n)).
```

```
Goal Z.of_nat (fact 15) = 1307674368000%Z.
```

```
Proof.
```

```
apply nat_spec with (F := factZ) (n := 20)  
  (P x y := Z.le 0 x -> Z.of_nat(fact(Z.to_nat x))=y).  
- eexists; reflexivity.  
- ... (* Z.of_nat is a morphism *)  
- reflexivity.  
Qed. (* axiom-free *)
```

It works just fine

But can we do without the hypothesis “ $\exists f, \forall x, P x (f x)$ ”?

A Constructive Fixed Point Combinator (Charguéraud 09)

```
Definition fixacc {T U} (dummy: U) (F: (T->U)->T->U)
  (R: T->T->bool) (x: T) (W: Acc R x) :=
  Acc_rect _ (fun u _ k =>
    let k' v := if R v u then k v _ else dummy in
    F k' u) W.
```

Just a fancy way of writing " $F^* x$ "

- " $R v u$ " describes the call graph. It holds when
 - either $F u$ was never called during the evaluation of $F^* x$,
 - or $F u$ performed a direct call to $F v$.
- W proves that the graph rooted at x is finite, acyclic.

Axioms! Lots of Axioms!

Assume the existence of a symbol

`fixrel: ((T -> U) -> (T -> U)) -> T -> U -> Prop`

such that `(fixrel F x y)` holds when $F^* x \equiv y$.

Axioms! Lots of Axioms!

Assume the existence of a symbol

`fixrel`: $((T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow (T \rightarrow U)) \rightarrow T \rightarrow U \rightarrow \text{Prop}$
such that $(\text{fixrel } F \ x \ y)$ holds when $F^* x \equiv y$.

```
Axiom fixrel_spec:  $\forall \{T \ U\} \ (F:(T \rightarrow U) \rightarrow T \rightarrow U) \ x \ y,$   
  fixrel F x y  $\rightarrow$   
     $\exists R,$   
     $(\forall u \ f1 \ f2, (\forall v, R \ v \ u \rightarrow f1 \ v = f2 \ v) \rightarrow$   
       $F \ f1 \ u = F \ f2 \ u) \ /\ \backslash$   
     $\exists W: \text{Acc } R \ x,$   
     $\forall d, y = \text{fixacc } d \ F \ R \ x \ W.$ 
```

Axioms! Lots of Axioms!

Assume the existence of a symbol

`fixrel: ((T -> U) -> (T -> U)) -> T -> U -> Prop`
such that `(fixrel F x y)` holds when $F^* x \equiv y$.

```
Axiom fixrel_spec: ∀ {T U} (F:(T->U)->T->U) x y,  
  fixrel F x y ->  
  ∃ R,  
    (∀ u f1 f2, (∀ v, R v u -> f1 v = f2 v) ->  
      F f1 u = F f2 u) /\  
    ∃ W: Acc R x,  
    ∀ d, y = fixacc d F R x W.
```

Consistency

Does it need decidable equality on T ?

Conclusion

Using (non) terminating computations inside proofs

- 1 Prove " $\forall k, F^n k x = y$ " by computation.
- 2 Compute then assume an accessibility witness.

Conclusion

Using (non) terminating computations inside proofs

- 1 Prove " $\forall k, F^n k x = y$ " by computation.
- 2 Compute then assume an accessibility witness.

Questions?

- Can we get rid of the hypothesis " $\exists f, \forall x, P x (f x)$ " in the generic lemma for the iterative version?
- Is the axiomatic version more useful in practice?
- It currently requires an ad-hoc proof for each F .
Can we find a generic lemma as with the iterative version?