

Parallelizing Mizar

Josef Urban*

Radboud University, Nijmegen

Abstract. This paper surveys and describes the implementation of parallelization of the Mizar proof checking and of related Mizar utilities. The implementation makes use of Mizar's compiler-like division into several relatively independent passes, with typically quite different processing speeds. The information produced in earlier (typically much faster) passes can be used to parallelize the later (typically much slower) passes. The parallelization now works by splitting the formalization into a suitable number of pieces that are processed in parallel, assembling from them together the required results. The implementation is evaluated on examples from the Mizar library, and future extensions are discussed.

1 Introduction and Motivation

While in the 90-ies the processing speed of a single CPU has grown quickly, in the last decade this growth has considerably slowed down, or even stopped. The main advances in processing power of computers have been recently done by packing multiple cores into a single CPU, and related technologies like hyperthreading. A low-range dual-CPU (Intel Xeon 2.27 GHz) MathWiki server of the Foundations Group at the Radboud University bought in 2010 has eight hyperthreading cores, so the highest raw performance is obtained by running sixteen processes in parallel. The server of the Mizar group at University of Białystok has similar characteristics, and the Mizar server at University of Alberta has twelve hyperthreading cores. Packing of CPU cores together is happening not only on servers, but increasingly also on desktops and notebooks, making the advantages of parallelization attractive to many applications.

To take advantage of this development, reasonable ways of parallelizing time-consuming computer tasks have to be introduced. This paper discusses the various ways of parallelization of proof checking with the Mizar formal proof verifier, and parallelization of the related Mizar utilities. Several parallelization methods suitable for different scenarios and use-cases are introduced, implemented, and evaluated.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the main tasks done today by the Mizar [7,17] verifier and related utilities, and the ways how they are performed. Section 3 explores the various possible ways and granularity levels in which suitable parallelization of the Mizar processing could be done, and their advantages and disadvantages for various use scenarios. Section 4 describes

* Supported by the NWO project MathWiki.

and evaluates parallelization of the processing of the whole Mizar library and Mizar wiki done on the coarsest level of granularity, i.e. on the article level. Section 5 then describes the recent parallelization done on sub-article levels of granularity, i.e. useful for the speedup of processing of a single Mizar article. Both the verification and various other utilities have been parallelized this way, and evaluation on hundreds of Mizar articles is done. Section 7 names possible future directions, and concludes.

2 Mizar Processing

2.1 Article Workflow

The term *Mizar Processing* can in the broad sense refer to several things. Mizar consists of a large library of formal mathematical articles, on top of which new articles are written, formally verified by the Mizar verifier, possibly also checked by various (proof improving) utilities during or after the writing, possibly HTML-ized for better understanding during and after the writing, and usually translated to TeX after they are written. During the verification a number of tools can be used, ranging from tools for library searching, tools for creating proof skeletons, to tools for ATP or AI based proof advice.

After a new article is written, it is typically submitted to the library, possibly causing some refactoring of the library and itself, and the whole new version of the library is re-verified (sometimes many times during the refactoring process), and again possibly some more utilities can be then applied (again typically requiring further re-verification) before the library reaches the final state. The new library is then HTML-ized and publicly released. The library also lives in the experimental Mizar wiki based on the git distributed version control system [28,2]. There, collaborative re-factoring of the whole library is the main goal, requiring fast real-time re-verification and HTML linking.

2.2 Basic Mizar Verification

In more detail, the basic verification of an article starts by selecting the necessary items from the library (so called *accommodation*) and creating an article-specific local environment (set of files) in which the article is then verified without further need to access the large library. The verification and other Mizar utilities then proceeds in several compiler-like passes that typically vary quite a lot in their processing times. The first *Parser* pass tokenizes the article and does a fast syntactic analysis of the symbols and a rough recognition of the main structures (proof blocks, formulas, etc.).

The second *Analyzer* pass then does the complete type computation and disambiguation of the overloading for terms and formulas, and checks the structural correctness of the natural deduction steps, and computes new goals after each such step. These processes typically take much longer than the parsing stage, especially when a relatively large portion of the library is used by the article, containing a large amount of type automations and overloaded constructs. The

main product of this pass is a detailed XML file containing the disambiguated form of the article with a number of added semantic information [23]. This file serves as the main input for the final *Checker* pass, and also for the number of other Mizar proof improving utilities (e.g., the *Relprem*¹ utility mentioned in Table 1), for the HTML-ization, and also for the various ATP and AI based proof advice tools.

The final *Checker* pass takes as its main input the XML file with the fully disambiguated constructs, and uses them to run the limited Mizar refutational theorem prover for each of the (typically many) atomic (*by*) justification steps. Even though this checker is continuously optimised to provide a reasonable combination of strength, speed, and “human obviousness”, this is typically the slowest of the verifier passes. Similar situation is with the various utilities for improving (already correct) Mizar proofs. Such utilities also typically start with the disambiguated XML file as an input, and typically try to merge some of the atomic proof steps or remove some redundant assumptions from them. This may involve running the limited Mizar theorem prover several times for each of the atomic proof steps, making such utilities even slower than the *Checker* pass.

2.3 Other Tools

All the processes described so far are implemented using the Mizar code base written in object-oriented extension of Pascal. The disambiguated XML file is also used as an input for creation of the HTML representation of the article, done purely by XSL processing. XSL processing is also used for translation of the article to an ATP format, serving as an input for preparing ATP problems (solvable by ATP systems) corresponding to the problems in the Mizar article, and also for preparing data for other proof advice systems (MML Query, Mizar Proof Advisor). The XSL processing is usually done in two stages. The first stage (called *absolutization*) is common for all these utilities, it basically translates the disambiguated constructs living in the local article’s environment into the global world of the whole Mizar library. The second stage is then the actual XSL translation done for a particular application. The XSL processing can take very different times depending on its complexity. Generally, XSL processors are not as much speed-optimized as, e.g., the Pascal compilers, so complex XSL processing can take more time than analogous processing programmed in Pascal.


Finally, there are a number of proof advice tools, typically taking as input the suitably translated XML file, and providing all kinds of proof advice using external processing. Let us mention at least the Automated Reasoning for Mizar [32,30,9] system, linking Mizar through its Emacs authoring environment and through a HTML interface to ATP systems (particular a custom version [29] of the Vampire-SInE system [15] and a customized [27] version of E [19]) usable for finding and completing proofs automatically, for explaining the Mizar atomic justifications, and for ATP-based cross-verification of Mizar. This processing adds (at least) two more stages: (i) It uses the MPTP system [22,25]

¹ Irrelevant Premises Detector

to produce the ATP problems corresponding to the Mizar formulation, and (ii) it uses various ATP/AI systems and metasytems to solve such problems. Attached to such functions is typically various pre/post-processing done in Emacs Lisp and/or as CGI functions.

See Figure 1 for the overall structure of Mizar and related processing for one article. Table 1 gives timings of the various parts of Mizar processing for the more involved Mizar article `fdiff_1` about real function differentiability² [14], and for the less involved Mizar article `abian` about Abian’s fixed point theorem³ [16] run on recent Intel Atom 1.66 GHz notebook⁴.

Fig. 1. Structure of the Mizar processing for one article



3 Survey of Mizar Parallelization Possibilities

There are several ways how to parallelize Mizar and related utilities, and several possible levels of granularity. Note that for any of these Mizar parallelization methods the main issue is speed, not the memory consumption. This is because

² http://mws.cs.ru.nl/~mptp/mml/mml/fdiff_1.miz

³ <http://mws.cs.ru.nl/~mptp/mml/mml/abian.miz>

⁴ This small measurement is intentionally done on a standard low-end notebook, while the rest of global measurements in this paper are done on the above mentioned server of the Foundations Group. This is in order to compare the effect of parallelized server-based verification with standard notebook work in Section 5.

Pascal does not have garbage collection, and Mizar is very memory efficient, taking typically less than 30MB RAM for verifying an article. The reason for this extreme care is mainly historical, i.e., the codebase goes back to times when memory was very expensive. Methods used for this range from exhaustive sharing of data structures, to using only the part of the library that is really necessary (see *accommodation* in 2.2).

The simplest method of parallelization which is useful for the Mizar wiki users, developers, and library maintainers is article-level parallelization of the whole library verification, and parallelization of various other utilities applied to the whole Mizar library. There are about 1100 Mizar articles in the recent library, and with this number the parallelization on the article level is already very useful and can bring a lot of speed-ups, especially useful in the real-time wiki setting, and for the more time consuming utilities like the above mentioned *Relprem*.

A typical user is however mainly interested in working with one (his own) article. For that, finer (sub-article) levels of parallelization are needed. A closer look at the Table 1 indicates that the *Parser* pass of the verification is very fast, while the *Analyzer* and especially the *Checker* passes are the bottlenecks (see also the global statistics for the whole MML processing done with article-level parallelization in Table 2).

3.1 Checker parallelization

There are several basic options to parallelizing the most costly verification operation - the *Checker* pass, they are explained in more detail below:

1. Running several *Checker* passes in parallel as separate executables, each checking only a part of the atomic steps conducted in the article
2. Running one *Checker* pass as only one executable, with multithreading code used for parallelizing the main checking procedure
3. Running one *Checker* pass as only one executable, with multithreading code used inside the main checking procedure
4. Combinations of above

Table 1. Speed of various parts of the Mizar processing on articles *fdiff_1* and *abian* in seconds - real time and user time

Processing (language)	real - fdiff.1	user - fdiff.1	real - abian	user - abian
Accommodation (Pascal)	1.800	1.597	1.291	1.100
Parser (Pascal)	0.396	0.337	0.244	0.183
Analyzer (Pascal)	28.455	26.155	4.182	4.076
Checker (Pascal)	39.213	36.631	10.628	10.543
Relprem (Pascal)	101.947	99.385	48.493	47.683
Absolutizer (XSL)	17.203	13.579	9.624	7.886
HTML-izer (XSL)	27.699	24.498	11.582	11.323
MPTP-izer (XSL)	70.153	68.919	47.271	45.410

As mentioned above, the input for the *Checker* pass is a fully disambiguated article, where only the atomic justification steps need to be checked, i.e. proved by the Mizar’s limited theorem prover. The number of such atomic justification steps in one article is typically high, about every second to third line in a formal Mizar text is justified in such a way. The result of one such theorem proving attempt is completely independent of others, and it is just a boolean value (true or false)⁵. All of these theorem proving attempts however share a lot of data-structures that are basically read-only for them, for example information about the types of all the ground terms appearing up to the particular point in the formal text, and information about the equalities holding about ground terms at particular points of the formal text.

The first method suggested above - running several *Checker* passes in parallel as separate executables, each checking only a part of the atomic steps conducted in the article - is relatively “low-tech”, however it has some good properties. First, in the methods based on multithreading, the relatively large amount of the shared data has to be cloned in memory each time a new thread is created for a new justification step. This is not the case when several executables are running from the beginning to the end, each with its own memory space. Second, the implementation can be relatively simple, and does not require use of any multithreading libraries, and related refactoring of the existing single-threaded code.

The second and third method require the use of a multithreading library (this is possible for the Free Pascal Compiler used for Mizar, with the *MTProcs* unit), and related code refactoring. There are several places where the multithreading can be introduced relatively easily, let us name at least the most obvious two: (i) the main entry to the refutational proof checker, and (ii) within the refutational proof checker, separately disproving each of the disjuncts in the toplevel disjunctive normal form created in the initial normalization phase. The advantage of such implementation in comparison with running several executables would probably be more balanced load, and in the latter case, possibly being able to use more extreme parallelization possibilities (e.g., if 1000 cores are available, but the article has only 500 atomic justifications).

3.2 Type Analysis and Caching: Why not use fine multithreading

Caching vs. Multithreading For the also relatively costly *Analyzer* pass, the methods based on fine multithreading however seem to be either relatively complicated or of relatively little value. The problem is following: A major and increasing amount of work done in *Analyzer* consists in computing the full types of terms. This is because the Mizar mechanisms for working with adjectives are being used more and more, and are being made stronger and stronger, recently to a level that could be compared to having arbitrary Prolog programs working over a finite domain (a finite set of ground terms). The method that then

⁵ Note that this is not generally true for nonclassical systems like Coq, where the proof might not be an opaque object.

very considerably improves the *Analyzer* efficiency in the singlethreaded case is simple caching of terms' types. With a simple multithreaded implementation, when the newly computed types are forgotten once the thread computing them exits, this large caching advantage is practically lost. Implementation where each thread updates the commonly used cache of terms' types is probably possible, but significantly more involved, because the access to the shared datastructures is then not just read-only (like in the *Checker* case), and the updates are likely to be very frequent.

Suitable Parallelization for Tree-like Documents Above is the reason why in the *Analyzer* case, it makes much more sense to rather have several “long-term-running” threads or processes, each developing and remembering its own cache of terms' types. The main problem is then to determine a proper level of granularity for dividing *Analyzer*'s work into such larger parts. Unlike in the *Checker* pass, *Analyzer* is not a large set of independent theorem proving runs returning just a boolean result. Analysing each term depends on the analysis of its subterms, and similarly, analysing the natural deduction structure of the proofs (another main task of this pass) depends on the results of the analysis of the proof's components (formulas, and natural deduction steps and subproofs). Thus, the finer the blocks used for parallelization, the larger the part that needs to be repeated by several threads (all of them having to analyse all the necessary parts of the nested proof, formula, and term levels leading to the fine parallelized part). To put this more visually, the formal text (proof, theory) is basically a tree (or forest) of various dependencies. The closer to the leaves the parallelization happens, the more common work has to be repeated by multiple threads or processes when descending down the branches to the parallelization points on those branches. Obviously, the best solution is then to parallelize not on the finest possible level, but on the coarsest possible level, i.e., as soon as there are enough branches for the parallelization.

Toplevel Proofs as Suitable Parallelization Entry Points To this requirement reasonably corresponds the choice of toplevel proofs in a given formal text as the entry points for parallelization. There are typically tens to hundreds of toplevel proofs in one article, and with some exceptions (very short articles, or articles consisting of one very involved proof) these toplevel proofs can usually be divided into the necessary number of groups with roughly the same overall length. Mizar (unlike e.g. Coq) never needs the proofs for anything, only the proved theorem can be used in later proofs. Thanks to this, a simple directive (`@proof`) was introduced in the Mizar language long time ago, in order to omit verification of the (possibly long) proofs that have already been proved, and would only slow-down the verification of the current proof. This directive basically tells to the *Parser* to skip all text until the end of the proof is found, only asserting the particular proposition proved by this skipped proof. Due to the file-based communication between the passes, the whole skipped proof therefore never appears in the *Analyzer*'s input, and consequently is never analyzed. This

feature can be used for file-based parallelization of the *Analyzer*, described in more detail in Section 5. It also parallelizes the *Checker*, and also can be used for easy parallelization of the subsequent HTML-ization.

3.3 HTML-ization parallelization

As mentioned above, HTML-ization of Mizar texts is based on the disambiguated article described in the XML file produced by the *Analyzer*. HTML-ization is done completely separately from the Mizar codebase written in Pascal, by XSL processing. Even though XSL is a pure lazily evaluated functional language⁶, as of January 2011, the author is not aware of a XSL processor implementing multithreading. The remaining choice is then again file-based parallelization, which actually corresponds nicely to the file-based parallelization usable for skipping whole proof blocks in the *Analyzer*. During the XSL processing, it is easy to put the HTML-ized toplevel proofs each into a separate file⁷, and then either to load the proofs into a browser on-demand by AJAX calls, or to merge the separate files with HTML-ized proofs created by the parallelization by a simple postprocessing into one big HTML file.

3.4 Parallelization of Related Mizar Processing

Remaining Mizar refactoring utilities (like *Relprem*) are typically implemented by modifying or extending the *Checker* or *Analyzer* passes, and thus the above discussion and solutions apply to them too. Creation of data for MML Query, Mizar Proof Advisor, and similar systems is done purely by XSL, and the file-based approach can again be applied analogously to HTML-ization. The same holds for translating the article to the MPTP format (extended TPTP), again done completely in XSL. A relatively important part used for the automated reasoning functions available for Mizar is the generation of ATP problems corresponding to the Mizar problems. This is done by the MPTP system implemented in Prolog. The problem generating code is probably quite easily parallelizable in multithreaded Prologs (Prolog is by design one of the most simply parallelizable languages), however the easiest way is again just to run several instances of MPTP in parallel, each instructed to create just a part of all the article's ATP problems. The recent Emacs authoring interface for Mizar implements the functions for communicating with ATP servers asynchronously [18], thus allowing to solve as many ATP-translated problems in parallel as the user wants (and the possible remote MPTP/ATP server allows). The asynchronously provided ATP

⁶ Thanks to being implemented in all major browsers, XSL is today probably by far the most widely used and spread purely functional language.

⁷ This functionality actually already exists independently for some time, in order to decrease the size of the HTML code loaded into browser, loading the toplevel proofs from the separate files by AJAX calls.

solutions then (in parallel with other editing operations) update the authored article using Emacs Lisp callbacks.⁸

As for the parallelization of the ATP solving of Mizar problems, this is a field where a lot of previous research exists [20,21], and in some systems (e.g. Waldmeister, recent versions of Vampire used for the Mizar ATP service) this functionality is readily available. Other options include running several instances of the ATPs with different strategies, different numbers of most relevant axioms, etc. The MaLAREa [26,33,10] metasystem for solving problems in large Mizar-like theories explores this number of choices in a controlled way, and it already has some parallelization options implemented.

4 Parallelization of the MML Processing on the Article Level

A strong motivation for fast processing of large parts of the library comes with the need for collaborative refactoring. As the library grows, it seems that the number of submissions make it more and more difficult for the small core team of the library maintainers and developers to keep the library compact, and well organized and integrated together. The solution that seems to work for Wikipedia is to outsource the process of library maintenance and refactoring to a large number of interested (or addicted) users, through a web interface to the whole library. In order for this to work in the formal case, it is however important to be able to quickly re-verify the parts of the library dependent on the refactored articles, and notify the users about the results, possibly re-generating the HTML presentation, etc.

The implementation of article-level parallelization is as follows. Instead of the old way of using shell (or equivalent MS Windows tools) for processing the whole library one article after another, a Makefile has been written, using the files produced by the various verification passes and other tools as targets, possibly introducing artificial (typically empty file) targets when there is no clear target of a certain utility. The easiest option once the various dependencies have been reasonably stated in the Makefile, is just to use the internal parallelization implemented in the GNU *make* utility. This parallelization is capable of using a pre-specified number of processes (via the `-j` option), and to analyse the Makefile dependencies so that the parallelization is only done when the dependencies allow that. The Makefile now contains dependencies for all the main processing parts mentioned above, and is regularly used by the author to process the whole MML and generate HTML and data for various other tools and utilities. In Table 2 the benefits of running `make -j64` on the recently acquired eight-core hyperthreading Intel Xeon 2.27 GHz server are summarized. The whole library verification and HTML-ization process that with the sequential processing can take half a day (or much more on older hardware), can be done in less than an hour when using this parallelization. See [28] for further details and challenges

⁸ See, e.g., the AMS 2011 system demonstration at <http://mws.cs.ru.nl/~urban/ams11/out4.ogv>

related to using this technique in the git-based formal Mizar wiki backend to provide reasonably fast-yet-verified library refactoring.

Table 2. Speed of various parts of the Mizar processing on the MML (1080 articles) with 64 process parallelization run on an 8-core hyperthreading machine, in seconds - real time and user time, total and averages for the whole MML.

Stage (language)	real times total	user times total	real times avrg	user times avrg
Parser (Pascal)	14	91	0.01	0.08
Analyzer (Pascal)	330	4903	0.30	4.53
Checker (Pascal)	1290	18853	1.19	17.46
Absolutizer (XSL)	368	4431	0.34	4.10
HTML-izer (XSL)	700	8980	0.65	8.31

Similar Makefile-based parallelization technology is also used by the MaLAREa system when trying to solve the ca. fifty thousand Mizar theorem by ATPs, and producing a database of their solutions that is used for subsequent better proof advice and improved ATP solving using machine learning techniques. One possible (and probably very useful) extension for purposes of such fast real-time library re-verification is to extract finer dependencies from the articles (e.g. how theorems depend on other theorems and definitions - this is already to a large extent done e.g. by the MPTP system), and further speed up such re-verification by checking only certain parts of the dependent articles, see [3] for detailed analysis. This is actually also one of the motivations for the parallelization done by splitting articles into independently verified pieces, described in the next section.

5 Parallelization of Single Article Processing

While parallelization of the whole (or large part of) library processing is useful, and as mentioned above it is likely going to become even more used, the main use-case of Mizar processing is when a user is authoring a single article, verifying it quite often. In the case of a formal mathematical wiki, the corresponding use-case could be a relatively limited refactoring of a single proof in a larger article, without changing any of the exported items (theorems, definitons, etc.), and thus not influencing any other proofs in any other article. The need in both cases is then to (re-)verify the article as quickly as possible, in the case of wiki also quickly re-generating the HTML presentation, giving the user a real-time experience and feedback.

5.1 Toplevel Parallelization

As described in Section 3, there are typically several ways how to parallelize various parts of the processing, however it is also explained there that the one which suits best the *Analyzer* and HTML-ization is a file-based parallelization over the toplevel proofs. This is what was also used in the initial implementation

of the Mizar parallelizer⁹. This section describes this implementation (using Perl and LibXML) in more detail.

As can be seen from Table 1 and Table 2, the *Parser* pass is very fast. The total user time for the whole MML in Table 2 is 91.160 seconds, which means that the average speed on a MML article is about 0.1 second. This pass identifies the symbols and the keywords in the text, and the overall block structure, and produces a file that is an input for the much more expensive *Analyzer* pass. Parsing a Mizar article by external tools is (due to the intended closeness to mathematical texts) very hard [5], so in order to easily identify the necessary parts (toplevel proofs in our case) of the formal text, the output of the *Parser* pass is now also printed in an XML format, already containing a lot of information about the proof structure and particular proof positions¹⁰

The Parallelizer's processing therefore starts by this fast Parser run, putting the necessary information in the XML file. This XML file is then (inside Perl) read by the LibXML functions, and the topLevel proof positions are extracted by simple XPath queries from it. This is also very fast, and adds very little overhead. These proof positions are an input to a (greedy) algorithm, which takes as another input parameter the desired number of processes (N) run in parallel (for compatibility with GNU make, also passed as the `-j` option to the parallelizer). This algorithm then tries to divide the topLevel proofs into N similarly hard groups. While there are various options how to estimate the expected verification hardness of a proof, the simplest and reasonably working one is the number of lines of the proof. Once the topLevel proofs are divided into the N groups, the parallelizer calls Unix `fork()` on itself with each proof group, spawning N child instances.

Each instance creates its own subdirectory (symbolically linking there the necessary auxiliary files from the main directory), and creates its own version of the verified article, by replacing the keyword `proof` with the keyword `@proof` for all topLevel proofs that do not belong to the proofs processed by this particular child instance. The *Parser* pass is then repeated on such modified input by the child instance, the `@proof` directives producing input for *Analyzer* that contains only the desired topLevel proofs. The costly subsequent passes like the *Analyzer*, *Checker*, and HTML-ization can then be run by the child instance on the modified input, effectively processing only the required topLevel proofs, which results in large speedups. Note that the Parser's work is to some extent repeated in the children, however its work in the skipped proofs is very easy (just counting brackets that open and close proofs), and this pass is in comparison with others very fast and thus negligible. The parallel instances of the Analyzer, Checker, and HTML-ization passes also overlap on the pieces of the formal text that are not inside the topLevel proofs (typically the stated theorems and definitions have

⁹ <http://github.com/JUrban/MPTP2/raw/master/MizAR/cgi-bin/bin/mizp.pl>

¹⁰ Note that the measurement of Parser speed in the above tables was done after the XMLization of the Parser pass, so the usual objection that printing a larger XML file slows down verification is (as usual) completely misguided, especially in the larger picture of costly operations done in the Analyzer and the Checker.

to be at least analyzed), however this is again usually just a negligible share of the formal text in comparison with the full text with all proofs.

The speedup measured for the verification (Parser, Analyzer, Checker) passes on the above mentioned article `fdiff_1` run with eight parallel processes `-j8` is given in the Table 3 below. While the total user time obviously grows with the number of parallel processes used, the real verification time is in this case decreased nearly four times. Additionally, in comparison with the notebook processing mentioned in the initial Table 1, the overall real-time benefit of remote parallelized server processing is a speedup factor of 20. This is a strong motivation for the server-based remote verification (and other) services for Mizar implemented in Emacs and through web interface described in [32]. The overall statistics done across all (395) MML articles that take in the normal mode more than ten seconds to verify is computed for parallelization with one, two, four, and eight processes, and compared in Table 4. The greatest real-time speedup is obviously achieved by running with eight processes, however, already using two processes helps significantly, while the overhead (in terms of user time ratios) is very low. When all the child instances finish their jobs, the parent parallelizer

Table 3. Comparison of the verification speed on article `fdiff_1` run in the normal mode and in the parallel mode, with eight parallel processes (`-j8`)

Article	real (normal)	user (normal)	real (-j8)	user (-j8)
<code>fdiff_1</code>	13.11	12.99	3.54	21.20

Table 4. Comparison of the verification speeds on 395 slow MML articles run with one, two, four, and eight parallel processes

	-j1	-j2	-j4	-j8
Sum of user times (s)	12561.07	13289.41	15937.42	21697.71
Sum of real times (s)	13272.22	7667.37	5165.9	4277.12
Ratio of user time to -j1	1	1.06	1.27	1.73
Ratio of real time to -j1	1	0.58	0.39	0.32

postprocesses their results. In the case of running just verification (Analyzer and Checker), the overall result is simply a file containing the error messages and positions. This file is created just by (uniquely) sorting together the error files produced by the child instances. Merging the HTML-ization results of the child instances is very simple thanks to the mechanisms described in Section 3.3. The `--ajax-proofs` option is used to place the HTMLized proofs into separate files, and depending on the required HTML output, either just bound to AJAX calls in the toplevel HTML-ization, inserting them on-demand, or postprocessing the toplevel HTML in Perl by the direct inclusion of the HTML-ized toplevel proofs into it (creating one big HTML file).

5.2 Finer Parallelization

The probably biggest practical disadvantage of the parallelization based on toplevel proofs is that in some cases, the articles really may consist of proofs

with very uneven size, in extreme cases of just one very large proof. In such cases, the division of the toplevel proofs into groups of similar size is going to fail, and the largest chunk is going to take much more time in verification and HTML-ization than the rest. One option is in such cases to recurse, and inspect the sub-proof structure of the very long proofs, again, trying to parallelize there. This was not done yet, and instead, the Checker-based parallelization was implemented, providing speedup just for the most expensive Checker pass, but on the other hand, typically providing a very large parallelization possibility. This is now implemented quite similarly to the toplevel proof parallelization, by modifying the intermediate XML file passed from the Analyzer to the Checker. As with the `@proof` user-provided directive, there is a similar internal directive usable in the XML file, telling the Checker to skip the verification of a particular atomic inference. This is the used very similarly to `@proof`: The parallelizer divides the atomic inferences into equally sized groups, and spawns N children, each of them modifying the intermediate XML file, and thus checking only the inferences assigned to the particular child. The errors are then again merged by the parent process, once all the child instances have finished.

The overall evaluation of this mode done again across all (395) MML articles that take in the normal mode more than ten seconds to verify is shown in Table 5 for (checker-only) -j8, and compared with the (toplevel) -j8 from Table 4 where the toplevel parallelization mode is used. The data confirm the general conjecture from Section 3.2: A lot of Mizar’s work is done in the type analysis module, and the opportunity to parallelize that is missed in the Checker-only parallelization. This results in lower overall user time (less work repetition in analysis), however higher real time (time perceived by the user). This parallelization is in some

Table 5. Comparison of the toplevel and checker-only verification speeds on 395 slow MML articles run with one and eight parallel processes

	-j1	-j8 (toplevel)	-j8 (checker-only)
Sum of user times (s)	12561.07	21697.71	18927.91
Sum of real times (s)	13272.22	4277.12	5664.1
Ratio of user time to -j1	1	1.73	1.51
Ratio of real time to -j1	1	0.32	0.43

sense orthogonal to the toplevel proof parallelization, and it can be used to complement the toplevel proof parallelization in cases when there are for instance only two major toplevel proofs in the article, but the user wants to parallelize more. I.e., it is no problem to recurse the parallelizer, using the Checker-based parallelization for some of the child instances doing toplevel-proof parallelization.

6 Related Work

As already mentioned, sophisticated parallelization and strategy scheduling have been around in some ATP systems for several years now, an advanced example is the infrastructure in the Waldmeister system [8]. The Large Theory Batch (LTB) division of the CADE ATP System Competition has started to encourage

such development by allowing parallelization on multicore competition machines. This development suits particularly well the ATP/LTB tasks generated in proof assistance mode for Mizar. Recent parallelization of the Isabelle proof assistant and its implementation language are reported in [12] and in [34], focusing on fitting parallelism within the LCF approach. This probably makes the setting quite different: [34] states that *there is no magical way to add the aspect of parallelism automatically*, which does not seem to be the case with the relatively straightforward approaches suggested and used here for multiple parts of Mizar and related processing. As always, there seems to be a trade-off between (in this case LCF-like) safety aspirations, and efficiency, usability, and implementation concerns. Advanced ITP systems are today much more than just simple slow proof checkers, facing similar “safety” vs. “efficiency” issues as ATP systems [13]. The Mizar philosophy favors (sometimes perhaps too much) the latter, arguing that there are always enough ways how to increase certainty, for example, by cross-verification as in [31], which has been recently suggested as a useful check even for the currently safest LCF-like system in [1]. Needless to say, in the particular case of parallelization a possible error in the parallelization code is hardly an issue for any proof assistant (LCF or not) focused on building large libraries. As already mentioned in Section 2, at least in case of Mizar the whole library is typically re-factored and re-verified many times, for which the safe file-based parallelization is superior to internal parallelization also in terms of efficiency, and this effectively serves as overredundant automated cross-verification of the internal parallelization code.

7 Future Work and Conclusions

The parallelizer has been integrated in the Mizar mode for Emacs [24] and can be used instead of the standard verification process, provided that Perl and LibXML are installed, and also in the remote server verification mode, provided Internet is available. The speedups resulting from combination of these two techniques are very significant. As mentioned above, other Mizar utilities than just the standard verifier can be parallelized in exactly the same way, and the Emacs environment allows this too. The solutions described in this paper might be quite Mizar-specific, and possibly hard to port e.g., to systems with non-opaque proofs like Coq, and the LCF-based provers, that do not use similar technique of compilation-like passes. Other, more mathematician-oriented Mizar-like systems consisting of separate linguistic passes like SAD/ForTheL [11] and Naproche [6] might be able to re-use this approach more easily.

As mentioned above, another motivation for this work comes from the work on a wiki for formal mathematics, and for that mode of work it would be good to have finer dependencies between the the various items introduced and proved in the articles. Once that is available, the methods developed here for file-based parallelization will be also usable in a similar way for minimalistic checking of only the selected parts of the articles that have to be quickly re-checked due to some change in their dependencies. This mode of work thus seems to be useful to have not just for Mizar, but for any proof assistant that would like to have its library available, editable, and real-time verifiable in an online web repository.

References

1. Mark Adams. Introducing HOL Zero - (extended abstract). In Komei Fukuda, Joris van der Hoeven, Michael Joswig, and Nobuki Takayama, editors, *ICMS*, volume 6327 of *LNCS*, pages 142–143. Springer, 2010.
2. Jesse Alama, Kasper Brink, Lionel Mamane, and Josef Urban. Large formal wikis: Issues and solutions. In James H. Davenport, William M. Farmer, Josef Urban, and Florian Rabe, editors, *Calculemus/MKM*, volume 6824 of *LNCS*, pages 133–148. Springer, 2011.
3. Jesse Alama, Lionel Mamane, and Josef Urban. Dependencies in formal mathematics: Applications and extraction for Coq and Mizar. In Johan Jeuring, John A. Campbell, Jacques Carette, Gabriel Dos Reis, Petr Sojka, Makarius Wenzel, and Volker Sorge, editors, *AISC/MKM/Calculemus*, volume 7362 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–16. Springer, 2012.
4. Serge Autexier, Jacques Calmet, David Delahaye, Patrick D. F. Ion, Laurence Rideau, Renaud Rioboo, and Alan P. Sexton, editors. *Intelligent Computer Mathematics, 10th International Conference, AISC 2010, 17th Symposium, Calculemus 2010, and 9th International Conference, MKM 2010, Paris, France, July 5-10, 2010. Proceedings*, volume 6167 of *LNCS*. Springer, 2010.
5. Paul A. Cairns and Jeremy Gow. Using and parsing the Mizar language. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 93:60–69, 2004.
6. Marcos Cramer, Bernhard Fisseni, Peter Koepke, Daniel Kühlwein, Bernhard Schröder, and Jip Veldman. The Naproche Project: Controlled Natural Language Proof Checking of Mathematical Texts. In Norbert E. Fuchs, editor, *CNL*, volume 5972 of *LNCS*, pages 170–186. Springer, 2009.
7. Adam Grabowski, Artur Kornilowicz, and Adam Naumowicz. Mizar in a nutshell. *Journal of Formalized Reasoning*, 3(2):153–245, 2010.
8. Thomas Hillenbrand. Citius altius fortius: Lessons learned from the theorem prover WALDMEISTER. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 86(1):9–21, 2003.
9. Cezary Kaliszyk and Josef Urban. MizAR 40 for Mizar 40. *CoRR*, abs/1310.2805, 2013.
10. Cezary Kaliszyk, Josef Urban, and Jiří Vyskočil. Machine learner for automated reasoning 0.4 and 0.5. *CoRR*, abs/1402.2359, 2014. Accepted to PAAR’14.
11. Alexander V. Lyaletski and Konstantin Verchinine. Evidence algorithm and system for automated deduction: A retrospective view. In Autexier et al. [4], pages 411–426.
12. David C. J. Matthews and Makarius Wenzel. Efficient parallel programming in poly/ml and isabelle/ml. In Leaf Petersen and Enrico Pontelli, editors, *DAMP*, pages 53–62. ACM, 2010.
13. William McCune and Olga Shumsky. Ivy: A preprocessor and proof checker for first-order logic. In Matt Kaufmann, Panagiotis Manolios, and J Strother Moore, editors, *Computer-Aided Reasoning: ACL2 Case Studies*, pages 265–281. Kluwer Academic, June 2000.
14. Konrad Raczkowski and Paweł Sadowski. Real function differentiability. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):797–801, 1990.
15. Alexandre Riazanov and Andrei Voronkov. The design and implementation of VAMPIRE. *Journal of AI Communications*, 15(2-3):91–110, 2002.
16. Piotr Rudnicki and Andrzej Trybulec. Abian’s fixed point theorem. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(3):335–338, 1997.
17. Piotr Rudnicki and Andrzej Trybulec. On equivalents of well-foundedness. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 23(3-4):197–234, 1999.

18. Piotr Rudnicki and Josef Urban. Escape to ATP for Mizar. In Pascal Fontaine and Aaron Stump, editors, *First International Workshop on Proof eXchange for Theorem Proving - PxTP 2011*, Wroclaw, Poland, 2011.
19. Stephan Schulz. E - A Brainiac Theorem Prover. *AI Commun.*, 15(2-3):111–126, 2002.
20. G. Sutcliffe and D. Seyfang. Smart Selective Competition Parallelism ATP. In A. Kumar and I. Russell, editors, *Proceedings of the 12th International FLAIRS Conference*, pages 341–345. AAAI Press, 1999.
21. Geoff Sutcliffe. The Design and Implementation of a Compositional Competition-Cooperation Parallel ATP System. In H. de Nivelle and S. Schulz, editors, *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on the Implementation of Logics*, number MPI-I-2001-2-006 in Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Research Report, pages 92–102, 2001.
22. Josef Urban. MPTP - Motivation, Implementation, First Experiments. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 33(3-4):319–339, 2004.
23. Josef Urban. XML-izing Mizar: Making semantic processing and presentation of MML easy. In Michael Kohlhase, editor, *MKM*, volume 3863 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 346–360. Springer, 2005.
24. Josef Urban. MizarMode - an integrated proof assistance tool for the Mizar way of formalizing mathematics. *Journal of Applied Logic*, 4(4):414–427, 2006.
25. Josef Urban. MPTP 0.2: Design, implementation, and initial experiments. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 37(1-2):21–43, 2006.
26. Josef Urban. MaLAREa: a metasytem for automated reasoning in large theories. In Geoff Sutcliffe, Josef Urban, and Stephan Schulz, editors, *ESARLT: Empirically Successful Automated Reasoning in Large Theories*, volume 257 of *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, pages 45–58. CEUR, 2007.
27. Josef Urban. BliStr: The Blind Strategymaker. *CoRR*, abs/1301.2683, 2014. Accepted to PAAR’14.
28. Josef Urban, Jesse Alama, Piotr Rudnicki, and Herman Geuvers. A wiki for mizar: Motivation, considerations, and initial prototype. In Autexier et al. [4], pages 455–469.
29. Josef Urban, Krystof Hoder, and Andrei Voronkov. Evaluation of automated theorem proving on the Mizar Mathematical Library. In *ICMS*, pages 155–166, 2010.
30. Josef Urban, Piotr Rudnicki, and Geoff Sutcliffe. ATP and presentation service for Mizar formalizations. *J. Autom. Reasoning*, 50:229–241, 2013.
31. Josef Urban and Geoff Sutcliffe. ATP-based cross-verification of Mizar proofs: Method, systems, and first experiments. *Mathematics in Computer Science*, 2(2):231–251, 2008.
32. Josef Urban and Geoff Sutcliffe. Automated reasoning and presentation support for formalizing mathematics in Mizar. In Autexier et al. [4], pages 132–146.
33. Josef Urban, Geoff Sutcliffe, Petr Pudlák, and Jirí Vyskocil. Malarea sg1- machine learner for automated reasoning with semantic guidance. In Alessandro Armando, Peter Baumgartner, and Gilles Dowek, editors, *IJCAR*, volume 5195 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 441–456. Springer, 2008.
34. Makarius Wenzel. Parallel proof checking in Isabelle/Isar. The ACM SIGSAM 2009 PLMMS Workshop.