

Zippy – Generic White-Box Proof Search with Zippers

Kevin Kappelmann  

Technical University of Munich, Boltzmannstrasse 3, 85748 Garching, Germany

Abstract

We present a framework for tree-based proof search, called Zippy. Unlike existing proof search tools, Zippy is largely independent of concrete search tree representations, search-algorithms, states and effects. It is designed to create analysable and navigable proof searches that are open to customisation and extensions by users. Zippy is founded on concepts from functional programming theory, particularly zippers, arrows, monads, and lenses. We implemented the framework in Isabelle’s metaprogramming language Isabelle/ML.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Functional constructs; Theory of computation → Automated reasoning; Theory of computation → Logic and verification

Keywords and phrases Proof search, Functional programming, Arrows, Monads, Lenses, Software design

Supplementary Material <https://github.com/kappelmann/zippy-isabelle>

1 Introduction

The usability of proof assistants crucially depends on their proof automation. There are different kinds of proof automation. Some automation is *domain-specific*, meaning that it operates on goals of a fixed form. Examples include decision procedures for various theories, e.g. Presburger arithmetic. Other automation is *general-purpose*, meaning that it is (mostly) unconstrained in the form of its input goals. Examples include ACL2’s [16] `waterfall`, Coq’s [28] `eauto` and `sauto` [6], Isabelle’s [27] `auto`, Lean’s `aesop` [22], and PVS’s `grind` [5].

General-purpose automation commonly performs *proof search*. Proof search is the act of automatically exploring the space of valid proof derivations in one way or another. Proof search tools typically try to find one or all proofs of a given goal. Some proof search tools are *black-box*, meaning that their exploration, i.e. the act of finding the proofs, cannot readily be predicted or examined by users and programs. Examples include tools integrating external solvers, so-called *hammers* [2], and machine-learning-based provers [19]. *White-box* proof search tools, in contrast, provide various means to predict and analyse their proof exploration. In this view, Isabelle’s dominant general-purpose automation `auto` is not truly white-box: while it performs a fairly predictable depth-first search, the search is implemented *implicitly*, meaning that it uses recursion in Isabelle’s metaprogramming language to perform the search and backtracking. Coq’s `eauto` and `sauto` similarly perform an implicit search. Lean’s `aesop`, in contrast, implements its search *explicitly*, meaning that it uses an explicit datatype (essentially, an AND/OR search tree) modelling its exploration of proof derivations. This search tree can be analysed as data in Lean itself.

Having access to proof explorations as data comes with many merits. First, proof assistant users can analyse them. For example, failing searches can be analysed to find gaps in the automation or issues in the search algorithm – such as looping cycles or unexpected search paths. Successful searches, on the other hand, can be analysed to gain insight into a theorem’s proof derivations and to understand what is happening under the hood of the automation. Members of large-scale verification projects noted the usefulness of such data for debugging, maintenance, and onboarding of new proof engineers [3]. Second, other tools can use the

search data. For example, machine-learning-based provers may be trained on it to find better search strategies, select promising, though incomplete, paths in failed searches, or suggest missing lemmas to make the search successful. UI tools may use the data to visualise the search process interactively. This way, search-based automation becomes more accessible to proof assistant users.

Another design dimension for general-purpose automation is customisability and extensibility. For instance, users of Isabelle’s `auto`, Coq’s `sauto`, and Lean’s `aesop` can add and remove theorems that may be used during proof search, register additional solvers for goals, and limit the search depth. Other options, however, are hard-wired, such as the search algorithm itself in the case of `auto`, `sauto`, ACL2’s `waterfall`, and PVS’s `grind` or the datatypes and effects used during proof search. Moreover, all mentioned tools are non-extensible in the sense that there is no (simple) way to add information to the proof search – such as additional caches, logs, and statistics – without changing the respective tool’s source code, which we believe is ill-advised in practice: First, most proof assistant users heavily rely on these tools and expect them to be stable. They thus cannot be changed for user experiments. Second, some modifications are non-compatible, such as competing representations of data stored during search. Third, catering for many extensions in a single tool may lead to a monolithic code base that tends to be hard to maintain and understand. For example, Coq’s `sauto` already contains 35 hard-coded options and 14 action types, ACL2 dozens of types of so-called hints and options for its `waterfall`, and Lean’s `aesop` 19 data slots for goals and 12 data slots for search rules at the time of writing.

We believe that too little attention has been paid to extensibility in the past. One key reason why state-of-the-art tools are non-extensible is that they are not based on sufficiently abstract concepts. Instead, they are implemented against specifications and interfaces with little room for variation, such as Lean’s `aesop` and Coq’s `sauto`, or against no specification or interface at all, such as Isabelle’s `auto`, ACL2’s `waterfall`, and PVS’s `grind`. As a result, they cannot be easily extended nor can their code be re-used by other proof search tools.

Contributions and Outline

To improve on the state-of-the-art, we devise a customisable and extensible framework for white-box, tree-based searches, called Zippy, and implement it in Isabelle’s metaprogramming language. Our contributions are as follows:

- We describe Zippy’s design in Section 2. Zippy is a generic framework in that it is largely independent of concrete search tree representations, search strategies, and logics it is applied to. At the same time, it does the bulk of heavy lifting needed for white-box, tree-based searches while allowing customisations and extensions by users. It does so by providing a specification for search tree navigation, a mechanism to generate instances satisfying the specification, and by using concepts and abstractions known from functional programming theory, particularly zippers [10], arrows [12], monads [23], and lenses [9, 4].
- In Section 3, we implement said concepts in Isabelle/ML [31]. These concepts are prominent in languages with typeclasses, such as Haskell, but typically not employed in ML-languages. Though it is known that monads and the like can be modelled with ML’s module system, serious applications are largely missing. We highlight a pitfall of this approach and how it can be taken care of in Isabelle/ML. We also sketch how Zippy’s central concept of alternating zippers can be defined in Isabelle/ML using its antiquotation mechanism [31].
- In Section 4, we demonstrate one way of building a generic proof search tool with Zippy in Isabelle. We provide liftings to embed Isabelle tactics as search steps and show how to

implement a best-first proof search in the style of Lean’s `aesop`.

This article’s supplementary material includes the implementation of Zippy in Isabelle/ML and an extended version of its example instantiation from Section 4. Section 5 contains related and future work.

2 The Design of Zippy

In this section, we devise the design of Zippy. We will provide an abstract specification for search tree navigation and a mechanism to generate instances satisfying the specification in Section 2.1. In Section 2.2, we will add concepts for extensible data manipulation. Zippy, then, is the sum of the devised specification, its instance generation, and concepts for data manipulation. Based on the considerations from Section 1, we first summarise the properties we desire for the framework:

- (a) Zippy should enable *general-purpose automation*, i.e. automation that is unconstrained in the form of its input goals.
- (b) Zippy should support *tree-based proof searches*, meaning that it should support proof explorations on search trees. The reason for choosing tree-based searches is that proof trees are the de facto standard format for formal proof derivations. Proof assistant users are thus familiar with them and have an intuition of how various expansion strategies, possibly written by themselves, affect searches on these trees. This has also been noted by the developers of Lean’s `aesop` [22].
- (c) Zippy should enable *white-box* searches, allowing users and other tools to analyse and modify proof explorations as data.
- (d) Zippy should be *customisable*, i.e. it should be independent of concrete search tree representations, search algorithms, states and effects.
- (e) Zippy should be *extensible*, allowing users to augment the search tree’s data without modifying Zippy’s source code while being able to re-use existing code written for the simpler tree.

To achieve these properties, we consider Lean’s `aesop` as a source of design inspiration. It is based on an AND/OR tree, where AND nodes contain the goals to be proven and OR nodes contain possible steps to expand their parent goal nodes. Next to this basic structure, its nodes contain various data, e.g. user-provided success probabilities for OR nodes and status flags (`proved`, `stuck`, `unknown`). It performs a best-first search based on its OR nodes’ success probabilities. Figure 1 shows a simplified example of this kind of search.


The example is quite paradigmatic for tree-based searches. Here are some observations:

- The search tree consists of several node types $\vec{\alpha} N_i$, where $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ is a (possibly empty) vector of polymorphic type arguments. In the case of Figure 1, there are two node types: goals and rules.
- Each node stores some content. Nodes of the same type $\vec{\alpha} N_i$ store content of the same type $\vec{\alpha} NC_i$. Nodes of different types may store content of different types.
- Each node of one type points to (possibly zero) children of another node type. These children may be described by a type $\vec{\alpha} NN_j$.
- The node types are *alternating*, meaning that the order of node types is fixed and cyclic.

In the example, goal nodes are followed by rule nodes, and vice versa.

We now define node types formally:

► **Definition 1 (Nodes).** A node type $\vec{\alpha} N = \vec{\alpha} NC \times \vec{\alpha} NN$ consists of a (node) content type $\vec{\alpha} NC$ and a (node) next type $\vec{\alpha} NN$.



■ **Figure 2** Step-wise abstraction of a search tree, from left to right. First, the nodes' data is abstracted. For this, node types $\vec{\alpha} N_i = \vec{\alpha} NC_i \times \vec{\alpha} NN_i$ are introduced. Polymorphic type arguments are omitted in the figure. Second, for each i , a container type $\vec{\alpha} CO_i$ is introduced, containing nodes of type $\vec{\alpha} N_i$. These containers are drawn dotted. Each $\vec{\alpha} NN_i$ is then set to point to a follow-up container. The last figure shows the resulting model, parametrised by a number n and arbitrary container and content types for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

$\alpha ZX := \alpha \text{list} \times \alpha \text{list}$, and the zipper is simply the product $\alpha Z := \alpha ZC \times \alpha ZX$. A zipper comes with a set of *moves*. Moving, for example, the list zipper $(x, (ls, r :: rs))$ focused on x to its successor r results in the zipper $(r, (x :: ls, rs))$. Moves may not succeed, e.g. when moving from the final element of a list to its non-existent successor. Modelling moves as standard $\vec{\alpha} Z \Rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z$ functions is hence insufficient. A second attempt is to consider the type $\vec{\alpha} Z \Rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z \text{ option}$ instead. But in Section 4, we will discover the need for moves other than those returning options. We require a general notion of contextual computation (e.g. with failure or state) that composes. For this, we turn to categories and arrows.


A *category* is a type constructor (\rightarrow) with identity $\text{id} : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ and associative composition $(\gg) : (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow (\beta \rightarrow \gamma) \Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$. Terms of type $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ are called *morphisms*. As noted by Hughes [12], categories alone are insufficient to write practical code, e.g. there is no way to save inputs across computations. Hughes hence introduced *arrows*, which are categories with functions $\text{arr} : (\alpha \Rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ and $(***) : (\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_1) \Rightarrow (\alpha_2 \rightarrow \beta_2) \Rightarrow (\alpha_1 \times \beta_1) \rightarrow (\alpha_2 \times \beta_2)$ subject to some expected laws [12]. Many effectful computations, e.g. those with failures, states, and choices, are arrows. We take them as the foundation for moves:

► **Definition 2 (Moves).** *The type of moves from α to β (in arrow (\rightarrow)) is defined as $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$. The type of homogenous α -moves (in arrow (\rightarrow)) is defined as $\alpha \overset{\circ}{\rightarrow} := \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$. We drop the arrow subscript if it is clear from context.*


Next, we fix the set of moves that a zipper must provide. For this, we must consider the kind of container types that we want to navigate. In this work, we limit ourselves to datatypes whose values admit a finitely-branching tree structure. Following [10], there are four move directions in such trees: A **right** move shifts the focus to the current element's right sibling, and a **down** move shifts the focus to its first (from left to right) child. The moves **left** and **up** are dual. Moreover, we need a move **zip** to initialise a zipper from a container and its inverse **unzip**, re-creating a container from a zipper. Figure 3 shows an example sequence of moves. We can now define our zipper specification:

► **Definition 3 (Zippers).** *A zipper for container $\vec{\alpha} CO$ in arrow (\rightarrow) is a structure $\vec{\alpha} Z := \vec{\alpha} ZC \times \vec{\alpha} ZX$ with content $\vec{\alpha} ZC$ and context $\vec{\alpha} ZX$ equipped with moves $\text{zip} : \vec{\alpha} CO \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z$, $\text{unzip} : \vec{\alpha} Z \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} CO$, and $\text{up, down, left, right} : \vec{\alpha} Z \overset{\circ}{\rightarrow}$.*

Recall that our search tree model consists of a number of alternating container types $\vec{\alpha} CO_i$.



■ **Figure 3** Zipper navigation in a tree-shaped container, using the move sequence [zip, down, down, right, up, unzip]. Focused parts are bold and red, containers are dotted, and nodes are solid. Initially, the whole container is in focus. We move to the root using zip. Using down, we move to its first child. This is once repeated. Then we move to the node’s right sibling using right. Using up moves to the node’s parent. Finally, unzip moves the focus to the container.



■ **Figure 4** Navigation in a linked zipper, from top-left to bottom-right, using the move sequence [Z_1 .zip, $down_1$, Z_2 .right, up_2 , Z_1 .unzip]. Focused parts are bold and red, containers are dotted, and nodes are solid. Edges inside of containers are dashed. Initially, the container $\vec{\alpha} CO_1$ is in focus. Using Z_1 .zip, we move to its node. Using $down_1$, we move to the children’s container’s root. Using Z_2 .right, we move to the node’s right sibling. Using up_2 , we move to the container’s parent. Finally, Z_1 .unzip moves the focus to the container.

Based on this structure, we introduce the notions of linked and alternating zippers that allow navigation both inside containers and between containers.

► **Definition 4** (Linked Zippers). An (n -)linked zipper contains, for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j < n$, a zipper $\vec{\alpha} Z_i$ in the fixed arrow (\rightarrow) and moves $down_j : \vec{\alpha} Z_j \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_{j+1}$ and $up_{j+1} : \vec{\alpha} Z_{j+1} \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_j$. We use dot notation to access the zippers’ data, e.g. Z_1 .right.

Figure 3 shows an example sequence of moves in a linked zipper.

► **Definition 5** (Alternating Zippers). An (n -)alternating zipper is an n -linked zipper with additional moves $down_n : \vec{\alpha} Z_n \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_1$ and $up_1 : \vec{\alpha} Z_1 \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_n$.

Alternating zippers are a specification to navigate instances of our search tree model, thus enabling white-box searches. A nice property of alternating zippers is that they are closed under products. We can use this to enrich alternating zippers with move-dependent data (such as positional information), as we will demonstrate in Section 4.

► **Definition 6** (Alternating Zipper Product). Fix two alternating zippers in the same arrow (\rightarrow) using zippers $\vec{\alpha} Z_{j,i} = \vec{\alpha} ZC_{j,i} \times \vec{\alpha} ZX_{j,i}$ for containers $\vec{\alpha} CO_{j,i}$ with moves $down_{j,i} : \vec{\alpha} Z_{j,i} \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_{j,i \oplus 1}$ and $up_{j,i} : \vec{\alpha} Z_{j,i} \rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_{j,i \ominus 1}$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$, where \oplus, \ominus denote modular addition and subtraction in $\{1, \dots, n\}$, i.e. $n \oplus 1 = 1$ and $1 \ominus 1 = n$. The alternating zipper product is given by

$$\vec{\alpha} Z_i := (\vec{\alpha} ZC_{1,i} \times \vec{\alpha} ZC_{2,i}) \times (\vec{\alpha} ZX_{1,i} \times \vec{\alpha} ZX_{2,i}), \quad (1)$$

$$\vec{\alpha} CO_i := \vec{\alpha} CO_{1,i} \times \vec{\alpha} CO_{2,i}, \quad Z_i.move := Z_{1,i}.move *** Z_{2,i}.move, \quad (2)$$

$$down_i := down_{1,i} *** down_{2,i}, \quad up_i := up_{1,i} *** up_{2,i}, \quad (3)$$

for $move \in \{\text{zip}, \text{unzip}, \text{right}, \text{left}, \text{up}, \text{down}\}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$.

It would be a bit tedious to craft alternating zippers manually. We next show how to automatically generate an important subset of them, thus offering not just a set of specifications but a usable framework.

2.1.1 Generating Alternating Zippers

We devise a mechanism to generate alternating zippers for the common case of input zippers with single polymorphic content, e.g. zippers focusing on α in α lists or α trees. We do so in two steps. First, we show how to generate them from zippers with node content and alternating next types, i.e. $\vec{\alpha} Z_i = \vec{\alpha} N_i \times \vec{\alpha} ZX_i$, with follow-up containers stored in $\vec{\alpha} NN_i$, as is the case for our search tree model. We call these *node zippers* below. Before we do so, we must decide how to precisely model each $\vec{\alpha} NN_i$. Nodes may have some or no children, suggesting $\vec{\alpha} NN_i = \vec{\alpha} CO_{i \oplus 1}$ option. But again, instead of picking a fixed type constructor, we proceed with a more general solution, leading us to monads.

A *monad* [23] is a type constructor m with functions $\text{pure} : \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha m$ and $(\gg=) : \alpha m \Rightarrow (\alpha \Rightarrow \beta m) \Rightarrow \beta m$ subject to the well-known monad laws [29]. Options, lists, states, and many other computation contexts are monads. We thus set $\vec{\alpha} NN_i = \vec{\alpha} CO_{i \oplus 1} m$ for our search tree model. Note that doing so leaves us with two types of contextual computations in a zipper: an arrow (\rightarrow) for moves and a monad m for $\vec{\alpha} NN_i$. In principle, there is nothing wrong with this, but in practice, it introduces two levels of computation contexts that have to be differentiated by the user. For the sake of simplicity, we opt to conflate the contexts at this stage. Fortunately, every monad m gives rise to an arrow $\alpha \rightarrow_m \beta := \alpha \Rightarrow \beta m$, the so-called Kleisli category [23], that we can use for this purpose; that is, we require $(\rightarrow) = (\rightarrow_m)$.¹

Generating Alternating Zippers from Node Zippers

Fix zippers $\vec{\alpha} Z_i = \vec{\alpha} N_i \times \vec{\alpha} ZX_i$ for containers $\vec{\alpha} CO_i$ in a Kleisli category (\rightarrow_m) with $\vec{\alpha} N_i = \vec{\alpha} NC_i \times \vec{\alpha} NN_i$ and $\vec{\alpha} NN_i = \vec{\alpha} CO_{i \oplus 1} m$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Each zipper Z_i stores data relevant for the navigation of container CO_i . We have to enrich the zippers such that they also hold data enabling the navigation between containers. For this, we mutually recursively define the new zipper contexts $\vec{\alpha} ZX'_i$ and types of parent data $\vec{\alpha} PZ_i$ by

$$\vec{\alpha} ZX'_i := \vec{\alpha} ZX_i \times \vec{\alpha} PZ_i m \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{\alpha} PZ_i := \vec{\alpha} NC_{i \ominus 1} \times \vec{\alpha} ZX'_{i \ominus 1}, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (4)$$

Intuitively, we enrich the contexts with the respective container's parent content and, recursively, its parent's enriched context. Next, we update the zippers to work on the enriched contexts. The new containers are defined by $\vec{\alpha} CO'_i := \vec{\alpha} CO_i \times \vec{\alpha} PZ_i m$ and the new zippers by $\vec{\alpha} Z'_i := \vec{\alpha} N_i \times \vec{\alpha} ZX'_i$. We define the functions $\text{mk}Z'_i : \vec{\alpha} Z_i \times \vec{\alpha} PZ_i m \Rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z'_i$ and $Z'_i \text{from} Z'_i : \vec{\alpha} Z'_i \Rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_i$ by

$$\text{mk}Z'_i ((zc, zx), pzm) := (zc, (zx, pzm)) \quad \text{and} \quad Z'_i \text{from} Z'_i (zc, (zx, pzm)) := (zc, zx). \quad (5)$$

Now we can lift the zippers' old moves

$$Z'_i.\text{zip}(co, pzm) := Z_i.\text{zip} co \gg= \text{arr} (\lambda z. \text{mk}Z'_i(z, pzm)), \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Z'_i.\text{unzip}(zc, (zx, pzm)) := \\ \text{arr } Z_i \text{from} Z'_i(zc, (zx, pzm)) \gg= Z_i.\text{unzip} \gg= \text{arr} (\lambda co. (co, pzm)). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

¹ Users requiring different computation contexts have to provide a suitable compound monad, for example, by using monad transformers [20].

For the remaining old moves, we define the lifting $\text{liftMove}_i : \vec{\alpha} Z_i^\circ \Rightarrow \vec{\alpha} Z_i'^\circ$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{liftMove}_i \text{ move } (zc, (zx, pzm)) &:= \\ \text{arr } Z_i \text{ from } Z_i' (zc, (zx, pzm)) &\gg \text{ move } \gg \text{arr } (\lambda z. \text{mk} Z_i' (z, pzm)) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and set $Z_i'.\text{move} := \text{liftMove}_i Z_i.\text{move}$ for each $\text{move} \in \{\text{right}, \text{left}, \text{up}, \text{down}\}$. Finally, we can define the missing moves between containers

$$\text{down}'_i ((nc, nm), zx') := nm \gg (\lambda co. Z_{i\oplus 1}' \text{.zip } (co, \text{pure } (nc, zx'))), \quad (9)$$

$$\text{up}'_i := Z_{i\oplus 1}' \text{.unzip} \gg (\lambda (co, pzm). pzm \gg \text{arr } (\lambda (nc, zx'). ((nc, \text{pure } co), zx'))). \quad (10)$$

Generating Node Zippers

The preceding construction takes input zippers aware of their follow-up containers, i.e. $\vec{\alpha} Z_i = \vec{\alpha} N_i \times \vec{\alpha} ZX_i$ and $\vec{\alpha} NN_i = \vec{\alpha} CO_{i\oplus 1} m$. We show how to create these zippers from zippers with single polymorphic content. Fix zippers $\alpha Z_i = \alpha \times \alpha ZX_i$ for containers αCO_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We instantiate the zippers such that they operate on the required node types. For this, we mutually recursively define the node types

$$\alpha^n N_i := \alpha_i \times \alpha^n NN_i \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^n NN_i := \alpha^n N_{i\oplus 1} CO_{i\oplus 1} m, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (11)$$

where $\alpha^n := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. The new zippers are then defined as $\alpha^n Z_i' := \alpha^n N_i \times \alpha^n N_i ZX_i$ for containers $\alpha^n N_i CO_i$ with node content $\alpha^n NC_i = \alpha_i$.

Summary

To sum up, let us evaluate our progress against the desired properties from the beginning of Section 2: Alternating zippers support a large class of search tree structures, thus satisfying Properties (a) and (b). They provide functionality to navigate these search trees, thus enabling white-box searches (Property (c)). As an abstract specification and its use of arrows and monads, alternating zippers are independent of concrete tree representations and effects, thus satisfying Property (d). Finally, we provided mechanisms to generate alternating zippers from simple input zippers. We next turn to the missing Property (e) – extensibility.

2.2 Extensible Search Trees

As discussed in Section 1, state-of-the-art white-box proof search tools offer little to no extensibility. One reason is that they are implemented against specifications with little room for variation. Alternating zippers abstract away from search tree-specific data. Generic code for alternating zippers remains usable even if one’s concrete search tree’s data representation or nodes’ content changes. However, alternating zippers only provide a specification for search tree navigation. Data manipulation, i.e. viewing and updating the search tree’s and its nodes’ content, is not covered. Naturally, we cannot write sensible proof automation without modifying any of the search tree’s data. But as it is, any such code will be coupled to the specific search tree’s data representations, which goes against our goal of extensibility. Just like we derived a specification for search tree navigation, we now need a specification framework to talk about data manipulation. Luckily, programming theory offers a solution to our problem: lenses [9, 4].

Essentially, a lens for α, β describes how to *get* a value of type β from a value of type α and how to *modify* a value of type β inside of α . Formally, a *lens in Kleisli category* (\rightarrow_m) is a value of type $(\alpha, \beta) \text{ lens}_m := (\alpha, \beta) \text{ getter}_m \times (\alpha, \beta) \text{ modifier}_m$, where $(\alpha, \beta) \text{ getter}_m := \alpha \rightarrow_m \beta$

and (α, β) $\text{modifier}_m := (\beta \rightarrow_m \alpha) \times \alpha \rightarrow_m \alpha$. We drop the m subscript if clear from context. Lenses are not only a framework to talk about but also simplify data manipulation. The reason is that they happily compose, forming a category. For the curious:

$$\text{id} := (\text{pure}, \lambda(f, x). f x), \quad (12)$$

$$(g_1, m_1) \gg (g_2, m_2) := (g_1 \gg_m g_2, \lambda(f, x). m_1 (\lambda y. m_2 (f, y), x)), \quad (13)$$

where \gg_m is Kleisli composition. We can thus create lenses for complexly nested data by composition of simpler sublenses.

► **Example 7.** Consider a node zipper $Z = \mathbb{N} \times ZX$ with $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}C \times \mathbb{N}N$. Given a lens $l_{Z, \mathbb{N}} : (Z, \mathbb{N})$ lens for the zipper's node and a lens $l_{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}C} : (\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}C)$ lens, for the node's content, we can create the lens $l_{Z, \mathbb{N}C} : (Z, \mathbb{N}C)$ lens for the zipper's node content by $l_{Z, \mathbb{N}C} := l_{Z, \mathbb{N}} \gg l_{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}C}$.

Combining alternating zippers with lenses gives us a specification framework to navigate search trees and manipulate their data independent of concrete data representations. Let us concretise this by means of an example.

► **Example 8.** Assume we have a 2-alternating zipper in Kleisli category (\rightarrow_m) with zipper content $ZC_2 = \mathbb{N}$. We can define a function $\text{zerochild} : Z_1 \rightarrow_m Z_2$ to zero the focused node's first child's number by

$$\text{zerochild} := \text{down}_1 \gg \text{arr}(\lambda(n, zx). (0, zx)). \quad (14)$$

As it is, zerochild is tied to the concrete representation of ZC_2 . If we, for example, extend the second zipper's content with a second field, say $ZC_2 = (\mathbb{N}, \text{string})$, the function zerochild is of no use. To keep our development extensible, we can rewrite the code using a lens $(\text{get}, \text{modify}) : (ZC_2, \mathbb{N})$ lens_m.² We define the function $\text{zerochild}' : Z_1 \rightarrow_m Z_2$ as follows

$$\text{zerochild}' := \text{down}_1 \gg (\lambda(zc, zx). \text{modify}(\text{arr}(\lambda_. 0), zc) \gg \text{arr}(\lambda zc. (zc, zx))). \quad (15)$$

This way, the function remains usable independent of changes to the second zipper's content. Certainly, this involved some overhead for the function in question. But the benefits start to shine when we deal with larger architectures, such as complex proof search automation.

As a final step, we add a design principle for data extension of search tree instances. Our approach is inspired by Isabelle/HOL's extensible record schemes [25]. The idea is to represent data slots, e.g. zipper contents, as records containing an extra polymorphic *more* field. Whenever we wish to extend a data slot, we instantiate its *more* field with a record containing the new data and a new *more* field. Again, let us concretise this with an example.

► **Example 9.** Consider an n -alternating zipper with zippers $Z_i = ZC_i \times ZX_i$ for containers CO_i with content $ZC_i = \mathbb{N}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. As it is, there is no general way to extend the alternating zipper such that, for example, ZC_1 additionally contains a **string** value. Assume now that the zippers are of the form $\alpha^n Z_i = \alpha^n ZC_i \times \alpha^n ZX_i$ for containers $\alpha^n CO_i$ with contents $\alpha^n ZC_i = (\mathbb{N} \times \alpha_i)$. The polymorphic variables α_i are used as the zippers' *more* fields. In this case, we can extend Z_1 's content with a **string** value by instantiation: We define $\alpha_{inst}^n := (\text{string} \times \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and set $\alpha^n Z'_i := \alpha_{inst}^n Z_i$, obtaining zippers for the containers $\alpha_{inst}^n CO_i$.

All in all, the framework achieves extensibility due to abstract specifications for search tree navigation and data manipulation, as well as a data extension principle for search tree instances. This concludes the design of Zippy.

² In ML-languages, such as Isabelle/ML, the lens may be passed as a ML-functor argument.

3 Implementing Zippy in Isabelle/ML

In this section, we describe a common pitfall when implementing monads, arrows, lenses, and the like with ML’s module system and how we take care of it in Isabelle/ML. Then we sketch how n -alternating zippers can be defined using metaprogramming for Isabelle/ML. For an introduction to ML’s module system, we refer to Paulson’s book [26, Chapter 7].

Monads, Arrows, Lenses in Isabelle/ML

It is known that monads and other type constructor specifications can be modelled with ML’s module system, exemplified by various blog posts online³ and a specification of monads in Isabelle/ML by the PSL framework [24]. However, expositions for serious applications are largely missing. Indeed, the standard approach entails a pitfall, which we demonstrate with an example:

► **Example 10.** The *state monad* (σ, α) $\text{state} := \sigma \Rightarrow \alpha \times \sigma$ takes a state of type σ and produces a value of type α along with an updated state. It is a monad with operations $\text{pure } x \ s := (x, s)$ and $(m \gg= f) \ s := (\lambda(x, s'). f \ x \ s') (m \ s)$. To implement state monads in ML-languages, we first create the signature of monads:

```
signature MONAD =
sig
  type 'a t
  val pure : 'a -> 'a t
  val bind : 'a t -> ('a -> 'b t) -> 'b t
end
```

Next, we implement the state monad.

```
structure State =
struct
  type ('s, 'a) t = 's -> 'a * 's
  fun pure x s = (x, s)
  fun bind m f s = let val (x, s') = m s in f x s' end
end
```

Unfortunately, `State` cannot be made an instance of `MONAD`. The issue is that `MONAD` expects a unary type constructor `'a t` while `State` uses a binary one, `('s, 'a) t`, to accommodate for arbitrary states `'s`. A common solution is to make `State` an ML-functor:

```
functor State' (type s) : MONAD =
struct
  type 'a t = s -> 'a * s
  fun pure x s = (x, s)
  ...
end
```

But mainstream ML-languages, particularly Standard ML, do not allow polymorphic functor instances such as `State' (type s = 's)`. As a result, users have to create separate instances of `State'` for every concrete state type they use in their code. To obtain a state-polymorphic monad instance of `State` in Isabelle/ML, there is no option but to generalise the signature of `MONAD` to include a polymorphic parameter `'p1` that is passed through the monad’s operations:

³ e.g. by Robert Harper <https://web.archive.org/web/20250214092012/https://existentialtype.wordpress.com/2011/05/01/of-course-ml-has-monads/>

```
signature MONAD_1 =
sig
  type ('p1, 'a) t
  val pure : 'a -> ('p1, 'a) t
  val bind : ('p1, 'a) t -> ('a -> ('p1, 'b) t) -> ('p1, 'b) t
end
```

Now it indeed holds that `State : MONAD_1`. Moreover, every `M : MONAD` is a `MONAD_1` with type `('p1, 'a) t = 'a M.t`.

The example highlights a general problem: $(k + 1)$ -ary type constructors `('p1, ..., 'pk, 'a) t` monadic in `'a` require corresponding $(k + 1)$ -ary types in a `MONAD_k` signature. It would be tedious to create these manually for each k . We use metaprogramming for Isabelle/ML by means of its antiquotation mechanism [31] to write arity-independent code that can be instantiated for arbitrary k . We use antiquotations `<pargs><ts>`, printing k polymorphic types `'p1, ..., 'pk` along with its passed type arguments `ts`, and `<#pargs>`, printing the number k that is configurable as Isabelle context data. The generic monad signature can then be implemented as follows:

```
signature MONAD_<#pargs> =
sig
  type <pargs><'a> t
  val pure : <pargs><'a> -> <pargs><'a> t
  val bind : <pargs><'a> t -> ('a -> <pargs><'b> t) -> <pargs><'b> t
end
```

This approach can be extended to other common type constructor classes. We created a library including applicatives, monads, monad transformers, traversables, arrows, lenses, and various instances, such as Kleisli categories, and state and list monads in Isabelle/ML.

Alternating Zippers in Isabelle/ML

Zippy is centrally built around the concept of n -alternating zippers (Definition 5), which contain zippers $\vec{\alpha} Z_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ in an arrow (\rightarrow) . As such, their definition in Isabelle/ML must be parametric in the number of type arguments $\vec{\alpha}$, the number of zippers n , and the number of polymorphic parameters for the underlying arrow `<#pargs>`. We use four additional antiquotations to obtain generic code: (1) `<eval><t>` to print `t`'s integer result, (2) `<zargs>` to print the list of polymorphic arguments $\vec{\alpha}$, (3) `<#zargs>` to print the number $|\vec{\alpha}|$, and (4) `<imap><{i} => t>` to print $t[j/\{i\}]$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, where $t[j/\{i\}]$ denotes syntactic substitution of any occurrence of `{i}` by `j` in `t`. We only show an excerpt to give an impression of how the code looks like – the details are technical and can be found in the implementation in the supplementary material.

```
signature <eval><n>_ALTERNATING_ZIPPER_<#pargs>_<#zargs> =
sig
  include ARROW_<#pargs>
  <imap><{i} => structure Z{ i } : ZIPPER_<#pargs>_<#zargs>
  <imap><{i} => val down{ i } :
    <pargs><<zargs> Z{ i }.zipper, <zargs> Z<eval><{i} ⊕ 1>.zipper> cat
  ...
```

We note that users of the framework are not forced to use these antiquotations but can write explicit Isabelle/ML code for a fixed configuration of their liking.

4 Proof Search with Zippy in Isabelle

We next demonstrate one way of building a concrete proof search tool with Zippy in Isabelle. We provide liftings to embed Isabelle tactics as search steps and demonstrate how to implement a best-first proof search akin to Lean’s `aesop`. We first devise an abstract base model for the tool and then highlight some implementation steps and extensions. The presented tool is kept simple for the sake of exposition. The supplementary material contains the complete code for an extended version of the model presented here.

Goal States, Meta Variables, and Tactics in Isabelle

An Isabelle *goal state* consists of a list of goals (i.e. theorems to be proven) $[G_1, \dots, G_n]$. The goals may contain and share meta variables (also called schematic variables) $?x$. A meta variable can be instantiated with a term. For soundness, instantiations of meta variables must be consistent across all goals. For example, the goal state $[?P \wedge ?Q, ?Q]$ may be instantiated to $[P \wedge \top, \top]$ but not $[P \wedge \top, ?Q]$.


An Isabelle *tactic* is a function taking a goal state and returning a lazy sequence of successor goal states. The sequence models alternatives, not conjunctions. For example, a tactic for disjunction introduction may map a goal state $P \vee Q$ to the goal state sequence $[[P], [Q]]$ while a tactic for conjunction introduction may map a goal state $P \wedge Q$ to the sequence $[[P, Q]]$. Many tactics in Isabelle are goal-indexed, meaning that they operate on a chosen goal G_i of the goal state. Such tactics take the goal index i as an extra argument. Since tactics are arbitrary functions, they are black-box, offering no structure (besides that they return alternatives) to analyse their proof search. But of course they can still be used as proof steps to expand the search tree in white-box proof search tools like ours. Indeed, virtually all automation in Isabelle is mapped to a tactic at the end of the day, so it is essential to enable their usage in our tool.

The Basic Proof Search Tree Model


We next devise the base structure of the search tree model we will implement with Zippy. As a starting point, we take the model presented in Figure 1, containing goal and prioritised rule nodes, and extend it to enable the embedding of Isabelle’s goal states and tactics.

First, we generalise goal nodes to contain an Isabelle goal state instead of a single goal. Second, we add goal indices to rule nodes to indicate a rule’s goal focus. Then we introduce *goal clusters* to reduce the number of duplicate proof step computations: Consider, for example, the goal state $[A \wedge B, C \wedge D]$. A tactic for conjunction introduction may independently be applied to goal 1 and goal 2 in any order. An exhaustive search tree, depicted in Figure 5, tries each order, resulting in equivalent successor states. As a remedy, we split goal states into independent goal clusters, resulting in search trees as depicted in Figure 6. However, we may not just put every goal into a separate cluster. The reason is that we have to consistently instantiate meta variables during the search. Our goal clusters will hence collect goals that transitively share a meta variable. These clusters are called *meta variable clusters* in Lean’s `aesop` [22]. Formally, goal clusters are the transitive closure of the relation denoting whether two goals share a meta variable. Goal clusters form an equivalence relation. For example, the goal clusters of goal state $[?x \wedge ?y, ?v, ?y \wedge ?z, ?z]$ are $[?x \wedge ?y, ?y \wedge ?z, ?z]$ and $[?v]$.

Next, we generalise rule nodes to nodes containing actions. An *action* is a morphism in the zipper’s arrow that takes the alternating zipper at the action’s node position and returns



■ **Figure 5** Proof search without goal clusters. Goal nodes are solid, and rule nodes are dashed, containing a rule, priority, and goal index. Selected nodes are bold and red. The duplication is marked in bold and blue.



■ **Figure 6** Proof search with goal clusters. Goal nodes are solid, goal clusters are dotted, and rule nodes are dashed.

an updated zipper. One important kind of action is a *tactic action*. Tactic actions apply a tactic to the action node’s parent goal cluster and attach the resulting successor states as children. Actions can be selected multiple times. For example, a tactic action may choose to attach its tactic’s results one at a time.

Finally, we add *action application nodes* beneath action nodes, storing metadata linked to the creation of a successor goal state by an action. For example, actions can mark their results as “promising”, indicating that they should be returned to the user even if proof search fails to solve some of its subgoals. This ensures that users receive useful feedback even when a proof search attempt is incomplete.

To sum up, we use four node types and hence build our tool on top of a 4-alternating zipper: (1) *goal state nodes* store an Isabelle goal state, (2) *goal cluster nodes* store one of their parent’s goal clusters, (3) *action nodes* store actions and goal indices, and (4) *action application nodes* store metadata created by an action’s application. We take four list zippers and generate the base alternating zipper as described in Section 2.1.1, resulting in $\alpha^4 Z_i = \alpha^4 N_i \times \alpha^4 ZX_i$ for containers $\alpha^4 CO_i = \alpha_i$ list with $\alpha^4 N_i = \alpha_i \times \alpha^4 NN_i$ and $\alpha^4 NN_i = \alpha^4 CO_{i \oplus 1} m$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. We keep the Kleisli category (\rightarrow_m) abstract for now.

Adding Goal Clusters

When initialising a search tree with an Isabelle goal state $[G_1, \dots, G_n]$, we have to construct the goal state’s equivalence relation of goal clusters. We achieve this with an imperative union-find structure that we ported to Isabelle/ML. It is indeed the only part of our implementation

using imperative features. We use a term index mapping each meta variable to its (initially empty) equivalence class of goals. For each goal, we take its meta variables and imperatively merge the goal's equivalence class with the class indexed by the term index.

Adding Actions

To add actions to the search tree, we extend the alternating zipper's data as described in Section 2.2. The type of actions should be of the form $\alpha^4 \text{ action} := \alpha^4 Z_3^\circ$, i.e. an arbitrary morphism updating the alternating zipper at its selected action node. Note, however, that this type should talk about zippers that already include such actions. We thus need to define the type of actions recursively:

$$\alpha^4 \text{ action} := \alpha^4 Z_3^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha^4 Z'_i := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha^4 \text{ action} \times \alpha_3, \alpha_4) Z_i. \quad (16)$$

We proceed analogously to add the remaining data we wish for in action nodes. For example, to add priorities, we define $\alpha^4 Z''_i := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \text{prio} \times \alpha_3, \alpha_4) Z'_i$, for some desired priority type `prio`. Of course, in the actual implementation, each extension is accompanied by an appropriate specification (i.e. ML signature) that abstracts from the concrete representation with the help of lenses.

As discussed, using Isabelle tactics as actions is quite essential. We sketch one way to do this next. This is meant to give the reader an impression of the complexity of adding slightly more difficult functionality. For ease of notation, we assume that tactics return standard lists, not lazy sequences. The function $\text{tacAction} : \text{tactic} \Rightarrow \alpha^4 \text{ action}$ is defined by

$$\text{tacAction } \text{tac } z := \text{up}_3 z \gg \text{getGCState} \gg \text{arr } \text{tac} \gg (\lambda ss. \text{listAction } ss z) \quad (17)$$

$$\text{listAction } [] z := \text{setPriority } \text{Prio.disabled } z \quad (18)$$

$$\text{listAction } (s :: ss) z := \text{addAANode } s z \gg \text{up}_4 \gg \text{setAction } (\text{listAction } ss) \quad (19)$$

$$\text{addAANode } s z := Z_3.\text{modifyNext } ((\lambda ns. \text{mkAANode } s :: ns), z) \gg \text{down}_3 \gg \text{initGS } s \quad (20)$$

where `getGCState` is the lens getter for a goal cluster's state, `setPriority`, `setAction`, `modifyNext` the obvious lens setters/modifiers, `mkAANode` a function creating a new node N_4 from the tactic's result, and `initGS` a morphism initialising and attaching the goal and goal clusters described by the result. The function `listAction` attaches its passed results as children, one at a time, and disables itself once the results are empty.

Adding Failure and State

Thus far, we kept the zippers' Kleisli category (\rightarrow_m) abstract. One computation effect we have to support is failure, e.g. for moves beyond the end of a zipper's container. We implemented an option monad for this purpose. Another helpful effect is state: Many tactics and functions in Isabelle/ML require access to the so-called *proof context*. The proof context stores various data, such as registered theorems used by the simplifier, term parsing options, and fixed variables. Typically, users explicitly pass around the context and use it wherever needed. We can make this context passing implicit using a monad supporting state, which we also implemented. Of course, the monad's state is polymorphic, as discussed in Section 3, and can thus be used to store arbitrary data, not just proof contexts. We use monad transformers to combine the failure and state effects in the implementation.

Adding Positional Information

It is useful to know the zipper's current location in the search tree. For example, one can use positional information to limit the proof search depth, to adjust action priorities based on

their depth in the search tree, to implement a replay mechanism for movements, and it serves as a debugging aid when inspecting proof searches. Adding positional information with Zippy is strikingly simple: we just create an alternating zipper for positional information and pair it with the search tree's alternating zipper.

We can model a zipper's position as an integer list, where the list's length encodes the (vertical) depth and the list's elements the horizontal position at each level of depth. For example, the position $[2, 0, -1]$ (read it right to left) corresponds to the sequence of moves [left, down, down, right, right]. An alternating zipper's position is just a list of zipper positions, i.e. \mathbb{Z} list list. An n -alternating zipper for positions can be implemented with zippers $Z_i := \mathbb{Z} \text{ list list} \times ()$ for containers $CO_i := \mathbb{Z} \text{ list list}$ and moves

$$Z_i.\text{zip } pss := \text{pure } ([0] :: pss), \quad Z_i.\text{unzip } (ps :: pss) := \text{pure } pss, \quad (21)$$

$$Z_i.\text{right } ((p :: ps) :: pss) := \text{pure } ((p + 1 :: ps) :: pss), \quad (22)$$

$$Z_i.\text{left } ((p :: ps) :: pss) := \text{pure } ((p - 1 :: ps) :: pss), \quad (23)$$

$$Z_i.\text{down } (ps :: pss) := \text{pure } ((0 :: ps) :: pss), \quad Z_i.\text{up } ((p :: ps) :: pss) := \text{pure } (ps :: pss), \quad (24)$$

$$\text{down}_i pss := \text{pure } ([0] :: pss), \quad \text{up}_i (ps :: pss) := \text{pure } pss, \quad (25)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Using Definition 6, we can adjoin this alternating zipper to the one we created for the proof search tree, giving us positional information for free. This approach can be used to add also other move-dependent data, such as an explicit history of moves that may be used for debugging and algorithmic analyses.

Running a Best-First Search

Finally, we sketch the implementation of a best-first search akin to Lean's `aesop`. The best-first search picks the tree's highest priority action, runs the action, and then repeats. To pick the highest-scoring action, we need a way to visit every action node of an alternating zipper. This, in turn, requires a way to visit the nodes of each zipper, e.g. by means of two enumeration morphisms $Z_i.\text{first} : CO_i \rightarrow Z_i$ and $Z_i.\text{next} : Z_i^\circ$. We assume that our Kleisli category (\rightarrow_m) supports failures, providing a function `catch` : $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow (\alpha \rightarrow \beta)$ such that `catch a1 a2` is an arrow running `a2` in case `a1` failed. A generic postorder depth-first enumeration, for example, can then be implemented by

$$Z_i.\text{first} := Z_i.\text{zip} \gg \text{repeat } Z_i.\text{down}, \quad (26)$$

$$Z_i.\text{next} := \text{catch } (Z_i.\text{right} \gg \text{repeat } Z_i.\text{down}) Z_i.\text{up}, \quad (27)$$

$$\text{repeat } \text{move } z := \text{try } (\text{move} \gg \text{repeat } \text{move}) z, \quad \text{try } \text{move} := \text{catch } \text{move } \text{id}, \quad (28)$$

assuming that $Z_i.\text{zip}$ moves to container CO_i 's top-left node and $Z_i.\text{down}$ to the leftmost child. Using the zippers' enumerations, it is a routine exercise to write morphisms $\text{first} : CO_1 \rightarrow Z_3$ and $\text{next} : Z_3^\circ$ enumerating all action nodes of our proof search zipper. We then implement a morphism $\text{maxAction} : CO_1 \rightarrow Z_3$ that folds this enumeration, returning the zipper containing the highest-scoring action. This action can then be applied and the process repeated:

$$\text{bestFirst} := \text{repeat } (\text{maxAction} \gg \text{applyAction} \gg \text{top}) \quad (29)$$

$$\text{applyAction } z := \text{getAction } z \gg (\lambda \text{action}. \text{action } z) \quad (30)$$

$$\text{top} := \text{repeat } (\text{up}_3 \gg \text{up}_2 \gg \text{up}_1 \gg \text{up}_4) \gg \text{up}_3 \gg \text{up}_2 \gg Z_1.\text{unzip} \quad (31)$$

Naturally, this implementation of `bestFirst` is kept simple for the sake of exposition, e.g. it loops in case indefinitely many steps can be applied.

5 Discussion

Our work combines approaches from the areas of (white-box) proof search for proof assistants and software design for functional programming languages. One ambitious white-box proof search tool is Lean’s `aesop` [22]. It uses an explicit AND/OR tree to implement a best-first proof search with priorities. Its search tree can be analysed as data in Lean itself. It offers so-called rule builders to register tactics and theorems as search steps and integrates several other features, like normalisation phases and tactic script generation [21]. ACL2 [16] includes a switch to log proof trees attempted by its `waterfall` as raw text. Unlike Zippy, both are not general frameworks for tree-based proof search but concrete proof search implementations: they are tied to a specific search tree datatype, are non-extensible by users, and offer no general specification for and generation of search tree models. As a generic framework, Zippy does not integrate application-specific features, like priorities or tactics as search steps, but offers means to readily integrate them if needed, as demonstrated in Section 4.

There are various other concrete proof search implementations, including Coq’s [28] `eauto` and `sauto` [6], Isabelle’s [27] `auto` and `auto2` [33], and PVS’s `grind` [5]. They all differ in the set of features they integrate, search strategies they employ, etc. But to our knowledge, none of them is extensible nor truly white-box, meaning that they do not provide means to readily predict their proof search and analyse it as data.

Zippy’s design is based on abstractions known from functional programming theory. Central to Zippy is the concept of zippers [10], which we extended to the novel concepts of linked and alternating zippers for search trees. Our definition of zippers, using moves `zip`, `unzip`, `right`, `left`, `up`, `down`, is inspired by Haskell’s “Scrap Your Zippers” framework [1], which implements a datatype-independent zipper in the `option` Kleisli category. The programming language community developed a rich set of abstractions to structure functional programs. These abstractions are prominent in Haskell, much less common in ML-languages, and virtually non-existent in Isabelle/ML. One exception is PSL [24], whose monads suffer from the pitfall described in Section 3, however. We described a generic approach using Isabelle/ML antiquotations that avoids this pitfall and implemented monads [23], arrows [12], monad transformers [20], and various instances thereof for composable computations with contexts, and lenses [9] for composable and extensible data manipulation in Isabelle/ML. While there are also formal translations from Haskell’s typeclasses to slight extensions of ML [30, 7], they do not handle type constructor classes.

Future Work

As discussed in Section 1, white-box proof search tools have many merits. Zippy enables users to build and extend such tools in Isabelle. One possible use case is to create white-box alternatives to existing automation, particularly Isabelle’s `auto`. Another one is porting automation from other provers, such as Lean’s `aesop`. We sketched one approach to do so in Section 4, including a prototype in the supplementary material. A third use case is to create new automation for areas requiring high levels of customisability and user extensibility. One such area is program and theorem synthesis with relational provers [11, 15]. Currently, there are three such provers of non-comparable strength in Isabelle – `autorep` [17, 18], `transfer` [32], `transport` [13]. They are all black-box and notoriously hard for beginners. One promising path to subsume them with a more accessible tool is to implement a white-box variant on top of `transport`’s theory [15]. Another area is emerging soft-type developments [14, 8]. Soft-type inference algorithms share many of the challenges of mentioned relational provers and users would hence benefit from an extensible, white-box implementation.

References

- 1 Michael D. Adams. Scrap Your Zippers: A Generic Zipper for Heterogeneous Types. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN Workshop on Generic Programming, WGP '10*, page 13–24, New York, NY, USA, 2010. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/1863495.1863499.
- 2 Jasmin C. Blanchette, Cezary Kaliszyk, Lawrence C. Paulson, and Josef Urban. Hammering towards QED. *Journal of Formalized Reasoning*, page 101–148, Jan. 2016. doi:10.6092/issn.1972-5787/4593.
- 3 Timothy Bourke, Matthias Daum, Gerwin Klein, and Rafal Kolanski. Challenges and Experiences in Managing Large-Scale Proofs. In Johan Jeuring, John A. Campbell, Jacques Carette, Gabriel Dos Reis, Petr Sojka, Makarius Wenzel, and Volker Sorge, editors, *Intelligent Computer Mathematics, CICM 2012*, pages 32–48, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-31374-5_3.
- 4 Bryce Clarke, Derek Elkins, Jeremy Gibbons, Fosco Loregiàn, Bartosz Milewski, Emily Pillmore, and Mario Román. Profunctor optics, a categorical update. *Compositionality*, 6:1, 2024. doi:10.32408/COMPOSITIONALITY-6-1.
- 5 Judy Crow, Sam Owre, John Rushby, Natarajan Shankar, , and Mandayam Srivas. A Tutorial Introduction to PVS. April 1995. URL: <http://www.csl.sri.com/papers/wift-tutorial/>.
- 6 Lukasz Czajka. Practical proof search for coq by type inhabitation. In Nicolas Peltier and Viorica Sofronie-Stokkermans, editors, *Automated Reasoning - 10th International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2020*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 28–57. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-51054-1_3.
- 7 Derek Dreyer, Robert Harper, Manuel M. T. Chakravarty, and Gabriele Keller. Modular type classes. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 42(1):63–70, January 2007. doi:10.1145/1190215.1190229.
- 8 Ciarán Dunne and J. B. Wells. Isabelle/HOL/GST: A Formal Proof Environment for Generalized Set Theories. In Kevin Buzzard and Temur Kutsia, editors, *Intelligent Computer Mathematics, CICM 2022*, pages 38–55. Springer, 2022. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-16681-5_3.
- 9 J. Nathan Foster, Michael B. Greenwald, Jonathan T. Moore, Benjamin C. Pierce, and Alan Schmitt. Combinators for Bidirectional Tree Transformations: A Linguistic Approach to the View-Update Problem. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems*, page 17–es, May 2007. doi:10.1145/1232420.1232424.
- 10 Gérard Huet. The Zipper. *Journal of Functional Programming*, page 549–554, September 1997. doi:10.1017/S0956796897002864.
- 11 Brian Huffman and Ondrej Kuncar. Lifting and Transfer: A Modular Design for Quotients in Isabelle/HOL. In *Certified Programs and Proofs - Third International Conference, CPP 2013, Melbourne, VIC, Australia, December 11-13, 2013, Proceedings*, pages 131–146, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-03545-1_9.
- 12 John Hughes. Generalising monads to arrows. *Science of Computer Programming*, 37(1-3):67–111, 2000. doi:10.1016/S0167-6423(99)00023-4.
- 13 Kevin Kappelmann. Transport via partial galois connections and equivalences. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, October 2023. <https://isa-afp.org/entries/Transport.html>, Formal proof development.
- 14 Kevin Kappelmann, Chen Josh, and Alexander Krauss. Isabelle/Set, 2023. URL: <https://github.com/kappelmann/Isabelle-Set>.
- 15 Kappelmann, Kevin. Transport via Partial Galois Connections and Equivalences. In Hur, Chung-Kil, editor, *Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems, APLAS 2023*, pages 225–245, Singapore, 2023. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-981-99-8311-7_11.
- 16 Matt Kaufmann, J. Strother Moore, and Panagiotis Manolios. *Computer-Aided Reasoning: An Approach*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, USA, 2000.
- 17 Peter Lammich. Automatic data refinement. In Sandrine Blazy, Christine Paulin-Mohring, and David Pichardie, editors, *Interactive Theorem Proving - 4th International Conference, ITP 2013*, pages 84–99. Springer, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-39634-2_9.

- 18 Peter Lammich. Automatic data refinement. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, October 2013. https://isa-afp.org/entries/Automatic_Refinement.html, Formal proof development.
- 19 Guillaume Lample, Timothee Lacroix, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Aurelien Rodriguez, Amaury Hayat, Thibaut Lavril, Gabriel Ebner, and Xavier Martinet. HyperTree Proof Search for Neural Theorem Proving. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 26337–26349. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022.
- 20 Sheng Liang, Paul Hudak, and Mark Jones. Monad Transformers and Modular Interpreters. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL '95, page 333–343, New York, NY, USA, 1995. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/199448.199528.
- 21 Jannis Limperg. Tactic Script Optimisation for Aesop. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP '25, page 98–111, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3703595.3705877.
- 22 Jannis Limperg and Asta Halkjær From. Aesop: White-Box Best-First Proof Search for Lean. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs*, CPP 2023, page 253–266, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3573105.3575671.
- 23 Eugenio Moggi. Notions of computation and monads. *Information and Computation*, pages 55–92, 1991. Selections from 1989 IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science. doi:10.1016/0890-5401(91)90052-4.
- 24 Yutaka Nagashima and Ramana Kumar. A Proof Strategy Language and Proof Script Generation for Isabelle/HOL. In Leonardo de Moura, editor, *Automated Deduction - CADE 26*, pages 528–545. Springer, 2017. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-63046-5_32.
- 25 Wolfgang Naraschewski and Markus Wenzel. Object-Oriented Verification Based on Record Subtyping in Higher-Order Logic. In Jim Grundy and Malcolm C. Newey, editors, *Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics, 11th International Conference, TPHOLs'98*, pages 349–366. Springer, 1998. doi:10.1007/BFB0055146.
- 26 Lawrence C. Paulson. *ML for the working programmer (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- 27 Lawrence C. Paulson, Tobias Nipkow, and Makarius Wenzel. From LCF to Isabelle/HOL. *Form. Asp. Comput.*, page 675–698, December 2019. doi:10.1007/s00165-019-00492-1.
- 28 The Coq Development Team. The Coq Proof Assistant, September 2024. doi:10.5281/zenodo.14542673.
- 29 Philip Wadler. Monads for Functional Programming. In Johan Jeuring and Erik Meijer, editors, *Advanced Functional Programming, First International Spring School on Advanced Functional Programming Techniques*, pages 24–52. Springer, 1995. doi:10.1007/3-540-59451-5_2.
- 30 Stefan Wehr and Manuel M. T. Chakravarty. ML Modules and Haskell Type Classes: A Constructive Comparison. In G. Ramalingam, editor, *Asian Symposium on Programming Languages and Systems, APLAS 2008*, pages 188–204. Springer, 2008. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-89330-1_14.
- 31 Makarius Wenzel. The Isabelle/Isar Implementation. Accessed: March 13, 2025. Snapshot: <https://web.archive.org/web/20241129063410/https://isabelle.in.tum.de/doc/implementation.pdf>. URL: <https://isabelle.in.tum.de/doc/implementation.pdf>.
- 32 Makarius Wenzel. The Isabelle/Isar Reference Manual. Accessed: March 13, 2025. Snapshot: <https://web.archive.org/web/20241231150616/https://isabelle.in.tum.de/doc/isar-ref.pdf>. URL: <https://isabelle.in.tum.de/doc/isar-ref.pdf>.
- 33 Bohua Zhan. AUTO2, A Saturation-Based Heuristic Prover for Higher-Order Logic. In Jasmin Christian Blanchette and Stephan Merz, editors, *Interactive Theorem Proving - 7th International Conference, ITP 2016*, pages 441–456. Springer, 2016. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-43144-4_27.