

# Taming Nontermination

Recovering Free Theorems with Linearity

---

**Nick Rioux** Amal Ahmed

July 20, 2017

College of Computer and Information Science  
Northeastern University

# Free Theorems

---

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

e.g.  $\text{id} = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). x$

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

e.g.  $\text{id} = \Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). x$

In fact,  $\text{id}$  is the only inhabitant of this type!

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

- $\Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). \lambda(y : \alpha). x$

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$$

- $\Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). \lambda(y : \alpha). x$
- $\Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). \lambda(y : \alpha). y$

# Linear Types

---



- A *linear* function uses its argument exactly once.

# Linear Types

- A *linear* function uses its argument exactly once.
- We can enforce this with a linear function type:

$$\mathcal{T} \multimap \mathcal{T}'$$

# Linear Types

- A *linear* function uses its argument exactly once.
- We can enforce this with a linear function type:

$$\mathcal{T} \multimap \mathcal{T}'$$

- For example:
  - $\vdash (\lambda(f : \text{bool} \multimap \text{Int}). f \text{ true}) : (\text{bool} \multimap \text{Int}) \multimap \text{Int}$  but

# Linear Types

- A *linear* function uses its argument exactly once.
- We can enforce this with a linear function type:

$$\mathcal{T} \multimap \mathcal{T}'$$

- For example:
  - $\vdash (\lambda(f : \text{bool} \multimap \text{Int}). f \text{ true}) : (\text{bool} \multimap \text{Int}) \multimap \text{Int}$  but
  - $\lambda(f : \text{bool} \multimap \text{Int}). f \text{ true}; f \text{ false}$  **cannot** be given a  $\multimap$  type.

## Linear Types: Preservation of Resources

- Linear functions preserve 'resources' (*i.e.* free variables)
- Zhao, Zhang, and Zdancewic '10 (ZZZ) show this can be useful.

## Linear Types: Preservation of Resources

- Linear functions preserve 'resources' (*i.e.* free variables)
- Zhao, Zhang, and Zdancewic '10 (ZZZ) show this can be useful.

Suppose

$$f \ v \multimap \dots \multimap e$$

Then

free linear variables in  $f \ v =$  free linear variables in  $e$

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \multimap \alpha$$

There are no values of this type!

$$\forall \alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \multimap \alpha$$

There are no values of this type! But how do we prove this?



# Linear Free Theorems

ZZZ approach:

1. Prove the usual free theorem (ignoring linearity).

Any inhabitants of  $\forall\alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \multimap \alpha$  must be equivalent to:

- $f_1 \approx \Lambda\alpha. \lambda(x:\alpha). \lambda(y:\alpha). x$  or
- $f_2 \approx \Lambda\alpha. \lambda(x:\alpha). \lambda(y:\alpha). y$

# Linear Free Theorems

ZZZ approach:

1. Prove the usual free theorem (ignoring linearity).

Any inhabitants of  $\forall \alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \multimap \alpha$  must be equivalent to:

- $f_1 \approx \Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). \lambda(y : \alpha). x$  or
- $f_2 \approx \Lambda \alpha. \lambda(x : \alpha). \lambda(y : \alpha). y$

2. Identify inhabitants that don't preserve free linear variables.

Applying  $f_1$  to free variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ ,

$$f_1 x_1 x_2 \approx x_1$$

But  $x_2$  was lost! (Similar problem with  $f_2$ .)

# Linear Free Theorems

ZZZ approach:

1. Prove the usual free theorem (ignoring linearity).

Any inhabitants of  $\forall\alpha. \alpha \multimap \alpha \multimap \alpha$  must be equivalent to:

- $f_1 \approx \Lambda\alpha. \lambda(x:\alpha). \lambda(y:\alpha). x$  or
- $f_2 \approx \Lambda\alpha. \lambda(x:\alpha). \lambda(y:\alpha). y$

2. Identify inhabitants that don't preserve free linear variables.

Applying  $f_1$  to free variables  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ ,

$$f_1 x_1 x_2 \approx x_1$$

But  $x_2$  was lost! (Similar problem with  $f_2$ .)

3. **Contradiction:** since linear functions must preserve resources,  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  cannot be well-typed linear functions.

# Compositional Compiler Correctness

---

We're interested in the correctness of CPS translations.

$$(e : \tau) \rightsquigarrow (e_{CPS} : \forall \alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)$$

We're interested in the correctness of CPS translations.

$$(e : \tau) \rightsquigarrow (e_{CPS} : \forall \alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)$$

e.g.  $(\text{true} : \text{bool}) \rightsquigarrow (\Lambda \alpha. \lambda(k : \text{bool} \rightarrow \alpha). k \text{ true}$   
 $: \forall \alpha. (\text{bool} \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha)$

# Continuation Shuffling

- Correctness depends on a key free theorem for the type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  called *continuation shuffling*.

# Continuation Shuffling

- Correctness depends on a key free theorem for the type  $\forall \alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  called *continuation shuffling*.
- **Problem:** Continuation shuffling breaks in languages with nontermination.



# Continuation Shuffling

- Correctness depends on a key free theorem for the type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  called *continuation shuffling*.
- **Problem:** Continuation shuffling breaks in languages with nontermination.
  - Reason: a term of type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  may use its continuation multiple times.

# Continuation Shuffling

- Correctness depends on a key free theorem for the type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  called *continuation shuffling*.
- **Problem:** Continuation shuffling breaks in languages with nontermination.
  - Reason: a term of type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  may use its continuation multiple times.
  - But our translation never produces such terms!

# Continuation Shuffling

- Correctness depends on a key free theorem for the type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  called *continuation shuffling*.
- **Problem:** Continuation shuffling breaks in languages with nontermination.
  - Reason: a term of type  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$  may use its continuation multiple times.
  - But our translation never produces such terms!
- **Solution:** Change the CPS target type to  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

**“Solution”**: Change the CPS target type to  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

- Now we need a proof technique that can take advantage of the linearity to prove continuation shuffling.

**“Solution”**: Change the CPS target type to  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

- Now we need a proof technique that can take advantage of the linearity to prove continuation shuffling.
- But this is hard!

# Continuation Shuffling

**“Solution”**: Change the CPS target type to  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

- Now we need a proof technique that can take advantage of the linearity to prove continuation shuffling.
- But this is hard!
- “Resources in = resources out” isn’t enough.
  - ZZZ approach requires a non-linear free theorem as a starting point, but we don’t even have that!

# Continuation Shuffling

**“Solution”**: Change the CPS target type to  $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

- Now we need a proof technique that can take advantage of the linearity to prove continuation shuffling.
- But this is hard!
- “Resources in = resources out” isn’t enough.
  - ZZZ approach requires a non-linear free theorem as a starting point, but we don’t even have that!
- We need to model what happens when free variables are used.
  - Then we can reason about the state of the program at the point that a continuation is used.

- There is a deep interaction between parametricity, linearity, and effects that we don't fully understand.



# Conclusion

- There is a deep interaction between parametricity, linearity, and effects that we don't fully understand.
- We would like to be able to reason about how linearity can tame effects because, in many situations, this is what linearity is all about.

Qed.