

Taming Nontermination

Recovering Free Theorems with Linearity

Nick Rioux Amal Ahmed

July 20, 2017

College of Computer and Information Science
Northeastern University

Free Theorems

Free Theorems

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

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

Free Theorems

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

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

In fact, id is the only inhabitant of this type!

Free Theorems

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

Free Theorems

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

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

Free Theorems

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

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

Linear Types

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:

$$\tau \multimap \tau'$$

Linear Types

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

$$\tau \multimap \tau'$$

- 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:

$$\tau \multimap \tau'$$

- 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

$$f \ v \longmapsto \dots \longmapsto e$$

Then

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

Linear Free Theorems

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

There are no values of this type!

Linear Free Theorems

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

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

CPS

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 $\forall\alpha. (\tau \rightarrow \alpha) \multimap \alpha$

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.

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.

Conclusion

- 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.