Why Linear Types Are The Future Of Systems Programming

Aditya Siram February 9, 2021

Outline

- ATS programming language
 - ML
 - linear types
 - refinement types
 - dependant types
 - As fast as C! ("blazing fast")
- Lots of typelevel madness
 - No optimizations
- Hongwei Xi
 - Boston University

- Very hard!
 - Research language
 - hbox overfull with ideas
 - Tons of accidental complexity
 - Keywords everywhere . . .
 - Zero docs
- And that's OK!
 - Our job to make usable things

- Goals
 - Not evangelism!
 - Not adoption!
 - Be dissatisfied
 - Inspire your next language

- Very difficult to present
 - Linear/dependant/refinement types, ML, C all converge
- Concrete motivating examples
 - High level handwaving
- Assuming comfort with ML like langs and basic C
- Start by taste of the ML & C side
- It'll get fairly advanced

• First from the ML side

• A linear Option (explanations come later ...)

```
datavtype Option_vt (a:vt@ype, bool) =
   | Some_vt(a, true) of (a)
   | None_vt(a, false)
```

• probably more familiar (_vt for viewtype)

```
datavtype Option_vt =
    | Some_vt of (a)
    | None_vt
```

• Indexed on a type-level bool, dependent types!

```
datavtype Option_vt =
   | Some_vt(a, true) of (a)
   | None_vt(a, false)
```

• Sort level bool

```
datavtype Option_vt =
  | Some_vt(a, true) of (a)
  | ...
```

• Parameterized on a view type, linear types!

All ADTs in ATS are GADTs

```
datavtype Option_vt (a:vt@ype, bool) =
   | Some_vt(a, true) of (a)
   | None_vt(a, false)
```

• A linear C array

```
absvtype arrayptr (a:vt@ype, 1:addr, n:int) = ptr(1)
vtypedef arrayptr (a:vt@ype, n:int) =
  [1:addr] arrayptr(a, 1, n)
```

• Just a pointer to some address, that's it

```
vtypedef arrayptr
...
1:addr = ptr(1)

^^^^^^
```

• Parameterized on a linear viewtype & size (should be size_t)

```
vtypedef arrayptr (a:vt@ype, n:int) =
...
```

• Returns an arrayptr to an existential (unknown) address type

```
l:addr = ptr(1)
vtypedef arrayptr =
[1:addr]
```

- Don't worry if this isn't clear
- Just a taste ...
- Tons type level concepts to learn!
- we'll get to some later . . .

• Now from the C side!

What resources are leaked?

```
int main(int argc, char** argv) {
  int* i = (int*)malloc(sizeof(int));
  *i = 10;
  FILE* fp = fopen("test.txt","r");
  return 0;
}
```

Memory!

```
int main(int argc, char** argv) {
  int* i = (int*)malloc(sizeof(int)); // <--- LEAK!!
  *i = 10;
  FILE* fp = fopen("test.txt","r");
  return 0;
}</pre>
```

File descriptor

```
int main(int argc, char** argv) {
  int* i = (int*)malloc(sizeof(int)); // <--- LEAK!!
  *i = 10;
  FILE* fp = fopen("test.txt","r"); // <-- LEAK!!
  return 0;
}</pre>
```

• Equivalent ATS program

```
implement main0 () = let
  val (pf | i) = malloc (sizeof<int>)
  val (pfset | ()) = ptr_set(pf | i, 10)
  val (pfFile | fp) = fopen("test.txt", "r")
in
  free(pfset | i);
  fclose(pfFile | fp);
end
```

• "Client-facing" code, analogous, safe, this is why ATS is "fast"

• malloc produces a linear proof pf, consumed by ptr_set

• ptr_set produces a proof pfset

• fopen produces a proof of the file descriptor pfFile

```
implement main0 () = let
  val (pf | i) = malloc (sizeof<int>)
  val (pfset | ()) = ptr_set(pf | i, 10)
  val (pfFile | fp) = fopen("test.txt", "r")
in
  free(pfset | i);
  fclose(pfFile | fp);
end
```

What happens when free and fopen are deleted?

```
implement main0 () = let
  val (pf | i) = malloc (sizeof<int>)
  val (pfset | ()) = ptr_set(pf | i, 10)
  val (pfFile | fp) = fopen("test.txt", "r")
in
```

end

• pfset is left unconsumed

```
implement main0 () = let
  val (pf | i) = malloc (sizeof<int>)
  val (pfset <---
  val (pfFile | fp) = fopen("test.txt", "r")
in</pre>
```

end

• pfFile is left unconsumed

```
implement main0 () = let
  val (pf | i) = malloc (sizeof<int>)
  val (pfset <---
  val (pfFile <---
in</pre>
```

end

Manual Management

Consumed by free

```
implement main0 () = let
    ...
    val (pfset <----
in
    free(pfset | i); <---
end</pre>
```

• Consumed by fclose, and that's it!

```
implement main0 () = let

val (pfFile <---
in

fclose(pfFile | fp); <--
end</pre>
```

- Linear types == generalized resource tracking!
- Free to write your all your code this way!
 - safe from buffer overflows & pointer bugs
 - ... there's sugar for implicitly passing proofs around
- Reuse decades of design sensibilities (safely!)
- But you're not benefitting from Functional Programming™...

Dependant & Refinement Types

- First "big" example
 - Read a number from the user between 1 and 10
 - Allocate an array of that length
 - Fill it.
 - Print it to console
 - Exit
- Doesn't seem like it but it's a LOT

Dependant & Refinement Types

- Overall structure, types simplified
- Not too far from a functional program

```
fun read_input():Option_vt(a) = ...
fun make_array (len:int n): arrayptr = ...
implement main0() = begin
    println! ("Length of array? (1-10):");
    case+ read_input<int>() of
    | ~None_vt() => println! ("Not a number!")
    | ~Some vt(len) =>
        if (len >= 1) * (len <= 10) then
          make_array(len)
        else println! ("Bad number!")
```

• Simplified make_array type signature

```
fun make_array (len:int n): arrayptr = ...
...
...
```

• Real make_array type signature

```
fun make_array
  {n:int| n >= 1; n <= 10}
  (len:int n): [l:addr] arrayptr(int,1,n) =
   ...</pre>
```

• len is indexed with a refined int sort, n.

```
fun make_array
  {n:int| n >= 1; n <= 10} <-- refines it
  (len:int n): [1:addr] arrayptr(int,1,n) =</pre>
```

• Array pointer at *some* address

• Length between 1 & 10!

```
fun make_array
  {n:int| n >= 1; n <= 10}
  (len:int n): [l:addr] arrayptr(int,1,n) =</pre>
```

• ... being called here

how does it know {n:int| n >= 1; n <= 10}?!!

• It statically understands runtime checks!

• Runtime checks discharge proofs at compile time.

 Now anything in make_array's call graph inherits the refinement

- Reading user input is actually the most interesting bit
 - It interleaves basic theorem, dependent types & runtime checks!
 - The interleaving is unique to ATS to my knowledge . . .

• The old read_input:

```
fun read_input():Option_vt(a) = ...
```

• The actual read_input type signature:

• The body:

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load<a> (stdin_ref,result)
in
if success then
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result)
  in Some vt(result) end
else
  let prval () = opt_unnone(result)
  in None_vt end
end
```

• Make a *stack* variable!

```
let
  var result: a? <---
in
if success then
else
end
```

• Fill it with user input

```
let
 var result: a?
 val success = fileref_load<a> (stdin_ref,result)
            in
if success then
else
end
```

• Stuff it into a Some:

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load<a> (stdin_ref,result)
in
if success then
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result)
  in Some_vt(result) end
else
end
```

• Hold up! result is of type a?, uninitialized

```
let
 var result: a? <----
in
if success then
  in Some_vt(result) end
else
end
```

• ...and Option_vt(a) needs a *not* a?

```
let
  var result: a? <----
in
if success then
  in Some_vt(result) <----</pre>
else
end
```

• The magic is happening with proof functions

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load <---</pre>
in
if success then <---
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result) <---</pre>
  in Some_vt(result) end
else
end
```

• Interleave a proof level function, erased at runtime!

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result)
else
end
```

• Step back and look at fileref_load

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load <---</pre>
in
if success then
else
end
```

• The scary type of fileref_load:

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
...
```

• Takes a reference to stdin:

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

• A reference (I-value) to an uninitialized stack variable:

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

And returns a bool indexed with bool!

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

• success == true indexed with a static true.

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

• failure == false indexed with a static false.

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

• The linear proof is in-place transformed ...

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

• ... into a tuple of an initialized a and static bool

```
(FILEref, &a? >> opt(a, b)) -<fun1> #[b:bool] bool(b)
```

Back to the example!

```
let
 var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
else
end
```

• success is a bool indexed with a bool

```
let
 var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load <---</pre>
in
if success then
else
end
```

• result is a now (a,true|false)

```
let
 var result: a? <---
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
else
end
```

• Now result is (a,true)!

```
let
 var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then <---
else
end
```

• Now look at the proof function opt_unsome

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result) <---</pre>
else
end
```

• The scary proof function:

```
praxi opt_unsome{a:vt@ype}
  (x: opt(a, true) >> a):<prf> void
...
```

• It's a "proof axiom" (praxi)

```
praxi opt_unsome{a:vt@ype}
...
```

• ... essentially a proof level assertion!

```
praxi opt_unsome{a:vt@ype}
...
```

• In-place transforms a opt(a,true) into a!

```
praxi opt_unsome{a:vt@ype}
  (x: opt(a, true) >> a):<prf> void
```

So now result is a not a? !

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result)
  in Some_vt(result) end <---
else
end
```

• opt_unnone does something similar!

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load<a> (stdin_ref,result)
in
if success then
else
  let prval () = opt_unnone(result) <--</pre>
  in None_vt end
end
```

• Everything after fileref_load is purely mechanical

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
                                        <--
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result) <--</pre>
  in Some vt(result) end
                                        <___
                                        <___
else
  let prval () = opt_unnone(result) <--</pre>
  in None_vt end
                                        <--
end
```

• Could all be synthesized!

```
let
  var result: a?
  val success = fileref_load
in
if success then
                                        <--
  let prval () = opt_unsome(result) <--</pre>
  in Some vt(result) end
                                        <___
                                        <___
else
  let prval () = opt_unnone(result) <--</pre>
  in None_vt end
                                        <--
end
```

- Taking stock . . .
- Dependent types are cool
- Interleaved proof functions are a game changer
- And! ...

Back to runtime checks!

```
fun read_input ... =
let
    ...
in
if success then <---
else ...</pre>
```

Back to runtime checks!

```
implement main0() =
...
case+ ... of
| ... =>
    if (len >= 1) * (len <= 10) then</pre>
```

- Manipulating proof terms as 1st class citizens is a game-changer
- Can statically avoid data races!
 - Given a proof of an array of length 1 and static index i
 - Statically split it into two proofs!
 - Give each thread a sub-proof
 - Can't access other thread's array elements!
- Emulate slices!

Proof function type signature:

```
prfun split
  {a:t@ype}
  {1:addr}_{n,i:nat \mid i \leq n}
  pfarr: array_v (a, l, n)
) : ( array_v (a, l, i),
      array_v (a, l+i*sizeof(a), n-i)
```

. . .

• prfun == proof level function prfun split

• Takes proof arguments of an array, static natural i

```
prfun split
   {a:t@ype}
   {1:addr}{n,i:nat | i <= n}
(
   pfarr: array_v (a, l, n)
) :</pre>
```

• Returns two proofs

```
prfun split
) : ( array_v (a, l, i), <--
      array_v (a, l+i*sizeof(a), n-i) <--
```

• Proof of an array at 1 of length i

```
prfun split
) : ( array_v (a, l, i), <--
```

• Proof of the second section of the array!

```
prfun split
) : (
      array_v (a, l+i*sizeof(a), n-i) <--
```

The body

```
sif i > 0 then let
  prval (pf1, pf2arr) = array_v_uncons pfarr
  prval (pf1res1, pf1res2) =
    split{..}{n-1,i-1} (pf2arr)
in
  (array_v_cons (pf1, pf1res1), pf1res2)
end else let
  prval EQINT () = eqint_make{i,0}((*void*))
in
  (array_v_nil (), pfarr)
end
```

• There a corresponding sif , "static" if

```
sif i > 0 then let
in
end else let
in
end
```

• Grab proof of the head and tail of the array

```
sif i > 0 then let
  prval (pf1, pf2arr) = array_v_uncons pfarr <--</pre>
in
end else let
in
end
```

• array_v_uncons is a praxi just like opt_unsome!

```
praxi array_v_uncons :
{a:vt0p}{1:addr}{n:int | n > 0}
array_v (a, l, n)
   -<prf> (a @ l, array_v (a, l+sizeof(a), n-1))
```

Recurse with the proof of the tail and updated static counters

```
sif i > 0 then let
  prval (pf1, pf2arr) = ...
 prval (pf1res1, pf1res2) =
    split{..}{n-1,i-1} (pf2arr)
in
end else let
in
end
```

• Put the two sections back together!

```
sif i > 0 then let
 prval (pf1, pf2arr) = ...
 prval (pf1res1, pf1res2) =
in
  (array_v_cons (pf1, pf1res1), pf1res2) <--
end else let
in
end
```

• Otherwise the first section is proof of an empty array

```
sif i > 0 then let
in
end else let
in
  (array_v_nil (), pfarr)
end
```

- In a function prval the proofs and work in parallel!
- thread1 and thread2 can not stomp on each other!
- That's it!

```
prval(pf1,pf2) = split(pfarr)
thread1(pf1 | ...);
thread2(pf2 | ...);
...
```

Taking stock

- Tip of the iceberg!
- Proof functions means very customizable type environments
- Dependant types means much easier domain modeling
 - Skeptical "simple sum types" are sufficient
- Linear types means bullet-proof resource tracking

Taking stock

- All these are great ideas!
 - ATS is a great POC!
- Steadily peels back the veil
 - eg. every language designers knowns proof terms
 - but keeps them internal!
 - ATS shows we're ready for them
- The engineering problem is UX/DX