# Linear Type Systems for Concurrent Languages

# Eijiro Sumii Naoki Kobayashi University of Tokyo

# Merit and Demerit of Concurrent Languages

Compared with sequential languagesMerit: more expressive power

- Inherently concurrent application (e.g. GUI)
- Parallel/distributed computation
- Demerit: more complicated behavior
  - Non-determinism (possibility of various results)
  - Deadlock (failure of due communication)

# Errors & Inefficiencies

# Example of Complication (1)

```
In MI :
 r:int ref
   (r:=3; r:=7; !r) (* evaluates to 7 *)
In CML [Reppy 91]:
 c:int chan
   (spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3));
    spawn(fn()=>send(c, 7));
    recv(c)) (* evaluates to either 3 or 7 *)
```

# Example of Complication (2)

```
In MI :
 let val r: int ref = ref 3
 in |r + |r + |r
 end (* evaluates to 9 *)
In CMI :
 let val c:int chan = channel()
      val = spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3))
 in recv(c) + recv(c) + recv(c))
 end (* evaluation gets stuck! *)
```

# Example of Complication (3)

In ML:

let val r1:bool ref = ref false
 val r2:bool ref = ref true
 in !r2 andalso !r1
 end (\* evaluates to false \*)
In CML:

• • •

# Example of Complication (3)

```
In ML:
```

#### In CMI : let val c1:bool chan = channel () val c2:bool chan = channel ()val = spawn(fn()=> (send(c1, false); send(c2, true))) in recv(c2) andalso recv(c1) end (\* evaluation gets stuck! \*)

# Our Approach

### Identify deterministic/deadlock-free parts by a static type system

Enrich Channel Types with Information of

"In what way a channel is used"

 $\Rightarrow$  Linear Channels, Usage Annotations

"In what order channels are used"

⇒ Time Tags

Rationale:

Type systems are usually compositional & tractable (unlike model checking, abstract interpretation, etc.)

# Outline

### Introduction

#### Basic Ideas

- Linear Channels [Kobayashi et al. 96]
- Time Tags [Kobayashi 97]
- Formalization in process calculi
- Extension by Usage Annotations

[Sumii & Kobayashi

98]

### Conclusion

# Basic Ideas (1): Linear Channels

- $c : p^m t chan$ 
  - - *"In which direction* c can be used"

*m* (multiplicity) ::= 1 (exactly once) | *w* (any times)

*"How many times c can be used"* 

c:-<sup>1</sup> int chan send(c, 3):unit

X c:-<sup>1</sup> int chan recv(c):int

# Basic Ideas (1): Linear Channels

#### c : $p^m$ t chan

"In which direction c can be used"

*m* (multiplicity) ::= 1 (exactly once) | w (any times)

*"How many times c can be used"* 

- c:-<sup>1</sup> int chan send(c, 3):unit

# Basic Ideas (1): Linear Channels

c:-1 int chan send(c, 3):unit
c:<sup>-1</sup> int chan recv(c):int

c: \$\$\frac{1} int chan
 (spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3));
 recv(c)): int

# Basic Ideas (2): Time Tags

# Basic Ideas (2): Time Tags

# Basic Ideas (2): Time Tags



Introduction Basic Ideas Linear Channels [Kobayashi et al. 96] Time Tags [Kobayashi 97] Formalization in process calculi Extension by Usage Annotations [Sumii & Kobayashi 98]

Conclusion

# Type Judgment in the Type System

# G; $\prec$ P

**G** : type environment (mapping from variables to types)

≺ : time tag ordering(binary relation on time tags)

**P** uses channels according to

the usage specified by  $\Gamma$  the order specified by  $\prec$ 

# Correctness of the Type System

Subject Reduction: "Reduction preserves well-typedness" **G**, c:  $\uparrow_t^1$  int chan;  $\prec$ (spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3)); let v = recv(c) in  $\frac{1}{4}$ ) **G**, c: $\frac{1}{4}$  int chan;  $\prec$ let  $v = 3 in \frac{1}{4}$ 

# Correctness of the Type System

Partial Confluence:

"Communication on linear channels won't cause non-determinism" G; ≺ P and Q Ü<sub>1</sub> P P Q' ↓ Q P\* R \*Ü Q' for some R

# Correctness of the Type System

Partial Deadlock-Freedom: "Non-cyclic communication on linear channels won't cause deadlock'' **G**:  $\prec$  **P P D Q** for some **Q** Unless P is trying to receive/send a value from/to some channel typed as  $p_{\pm}^{m}$  t chan where either  $m^{1}$  1, t  $\prec^{+}$  t,  $p = -or^{-}$ 



Introduction Basic Ideas Linear Channels [Kobayashi et al. 96] Time Tags [Kobayashi 97] Formalization in process calculi Extension by Usage Annotations [Sumii & Kobayashi 98]

Conclusion

#### U (usage) ::= $\circ$ (output) **I\_U** (input & sequential execution) UV (concurrent execution) **U** (replication) - (none) $\checkmark$ c:( $0 \mid 0 \mid I.I.-$ )<sub>t</sub> int chan; Æ (spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3)); spawn(fn()=>send(c, 7)); let v = recv(c) $w = recv(c) in \frac{1}{4}$

- Annotate **I**'s and **O**'s with
- Capability (c)
  - "The input/output will succeed (if it is performed)"
- Obligation (o)
  - "The input/output must be performed
    - (though it won't succeed)"

— "Deadlock" if these assumptions don't hold

*"For every* I/O *with capability, a corresponding* O/I *with obligation"* 

c:(0<sub>0</sub> | I<sub>c</sub>.-)<sub>t</sub> int chan; Æ
 (spawn(fn()=>send(c, 3));
 let v = recv(c) in ¼)

 C:(0<sub>0</sub> | I<sub>c</sub>.-)<sub>t</sub> int chan; Æ
 let v = recv(c) in ¼

We can uniformly express usage of Linear Channels  $O_{CO} | (I_{CO}, -)$ "Semaphore" Channels  $0_{0}$  |! ( $I_{0}$ ,  $0_{0}$ ) Client-Server Channels  $!0_{-}|!(I_{-})$ 

etc.

### Usage as LL-Formula

#### $[|\_|]: Usage \rightarrow LLFormula$

 $\begin{bmatrix} | \ O_{co} \ | \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{m} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} | \ \mathbf{I}_{co} \ U \ | \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{m} - \circ \begin{bmatrix} | \ U \ | \end{bmatrix}$  $\begin{bmatrix} | \ O_{c} \ | \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{m} \oplus \mathbf{1} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} | \ \mathbf{I}_{c} \ U \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} - \circ \begin{bmatrix} | \ U \ | \end{bmatrix}) \oplus \mathbf{1}$  $\begin{bmatrix} | \ O_{o} \ | \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{m} \& \mathbf{1} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} | \ \mathbf{I}_{o} \ U \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} - \circ \begin{bmatrix} | \ U \ | \end{bmatrix}) \& \mathbf{1}$  $\begin{bmatrix} | \ O_{o} \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} \& \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} | \ \mathbf{I}_{o} \ U \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} - \circ \begin{bmatrix} | \ U \ | \end{bmatrix}) \& \mathbf{1}$  $\begin{bmatrix} | \ O \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} \& \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1} \qquad \begin{bmatrix} | \ \mathbf{I} \ U \ | \end{bmatrix} = (\mathbf{m} - \circ \begin{bmatrix} | \ U \ | \end{bmatrix}) \& \mathbf{1}$ 

- $[|U|V|] = [|U|] \otimes [|V|]$
- [|-|] = 1[|U|] ! U|

### Usage as LL-Formula

*U* is a "reliable" usage *i.e., For every* **I**/**O** *with capability, a corresponding* **O**/**I** *with obligation exists* 

 $\begin{bmatrix} | U | \end{bmatrix} \text{ always reduces to } \mathbf{1}$ i.e., no unexpected garbage (producer/consumer) remains e.g.  $\begin{bmatrix} | O_0 | I_0 - 1 \end{bmatrix} - 0 \mathbf{1} \quad \mathbf{0} \quad (\mathbf{m} \& \mathbf{1}) \otimes ((\mathbf{m} - 0 \mathbf{1}) \oplus \mathbf{1}) - 0 \mathbf{1}$ 

### Conclusion

#### Summary: **"Resource- & order-conscious" type system** with *linear channels & time tags*

Future Work

 Type Inference Algorithm for Usage Annotations (Cf. for time tag ordering [Kobayashi 97], for linear channels [Igarashi & Kobayashi 97])
 Aggressive Optimization by the Type Information
 Semantics of Time Tag Ordering — Linear Logic with Sequencing Operator?