

















Imperial College London

Session Types and Linear Logic WadlerFest

Bernardo Toninho, Nobuko Yoshida

11 April 2016

Session Types [Honda et al93]:

• Typing discipline for π -calculus



Session Types [Honda et al93]:

- Typing discipline for π -calculus
- Structure channel-based comm. with the notion of a session.
 - Sequence of interactive behaviours between two agents.

Session Types [Honda et al93]:

- Typing discipline for π -calculus
- Structure channel-based comm. with the notion of a session.
 - Sequence of interactive behaviours between two agents.
 - Intrinsic notion of duality (send/receive, branch/select).

Session Types [Honda et al93]:

- Typing discipline for π -calculus
- Structure channel-based comm. with the notion of a session.
 - Sequence of interactive behaviours between two agents.
 - Intrinsic notion of duality (send/receive, branch/select).
- Ensure communication safety (liveness, fidelity, ...)

Session Types [Honda et al93]:

- Typing discipline for π -calculus
- Structure channel-based comm. with the notion of a session.
 - Sequence of interactive behaviours between two agents.
 - Intrinsic notion of duality (send/receive, branch/select).
- Ensure communication safety (liveness, fidelity, ...)

Linear Logic [Girard98]:

A substructural logic of resources.

Session Types [Honda et al93]:

- Typing discipline for π -calculus
- Structure channel-based comm. with the notion of a session.
 - Sequence of interactive behaviours between two agents.
 - Intrinsic notion of duality (send/receive, branch/select).
- Ensure communication safety (liveness, fidelity, ...)

Linear Logic [Girard98]:

- A substructural logic of resources.
- Marriage of the dualities of classical logic with constructive aspects of intuitionistic logic.
- Far reaching applications in CS (linear λ-calculus, implicit comp. complexity, linear types, etc.)

Propositions as Types:

• A (deep) connection between prop. logic and λ -calculus.



Propositions as Types:

- A (deep) connection between prop. logic and λ -calculus.
- Proofs as programs, computation as proof simplification.

Propositions as Types:

- A (deep) connection between prop. logic and λ -calculus.
- Proofs as programs, computation as proof simplification.
- Not just prop. logic...

Propositions as Types:

- A (deep) connection between prop. logic and λ -calculus.
- Proofs as programs, computation as proof simplification.
- Not just prop. logic...

Concurrency Theory:

- Process Algebra (CSP [Hoare78], CCS, π-calculus [Milner80,89])
- Language-based models of message-passing concurrency.
- A plethora of typing systems (I/O types, Usage types, Linear types, ..., Session types)

Linear Logic and Concurrency:

A logic of interacting resources?



Linear Logic and Concurrency:

- A logic of interacting resources?
- Initial efforts explored connections to concurrency:
 - Abramsky's computational interpretation [Abramsky93]
 - Bellin and Scott's refinement to a π -calculus [BellinScott94]
 - Specification structures / Interaction cat. [Abramsky et al.95]

Linear Logic and Concurrency:

- A logic of interacting resources?
- Initial efforts explored connections to concurrency:
 - Abramsky's computational interpretation [Abramsky93]
 - Bellin and Scott's refinement to a π -calculus [BellinScott94]
 - Specification structures / Interaction cat. [Abramsky et al.95]
- No real "Curry-Howard isomorphism"....

Linear Logic and Concurrency:

- A logic of interacting resources?
- Initial efforts explored connections to concurrency:
 - Abramsky's computational interpretation [Abramsky93]
 - Bellin and Scott's refinement to a π -calculus [BellinScott94]
 - Specification structures / Interaction cat. [Abramsky et al.95]
- No real "Curry-Howard isomorphism"....

Why does it matter?

- New means of reasoning about concurrent phenomena.
- Good metalogical properties map to good program properties.

What is old is new again

ILL and Session Types – SILL [CairesPfenning10]

- Interpret Session Types as ILL propositions.
- Proofs as typing derivations for π-calculus.
- Process reduction as cut reduction/elimination.



What is old is new again

ILL and Session Types – SILL [CairesPfenning10]

- Interpret Session Types as ILL propositions.
- Proofs as typing derivations for π -calculus.
- Process reduction as cut reduction/elimination.

CLL and Session Types – CP [Wadler12,14]

- Full linear logic.
- Further from π -calculus, but matching LL precisely.
- ► Embeds a session-typed functional language (GV) into CP.

Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

A, B ::=



Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

 $\begin{array}{rcl} A,B & ::= & A \otimes B & \text{output } A \text{ then behave as } B \\ & & A \, {}^{\mathfrak{N}} B & \text{Input } A \text{ then behave as } B \end{array}$



Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

 $\begin{array}{rcl} A,B & ::= & A \otimes B & \text{output } A \text{ then behave as } B \\ & A & \Im & B & \text{Input } A \text{ then behave as } B \\ & A \oplus B & \text{Select from } A \text{ or } B \\ & A & \& B & \text{Offer choice of } A \text{ or } B \end{array}$

Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

::=	$A \otimes B$	output A then behave as B
	A 28 B	Input A then behave as B
	$A \oplus B$	Select from A or B
	A & B	Offer choice of A or B
	!A	Server Accept
	?A	Client Request
	::=	A ⅔ B A ⊕ B A & B !A

Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

A, B	::=	$A \otimes B$	output A then behave as B
		A 28 B	Input A then behave as B
		$A \oplus B$	Select from A or B
		A & B	Offer choice of A or B
		!A	Server Accept
		?A	Client Request
		1	Unit for \otimes

Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

A, B	::=	$A \otimes B$	output A then behave as B
		A 28 B	Input A then behave as B
		$A \oplus B$	Select from A or B
		A & B	Offer choice of A or B
		!A	Server Accept
		?A	Client Request
		1	Unit for ⊗

Cut as Composition

$$(\mathsf{cut})rac{Pdash\Delta, x: A \quad Qdash\Delta', x: A^{\perp}}{oldsymbol{
u} x. (P \mid Q)dash\Delta, \Delta'}$$

. . .

Meanings of Propositions

CLL Propositions as Sessions

A, B	::=	$A \otimes B$	output A then behave as B
		A 28 B	Input A then behave as B
		$A \oplus B$	Select from A or B
		A & B	Offer choice of A or B
		!A	Server Accept
		?A	Client Request
		1	Unit for ⊗

Identity as Forwarding

. . .

$$(id)$$
 $\overline{x \leftrightarrow y \vdash x: A, y: A^{\perp}}$

Session Types and Linear Logic Reductions

Input and Output:

$$(\otimes)\frac{P\vdash \Delta_1, y: A \quad Q\vdash \Delta_2, x: B}{x[y].(P\mid Q)\vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2, x: A\otimes B}$$

Session Types and Linear Logic Reductions

Input and Output:

$$(\otimes)\frac{P\vdash\Delta_1, y:A\quad Q\vdash\Delta_2, x:B}{x[y].(P\mid Q)\vdash\Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A\otimes B} \quad (\mathfrak{V})\frac{P\vdash\Delta_3, y:A, x:B}{x(y).P\vdash\Delta_3, x:A\mathfrak{V}B}$$

Session Types and Linear Logic Reductions

Input and Output:

$$(\otimes)\frac{P\vdash\Delta_1, y:A\quad Q\vdash\Delta_2, x:B}{x[y].(P\mid Q)\vdash\Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A\otimes B} \quad (\Im)\frac{P\vdash\Delta_3, y:A, x:B}{x(y).P\vdash\Delta_3, x:A\Im B}$$

Communication as principal cut reductions:

$$\frac{P \vdash \Delta_1, y:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta_2, x:B}{x[y].(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A \otimes B} \quad \frac{R \vdash y:A^{\perp}, x:B^{\perp}}{x(y).R \vdash \Delta_3, x:A^{\perp} \Im B^{\perp}}$$
$$\frac{\nu x.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid x(y).R) \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3}{(x_1 \perp Q) \mid x(y).R \mid \Delta_2, \Delta_3}$$

Session Types and Linear Logic Reductions

Input and Output:

$$(\otimes)\frac{P\vdash\Delta_1, y:A\quad Q\vdash\Delta_2, x:B}{x[y].(P\mid Q)\vdash\Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A\otimes B} \quad (\Im)\frac{P\vdash\Delta_3, y:A, x:B}{x(y).P\vdash\Delta_3, x:A\Im B}$$

Communication as principal cut reductions:

$$\frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B}{x[y].(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, x:A \otimes B} \quad \frac{R \vdash y:A^{\perp}, x:B^{\perp}}{x(y).R \vdash \Delta_{3}, x:A^{\perp} \Im B^{\perp}}$$
$$\frac{\nu x.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid x(y).R) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}}{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A} \quad \frac{Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, y:A^{\perp}, x:B^{\perp}}{\nu x.(Q \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}, y:A^{\perp}}$$
$$\implies \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A \quad \frac{Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, y:A^{\perp}, x:B^{\perp}}{\nu y.(Q \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}, y:A^{\perp}}}{\nu y.(P \mid \nu x.(Q \mid R)) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}}$$

What about the other proof conversions?

$$(\operatorname{cut}) \frac{\stackrel{(\otimes)}{\underset{x[y].(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A \otimes B, z:C}{P \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2, x:A \otimes B, z:C}}{\underset{\nu z.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid R) \vdash \Delta_1, x:A \otimes B, \Delta_2, \Delta_3}{R \vdash \Delta_3, z:C^{\perp}}$$

What about the other proof conversions?

$$(\otimes) = \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B}{x[y].(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, x:A \otimes B, z:C} \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, z:C^{\perp} = \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:A \otimes B, z:C}{\nu z.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{1}, x:A \otimes B, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}} = (\otimes) \frac{(\operatorname{cut}) \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, z:C^{\perp}}{\nu z.(P \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{3}, y:A} \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B}{x[y].(\nu z.(P \mid R) \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_{1}, x:A \otimes B, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}}$$

=

What about the other proof conversions?

$$(\otimes)$$

$$(\operatorname{cut}) \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B}{x[y].(P \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, x:A \otimes B, z:C} \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, z:C^{\perp}$$

$$(\operatorname{cut}) \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, z:C^{\perp}}{\nu z.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{1}, x:A \otimes B, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}} \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B$$

$$\implies (\otimes) \frac{(\operatorname{cut}) \frac{P \vdash \Delta_{1}, y:A, z:C \quad R \vdash \Delta_{3}, z:C^{\perp}}{\nu z.(P \mid R) \vdash \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{3}, y:A} \quad Q \vdash \Delta_{2}, x:B}{x[y].(\nu z.(P \mid R) \mid Q) \vdash \Delta_{1}, x:A \otimes B, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}} \quad \nu z.(x[y].(P \mid Q) \mid R) \Longrightarrow x[y].(\nu z.(P \mid R) \mid Q) \quad \text{if } z \in fn(P)$$

Putting it all together

CP Reduction

- One CP reduction for every principal cut reduction (one per dual prop. pair).
- One CP reduction for each commutting conversion (2 for ⊗, 2 for ⊕, none for 0, one for the rest).



Putting it all together

CP Reduction

- One CP reduction for every principal cut reduction (one per dual prop. pair).
- One CP reduction for each commutting conversion (2 for ⊗, 2 for ⊕, none for 0, one for the rest).

Metatheorems

- If $P \vdash \Delta$ and $P \Longrightarrow Q$ then $Q \vdash \Delta$.
- ▶ If $P \vdash \Delta$ there exists Q such that $P \Longrightarrow^* Q$ and Q is not a cut.

Why does it matter?

- Safety/liveness properties "for free".
- A solid foundation to build on:
 - Encodings of λ-calculi into π-calculus / CP [Toninho et al.12,Wadler12,LindleyMorris15].
 - Value-dependent / refinement session types [Toninho11].
 - Multiparty sessions [Carbone et al.,15].
 - Dynamic monitoring [Jia et al.16]
 - "Better" designed languages [Wadler12, Toninho et al13]
 - ▶ ...

Why does it still matter?

- Curry-Howard iso. gave us Haskell, ML, ...
- Need a "real" language that puts this all together!

Why does it still matter?

- Curry-Howard iso. gave us Haskell, ML, ...
- Need a "real" language that puts this all together!
- A better approach to logic and multiparty sessions.

Why does it still matter?

- Curry-Howard iso. gave us Haskell, ML, ...
- Need a "real" language that puts this all together!
- A better approach to logic and multiparty sessions.
- True non-determinism?
- More π-calculus-like behaviours?

Why does it still matter?

- Curry-Howard iso. gave us Haskell, ML, ...
- Need a "real" language that puts this all together!
- A better approach to logic and multiparty sessions.
- True non-determinism?
- More π-calculus-like behaviours?
- Dependent types?
- etc. . .

The connections of linear logic and session types:

- Linear propositions as session types.
- Proofs as processes.
- Communication and proof conversion.

- The connections of linear logic and session types:
 - Linear propositions as session types.
 - Proofs as processes.
 - Communication and proof conversion.
- Logic gives us comm. safety / liveness for free.

- The connections of linear logic and session types:
 - Linear propositions as session types.
 - Proofs as processes.
 - Communication and proof conversion.
- Logic gives us comm. safety / liveness for free.
- ...but also a general and powerful framework to reason about concurrency!

- The connections of linear logic and session types:
 - Linear propositions as session types.
 - Proofs as processes.
 - Communication and proof conversion.
- Logic gives us comm. safety / liveness for free.
- ...but also a general and powerful framework to reason about concurrency!
- Only scratched the surface!

mrg.doc.ic.ac.uk 12/12

