

Linear Contextual Metaprogramming and Session Types

Pedro Ângelo

LIACC, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade do Porto, Portugal
LASIGE, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
pjangelo@ciencias.ulisboa.pt

Atsushi Igarashi

Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
igarashi@kuis.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Vasco T. Vasconcelos

LASIGE, Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
vmvasconcelos@ciencias.ulisboa.pt

We explore the integration of metaprogramming in a call-by-value linear lambda-calculus and sketch its extension to a session type system. We build on a model of contextual modal type theory with multi-level contexts, where contextual values, closing arbitrary terms over a series of variables, may then be boxed and transmitted in messages. Once received, one such value may then be unboxed (with a let-box construct) and locally applied before being run. We present a series of examples where servers prepare and ship code on demand via session typed messages.

1 Introduction

Metaprogramming manipulates code in order to generate and evaluate code at runtime, allowing in particular to explore the availability of certain arguments to functions in order to save computational effort. In this paper we are interested in programming languages where the code produced is typed by construction and where code may refer to a context providing types for the free variables, commonly known as contextual typing [8, 11, 12, 13]. On an orthogonal axis, session types have been advocated as a means to discipline concurrent computations, by accurately describing protocols for the channels used to exchange messages between processes [1, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17].

The integration of session types with metaprogramming allows to setup code-producing servers that run in parallel with the rest of the program and provide code on demand, exchanged on typed channels. Linearity is central to session types, but current metaprogramming models lack support for such a feature. We extend a simple model of contextual modal type theory (with monomorphic contexts) with support for linear types, to obtain a call-by-value linear lambda calculus with multi-level contexts. We then sketch how to extend this language with support for concurrency and session types.

Our development is based on Davies and Pfenning [4], where we use a box modality to distinguish generated code. We further allow code to refer to variables in a context, described by contextual types, along the lines of Nanevski et al. [13]. Mœbius [8] further adds to modal contextual type theory the provision for pattern matching on code, for generating polymorphic code, and for generating code that depends on other code fragments. We forgo the first two directions, and base our development on the last. We propose a multilevel contextual modal *linear* lambda calculus, where in particular the composition of code fragments avoids creating extraneous administrative redexes due to boxing and unboxing.

An alternative starting point would have been the Fitch- or Kripke-style formulation, providing for the Lisp quote/unquote, where typing contexts are viewed as stacks modeling the different stages of computation [11]. It seemed to us that the let-box approach would simplify the extension to the linear setting, and then to session types.

To motivate the problem let us start with the issue of generating code to send a fixed number of integers on a stream. The type of streams, as seen from the side of processes writing on the stream is as follows.

```
type Stream =  $\oplus$ {More: !Int.Stream, Done: Close}
```

The writer chooses between selecting More values or selecting Done. In the former case, the writer sends an integer value and “goes back to the beginning”; in the latter case the writer must close the channel. Function `sendFives` accepts an integer value and returns a code fragment that requires a Stream and, when executed, produces a unit value, written `[Stream ⊢ Unit]`. We proceed by pattern-matching on the parameter.

```
sendFives : Int → [Stream ⊢ Unit]
sendFives 0 = box (y. close (select Done y))
sendFives n = let box u = sendFives (n - 1)
               in box (x. u[send 5 (select More x)])
```

When all values have been sent in the stream (when n is 0), all it remains is to `select` Done and then close the channel. The `box` expression generates code under a variable environment (an evaluation context), in this case containing variable y alone, the channel endpoint. Otherwise, we recursively compute code to send $n-1$ values, unbox it storing the result in u , and then prepare code to send the n -th value. Expression `u[send 5 (select More x)]` (an applied variable) applies expression `send 5 (select More x)` of type Stream to u (a contextual value of type `(Stream ⊢ Unit)`) to obtain an expression of type Unit. If u is the contextual value y . `close (select Done y)`, then the explicit substitution evaluates to `close (select Done send 5 (select More x))`.

We may now compute and run code to send a fixed number of integer values.

```
send4Fives : Stream → Unit
send4Fives c = let box u = sendFives 4 in u[c]
```

Expression `sendFives 4` is a boxed code fragment of type `[Stream ⊢ Unit]`. Then, u is an (unboxed) code fragment of contextual type `(Stream ⊢ Unit)`. We provide the code fragment with an explicit substitution `[c]`. The whole `let` expression then amounts to running the code

```
close (select Done (send 5 (select More (... send 5 (select More c) ...))))
```

without calling function `sendFives` or using recursion in any other form.

The next example transmits code on channels. Imagine a server preparing code on behalf of clients. The server uses a channel to interact with its clients: it first receives a number n , then replies with code to send n fives, and finally waits for the channel to be closed. The type of the communication channel is as follows.

```
type Builder = ?Int.![Stream ⊢ Unit].Wait
```

The server receives n on a given channel and computes the code using a call to `sendFives`:

```
serveFives : Builder → Unit
serveFives c =
  let (n,c) = receive c in wait (send (sendFives n) c)
```

On the other end of the channel sits a client: it sends a number (4 in this case), receives the code (of type `[Stream ⊢ Unit]`), closes the channel and evaluates the code received.

```
sendFives' : Dual Builder → Stream → Unit
sendFives' c d =
```

```

let (code, c) = receive (send 4 c) in close c ;
let box u = code in u[d]

```

The **Dual** operator on session types provides a view of the other end of the channel. In this case, **Dual** Builder is the type $!Int.[Stream \vdash \mathbf{Unit}].\mathbf{Close}$, where $!$ is turned into $?$ and **Wait** is turned into **Close** (and conversely in both cases). Notice that code is a boxed code fragment of type $[Stream \vdash \mathbf{Unit}]$, hence u is the corresponding code fragment (of type $(Stream \vdash \mathbf{Unit})$) and $u[d]$ runs the code on channel d .

To complete the example we need a function for reading streams, a consumer of type **Dual** Stream \rightarrow **Unit**. Function `readInts` reads and discards all integer values on the stream and then waits for the stream to be closed.

```

readInts : Dual Stream  $\rightarrow$  Unit
readInts (Done c) = wait c
readInts (More c) = let (_, c) = receive c in readInts c

```


Finally, the main thread forks two threads—one running `serveFives`, the other to collect the integer values (`readInts`)—and continues with `sendFives'`. We take advantage of a primitive function, `forkWith` that expects a suspended computation (a thunk), creates a new channel, forks the thunk on one end of the channel, and returns the other end of the channel for further interaction.

```

main : Unit
main =
  let c = forkWith ( $\lambda\_ \rightarrow$  serveFives) in — c : Dual Builder
  let d = forkWith ( $\lambda\_ \rightarrow$  readInts) in — d : Stream
  sendFives' c d

```

The interaction among the three processes is depicted as follows



where the code produced by function `serveFives` and transmitted to `sendFives'` is

```

box (close (select Done (send 5 (select More (... (select More c)...))))))

```

In the rest of the paper we develop our system. In section 2 we introduce the call-by-value linear lambda calculus with multi-level contexts and in section 3 we sketch the extensions required to type and run the examples in this section. We conclude in section 4.

2 Linear staged metaprogramming

This section introduces the call-by-value linear lambda calculus with multi-level contexts.

Syntax Our language is defined over the syntactic categories of set of variables, x, y, z . We write \bar{X} for a sequence of objects $X_1 \cdots X_n$ with $n \geq 0$. The empty sequence (when $n = 0$) is denoted by ε .

Contextual type	τ	::=	$(\bar{\tau} \vdash T)$
Type	T, U	::=	$* \mid T \rightarrow T \mid \square \tau$
Contextual value	ρ, σ	::=	$\bar{x}.M$
Value	v	::=	$* \mid \lambda x.M \mid \text{box } \sigma$
Term	M, N	::=	$v \mid x[\bar{\sigma}] \mid \text{let } * = M \text{ in } M \mid MM \mid \text{let box } x = M \text{ in } M$
Level	k, m, n	$\in \mathbb{N}$	
Typing context	Γ, Δ	::=	$\varepsilon \mid \Gamma, x :^n \tau$

Types include the unit ($*$) linear type, the linear arrow type $T \rightarrow U$, and the linear boxed contextual type $\square \tau$. A contextual type τ of the form $(\bar{\tau} \vdash T)$ represents code of type T , parameterized on variables typed by a list of contextual types $\bar{\tau}$, called *contexts* [8, 11].

To objects of the form $\bar{x}.M$ we call *contextual values*. They denote code fragments M parameterized by the variables in sequence \bar{x} . The values in the language include $*$ (introducing type $*$), lambda abstraction (introducing the arrow type), and the box term (introducing the contextual modal type $\square \tau$). Terms include values, contextual term variables $x[\bar{\sigma}]$ applying contextual values $\bar{\sigma}$ to the code fragment described by x , the let $*$ (eliminating $*$), lambda application (eliminating the arrow type), and the let box term (eliminating the contextual modal type $\square \tau$).

When \bar{x} is the empty sequence we sometimes write M in place of the contextual value $\varepsilon.M$. Similarly, when $\bar{\sigma}$ is the empty sequence we sometimes write x instead of the contextual term variable $x[\varepsilon]$. Furthermore, in examples we write *Unit* in place of $*$, and $[\bar{\tau} \vdash T]$ in place of $\square(\bar{\tau} \vdash T)$.

The bindings in the language are the following. Variable x is bound in M (but not in N) in terms $\lambda x.M$ and $\text{let box } x = N \text{ in } M$. The set of bound and free variables in terms (free M) are defined accordingly. We follow the variable convention whereby terms that differ only in the names of the bound variables are interchangeable in all contexts [14].

Contexts for local and outer variables Typing contexts bind contextual types to variables; we annotate each entry with its level n . We assume that contexts contain no duplicate variables and write Γ, Δ for the context containing the entries in both Γ and Δ , provided they feature disjoint sets of variables.

We introduce two predicates on typing contexts. If $\Gamma = x_1 :^{k_1} \tau_1, \dots, x_m :^{k_m} \tau_m$, then $\Gamma^{<n}$ holds when n is greater than all the levels of the bindings in Γ (that is, k_1, \dots, k_m), and $\Gamma^{\geq n}$ holds when n is smaller or equal than all the levels in Γ . More precisely,

$$\Gamma^{<n} \text{ holds when } \max(0, k_1, \dots, k_m) < n \qquad \Gamma^{\geq n} \text{ holds when } m = 0 \text{ or } \min(k_1, \dots, k_m) \geq n$$

Intuitively, $\Gamma^{<n}$ denotes the local variables in a code fragment of level n , whereas $\Gamma^{\geq n}$ denotes the outer variables. Notice that there is no context Γ for which $\Gamma^{<0}$ (not even the empty context), meaning that code fragments start at level 1.

Substitution Substitution is that of the linear lambda calculus except for the fact that we use applied modal variables $x[\bar{\sigma}]$ rather than ordinary variables x . We denote by $[\sigma/x]M$ the term obtained by replac-

ing variable x by the contextual value σ in term M . We detail some illustrative cases.

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar{z}.M/x](x[\bar{\rho}]) &= [\bar{\rho}/\bar{z}]M \\ [\sigma/x](\text{let box } y = M \text{ in } N) &= \begin{cases} \text{let box } y = [\sigma/x]M \text{ in } N & \text{if } x \in \text{free } M \\ \text{let box } y = M \text{ in } [\sigma/x]N & \text{if } x \in \text{free } N \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Substitution on `let *` and on application is similar to `let box`. Substitution on the remaining type constructors is an homomorphism; for example $[\sigma/x](\text{box } (\bar{y}.M)) = \text{box } (\bar{y}.[\sigma/x]M)$. Substitution on applied variables, $[\bar{z}.M/x](y[\bar{\rho}])$, is defined only when x and y coincide and when \bar{z} and $\bar{\rho}$ are sequences of the same length (the variable convention ensures that the variables in \bar{z} are pairwise distinct and not free outside M , hence the substitution of the various variables in \bar{z} can be performed in sequence). Substitution in `let box` is defined only when $x \in \text{free } (MN)$; it is undefined when x is both free in M and in N . The typing system guarantees substitution is defined for all typable processes. Typing judgments are of the form $\Gamma \vdash M : T$ stating that term M has type T under typing context Γ ; the rules are introduced below.

Lemma 2.1 (Substitution principle).

$$\frac{\Gamma, x :^n \tau \vdash M : T \quad \Delta^{\geq n} \vdash \sigma : \tau}{\Gamma, \Delta^{\geq n} \vdash [\sigma/x]M : T} \text{ SUBS}$$

When the contextual term variable denotes a parameterless code fragment, we recover the conventional substitution principle in linear type systems. If we write $(\varepsilon \vdash T)$ simply as T , and the contextual value $\varepsilon.N$ as N , we have

$$\frac{\Gamma, x :^n (\varepsilon \vdash U) \vdash M : T \quad \Delta^{\geq n} \vdash \varepsilon.N : (\varepsilon \vdash U)}{\Gamma, \Delta^{\geq n} \vdash [\varepsilon.N/x]M : T} \quad \text{abbreviated to} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : U \vdash M : T \quad \Delta \vdash N : U}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash [N/x]M : T}$$

Evaluation Evaluation on terms is given by the relation $M \longrightarrow N$ defined by the axioms

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x.M)v &\longrightarrow [\varepsilon.v/x]M \\ \text{let } * = * \text{ in } M &\longrightarrow M \\ \text{let box } x = \text{box } \sigma \text{ in } M &\longrightarrow [\sigma/x]M \end{aligned}$$

compounded by the usual congruence rules of the call-by-value λ -calculus. We do not allow reduction inside a box term (a value) as we do not allow reduction under a λ (another value).

Typing contextual terms Contextual terms are closures of the form $\bar{x}.M$, closing term M over a sequence of variables \bar{x} . Such a contextual term is given a contextual type $(\bar{\tau} \vdash T)$ when M is of type T under the hypothesis that the variables in \bar{x} are of the types in $\bar{\tau}$.

$$\frac{\Gamma^{\geq n}, x :^k \tau^{\leq n} \vdash M : T}{\Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash \bar{x}.M : (\bar{\tau} \vdash T)} \text{ CTXT}$$

Intuitively, the free variables of M are split in two groups: local and outer. The local variables, \bar{x} , are distinguished in the contextual term $\bar{x}.M$ and typed under context $x :^k \tau^{\leq n}$ where n is an upper bound of the levels k_i assigned to each local variable. The level of each local variable is arbitrary, as long as it is lower than n . Outer variables are typed under context $\Gamma^{\geq n}$. Natural number n thus denotes the level at which the code fragment $\bar{x}.M$ is typed. In general, a contextual term σ can be typed at different levels. All resources (variables) in the context Γ in the conclusion are consumed in the premise; furthermore resources \bar{x} are consumed in the derivation of M (implying that they must be free in M).

Typing variables Variables are of the form $x[\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_m]$, denoting a contextual term applied to contextual values $\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_m$. To type each σ_i we need a separate context which we call Γ_i . The type of x must be a contextual type of the form $(\tau_1 \cdots \tau_m \vdash T)$ and each contextual term σ_i must be of type τ_i . We can easily see that all resources in the typing context in the conclusion are consumed: the various Γ_i are consumed in the premises, that for x is consumed at the right of the turnstile. This guarantees that all resources are used and thus that the rule includes no implicit form of weakening.

$$\frac{\overline{\Gamma \vdash \overline{\sigma} : \overline{\tau}}}{\overline{\Gamma, x : ^n (\overline{\tau} \vdash T) \vdash x[\overline{\sigma}] : T}} \text{VAR}$$

The lengths of all sequences, $\overline{\Gamma}$, $\overline{\sigma}$ and $\overline{\tau}$, must coincide. When the sequences are empty, the rule becomes an axiom. In fact rule VAR is the natural generalization of the axiom in the linear λ -calculus, obtained when writing type $(\varepsilon \vdash T)$ in the context as T , writing applied variable $x[\varepsilon]$ as x , and omitting the level of the variable in the context.

$$\frac{}{x : ^n (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash x[\varepsilon] : T} \quad \text{abbreviated to} \quad \frac{}{x : T \vdash x : T}$$

Typing λ abstraction and application We now address the conventional typing rules for the introduction and elimination of the arrow in the linear lambda calculus; the rules are below.

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : ^0 (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash M : U}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.M : T \rightarrow U} \rightarrow I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : T \rightarrow U \quad \Delta \vdash N : T}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash MN : U} \rightarrow E$$

The λ -bound variable x is local to M , hence of level 0.

Local soundness. Notice that $\Delta^{\geq 0}$ is true of all contexts Δ .

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma, x : ^0 (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash M : U}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.M : T \rightarrow U} \rightarrow I \quad \Delta \vdash v : T}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash (\lambda x.M)v : U} \rightarrow E \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : ^0 (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash M : U \quad \frac{\Delta \vdash v : T}{\Delta \vdash \varepsilon.v : (\varepsilon \vdash T)} \text{CTXT}}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash [\varepsilon.v/x]M : U} \text{SUBS}$$

Local completeness:

$$\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M : T \rightarrow U \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash M : T \rightarrow U \quad \frac{}{x : ^0 (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash x[\varepsilon] : T} \text{VAR}}{\Gamma, \Delta, x : ^0 (\varepsilon \vdash T) \vdash M(x[\varepsilon]) : U} \rightarrow E}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash \lambda x.M(x[\varepsilon]) : T \rightarrow U} \rightarrow I$$

Typing * introduction and elimination Rules:

$$\frac{}{\vdash * : *} \text{*I} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : * \quad \Delta \vdash N : T}{\Gamma, \Delta \vdash \text{let } * = M \text{ in } N : T} \text{*E}$$

Local soundness and local completeness:

$$\frac{}{\vdash * : *} \text{*I} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : T}{\vdash \text{let } * = * \text{ in } M : T} \text{*E} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Gamma \vdash M : T$$

Typing box introduction and elimination The box introduction and elimination rules are as follows.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \sigma : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \text{box } \sigma : \square\tau} \square\text{I} \quad \frac{\Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash M : \square\tau \quad \Delta, x : ^n \tau \vdash N : T}{\Gamma^{\geq n}, \Delta \vdash \text{let box } x = M \text{ in } N : T} \square\text{E}$$

In rule $\square\text{I}$, the type of the box is the contextual modal type $\square\tau$ if the contextual term σ has type τ . The context for the box elimination rule, $\square\text{E}$, is split into two: one part ($\Gamma^{\geq n}$) to type M , the other (Δ) to type N . Term M must denote a code fragment, hence the type of M must be a contextual modal type $\square\tau$. Term N is typed under context Δ extended with an entry for x . The context in the conclusion is formed by the juxtaposition of the contexts in the premises thus ensuring that all resources are fully consumed. The level n of variable x determines the level of code M . In contrast to preceding work [4, 8, 12], level control is shifted from box introduction to the rule that types contextual values. A rule derived from CTXT followed by $\square\text{I}$ coincides with the box introduction rule of Mœbius [8]:

$$\frac{\Gamma^{\geq n}, \overline{x : ^k \tau} < ^n \vdash M : T}{\Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash \text{box}(\bar{x}.M) : \square(\bar{\tau} \vdash T)}$$

Local soundness:

$$\frac{\frac{\Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash \sigma : \tau}{\Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash \text{box } \sigma : \square\tau} \square\text{I} \quad \Delta, x : ^n \tau \vdash M : T}{\Gamma^{\geq n}, \Delta \vdash \text{let box } x = \text{box } \sigma \text{ in } M : T} \square\text{E} \Rightarrow \frac{\Delta, x : ^n \tau \vdash M : T \quad \Gamma^{\geq n} \vdash \sigma : \tau}{\Gamma^{\geq n}, \Delta \vdash [\sigma/x]M : T} \text{SUBS}$$

Local completeness:

$$\Gamma^{\geq 2} \vdash M : \square\tau \Rightarrow \frac{\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{x_i : ^1 (\mathcal{E} \vdash U_i)} \vdash x_i[\mathcal{E}] : U_i}{x_i : ^1 (\mathcal{E} \vdash U_i) \vdash \mathcal{E}.x_i[\mathcal{E}] : (\mathcal{E} \vdash U_i)} \text{CTXT} \quad \text{VAR}}{\overline{u : ^2 \tau, x : ^1 (\mathcal{E} \vdash U)} \vdash u[\mathcal{E}.x[\mathcal{E}]] : T} \text{VAR}}{\overline{u : ^2 \tau \vdash \bar{x}.u[\mathcal{E}.x[\mathcal{E}]] : \tau} \text{CTXT}} \quad \square\text{I}}{\Gamma^{\geq 2} \vdash \text{let box } u = M \text{ in box}(\bar{x}.u[\mathcal{E}.x[\mathcal{E}]])) : \square\tau} \square\text{E}$$

where τ abbreviates $(\overline{(\mathcal{E} \vdash U)} \vdash T)$ and $\bar{U} = U_1 \cdots U_m$ and similarly for \bar{x} .

An example from Mœbius Concrete syntax apart, the β -reduction for box terms is that of Mœbius [8]. We adapt an example to make it linear.

```
let box r = box (y. y + 2) in
let box u = box (c, x. 3 * z + c[2 * x]) in
  box (y. u[y. r[y], y])
```

reduces to

```
let box u = box (c, x. 3 * z + c[2 * x]) in
  box (y. u[y. y + 2, y])
```

under substitution $[(y. y + 2) / r]$, which in turn reduces to

box ($y. 3 * z + 2 * y + 2$)

under substitution $[(c, x. 3 * z + c[2 * x]) / u]$, generating no administrative redexes. The original redex (or any contractum) has type $\square(\vdash \mathbf{Int})$ under typing context $z :^3 (\vdash \mathbf{Int})$, assuming suitable rules for integer constants and arithmetic operators. Contextual value $(y. y + 2)$, and hence also the contextual variable r , is typed at level 2. Contextual value $(c, x. 3 * z + c[2 * x])$, and hence also contextual variable u , is typed at level 2. Variable z can be typed at level 2.

3 From linear staged to session staged metaprogramming

This section briefly outlines what it takes to bridge the gap between the linear lambda calculus with multi-level contexts and the language required to type and run the examples in the introduction.

First and foremost, *session types* must be introduced in the syntax of types. In the absence of polymorphism, a new syntactic category S may be introduced for session types. Session types include input and output ($?T.S$ and $!T.S$), branch and select ($\&\{l : S_l\}^{l \in L}$ and $\oplus\{l : S_l\}^{l \in L}$), and channel closing (Wait and Close), where l denotes a label and L a label set. In addition, and in order to express the Stream type in the example, we need recursive types. They are usually introduced in the form of a μ (or *rec*) constructor and type references (sometimes called type variables), and treated equi- recursively. Session types then become an extra constructor for types T [7, 17]. For a more ambitious setting one may consider the sequential composition of types $(R; S)$ and continuation-less input and output ($?T$ and $!T$) as in context-free session types [1, 16].

At the level of *terms*, we require a few session-related primitives. We need constants to receive, to send, to select a choice, to wait for a channel to be closed and to close a channel. These can be given type schemes. For example, the type of constant *send* can be given by a type of the form $T \rightarrow !T.S \rightarrow S$, a function receiving a value to be sent and a channel on which to send the value, and returning the channel on which to continue interaction. We further need a constant to fork a new thread whose type can be given by type $(* \rightarrow *) \rightarrow *$, accepting a thunk and giving back a unit value. Branching (achieved by pattern-matching in the examples) cannot be given by a constant. We then add a new term constructor *match* M with $\{l : M_l\}^{l \in L}$. Finally we need a primitive to create a new channel, usually of the form $\text{new } S$, returning the two end points of the newly created channel. Both the primitive receive operation and channel creation $\text{new } S$ return a pair; we then need *linear* pairs of type $T \times U$, with introduction (M, N) and elimination $\text{let } (x, y) = M \text{ in } N$ terms. Details can be found in Gay and Vasconcelos [5].

The description so far produces a *linear* session typed language. In particular we cannot take advantage of recursive types for there is no support for consuming such a type. Recursive functions are the usual means of consuming recursive types, a Stream for example, but they constitute the finished example of non-linear resources. A simple way out is to annotate entries in the typing context with the number of times a resource can be used, along the lines of Linear Haskell [3] or Quantitative Type Theory [2, 9] (also used in Nominal Session Types [10]). An alternative would be to introduce shared resources, functions in particular, in the linear type system [5].

The fork operator creates a new thread. Yet the term language depicted so far features no support for threads running concurrently. This is usually achieved by introducing a separate language for *processes*, denoted by P, Q . The basic processes are terms, for example of the form $\langle M \rangle$, composed by means of the parallel composition of two processes, $P \mid Q$, and of scope restriction, $(\nu xy)P$, describing the two end points x and y of a channel circumscribed to process P . Processes come equipped with a notion of reduction, featuring axioms for output-input, select-branch, and close-wait interactions, complemented

with suitable congruence rules. For example, the axiom, for output-input might be as follows,

$$(\nu xy)(\langle E[\text{send } \nu x] \rangle \mid \langle F[\text{receive } y] \rangle) \rightarrow (\nu xy)(\langle E[x] \rangle \mid \langle F[(\nu, y)] \rangle)$$

where the $\text{send } \nu x$ term in evaluation context E is rewritten in channel x (so that term $E[x]$ may continue interaction on x) and the $\text{receive } y$ term in evaluation context F is rewritten in a pair featuring the value received ν and the continuation channel y (so that term $F[(\nu, y)]$ may use the value ν in the message while continuing the interaction on y). Details can be found in different sources [1, 5].

4 Conclusion and future work

We show how to integrate staged metaprogramming into a linear lambda calculus and sketch how to extend the language to concurrency and session types. The type system we propose is deliberately non-algorithmic. We believe that standard techniques—including an explicitly typed and level-annotated syntax [8] and having the typing rules “return” the unused part of the context [18]—would lead to algorithmic type checking.

Acknowledgements This work was partly supported by JSPS Invitational Short-Term Fellowships for Research in Japan. It was further supported by the FCT through project Safe-Sessions (doi: 10.54499/PTDC/CCI-COM/6453/2020), by the LASIGE Research Unit (doi: 10.54499/UIDB/00408/2020 and doi: 10.54499/UIBP/00408/2020), and by the LIACC Research Unit (doi: 10.54499/UIDB/00027/2020 and doi: 10.54499/UIBP/00027/2020),

References

- [1] Bernardo Almeida, Andreia Mordido, Peter Thiemann & Vasco T. Vasconcelos (2022): *Polymorphic lambda calculus with context-free session types*. *Inf. Comput.* 289(Part), p. 104948, doi:10.1016/J.IC.2022.104948.
- [2] Robert Atkey (2018): *Syntax and Semantics of Quantitative Type Theory*. In: *LICS*, ACM, pp. 56–65, doi:10.1145/3209108.3209189.
- [3] Jean-Philippe Bernardy, Mathieu Boespflug, Ryan R. Newton, Simon Peyton Jones & Arnaud Spiwack (2018): *Linear Haskell: practical linearity in a higher-order polymorphic language*. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 2(POPL), pp. 5:1–5:29, doi:10.1145/3158093.
- [4] Rowan Davies & Frank Pfenning (2001): *A modal analysis of staged computation*. *J. ACM* 48(3), pp. 555–604, doi:10.1145/382780.382785.
- [5] Simon J. Gay & Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos (2010): *Linear type theory for asynchronous session types*. *J. Funct. Program.* 20(1), pp. 19–50, doi:10.1017/S0956796809990268.
- [6] Kohei Honda (1993): *Types for Dyadic Interaction*. In: *CONCUR, LNCS 715*, Springer, pp. 509–523, doi:10.1007/3-540-57208-2_35.
- [7] Kohei Honda, Vasco Thudichum Vasconcelos & Makoto Kubo (1998): *Language Primitives and Type Discipline for Structured Communication-Based Programming*. In: *ESOP, LNCS 1381*, Springer, pp. 122–138, doi:10.1007/BFb0053567.
- [8] Junyoung Jang, Samuel Gélineau, Stefan Monnier & Brigitte Pientka (2022): *Mæbius: metaprogramming using contextual types: the stage where system F can pattern match on itself*. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 6(POPL), pp. 1–27, doi:10.1145/3498700.

- [9] Conor McBride (2016): *I Got Plenty o' Nuttin'*. In: *A List of Successes That Can Change the World - Essays Dedicated to Philip Wadler on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 9600*, Springer, pp. 207–233, doi:10.1007/978-3-319-30936-1_12.
- [10] Andreia Mordido, Janek Spaderna, Peter Thiemann & Vasco T. Vasconcelos (2023): *Parameterized Algebraic Protocols*. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7(PLDI), pp. 1389–1413, doi:10.1145/3591277.
- [11] Yuito Murase, Yuichi Nishiwaki & Atsushi Igarashi (2023): *Contextual Modal Type Theory with Polymorphic Contexts*. In: *ESOP, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 13990*, Springer, pp. 281–308, doi:10.1007/978-3-031-30044-8_11.
- [12] Aleksandar Nanevski & Frank Pfenning (2005): *Staged computation with names and necessity*. *J. Funct. Program.* 15(5), pp. 893–939, doi:10.1017/S095679680500568X.
- [13] Aleksandar Nanevski, Frank Pfenning & Brigitte Pientka (2008): *Contextual modal type theory*. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 9(3), pp. 23:1–23:49, doi:10.1145/1352582.1352591.
- [14] Benjamin C. Pierce (2002): *Types and programming languages*. MIT Press.
- [15] Kaku Takeuchi, Kohei Honda & Makoto Kubo (1994): *An Interaction-based Language and its Typing System*. In: *PARLE, LNCS 817*, Springer, pp. 398–413, doi:10.1007/3-540-58184-7_118.
- [16] Peter Thiemann & Vasco T. Vasconcelos (2016): *Context-free session types*. In: *ICFP, ACM*, pp. 462–475, doi:10.1145/2951913.2951926.
- [17] Vasco T. Vasconcelos (2012): *Fundamentals of session types*. *Inf. Comput.* 217, pp. 52–70, doi:10.1016/J.IC.2012.05.002.
- [18] David Walker (2005): *Advanced Topics in Types and Programming Languages*, chapter Substructural Type Systems, pp. 3–44. The MIT Press.