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What is version control?

- One or more coauthors edit a tree of documents concurrently
- Asynchronous edits: coauthors can choose when they want to “sync” or “merge”
- Edits may conflict
- Review a project’s history
A solved problem?

Our tools (Git, Hg, SVN, CVS...):

▶ Aren’t used by non-coders, despite their maturity (30 years+)

▶ Are distributed, yet most of the time used with a global central server:
  All paths may not lead to Chrome, but can the same be said for GitHub?

▶ Require strong work discipline and planning

▶ Waste significant human worktime at a global scale

Improvements have been proposed (Darcs) but don’t really scale.
Is there a quick fix?

- Leaky abstractions: if Merkle trees are the core mechanism, they can’t be hidden from the user.¹

- Strict ordering of snapshots is the main feature, yet the most used Git commands (rebase, rerere, cherry-pick...) are “fixes” around that “feature”.

¹Credit: Raphaël Gomès, Mercurial core team
Some symptoms that it may not be a solved problem

- Inflation of commands and options: https://git-man-page-generator.lokaltog.net
- Inflation of UIs: even “big tech” is now investing in Git/Mercurial UIs.
- Inflation of forges: how many started in the last year alone? (vs how many text editors? window managers?)
Our demands

- **Associative merges:**
  
  *Changes A and B together are the same as A, followed by B.*

- **Commutative merges:**

  *If A and B can be produced independently, their order does not matter.*

- **Branches (or maybe not: more on that later)**

- **Low algorithmic complexity, and ideally fast implementations**
Associative merges, a.k.a “one-by-one review”
So you think you know Git merge?

3-way merge (Git, Hg, SVN, CVS...) is not associative
Workflow: review your PRs, then merge and then review them again
Commutative merges

Git and SVN are never commutative, why would we want this?

- *Unapplying* old changes, even after others have been applied.
- *Cherry-picking*.
- *Partial clones*: pull the patches related to a subproject, or merge repos transparently.
States vs changes

- Git, Hg, SVN, CVS... store *states*, and compute *changes* when needed (3-way merge).

- What if we did the *opposite*?

- What if we stored *both*?
A change-based idea: Operational Transforms

\[
\begin{align*}
T_1 &= \text{ins}(0, \text{"x")}\ \\
T_2 &= \text{del}(2, \text{"c")}\ \\
T_2' &= \text{del}(3, \text{"c")}
\end{align*}
\]

- **Darcs** does this, and uses it to detect conflicts
- Quadratic explosion of cases
- A nightmare to implement
A hybrid (state/change) approach: CRDTs

- General principle: design a structure where all operations have the properties we want
- Natural examples: increment-only counters, insert-only sets...
- More subtle: tombstones, Lamport clocks...
- Useless: a full Git repository (not just HEAD)
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Conflicts

- Where we need a good tool the most
- The exact definition depends on the tool
- *Example:* Alice and Bob write to the same file at the same place
- *Example:* Alice renames a file from $f$ to $g$ while Bob renames $f$ to $h$
- *Example:* Alice renames a function $f$ while Bob adds a call to $f$
Using category theory

For any two patches $f$ and $g$, we want a unique state $P$ such that:

$\forall$ states $Q$ accessible by Alice and Bob after $f$ and $g$, respectively, there is a patch from $P$ to $Q$.

If $P$ exists, we call $P$ the pushout of $f$ and $g$.

Started by Samuel Mimram and Cinzia Di Giusto
Using category theory

For any two patches $f$ and $g$, we want a unique state $P$ such that:
For any state $Q$ accessible by Alice and Bob after $f$ and $g$, respectively

\[
\begin{align*}
X & \xrightarrow{f} Y \\
g & \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
Z & \xrightarrow{P} Q
\end{align*}
\]

If $P$ exists, we call $P$ the pushout of $f$ and $g$.

 Started by Samuel Mimram and Cinzia Di Giusto
Using category theory

For any two patches $f$ and $g$, we want a unique state $P$ such that:
For any state $Q$ accessible by Alice and Bob after $f$ and $g$, respectively
There is a patch from $P$ to $Q$.

If $P$ exists, we call $P$ the pushout of $f$ and $g$.

Started by Samuel Mimram and Cinzia Di Giusto
Problem: the pushout doesn’t always exist

- Equivalent to saying that conflicts happen.
- How to generalise the representation of states \((X, Y, Z)\) so that all pairs of changes \((f, g)\) have a pushout?

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\
\downarrow{g} & & \downarrow \\
Z & \rightarrow & P
\end{array}
\]

**Solution:** States are directed graphs, where:

- Vertices are bytes (or byte intervals).
- Edges represent the union of all known orders between bytes.
Adding some bytes

- Vertices are labelled by a change number $c_0$ and an interval (such as $[0, n]$) in that change.
- Edges are labelled by the change that introduced them.

Here, $c_1$ adds $m$ bytes between positions $i - 1$ and $i$ of $c_0$: 

![Diagram showing vertices and edges labeled with change numbers and intervals]
Deleting bytes

Deleting bytes \( j \) to \( i \) from \( c_0 \), and 0 to \( k \) from \( c_1 \):
That’s all we need!

Two kinds of changes:

- Add a vertex, in a context (parents and children)
- Change an edge’s label
Our definition of conflicts

- *Alive* vertices are vertices whose incoming edges are all alive.
- *Dead* vertices are vertices whose incoming edges are all dead.
- Other vertices are called *zombies.*

A graph has *no conflict* if and only if it has no zombie and all its alive vertices are totally ordered.
Notes

- Changes are partially ordered by their dependencies on other changes.
- Cherry-picking is the same as applying a patch.
- No `git rerere`: conflicts are solved by changes, which can be cherry-picked.
- Partial clones/monorepos/submodules: easy as long as “wide” patches are disallowed.
- Large files: the description of operations (insertions/deletions) is not even stored in the graph.
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Working with large graphs on disk

- We can’t load the entire graph each time.
- Store edges in a key-value store.
- Transactions: passive crash-safety.
- Branches: efficiently forkable store.
Introducing *Sanakirja*, an on-disk transactional KV store

- ACID block allocator in a file
- Crash-safety using referential transparency and copy-on-write.
- Forkable in $O(\log n)$, where $n$ is the total size.
- Written in Rust, allowing direct pointers to generic types stored in the file.
- Generic underlying storage layer: we’ve used it on memory-mapped files, zstd-compressed files, Cloudflare KV...
- But: tricky API, conflicting with most aspects of the Rust memory model (not completely avoidable).
Sanakirja is the fastest we’ve tested

- Performance of retrieval (get) and insertion (put) into a B tree.
- Not specific to Pijul.
Sanakirja is the fastest we’ve tested

- Performance of retrieval (get) and insertion (put) into a B tree.
- Not specific to Pijul.
Modular databases

- Sanakirja is actually just a transactional block allocator with reference-counting included.

- I have built on-disk R trees, Patricia trees (text search!), Ropes.

- Composite types: Pijul stores branches as (roughly) a $\text{BTree<String, BTree<Vertex, Edge>>}$. I have a prototype text editor with forkable files, its type is $\text{BTree<String, (Rope, BTree<Vertex, Edge>>)}>$. 

Interested in datastructures and performance challenges? Join us!
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Things we get for free

- Superfast pijul credit\(^2\): info readily available in the graph
- Have your bugfixes on your main branch.
- Submodules for free: changes on unrelated projects are commutative!
- Signing + identity: your identity is your public key. Patches signed by default, identity (email/name/…) changes for free.
- Free cherry-picking: just apply that patch, no need to change its identity.
- Almost free scalability, no Rube Goldberg machine needed.

\(^2\)Stop blaming your coauthors!
Commutative state identifiers

- We want to check repo states equality, even with different orders.
- We want to compute each state identifier in constant time from the previous state id and a patch.
- We want states to be hard to forge.

Solution: **discrete log on elliptic curves!**

Turn each patch identity $h$ into an integer, and have the state with patches $h_0, h_1, \ldots, h_n$ be identified by $e^{h_0 \cdot h_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot h_n}$. 

Towards a hybrid state/patch system

- In Git/SVN/CVS/Hg, commits are *states*, not changes, even though patches can be applied and recomputed.

- Darcs only has changes, and recomputes states as needed.

- Pijul has both: a data structure modelling the current state, but it was found from the patches and is therefore completely transparent.
Towards a hybrid state/patch system: ongoing projects

- **Lightweight tags** to add super fast history browsing, while retaining all the good properties of patches.

  Current tags: Sanakirja, but using a compressed file as a backend rather than the raw disk.

- **Patch groups**, i.e. keywords to describe features, allowing patches on the same branch to be handled (pushed) independently, even when interspersed with others.

- **Cues** to avoid half-merged states when merging a series of patches.
Help us!

- This is currently a large project with a small team, but proper maths can make that work.
- Bootstrapped (used for itself) since 2017.
- Documentation, accessibility, UI, bikeshedding...
- “Good first bugs” tags on nest.pijul.com/pijul/pijul to get acquainted with our codebase.
- https://pijul.zulipchat.com
Conclusion

- Open Source version control based on algorithms and theorems.
- Scalable to monorepos and large files.
- Potentially usable by non-coders: parliaments, artists, lawyers, Sonic Pi composers, LEGO builders…
- Repo hosting service available: nest.pijul.com

Acknowledgements: Florent Becker, Tankf33der, Rohan Hart, Chris Bailey, Angus Finch…