Git: A Case Study in System and Data-Structure Design

• Git is a distributed version-control system, apparently the most popular of these currently.

• Conceptually, it stores snapshots (versions) of the files and directory structure of a project, keeping track of their relationships, authors, dates, and log messages.

• It is distributed, in that there can be many copies of a given repository, each supporting independent development, with machinery to transmit and reconcile versions between repositories.

• Its operation is extremely fast (as these things go).
A Little History

- Developed by Linus Torvalds and others in the Linux community when the developer of their previous, proprietary VCS (Bitkeeper) withdrew the free version.

- Initial implementation effort seems to have taken about 2-3 months, in time for the 2.6.12 Linux kernel release in June, 2005.

- As for the name, according to Wikipedia,
  
  Torvalds has quipped about the name Git, which is British English slang meaning “unpleasant person”. Torvalds said: “I’m an egotistical bastard, and I name all my projects after myself. First ‘Linux’, now ‘git’.” The man page describes Git as “the stupid content tracker.”

- Initially, was a collection of basic primitives (now called “plumbing”) that could be scripted to provide desired functionality.

- Then, higher-level commands (“porcelain”) built on top of these to provide a convenient user interface.
Major User-Level Features (I)

• Abstraction is of a graph of versions or snapshots (called *commits*) of a complete project.

• The graph structure reflects ancestry: which versions came from which.

• Each commit contains
  - A directory tree of files (like a Unix directory).
  - Information about who committed and when.
  - Log message.
  - Pointers to commit (or commits, if there was a merge) from which the commit was derived.
Conceptual Structure

- Main internal components consist of four types of object:
  - **Blobs**: basically hold contents of files.
  - **Trees**: directory structures of files.
  - **Commits**: Contain references to trees and additional information (committer, date, log message).
  - **Tags**: References to commits or other objects, with additional information, intended to identify releases, other important versions, or various useful information. (Won't mention further today).
Commits, Trees, Files
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Major User-Level Features (II)

- Each commit has a name that uniquely identifies it to all versions.
- Repositories can transmit collections of versions to each other.
- Transmitting a commit from repository $A$ to repository $B$ requires only the transmission of those objects (files or directory trees) that $B$ does not yet have (allowing speedy updating of repositories).
- Repositories maintain named \textit{branches}, which are simply identifiers of particular commits that are updated to keep track of the most recent commits in various lines of development.
- Likewise, \textit{tags} are essentially named pointers to particular commits. Differ from branches in that they are not usually changed.
Internals

- Each Git repository is contained in a directory.
- Repository may either be *bare* (just a collection of objects and metadata), or may be included as part of a working directory.
- The data of the repository is stored in various *objects* corresponding to files (or other “leaf” content), trees, and commits.
- To save space, data in files is *compressed*.
- Git can *garbage-collect* the objects from time to time to save additional space.
The Pointer Problem

- Objects in Git are files. How should we represent pointers between them?

- Want to be able to transmit objects from one repository to another with different contents. How do you transmit the pointers?

- Only want to transfer those objects that are missing in the target repository. How do we know which those are?

- Could use a counter in each repository to give each object there a unique name. But how can that work consistently for two independent repositories?
Content-Addressable File System

• Could use some way of naming objects that is universal.
• We use the names, then, as pointers.
• Solves the “Which objects don’t you have?” problem in an obvious way.
• Conceptually, what is invariant about an object, regardless of repository, is its contents.
• But can’t use the contents as the name for obvious reasons.
• **Idea:** Use a hash of the contents as the address.
• **Problem:** That doesn’t work!
• **Brilliant Idea:** Use it anyway!!
How A Broken Idea Can Work

- The idea is to use a hash function that is so unlikely to have a collision that we can ignore that possibility.
- Cryptographic Hash Functions have relevant property.
- Such a function, $f$, is designed to withstand cryptoanalytic attacks. In particular, should have
  - **Pre-image resistance**: given $h = f(m)$, should be computationally infeasible to find such a message $m$.
  - **Second pre-image resistance**: given message $m_1$, should be infeasible to find $m_2 \neq m_1$ such that $f(m_1) = f(m_2)$.
  - **Collision resistance**: should be difficult to find any two messages $m_1 \neq m_2$ such that $f(m_1) = f(m_2)$.
- With these properties, scheme of using hash of contents as name is extremely unlikely to fail, even when system is used maliciously.
SHA1

- Git uses **SHA1** (Secure Hash Function 1).
- Can play around with this using the `hashlib` module in Python3.
- All object names in Git are therefore 160-bit hash codes of contents, in hex.
- E.g. a recent commit in the shared CS61B repository could be fetched (if needed) with

  ```
git checkout e59849201956766218a3ad6ee1c3aab37dfec3fe
  ```