

# How To Write Shared Libraries

Ulrich Drepper  
Red Hat, Inc.  
drepper@redhat.com

December 1, 2002

## Abstract

Today, shared libraries are ubiquitous. Developers use them for multiple reasons and create them just as they would create application code. This is a problem, though, since on many platforms some additional techniques must be applied even to generate decent code. Even more knowledge is needed to generate optimized code. This paper introduces the required rules and techniques. In addition, it introduces the concept of ABI (Application Binary Interface) stability and shows how to manage it.

## 1 Preface

For a long time, programmers collected commonly used code in libraries so that code could be reused. This saves development time and reduces errors since reused code only has to be debugged once. With systems running dozens or hundreds of processes at the same time reuse of the code at link-time solves only part of the problem. Many processes will use the same pieces of code which they import for libraries. With the memory management systems in modern operating systems it is also possible to share the code at run-time. This is done by loading the code into physical memory only once and reusing it in multiple processes via virtual memory. Libraries of this kind are called shared libraries.

The concept is not very new. Operating system designers implemented extensions to their system using the infrastructure they used before. The extension to the OS could be done transparently for the user. But the parts the user directly has to deal with created initially problems.

The main aspect is the binary format. This is the format which is used to describe the application code. Long gone are the days that it was sufficient to provide a memory dump. Multi-process systems need to identify different parts of the file containing the program such as the text, data, and debug information parts. For this, binary formats were introduced early on. Commonly used in the early Unix-days were formats such as `a.out` or COFF. These binary formats were not designed with shared libraries in mind and this clearly shows.

### 1.1 A Little Bit of History

The binary format used initially for Linux was an `a.out` variant. When introducing shared libraries certain design

decisions had to be made to work in the limitations of `a.out`. The main accepted limitation was that no *relocations* are performed at the time of loading and afterward. The shared libraries have to exist in the form they are used at run-time on disk. This imposes a major restriction on the way shared libraries are built and used: every shared library must have a fixed load address; otherwise it would not be possible to generate shared libraries which do not have to be relocated.

The fixed load addresses had to be assigned and this has to happen without overlaps and conflicts and with some future safety by allowing growth of the shared library. It is therefore necessary to have a central authority for the assignment of addresses which in itself is a major problem. But it gets worse: given a Linux system of today with many hundred of DSOs (Dynamic Shared Objects) the address space and the virtual memory available to the application gets severely fragmented. It would even have happened by today that the assignment authority ran out of addresses to assign, at least on 32-bit machines.

We still have not covered all the drawbacks of the `a.out` shared libraries. Since the applications using shared libraries should not have to be relinked after changing a shared library it uses, the entry points, i.e., the function addresses, must not change. This can only be guaranteed if the entry points are kept separate from the actual code. A table of function stubs which call the actual implementation was used in the Linux-solution. The static linker would get the address of each function stub from a special file (with the filename extension `.sa`). At run-time a file ending in `.so.X.Y.Z` was used and it had to correspond to the used `.sa` file. This in turn requires that an allocated entry in the stub table always had to be used for the same function. The allocation of the table had to be carefully taken care of. Introducing a new interface meant appending to the table. It was never possible to retire a table entry. To avoid using an old shared library

---

with a program linked with a newer version, some record had to be kept in the application: the  $X$  and  $Y$  parts of the name of the `.so.X.Y.Z` suffix was recorded and the dynamic linker made sure minimum requirements were met.

The benefits of the scheme are that the resulting program runs very fast. Calling a function in such a shared libraries is very efficient. It can be implemented with only two absolute jumps: the first from the user code to the stub, and the second from the stub to the actual code of the function. This is probably faster than any other shared library implementation, but its speed comes at too high a price:

1. a central assignment of address ranges is needed
2. collisions are possible (likely) with catastrophic results
3. the address space gets severely fragmented

For all these reasons and more, Linux converted early on to using ELF (Executable Linkage Format) as the binary format. The ELF format is defined by the generic specification (gABI) to which processor-specific extensions (psABI) are added.

## 1.2 The Move To ELF

For programmers the main advantage of the switch to ELF was that creating ELF shared libraries, or in ELF-speak Dynamic Shared Objects (DSOs), becomes very easy. The only difference between generating an application and a DSO is in the final link command line. One additional option (`--shared` in the case of GNU ld) tells the linker to generate a DSO instead of an application, the latter being the default. In fact, DSOs are nothing but a special kind of binary; the difference is that they have no fixed load address and will require the dynamic linker to actually become executable.

This, together with the introduction of GNU Libtool which will be described later, lead to the wide adoption of DSOs by programmers. Proper use of DSOs can help save large amounts of resources. But some rules must be followed to get any benefits, and some more rules have to be followed to get optimal results. Explaining these rules will be the topic of a large portion of this paper.

Not all uses of DSOs are for the purpose of saving resources. DSOs are today also often used as a way to structure programs. Different parts of the program are put into separate DSOs. This can be a very powerful tool, especially in the development phase. Instead of relinking the entire program it is only necessary to relink the DSO(s) which changed. This is often much faster.

Some projects decide to keep many separate DSOs even in the deployment phase even though the DSOs are not reused in other programs. In many situations it is certainly a useful thing to do: DSOs can be updated individually, reducing the amount of data which has to be transported. But the number of DSOs must be kept to a reasonable level. Not all programs do this, though, and we will see later on why this can be a problem.

Before we can start discussing all this some understanding of ELF and its implementation is needed.

## 1.3 How Is ELF Implemented?

The handling of a statically linked application is very simple. Such an application has a fixed load address which the kernel knows. The load process consists simply of making the binary available in the appropriate address space of a newly created process and transferring control to the entry point of the application. Everything else was done by the static linker when creating the executable.

Dynamically linked binaries, in contrast, are not complete when they are loaded from disk. It is therefore not possible for the kernel to immediately transfer control to the application. Instead some other helper program, which obviously has to be complete, is loaded as well. This helper program is the *dynamic linker*. The task of the dynamic linker is it to complete the dynamically linked application by loading the DSOs it needs (the dependencies) and to perform the relocations. Then finally control can be transferred to the program.

This is not the last task for the dynamic linker in most cases, though. ELF allows the relocations associated with a symbol to be delayed until the symbol is needed. This lazy relocation scheme is optional and optimizations discussed below for relocations performed at startup immediately effect the lazy relocations as well. So we ignore in the following everything after the startup is finished.

## 1.4 Startup: In The Kernel

Starting execution of a program starts in the kernel, normally in the `execve` system call. The currently executed code is replaced with a new program. This means the address space content is replaced by the content of the file containing the program. This does not happen by simply mapping (using `mmap`) the content of the file. ELF files are structured and there are normally at least three different kinds of regions in the file:

- Code which is executed; this region is normally not writable;

<pre> typedef struct {     Elf32_Word p_type;     Elf32_Off  p_offset;     Elf32_Addr p_vaddr;     Elf32_Addr p_paddr;     Elf32_Word p_filesz;     Elf32_Word p_memsz;     Elf32_Word p_flags;     Elf32_Word p_align; } Elf32_Phdr; </pre>	<pre> typedef struct {     Elf64_Word p_type;     Elf64_Word p_flags;     Elf64_Off  p_offset;     Elf64_Addr p_vaddr;     Elf64_Addr p_paddr;     Elf64_Xword p_filesz;     Elf64_Xword p_memsz;     Elf64_Xword p_align; } Elf64_Phdr; </pre>
--	---

Figure 1: ELF Program Header C Data Structure

- Data which is modified; this region is normally not executable;
- Data which is not used at run-time; since not needed it should not be loaded at startup.

Modern operating systems can protect memory regions to allow and disallow reading, writing, and executing separately for each page of memory.<sup>1</sup> It is preferable to mark as many pages as possible not writable since this means that the pages can be shared between processes which use the same application or DSO the page is from.

The kernel finds the different regions, or segments in ELF-speak, and their access permissions the ELF file format defines a table which contains just this information, among other things. The ELF Program Header is represented by the C types `Elf32_Phdr` and `Elf64_Phdr` which are defined as can be seen in figure 1.

To locate the program header data structure another data structure is needed, the ELF Header. The ELF header is the only data structure which has a fixed place in the file, starting at offset zero. Its C data structure can be seen in figure 2. The `e_phoff` field specifies where, counted from the beginning of the file, the program header table starts. The `e_phnum` field contains the number of entries in the program header table and the `e_phentsize` field contains the size of each entry. This last value is at run-time only really useful as consistency check for the binary.

To locate the segments the kernel looks through the `e_phnum` program header entries and handles those with `PT_LOAD` in the `p_type` field. The `p_offset` and `p_filesz` fields specify where in the file the segment starts and how long it is. The `p_vaddr` and `p_memsz` fields specifies where the segment is located in the the process' virtual address space and how large the memory region is. The size in the file can be smaller than in memory. The first `p_filesz` bytes of the memory region are initialized from the data in the file, the difference is initialized with zero. This can

<sup>1</sup>A memory page is the smallest entity the memory subsystem of the OS operates on. The size of a page can vary between different architectures and even within systems using the same architecture.

be used to handle BSS sections<sup>2</sup>, sections for uninitialized variables which are according to the C standard initialized with zero. Handling uninitialized variables this way has the advantage that the file size can be reduced since no initialization value has to be stored.

The `p_flags` finally tells the kernel what permissions to use for the memory pages. This field is a bitmap with the bits given in the following table being defined. The flags are directly mapped to the flags `mmap` understands.

<code>p_flags</code>	Value	<code>mmap</code> flag	Description
<code>PF_X</code>	1	<code>PROT_EXEC</code>	Execute Permission
<code>PF_W</code>	2	<code>PROT_WRITE</code>	Write Permission
<code>PF_R</code>	4	<code>PROT_READ</code>	Read Permission

After mapping all the `PT_LOAD` segments using the appropriate permissions and the specified address, or after freely allocating an address for dynamic objects which have no fixed load address, the next phase can start. The virtual address space of the dynamically linked executable itself is set up. But the binary is not complete. The kernel has to get the dynamic linker to do the rest and for this it has to be loaded in the same way as the executable itself (i.e., look for the loadable segments in the program header). The difference is that the dynamic linker itself must be complete.

Which binary implements the dynamic linker is not hardcoded in the kernel. Instead the program header of the application contains an entry with the tag `PT_INTERP`. The `p_offset` field of this entry contains the offset of a NUL-terminated string which specifies the file name of this file. The only requirement on the named file is that its load address does not conflict with the load address of any possible executable it might be used with. In general this means that the dynamic linker has no fixed load address and can be loaded anywhere; this is just what dynamic binaries allow.

<sup>2</sup>A BSS section contains only NUL bytes. Therefore they do not have to be represented in the file on the storage medium. The loader just has to know the size so that it can allocate memory large enough and fill it with NUL

<pre> typedef struct {     unsigned char e_ident[EI_NIDENT];     Elf32_Half    e_type;     Elf32_Half    e_machine;     Elf32_Word    e_version;     Elf32_Addr    e_entry;     Elf32_Off     e_phoff;     Elf32_Off     e_shoff;     Elf32_Word    e_flags;     Elf32_Half    e_ehsize;     Elf32_Half    e_phentsize;     Elf32_Half    e_phnum;     Elf32_Half    e_shentsize;     Elf32_Half    e_shnum;     Elf32_Half    e_shstrndx; } Elf32_Ehdr; </pre>	<pre> typedef struct {     unsigned char e_ident[EI_NIDENT];     Elf64_Half    e_type;     Elf64_Half    e_machine;     Elf64_Word    e_version;     Elf64_Addr    e_entry;     Elf64_Off     e_phoff;     Elf64_Off     e_shoff;     Elf64_Word    e_flags;     Elf64_Half    e_ehsize;     Elf64_Half    e_phentsize;     Elf64_Half    e_phnum;     Elf64_Half    e_shentsize;     Elf64_Half    e_shnum;     Elf64_Half    e_shstrndx; } Elf64_Ehdr; </pre>
---	---

Figure 2: ELF Header C Data Structure

After mapping the dynamic linker as well in the memory of the stillborn process we can start the dynamic linker. Note it is not the entry point of the application to which control is transferred to. Only the dynamic linker is ready to run. Instead of calling the dynamic linker right away one more step is performed. The dynamic linker somehow has to be told where the application can be found and where control has to be transferred to once the application is complete. For this a structured way exists. The kernel puts an array of tag-value pairs on the stack of the new process. This *auxiliary vector* contains beside the two aforementioned values several more values which allow the dynamic linker to avoid several system calls. The `elf.h` header file defines a number of constants with a `AT_` prefix. These are the tags for the entries in the auxiliary vector.

After setting up the auxiliary vector the kernel is finally ready to transfer control to the dynamic linker in user mode. The entry point is defined in `e_entry` field of the ELF header of the dynamic linker.

## 1.5 Startup in the Dynamic Linker

The second phase of the program startup happens in the dynamic linker. Its tasks include:

- Determine and load dependencies;
- Relocate the application and all dependencies;
- Initialize the application and dependencies in the correct order.

In the following we will discuss in more detail only the relocation handling. For the other two points the way for better performance is clear: have fewer dependencies.

Each participating object is initialized exactly once but some topological sorting has to happen. The identify and load process also scales with the number dependencies; in most (all?) implementations this is not only a linear growth.

The relocation process is normally<sup>3</sup> the most expensive part of the dynamic linker's work. It is a process which is asymptotically at least  $O(rs)$  where  $r$  is the number of relocations and  $s$  is the number of symbols defined in all participating objects. Deficiencies in the ELF hash table function and various ELF extensions modifying the symbol lookup functionality may well increase the factor to  $O(rs \log s)$ . This should make clear that for improved performance it is significant to reduce the number of relocations and symbols as much as possible. We will after explaining the relocation process do some estimates for actual numbers.

### 1.5.1 The Relocation Process

Relocation in this context means adjusting the application and the DSOs loaded as the dependencies for their own and all other load addresses. There are two kinds of dependencies:

- Dependencies to locations which are known to be in the own object. These are not associated with a specific symbol since the linker knows the relative position of the location in the object.

Note that applications do not have relative relocations since the load address of the code is known at link-time and therefore the static linker is able to perform the relocation.

<sup>3</sup>We ignore the pre-linking support here which in many cases can reduce significantly or even eliminate the relocation costs.

- Dependencies based on symbols. The reference of the definition is generally, but not necessarily, in a different object than the definition.

The implementation of relative relocations is easy. The linker can compute the offset of the target destination in the object file at link-time. To this value the dynamic linker only has to add the load address of the object and store the result in the place indicated by the relocation. At runtime the dynamic linker has to spend only a very small and constant amount of time which does not increase if more DSOs are used.

The relocation based on a symbol is much more complicated. The ELF symbol resolution process was designed very powerful so that it can handle many different problems. All this powerful functionality adds to the complexity and run-time costs, though. Readers of the following description might question the decisions which led to this process. We cannot argue about this here; readers are referred to discussions of ELF. Fact is that symbol relocation is a costly process and the more DSOs participate or the more symbols are defined in the DSOs, the longer the symbol lookup takes.

The result of any relocation will be stored somewhere in the object with the reference. Ideally and generally the target location is in the data segment. If code is incorrectly generated by the user, compiler, or linker relocations might modify text or read-only segments. The dynamic linker will handle this correctly if the object is marked, as required by the ELF specification, with the `DF_TEXTREL` set in the `DT_FLAGS` entry of the dynamic section (or the existence of the `DT_TEXTREL` flag in old binaries). But the result is that the modified page cannot be shared with other processes using the same object. The modification process itself is also quite slow since the kernel has to reorganize the memory handling data structures quite a bit.

### 1.5.2 Symbol Relocations

The dynamic linker has to perform a relocation for all symbols which are used at run-time and which are not known at link-time to be defined in the same object as the reference. Due to the way code is generated on some architectures it is possible to delay the processing of some relocations until the references in question are actually used. This is on many architectures the case for calls to functions. All other kinds of relocations always have to be processed before the object can be used. We will ignore the *lazy relocation processing* since this is just a method to delay the work. It eventually has to be done and so we will include it in our cost analysis. To actually perform all the relocations before using the object is used by setting the environment variable `LD_BIND_NOW` to a non-empty value.

The actual lookup process is repeated from start for each symbol relocation in each loaded object. Note that there can be many references to the same symbol in different objects. The result of the lookup can be different for each of the objects so there can be no short cuts except for caching results for a symbol in each object in case more than one relocation references the symbol. The *lookup scope* mentioned in the steps below is an ordered list of most loaded objects which can be different for each object itself. The way the scope is computed is quite complex and not really relevant here so we refer the interested reader to the ELF specification. Important is that the length of the scope is normally directly dependent on the number of loaded objects. This is another factor where reducing the number of loaded objects is increasing performance.

The lookup process for one symbol proceeds in the following steps:

1. Determine the hash value for the symbol name.
2. In the first/next object in the lookup scope:
  - 2.a Determine the hash bucket for the symbol using the hash value and the hash table size in the object.
  - 2.b Get the name offset of the symbol and using it the NUL-terminated name.
  - 2.c Compare the symbol name with the relocation name.
  - 2.d If the names match, compare the version names as well. This only has to happen if both, the reference and the definition, are versioned. It requires a string comparison, too. If the version name matches or no such comparison is performed, we found the definition we are looking for.
  - 2.e If the definition does not match, retry with the next element in the chain for the hash bucket.
  - 2.f If the chain does not contain any further element there is no definition in the current object and we proceed with the next object in the lookup scope.
3. If there is no further object in the lookup scope the lookup failed.

Note that there is no problem if the scope contains more than one definition of the same symbol. The symbol lookup algorithm simply picks up the first definition it finds. This has some perhaps surprising consequences. Assume DSO 'A' defines and references an interface and DSO 'B' defines the same interface. If now 'B' precedes 'A' in the scope the reference in 'A' will be satisfied by the definition in 'B'. It is said that the definition in 'B' interposes the definition in 'A'. This concept is very

```

Histogram for bucket list length in section [ 2 ] '.hash' (total of 1023 buckets):
Addr: 0x42000114 Offset: 0x000114 Link to section: [ 3 ] '.dynsym'
Length Number % of total Coverage
  0      132    12.9%    12.9%
  1      310    30.3%    15.3%
  2      256    25.0%    40.6%
  3      172    16.8%    66.0%
  4       92     9.0%    84.2%
  5       46     4.5%    95.5%
  6       14     1.4%    99.7%
  7        1     0.1%   100.0%
Average number of tests:  successful lookup: 1.994080
                          unsuccessful lookup: 1.981427

```

Figure 3: Example Output for `readelf -I libc.so`

```

Histogram for bucket list length in section [ 2 ] '.hash' (total of 191 buckets):
Addr: 0x00000114 Offset: 0x000114 Link to section: [ 3 ] '.dynsym'
Length Number % of total Coverage
  0      103    53.9%
  1       71    37.2%    67.0%
  2       16     8.4%    97.2%
  3        1     0.5%   100.0%
Average number of tests:  successful lookup: 1.179245
                          unsuccessful lookup: 0.554974

```

Figure 4: Example Output for `readelf -I libnss_files.so`

powerful since it allows more specialized implementation of an interface to be used without replacing the general code. One example for this mechanism is the use of the `LD_PRELOAD` functionality of the dynamic linker where additional DSOs which were not present at link-time are introduced in run-time.

Looking at the algorithm it can be seen that the performance of each lookup depends among other factors on the length of the hash chains and the number of objects in the lookup scope. These are the two loops described above. The lengths of the hash chains depend on the number of symbols and the choice of the hash table size. Since the hash function used in the initial step of the algorithm must never change these are the only two remaining variables. Many linkers do not put special emphasis on selecting an appropriate table size. The GNU linker tries to optimize the hash table size for minimal lengths of the chains if it gets passed the `-O` option (note: the linker, *not* the compiler, needs to get this option).

A note on the current implementation of the hash table optimization. The GNU binutils linker has a simple minded heuristic which often favors small table sizes over short chain length. For large projects this might very well *increase* the startup costs. The overall memory consumption will be sometimes significantly reduces which might compensate sooner or later but it is still advised to check the effectiveness of the optimization. A new linker implementation is going to be developed and it contains a better algorithm.

To measure the effectiveness of the hashing two numbers

are important:

- The average chain length for a successful lookup.
- The average chain length for an unsuccessful lookup.

It might be surprising to talk about unsuccessful lookups here but in fact they are the rule. Note that “unsuccessful” means only unsuccessful in the current objects. Only for objects which implement almost everything they get looked in for is the successful lookup number more important. In this category there are basically only two objects on a Linux system: the C library and the dynamic linker itself.

Some versions of the `readelf` program compute the value directly and the output is similar to figures 3 and 4. The data in these examples shows us a number of things. Based on the number of symbols (2027 versus 106) the chosen table size is radically different. For the smaller table the linker can effort to “waste” 53.9% of the hash table entries which contain no data. That’s only 412 bytes on a gABI-compliant system. If the same amount of overhead would be allowed for the `libc.so` binary the table would be 4 kilobytes or more larger. That is a big difference. The linker has a fixed cost function integrated which takes the table size into account.

The increased relative table size means we have significantly shorter hash chains. This is especially true for the

average chain length for an unsuccessful lookup. The average for the small table is only 28% of that of the large table.

What these numbers should show is the effect of reducing the number of symbols in the dynamic symbol table. With significantly fewer symbols the linker has a much better chance to counter the effects of the suboptimal hashing function.

Another factor in the cost of the lookup algorithm is connected with the strings themselves. Simple string comparison is used on the symbol names which are stored in a string table associated with the symbol table data structures. Strings are stored in the C-format; they are terminated by a NUL byte and no initial length field is used. This means string comparisons has to proceed until a non-matching character is found or until the end of the string. This approach is susceptible to long strings with common prefixes. Unfortunately this is not uncommon.

```
namespace some_namespace {
    class some_longer_class_name {
        int member_variable;
    public:
        some_longer_class_name (int p);
        int the_getter_function (void);
    };
}
```

The name mangling scheme used by the GNU C++ compiler before version 3.0 used a mangling scheme which put the name of a class member first along with a description of the parameter list and following it the other parts of the name such as namespaces and nested class names. The result is a name which distinguishable in the beginning if the member names are different. For the example above the mangled names for the two members functions look like this figure 5.

In the new mangling scheme used in today's gcc versions and all other compilers which are compatible with the common C++ ABI the names start with the namespaces and class names and end with the member names. Figure 6 shows the result for the little example. The mangled names for the two member functions differs only after the 43<sup>rd</sup> character. This is really bad performance-wise if the two symbols should fall into the same hash bucket.

Ada has similar problems. The standard Ada library for gcc has all symbols prefixed with `ada_.`, then the package and sub-package names, followed by function name. Figure 7 shows a short excerpt of the list of symbols from the library. The first 23 character are the same for all the names.

The length of the strings in both mangling schemes is worrisome since each string has to be compared completely when the symbol itself is searched for. The names

in the example are not extra ordinarily long either. Looking through the standard C++ library one can find many names longer than 120 characters and even this is not the longest. Other system libraries feature names longer than 200 characters and complicated, "well designed" C++ projects with many namespaces, templates, and nested classes can feature names with more than 1,000 characters. One plus point for design, but minus 100 points for performance.

With the knowledge of the hashing function and the details of the string lookup let us look at a real-world example: OpenOffice.org. The package contains 144 separate DSOs. During startup about 20,000 relocations are performed. The number of string comparisons needed during the symbol resolution can be used as a fair value for the startup overhead. We compute an approximation of this value now.

The average chain length for unsuccessful lookup in all DSOs of the OpenOffice.org 1.0 release on IA-32 is 1.1931. This means for each symbol lookup the dynamic linker has to perform on average  $72 \times 1.1931 = 85.9032$  string comparisons. For 20,000 symbols the total is 1,718,064 string comparisons. The average length of an exported symbol defined in the DSOs of OpenOffice.org is 54.13. Even if we are assuming that only 20% of the string is searched before finding a mismatch (which is an optimistic guess since every symbol name is compared completely at least once to match itself) this would mean a total of more then 18.5 million characters have to be loaded from memory and compared. No wonder that the startup is so slow, especially since we ignored other costs.

Changing any of the factors 'number of exported symbols', 'length of the symbol strings', 'number and length of common prefixes', 'number of DSOs', and 'hash table size optimization' can reduce the costs dramatically. In general the percentage spent on relocations of the time the dynamic linker uses during startup is around 50-70% if the binary is already in the file system cache, and about 20-30% if the file has to be loaded from disk.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore worth spending time on these issues and in the remainder of the text we will introduce methods to do just that. So far to remember: pass `-O1` to the linker to generate the final product.

### 1.5.3 GOT and PLT

The Global Offset Table (GOT) and Procedure Linkage Table (PLT) are the two data structures central to the ELF run-time. We will introduce now the reasons why they are used and what consequences arise from that.

Relocations are created for source constructs like

<sup>4</sup>These numbers assume pre-linking is not used.

```
__Q214some_namespace22some_longer_class_namei
the_getter_function__Q214some_namespace22some_longer_class_name
```

Figure 5: Mangled names using pre-gcc 3 scheme

```
_ZN14some_namespace22some_longer_class_nameC1Ei
_ZN14some_namespace22some_longer_class_nameI9the_getter_functionEv
```

Figure 6: Mangled names using the common C++ ABI scheme

```
ada__calendar__delays__elabb
ada__calendar__delays__timed_delay_nt
ada__calendar__delays__to_duration
```

Figure 7: Names from the standard Ada library

```
extern int foo;
extern int bar (int);
int call_bar (void) {
    return bar (foo);
}
```

The call to `bar` requires two relocations: one to load the value of `foo` and another one to find the address of `bar`. If the code would be generated knowing the addresses of the variable and the function the assembler instructions would directly load from or jump to the address. For IA-32 the code would look like this:

```
pushl  foo
call   bar
```

This would encode the addresses of `foo` and `bar` as part of the instruction in the text segment. If the address is only known to the dynamic linker the text segment would have to be modified at run-time. According to what we learned above this must be avoided.

Therefore the code generated for DSOs, i.e., when using `-fpic` or `-fPIC`, looks like this:

```
movl   foo@GOT(%ebx), %eax
pushl  (%eax)
call   bar@PLT
```

The address of the variable `foo` is now not part of the instruction. Instead it is loaded from the GOT. The address of the location in the GOT relative to the PIC register value (`%ebx`) is known at link-time. Therefore the text segment does not have to be changed, only the GOT.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>There is one more advantage of using this scheme. If the instruction would be modified we would need one relocation per load/store instruction. By storing the address in the GOT only one relocation is needed.

The situation for the function call is similar. The function `bar` is not called directly. Instead control is transferred to a stub for `bar` in the PLT (indicated by `bar@PLT`). For IA-32 the PLT itself does not have to be modified and can be placed in a read-only segment, each entry is 16 bytes in size. Only the GOT is modified and each entry consists of 4 bytes. The structure of the PLT in a DSO looks like this:

```
.PLT0:pushl 4(%ebx)
      jmp *8(%ebx)
      nop; nop
      nop; nop
.PLT1: jmp *name1@GOT(%ebx)
      pushl $offset1
      jmp .PLT0@PC
.PLT2: jmp *name2@GOT(%ebx)
      pushl $offset2
      jmp .PLT0@PC
```

This shows three entries, there are as many as needed, all having the same size. The first entry, labeled with `.PLT0`, is special. It is used internally as we will see. All the following entries belong to exactly one function symbol. The first instruction is an indirect jump where the address is taken from a slot in the GOT. Each PLT entry has one GOT slot. At startup time the dynamic linker fills the GOT slot with the address pointing to the second instruction of the appropriate PLT entry. I.e., when the PLT entry is used for the first time the jump ends at the following `pushl` instruction. The value pushed on the stack is also specific to the PLT slot and it is the offset of the relocation entry for the function which should be called. Then control is transferred to the special first PLT entry which pushes some more values on the stack and finally jumps into the dynamic linker. The dynamic linker has to make sure that the third GOT slot (offset 8) contains the address of the entry point in the dynamic linker. Once the dynamic linker has determined the address of the function it stores the result in the GOT entry which was used in the `jmp` instruction at the beginning of the PLT entry before jumping to the found function. This

has the effect that all future uses of the PLT entry will not go through the dynamic linker, but will instead directly transfer to the function. The overhead for all but the first call is therefore “only” one indirect jump.

The PLT stub is always used if the function is not guaranteed to be defined in the object which references it. Please note that a simple definition in the object with the reference is not enough to avoid the PLT entry. Looking at the symbol lookup process it should be clear that the definition could be found in another object (interposition) in which case the PLT is needed. We will later explain exactly when and how to avoid PLT entries.

How exactly the GOT and PLT is structured is architecture-specific. What was said here about IA-32 is in some form applicable to some other architectures but not for all. We can anyhow summarize the costs of using GOT and PLT like this:

- every use of a global variable which is exported uses a GOT entry and loads the variable values indirectly;
- each function which is called (as opposed to referenced as a variable) which is not guaranteed to be defined in the calling object requires a PLT entry. The function call is performed indirectly by transferring control first to the code in the PLT entry which in turn calls the function.
- for some architectures each PLT entry requires at least one GOT entry.

Avoiding a jump through the PLT therefore removed on IA-32 16 bytes of text and 4 bytes of data. Avoiding the GOT when accessing a global variable saves 4 bytes of data and one load instruction (i.e., at least 3 bytes of code and cycles during the execution). In addition each GOT entry has a relocation associated with the costs described above.

#### 1.5.4 Running the Constructors

Once the relocations are performed the DSOs and the application code can actually be used. But there is one more thing to do: optionally the DSOs and the application must be initialized. The author of the code can define for each object a number of initialization functions which are run before the DSO is used by other code. To perform the initialization the functions can use code from the own object and all the dependencies. To make this work the dynamic linker must make sure the objects are initialized in the correct order, i.e., the dependencies of an object must be initialized before the object.

To guarantee that the dynamic linker has to perform a topological sort in the list of objects. This sorting is no

linear process. Like all sorting algorithms the run-time is at least  $O(n \log n)$  and since this is actually a topological sort the value is even higher. And what is more: since the order at startup need not be the same as the order at shutdown (when finalizers have to be run) the whole process has to be repeated.

So we have again a cost factor which is directly depending on the number of objects involved. Reducing the number helps a bit even though the actual costs are normally much less than that of the relocation process.

## 1.6 Summary of the Costs of ELF

We have now discussed the startup process and how it is affected by the form of the binaries. We will now summarize the various factors so that we later on can determine the benefits of an optimization more easily.

**Code Size** As everywhere, a reduced size for code with the same semantics often means higher efficiency and performance. Smaller ELF binaries need less memory at run-time.

In general the programmer will always generate the best code possible and we do not cover this further. But it must be known that every DSO includes a certain overhead in data and code. Therefore fewer DSOs means smaller text.

**Number of Objects** The fact that a smaller number of objects containing the same functionality is beneficial has been mentioned in several places:

- Fewer objects are loaded at run-time. This directly translates to fewer system call. In the GNU dynamic linker implementation loading a DSO requires 8 system calls, all of them can be potentially quite expensive.
- Related, the application and the dependencies with additional dependencies must record the names of the dependencies. This is not a terribly high cost but certainly can sum up if there are many dozens of dependencies.
- The lookup scope grows. This is one of the dominating factors in cost equation for the relocations.
- More objects means more symbol tables which in turn normally means more duplication. Undefined references are not collapsed into one and handling of multiple definitions have to be sorted out by the dynamic linker. Moreover, symbols are often exported from a DSO to be used in another one. This would not have to happen if the DSOs would be merged.
- The sorting of initializers/finalizers is more complicated.

```

$ env LD_DEBUG=statistics /bin/echo '+++ some text +++'
...:
...:   run-time linker statistics:
...:     total startup time in dynamic loader: 748696 clock cycles
...:       time needed for relocation: 378004 clock cycles (50.4%)
...:         number of relocations: 133
...:     number of relocations from cache: 5
...:       time needed to load objects: 193372 clock cycles (25.8%)
+++ some text +++
...:
...:   run-time linker statistics:
...:     final number of relocations: 188
...:     final number of relocations from cache: 5

```

Figure 8: Gather Startup Statistics

- In general does the dynamic linker have some overhead for each loaded DSO per process. Every time a new DSO is requested the list of already loaded DSOs must be searched which can be quite time consuming since DSOs can have many aliases.

**Number of Symbols** The number of exported and undefined symbols determines the size of the dynamic symbol table, the hash table, and the average hash table chain length. The normal symbol table is not used at run-time and it is therefore not necessary to strip a binary of it. It has no impact on performance.

Additionally, fewer exported symbols means fewer chances for conflicts when using pre-linking (not covered further).

**Length of Symbol Strings** Long symbol lengths cause often unnecessary costs. A successful lookup of a symbol must match the whole string and comparing dozens or hundreds of characters takes time. Unsuccessful lookups suffer if common prefixes are long as in the new C++ mangling scheme. In any case do long symbol names cause large string tables which must be present at run-time and thereby is adding costs in load time and in use of address space which is an issue for 32-bit machines.

**Number of Relocations** Processing relocations constitute the majority of work during start and therefore any reduction is directly noticeable.

**Kind of Relocations** The kind of relocations which are needed is important, too, since processing a relative relocation is much less expensive than a normal relocation. Also, relocations against text segments must be avoided.

**Placement of Code and Data** All executable code should be placed in read-only memory and the compiler normally makes sure this is done correctly. When creating data objects it is mostly up to the user to make sure it is placed in the correct segment. Ideally data is also read-only but this works only

for constants. The second best choice is a zero-initialized variable which does not have to be initialized from file content. The rest has to go into the data segment.

In the following we will not cover the first two points given here. It is up to the developer of the DSO to decide about this. There are no small additional changes to make the DSO behave better, these are fundamental design decisions. We have voiced an opinion here, whether it is has any effect remains to be seen.

## 1.7 Measuring ld.so Performance

To perform the optimizations it is useful to quantify the effect of the optimizations. Fortunately it is very easy to do this with glibc's dynamic linker. Using the `LD_DEBUG` environment variable it can be instructed to dump information related to the startup performance. Figure 8 shows an example invocation, of the `echo` program in this case.

The output of the dynamic linker is divided in two parts. The part before the program's output is printed right before the dynamic linker turns over control to the application after having performed all the work we described in this section. The second part, a summary, is printed after the application terminated (normally). The actual format might vary for different architectures. It includes the timing information only on architectures which provide easy access to a CPU cycle counter register (modern IA-32, IA-64, x86-64, Alpha in the moment). For other architectures these lines are simply missing.

The timing information provides absolute values for the total time spend during startup in the dynamic linker, the time needed to perform relocations, and the time spend in the kernel to load/map binaries. In this example the relocation processing dominates the startup costs with more than 50%. There is a lot of potential for optimizations here. The unit used to measure the time is CPU

cycles. This means that the values cannot even be compared across different implementations of the same architecture. E.g., the measurement for a Pentium<sup>RM</sup> III and a Pentium<sup>RM</sup> 4 machine will be quite different. But the measurements are perfectly suitable to measure improvements on one machine which is what we are interested here.

Since relocations play such a vital part of the startup performance some information on the number of relocations is printed. In the example a total of 133 relocations are performed, from the dynamic linker, the C library, and the executable itself. Of these 5 relocations could be served from the relocation cache. This is an optimization implemented in the dynamic linker to handle the case of multiple relocations against the same symbol more efficient. After the program itself terminated the same information is printed again. The total number of relocations here is higher since the execution of the application code caused a number, 55 to be exact, run-time relocations to be performed.

The number of relocations which are processed is stable across successive runs of the program. The time measurements not. Even in a single-user mode with no other programs running there would be differences since the cache and main memory has to be accessed. It is therefore necessary to average the run-time over multiple runs.

It is obviously also possible to count the relocations without running the program. Running `readelf -d` on the binary shows the dynamic section in which the `DT_RELSZ`, `DT_RELENT`, `DT_RELCOUNT`, and `DT_PLTRELSZ` entries are interesting. They allow computing the number of normal and relative relocations as well as the number of PLT entries. If one does not want to do this by hand the `relinfo` script in appendix A can be used.

## 2 Optimizations for DSOs

In this section we describe various optimizations based on C or C++ variables or functions. The choice of variable or function, unless explicitly said, is made deliberately since many of the implementations apply to the one or the other. But there are some architectures where functions are handled like variables. This is mainly the case for embedded RISC architectures like SH-3 and SH-4 which have limitations in the addressing modes they provide which make it impossible to implement the function handling as for other architectures. In most cases it is no problem to apply the optimizations for variables and functions at the same time. This is what in fact should be done all the time to achieve best performance across all architectures.

The most important recommendation is to always use `-fpic` or `-fPIC` when generating code which ends up in DSOs. This applies to data as well as code. Code which

is not compiled this way almost certainly will contain text relocations. For these there is no excuse. Text relocations requires extra work to apply in the dynamic linker. And argumentation saying that the code is not shared because no other process uses the DSO is invalid. In this case it is not useful to use a DSO in the first place; the code should just be added to the application code.

Some people try to argue that the use of `-fpic`/`-fPIC` on some architectures has too many disadvantages. This is mainly brought forward in argumentations about IA-32. Here the use of `%ebx` as the PIC register deprives the compiler of one of the precious registers it could use for optimization. But this is really not that much of a problem. First, not having `%ebx` available was never a big penalty. Second, in modern compilers (e.g., gcc after release 3.1) the handling of the PIC register is much more flexible. It is not always necessary to use `%ebx` which can help eliminating unnecessary copy operations. And third, by providing the compiler with more information as explained later in this section a lot of the overhead in PIC can be removed. This all combined will lead to overhead which is in most situations not noticeable.

Which of the two options, `-fpic` or `-fPIC`, has to be decided on a case-by-case basis. For some architectures there is no difference at all and people tend to be careless about the use. For most RISC there is a big difference. As an example, this is the code gcc generates for SPARC to read a global variable `global` when using `-fpic`:

```
sethi %hi(_GLOBAL_OFFSET_TABLE_-4),%l7
call  .LLGETPC0
add   %l7,%lo(_GLOBAL_OFFSET_TABLE_+4),%l7
ld    [%l7+global],%g1
ld    [%g1],%g1
```

And this is the code sequence if `-fPIC` is used:

```
sethi %hi(_GLOBAL_OFFSET_TABLE_-4),%l7
call  .LLGETPC0
add   %l7,%lo(_GLOBAL_OFFSET_TABLE_+4),%l7
sethi %hi(global),%g1
or    %g1,%lo(global),%g1
ld    [%l7+%g1],%g1
ld    [%g1],%g1
```

In both cases `%l7` is loaded with the address of the GOT first. Then the GOT is accessed to get the address of `global`. While in the `-fpic` case one instruction is sufficient, three instructions are needed in the `-fPIC` case. The `-fpic` option tells the compiler that the size of the GOT does not exceed an architecture-specific value (8kB in case of SPARC). If only that many GOT entries can be present the offset from the base of the GOT can be encoded in the instruction itself, i.e., in the `ld` instruction of the first code sequence above. If `-fPIC` is used

no such limit exists and so the compiler has to be pessimistic and generate code which can deal with offsets of any size. The difference in the number of instructions in this example correctly suggests that the `-fpic` should be used at all times unless it is absolutely necessary to use `-fPIC`. The linker will fail and write out a message when this point is reached and one only has to recompile the code.

When writing assembler code by hand it is easy to miss cases where position independent code sequences must be used. The non-PIC sequences look and actually are simpler and more natural. Therefore it is extremely important to in these case to check whether the DSO is marked to contain text relocations. This is easy enough to do:

```
readelf -d binary | grep TEXTREL
```

If this produces any output text relocations are present and one better starts looking what causes them.

## 2.1 Data Definitions

Variables can be defined in C and C++ in several different ways. Basically there are three kinds of definitions:

**Common** Common variables are more widely used FORTRAN but they got used in C and C++ as well to work around mistakes of programmers. Since in the early days people used to drop the `extern` keyword from variable definitions, in the same way it is possible to drop it from function declaration, the compiler often has multiple definitions of the same variable in different files. To help the poor and clueless programmer the C/C++ compiler normally generates common variables for uninitialized definitions such as

```
int foo;
```

For common variables there can be more than one definition and they all get unified into one location in the output file. Common variables are always initialized with zero. This means their value does not have to be stored in an ELF file. Instead the file size of a segment is chosen smaller than the memory size as described in 1.4.

**Uninitialized** If the programmer passes the `-fno-common` option to the compiler the latter will generate uninitialized variables instead of common variables if a variable definition has no initializer. The result at run-time is the same, no value is stored in the file. But the representation in the object file is different and it allows the linker to find multiple definitions and flag them as errors. Another difference is that it is possible to define alias, i.e., alternative names,

for uninitialized variables while this is not possible for common variables.

With recent gcc versions there is another method to create uninitialized variables. Variables initialized with zero are stored this way. Earlier gcc versions stored them as initialized variables which took up space in the file.

**Initialized** The variable is defined and initialized to a programmer-defined value. In C:

```
int foo = 42;
```

In this case the initialization value is stored in the file. As described in the previous case initializations with zero are treated special by some compilers.

Normally there is not much the user has to do to create optimal ELF files. The compiler will take care of avoiding the initializers. To achieve the best results even with old compilers it is desirable to avoid explicit initializations with zero if possible. This creates normally common variables but if combined with gcc's `-fno-common` flag the same reports about multiple definitions one would get for initialized variables can be seen.

There is one thing the programmer is responsible for. As an example look at the following code:

```
bool is_empty = true;
char s[10];

const char *get_s (void) {
    return is_empty ? NULL : s;
}
```

The function `get_s` uses the boolean variable `is_empty` to decide what to do. If the variable has its initial value the variable `s` is not used. The initialization value of `is_empty` is stored in the file since the initialize is non-zero. But the semantics of `is_empty` is chosen arbitrarily. There is no requirement for that. The code could instead be rewritten as:

```
bool not_empty = false;
char s[10];

const char *get_s (void) {
    return not_empty ? s : NULL;
}
```

Now the semantics of the control variable is reverted. It is initialized with `false` which is guaranteed to be the numeric value zero. The test in the function `get_s` has to be changed as well but the resulting code is not less or more efficient than the old code.

By simple transformations like that it is often possible to avoid creating initialized variables and instead using common or uninitialized variables. This saves disk space and eventually improves startup times. The transformation is not limited to boolean values. It is sometimes possible to do it for variables which can take on more than two values, especially enumeration values. When defining enums one should always put the value, which is most often used as initializer, first in the enum definition. I.e.

```
enum { val1, val2, val3 };
```

should be rewritten as

```
enum { val3, val1, val2 };
```

if `val3` is the value most often used for initializations. To summarize, it is always preferable to add variables as uninitialized or initialized with zero as opposed to as initialized with a value other than zero.

## 2.2 Export Control

When creating a DSO from a collection of object files the dynamic symbol table will by default contain all the symbols which are globally visible in the object files. In most cases this set is far too large. Only the symbols which are actually part of the ABI should be exported. Failing to restrict the set of exported symbols are numerous drawbacks:

- Users of the DSO could use interfaces which they are not supposed to. This is problematic in revisions of the DSO which are meant to be binary compatible. The correct assumption of the DSO developer is that interfaces, which are not part of the ABI, can be changed arbitrarily. But there are always users who claim to know better or do not care about rules.
- According to the ELF lookup rules all symbols in the dynamic symbol table can be interposed (unless the visibility of the symbol is restricted). I.e., definitions from other objects can be used. This means that local references cannot be bound at link time. If it is known or intended that the local definition should *always* be used the symbol in the reference must not be exported or the visibility must be restricted.
- The dynamic symbol table and its string table are available at run-time and therefore must be loaded. This can add a significant amount of memory, even though it is read-only. One might think that the size is not much of an issue but if one examines the length of the mangled names of C++ variables or functions it becomes obvious that this is not the case. In addition we have the run-time costs of

larger symbol tables which we discussed in the previous section.

We will now present a number of possible solutions for the problem of exported interfaces. Some of them solve the same problem in slightly different ways. We will say which method should be preferred. The programmer has to make sure that whatever is used is available on the target system.

In the discussions of the various methods we will use one example:

```
int last;

int next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index (int scale) {
    return next () << scale;
}
```

Compiled on a IA-32 Linux machine a DSO with only this code (plus startup code etc) contains seven relocations, two of which are relative, and four PLT entries (use the `relnfo` script). We will see how we can improve on this. Four of the normal and both relative relocations as well as three PLT entries are introduced by the additional code used by the linker to create the DSO. The actual example code creates only one normal relocation for `last` and one PLT entry for `next`. To increment and read the variable `last` in `next` the compiler generates code like

```
movl  last@GOT(%ebx), %edx
movl  (%edx), %eax
incl  %eax
movl  %eax, (%edx)
```

and the call of `next` is compiled to

```
call next@PLT
```

These code fragments were explained in section 1.5.3.

### 2.2.1 Use `static`

The easiest way to not export a variable or function is to define it file-local scope. In C and C++ this is done by defining it with `static`. This is for many people obvious but unfortunately not for all. Many consider adding `static` as optional. This is true when considering only the C semantics of the code.

If in our example neither `last` or `next` are needed outside the file we can change the source to:

```
static int last;

static int next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index (int scale) {
    return next () << scale;
}
```

Compiled in the same way as before we see that all the relocations introduced by our example code vanished. I.e., we are left with six relocations and three PLT entries. The code to access `last` now looks like this:

```
movl  last@GOTOFF(%ebx), %eax
incl  %eax
movl  %eax, last@GOTOFF(%ebx)
```

The code improved by avoiding the step which loads the address of the variable from the GOT. Instead, both memory accesses directly address the variable in memory. At link-time the variable location has a fixed offset from the PIC register, indicated symbolically by `last@GOTOFF`. By adding the value to the PIC register value we get the address of `last`. Since the value is known at link-time this construct does not need a relocation at run-time.

The situation is similar for the call to `next`. The IA-32 architecture, like many others, know a PC-relative addressing mode for jumps and calls. Therefore the compiler can generate a simple jump instruction

```
call next
```

and the assembler generates a PC-relative call. The difference between the address of the instruction following the `call` and the address of `next` is constant at link-time and therefore also does not need any relocation.

The generated code is optimal. The compiler might even consider inlining some code if it finds that this is beneficial. It is always advised that the programmer places the various variable and function definitions in the same file as the references and then define the referenced objects as `static`. When generating the production binaries it might even be desirable to merge as many input files as possible together to mark as many objects as possible `static`. Unless one is comfortable with one giant file there is a limit on how many functions can be grouped together. It is not necessary to continue the process ad infinitum since there are other ways to achieve the same result (minus inlining).

## 2.2.2 Define Visibility

The next best thing to using `static` is to explicitly define the visibility of objects in the DSO. The generic ELF ABI defines visibility of symbols. The specification defines four classes of which here only two are of interest. `STV_DEFAULT` denotes the normal visibility. The symbol is exported and can be interposed. The other interesting class is denoted by `STV_HIDDEN`. Symbols marked like this are not exported from the DSO and therefore cannot be used from other objects.

Since the C language does not provide mechanisms to define the visibility of a function or variable gcc resorts once more to using attributes:

```
int last
__attribute__ ((visibility ("hidden")));

int
__attribute__ ((visibility ("hidden")))
next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index (int scale) {
    return next () << scale;
}
```

This defines the variable `last` and the function `next` as hidden. All the object files which make up the DSO which contains this definition can use these symbols. I.e., while `static` restricts the visibility of a symbol to the file it is defined in, the hidden attribute limits the visibility to the DSO the definition ends up in. In the example above the definitions are marked. In fact it is more important that the declarations are marked appropriately since it is mainly the code generated for in a reference that is influenced by the attribute.

Beside telling the backend of the compiler to emit code to flag the symbol as hidden the attribute has another purpose: it allows the compiler to assume the definition is local. This means the addressing of variables and function can happen as if the definitions would be locally defined in the file as `static`. Therefore the same code sequences we have seen in the previous section can be generated. Using the hidden visibility attribute is therefore almost completely equivalent to using `static`; the only difference is that the compiler cannot automatically inline the function since it need not see the definition.

We can now refine the rule for using `static`: merge source files and mark as many functions `static` as far as one feels comfortable. In any case merge the files which contain functions which potentially can be inlined. In all other cases mark functions (the declarations) which are not to be exported from the DSO as hidden.

Note that the linker will not add hidden symbols to the dynamic symbol table. I.e., even though the symbol tables of the object files contain hidden symbols they will disappear automatically. By maximizing the number of hidden declarations we therefore reduce the size of the symbol table to the minimum.

The generic ELF ABI defines another visibility mode: protected. In this scheme references to symbols defined in the same object are always satisfied locally. But the symbols are still available outside the DSO. This sounds like an ideal mechanism to optimize DSO by avoiding the use of exported symbols (see section 2.2.5) but it isn't. Processing references to protected symbols is even more expensive than normal lookup. The problem is a requirement in the ISO C standard. The standard requires that functions, pointing to the same function, can be compared for equality. This rule would be violated with a fast and simple-minded implementation of the protected visibility. Assume an application which references a protected function in a DSO. Also in the DSO is another function which references said function. The pointer in the application points to the PLT entry for the function in the application's PLT. If a protected symbol lookup would simply return the address of the function inside the DSO the addresses would differ.

In programming environments without this requirements on function pointers the use of the protected visibility would be useful and fast. But since there usually is only one implementation of the dynamic linker on the system and this implementation has to handle C programs as well, the use of protected is highly discouraged.

### 2.2.3 Use Export Maps

If for one reason or another none of the previous two solutions are applicable the next best possibility is to instruct the linker to do something. Only the GNU and Solaris linker are known to support this, at least with the syntax presented here. Using export maps is not only useful for the purpose discussed here. When discussing maintenance of APIs and ABIs in chapter 3 the same kind of input file is used. This does not mean the previous two methods should not be preferred. Instead, export (and symbol) maps can and should always be used in addition to the other methods described.

The concept of export maps is to tell the linker explicitly which symbols to export from the generated object. Every symbol can belong to one of two classes: exported or not exported. Symbols can be listed individually, glob-expressions can be used, or the special `*` catch-all glob expression can be used. The latter only once. The symbol map file for our example code could look like this:

```
{
```

```
    global: index;  
    local: *;  
};
```

This tells the linker that the symbol `index` is to be exported and all others (matched by `*`) are local. We could have listed `last` and `next` explicitly in the `local:` list but it is generally advised to always use the catch-all case to mark all not explicitly mentioned symbols as local. This avoids surprises by allowing access only to the symbols explicitly mentions. Otherwise there would also be the problem with symbols which are matched neither by the `global:` nor by the `local:`, resulting in unspecified behavior. Another unspecified behavior is if a name appears in both lists or is matched using globbing in both lists.

To generate a DSO with this method the user has to pass the name of the map file with the `--version-script` option of the linker. The name of the option suggests that the scripts can be used for more. We will get back to this when we discuss ABIs in the next chapter.

```
$ gcc -shared -o foo.so foo.c -fPIC \  
    -Wl,--version-script=foo.map
```

The file `foo.map` is supposed to contain text like the one shown above.

Using export maps seems like a very desirable solution. The sources do not have to be made less readable using attribute declarations or eventually pragmas. All the knowledge of the ABI is kept locally in the export map file. But this process has one fundamental problem: exactly because the sources are not modified the final code is not optimal. The linker is used only after the compiler already did its work and the once generated code cannot be optimized significantly.

In our running example the compiler must generate the code for the `next` function under the worst case scenario assumption that the variable `last` is exported. This means the code sequence using `@GOTOFF` which was mentioned before cannot be generated. Instead the normal two instruction sequence using `@GOT` must be generated.

This is what the linker will see when it gets instructed to hide the symbol `last`. The linker will not touch the actual code. Code relaxation here would require substantial analysis of the following code which is in theory possible but not implemented. But the linker will not generate the normal `R_386_GLOB_DAT` relocation either. Since the symbol is not exported no interposition is allowed. The position of the local definition relative to the start of the DSO is known and so the linker will generate a relative relocation.

For function calls the result is often as good as it gets.

The code generated by the compiler for a PC-relative jump and a jump through the PLT is identical. It is just the code which is called (the target function versus the code in the PLT) which makes the difference. The code is only not optimal in one case: if the function call is the only reason the PIC register is loaded. For a call to a local function this is not necessary and loading the PIC is just a waste of time and code.

To summarize, for variables the use of symbol maps creates larger and less efficient code, adds an entry in the GOT, and adds a relative relocation. For functions the generated code sometimes contains unnecessary loads of the PIC. One normal relocation is converted into a relative relocation and one PLT entry is removed. This is one relative relocation worse than the previous methods. These deficiencies are the reason why it is much preferable to tell the compiler what is going on since after the compiler finished its work certain decisions cannot be reverted anymore.

## 2.2.4 Libtool's `-export-symbols`

The fourth method to restrict symbol export is the least desirable of them. It is the one used by the GNU Libtool program when the `-export-symbols` option is used. This option is used to pass to Libtool the name of a file which contains the names of all the symbols which should be exported, one per line. The Libtool command line might look like this:

```
$ libtool --mode=link gcc -o libfoo.la \  
foo.lo -export-symbols=foo.sym
```

The file `foo.sym` would contain the list of exported symbols. `foo.lo` is the special kind of object files Libtool generates. For more information on this and other strange details from the command line consult the Libtool manual.

Interesting for us here is the code the linker produces using this method. For the GNU linker Libtool converts the `-export-symbols` option into the completely useless `-retain-symbols-file` option. This option instructs the linker to prune the normal symbol tables, not the dynamic symbol table. The normal symbol table will contain only the symbols named in the export list file plus the special `STT_SECTION` symbols which might be needed in relocations. All local symbols are gone. The problem is that the dynamic symbol table is not touched at all and this is the table which is actually used at runtime.

The effect of the using `libtool` this way is that programs reading the normal symbol table (for instance `nm`) do not find any symbols but those listed in the export list. And that is it. There are no runtime effects. Neither

have any symbols been made unavailable for the dynamic linker, nor have any normal relocations been converted into relative relocations.

The only reason this method is mentioned here is that there is hope `libtool` will learn about converting the export lists into the anonymous version maps we have seen in the previous section when the GNU linker is used. At that point `libtool` will become useful. Until then relying on its `-export-symbols` option is misleading at best.

## 2.2.5 Avoid Using Exported Symbols

In some situations it might not be desirable to avoid exporting a symbol but at the same time all local references should use the local definition. This also means that the uses of the symbols is cheaper since the less general code sequences can be used. This is a subset of the problem discussed so far. A solution needs a different approach since so far we achieved the better code by not exporting only.

Since a symbol cannot be exported and not-exported at the same time the basic approach is to use two names for the same object. The two names then can be treated differently. There are multiple possibilities to create two names, varying in efficiency and effort.

At this point it is necessary to add a warning. By performing this optimization the semantics of the program changes since the optimization interferes with the symbol lookup rules. It is now possible to use more than one symbol with a given name in the program. Code outside the DSO might find a definition of a symbol somewhere else while the code in the DSO always uses the local definition. This might lead to funny results. Often it is acceptable since multiple definitions are not allowed. A related issue is that one rule of ISO C can be violated by this. ISO C says that functions are identified by their names (identifiers) and that comparing the function pointers one can test for equality. The ELF implementation work hard to make sure this rule is normally obeyed. When forcing the use of local symbols code inside and outside the DSO might find different definitions for a given name and therefore the pointers do not match. It is important to always consider these side effects before performing the optimization.

**Wrapper Functions** Only applicable to functions, using wrappers is the most portable but also most costly way to solve the problem. If in our example code we would want to export `index` as well as `next` we could use code like this:

```
static int last;
```

```

static int next_int (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int next (void) {
    return next_int ();
}

int index (int scale) {
    return next_int () << scale;
}

```

The function `next` is now a simple wrapper around `next_int`. All calls to `next_int` are recognized by the compiler as calls to a local function since `next_int`, unlike `next`, is defined with `static`. Therefore no PLT entries is used for the call in `index`.

The drawback of this method is that additional code is required (the code for the new `next` function) and that calling `next` also minimally slower than necessary at runtime. As a fallback solution, in case no other method works, this is better than nothing.

**Using Aliases** Introducing two names without adding code can be achieved by creating aliases for existing objects. Support for this is included in `gcc`; this does not only include the creation of the alias, `gcc` also knows the type for the alias and can perform appropriate tests when the alias is used. The here goal is therefore to create an alias and tell `gcc` and/or the linker to not export the symbol. I.e., we apply the same techniques described in the previous sections now to an alias. The only difference is that defining an alias as `static` will not work. The best method therefore is to use visibility attributes. The other discussed methods will also work but we do not discuss them further here.

If in our example we want to export both `last` and `next` we can rewrite the example like this:

```

int last;
extern __typeof (last) last_int
    __attribute ((alias ("last"),
                 visibility ("hidden")));

int next (void) {
    return ++last_int;
}
extern __typeof (next) next_int
    __attribute ((alias ("next"),
                 visibility ("hidden")));

int index (int scale) {
    return next_int () << scale;
}

```

This is quite a collection of non-standard `gcc` extensions to the C language so it might need some explanation. The

actual definitions of all three objects are the same as in the original code. All these objects are exported. The difference in the definitions is that `next` is using the internal alias `last_int` instead of `last` and similarly for `index` and `next`. What looks like two declarations is the mechanism by which `gcc` is told about the aliases. It is basically an `extern` declaration of an object with the same type (we use here `__typeof` to ensure that) which has an alias added. The `alias` attribute names the object this is an alias of.

To achieve the results we want, namely that the aliases are not exported and that `gcc` gets told about this, we have to add the hidden visibility attribute. Looking back at section 2.2.2 it should be easy to see that the use of this attribute is equivalent.

If the visibility attributes cannot be used for some reason almost the same code should be used, only leaving out

```
, visibility ("hidden")
```

This will create a normal alias with the same scope as the original symbol. Using `export` maps the alias can then be hidden. The resulting binary will not use the efficient code sequences (see section 2.2.3) but the local definition will always be used.

**DF\_SYMBOLIC** The original designers of the ELF format considered the possibility that preferring local definitions might be useful. They have included a mechanism which can enforce this. If the `DF_SYMBOLIC` flag is set in the `DT_FLAGS` entry of the dynamic section (or in older ELF binaries: if the dynamic section contains an `DT_SYMBOLIC` entry) the dynamic linker has to prefer local definitions.

This approach has numerous disadvantages. First, all interfaces are affected. The other approaches discussed here have a per-interface granularity. Treated all interfaces like this is normally not the right way. The second disadvantage is that the compiler does not get told about the use of local symbols and therefore cannot optimize the uses, just as if `export` maps would be used. And what is even worse, calls to local functions still use the PLT entries. The PLT and GOT entries are still created and the jump is indirect. This might be useful in some situations (e.g., when using `LD_PROFILE`) but usually means a big, missed opportunity for optimization.

Finally the third problem is that the lookup scope is changed in a way which can lead to using unexpected dependencies. `DF_SYMBOLIC` effectively puts the own object in the first spot of its own lookup scope so that there are a number of other DSO which are seen before the dependencies. This is nothing new but the fact that the DSO marked with `DF_SYMBOLIC` is in an unusual place can cause unexpected versions from being picked up.

---

The advise here is to *never* use `DF_SYMBOLIC`. It does not improve the code, forces all symbols to be treated the same, and can cause problems in symbol lookup. It is mentioned here only for completeness and as a warning.

## 2.3 Shortening Symbol Names

The description of the ELF symbol lookup algorithm shows that one of the cost factors for the lookup is length of the symbols involved. For successful lookups the entire string has to be matched and unsuccessful lookups require matching the common prefix of the involved strings.

The flat namespace of the C programming environment makes following the guideline to use short names easy. The names the programmer uses are directly mapped to names in the ELF file. The same is true for some other programming environments such as traditional Pascal and FORTRAN.

Programming environments with more sophisticated symbol handling use name mangling. The most prominent programming language in this class is C++. The symbol string of a function consists beside the function name also of a description of the parameter list, the classes the function is a member of and the namespaces the class or function is defined in. This can lead to enormously long symbol names. Names of more than 1,000 characters have been sighted in the wild. Ada names tend to get very long because of the package namespace.

The object and namespace model in C++ is used to manage the complexity of large projects and to facilitate code reuse. Therefore it is desirable keep symbol names unmodified during the development process. But once a program is to be deployed the long names become a nuisance. This is when a person can step in and shorten the names.

In C++ the most critical classes are those with templates and/or deeply nested namespaces and class definitions. If such classes are part of the interface of a DSO the programmer should make a change. A shorter name for a class can be introduced by deriving publically a new class from the class with the long name. The definition could be in the global scope to avoid the namespace part of the mangled name. The symbols associated with this new class can be exported, the original class' names are not. This does not remove the names of the original class from the non-dynamic symbol table but this table does not play any role at run-time.

The wrapper class will have to redefine all non-virtual member functions of the class it is helping to export. This requires some work and it might add run-time costs by an additional function call, the one to the wrapper function. By using inlining this additional function call can be removed.

Shortening symbol names can be considered a micro-optimization and certainly shouldn't be performed prematurely. When keeping this optimization in mind during the development it might be easy to implement and the possible benefits can be big. Memory operations are slow and if the number of bytes which have to be loaded can be reduced this definitely has measurable results.

## 2.4 Choosing the Right Type

The selection of the right type can have significant impact on the performs, startup time, and size of a program. Most of the time it seems obvious what the right type is but alternatives are sometimes available and in other cases it might be preferable to rearrange code slightly. This section will provide a few concrete examples which by no means are meant to be a complete representation of all the cases which can be optimized.

### 2.4.1 Pointers vs. Arrays

In some situations there is little or no difference between pointers and arrays in C. The prototypes

```
void scale (int arr[10], int factor)
and
void scale (int *arr, int factor)
```

are in fact mostly equivalent. So people got the impression that there is never a difference and one often finds code like this:

```
char *str = "some string";
```

This is correct and meaningful in some situations. A variable `str` is created with an initial value being a pointer to a string. This specific piece of code compiles fine with some compilers but will generate a warning when compiled with `gcc`. More on that in the next section.

The point to be made here is that the use of a variable in this situation is often unnecessary. There might not be an assignment to `str` (note: not the string, the pointer variable). The value could be used only in I/O, string generation, string comparison or whatever.

If this is the case the code above is not optimal and wastes resources. All that would be needed is the string itself. A better definition would therefore be:

```
char str[] = "some string";
```

This is something completely different than the code before. Here `str` is only a name for a sequence of bytes

which contains initially the sequence "some string". By rewriting code in this way whenever it is possible we save one pointer variable in the non-sharable data segment, and one relative relocation to initialize the variable with a pointer to the string. Eventually the compiler is able to generate better code since it is known that the value of `str` can never change (the bytes pointed to by `str` can change).

## 2.4.2 Forever const

One nit still exists with the result in the last section: the string is modifiable. Very often the string will never change. In such a case the unsharable data segment is unnecessarily big.

```
const char str[] = "some string";
```

After adding the `const` keyword the compiler is able to move the string in sharable read-only memory. This not only improves the program's resource use and startup speed, it also allows to catch mistakes like writing into this string.

But that is not all. Modern `gcc` and linker versions can work together to perform cross-object optimizations. I.e., strings which appear in more than one object file appear only once in the final output. And even more: some linkers perform suffix optimizations, something which is possible with the string representation used in C. For this it is only necessary to realize that a string, which is the backpart of a longer string (including the NUL byte), can be represented by the bytes from the longer string.

```
const char s1[] = "some string";
const char s2[] = "string";
```

In this case only the string "some string" has to be stored in the read-only data segment. The string "string" is represented by a reference to the fifth character of the longer string.

To make this possible the compiler has to emit the string data in specially marked section. The sections are marked with the flags `SHF_MERGE` and `SHF_STRINGS`.

Not all strings can be handled, though. If a string contains an explicit NUL byte, as opposed to the implicit one at the end of the string, the string cannot be placed in mergeable section. Since the linker's algorithms use the NUL byte to find the end of the string the rest of the input string would be discarded. It is therefore desirable to avoid strings with explicit NUL bytes.

## 2.4.3 Arrays of Data Pointers

Some data structure designs which work perfectly well in application code add significant costs when used in DSOs. This is especially true for array of pointers. One example which shows the dilemma can be met frequently in well-designed library interface. A set of interfaces returns error number which can be converted using another function into strings. The code might look like this:

```
static const char *msgs[] = {
    [ERR1] = "message for err1",
    [ERR2] = "message for err2",
    [ERR3] = "message for err3"
};

const char *errstr (int nr) {
    return msgs[nr];
}
```

The problematic piece is the definition of `msgs`. `msgs` is as defined here a variable placed in non-sharable, writable memory. It is initialized to point to three strings in read-only memory (that part is fine). Even if the definition would be written as

```
static const char *const msgs[] = {
```

(note the addition `const`) this would not change anything. The compiler still would have the place the variable in writable memory. The reason are three relative relocation which modify the content of the array after loading. The total cost for this code is three words of data in writable memory and three relocations modifying this data in addition to the memory for the strings themselves.

Whenever a variable, array, structure, or union, contains a pointer, the definition of an initialized variable requires relocations which in turn requires the variable to be placed in writable memory. This along with the increased startup time due to processing of the relocations is not acceptable for code which is used only in error cases.

For a simple case as the example above a solution entirely within C can be used by rewriting the array definition like this:

```
static const char msgs[][17] = {
    [ERR1] = "message for err1",
    [ERR2] = "message for err2",
    [ERR3] = "message for err3"
};
```

The result of this code is optimal. The array `msgs` is placed entirely in read-only memory since it contains no pointer. The C code does not have to be rewritten. The drawback of this solution is that it is not always applicable. If the strings have different lengths it would mean

wasting quite a bit of memory since the second dimension of the array has to be that of the length of the longest string plus one. The waste gets even bigger if the values `ERR0`, `ERR1`, and `ERR2` are not consecutive and/or do not start with zero. Every missing entry would mean, in this case, 17 unused bytes.

There are other methods available for case which cannot be handled as the example above but none without major code rewrite.<sup>6</sup> One possible solution for the problem is the following. This code is not as elegant as the original code but it is still maintainable. Ideally there should be a tool which generates from a description of the strings the appropriate data structures. This can be done with a few lines

```
static const char msgstr[] =
    "message for err1\n0"
    "message for err2\n0"
    "message for err3";

static const size_t msgidx[] = {
    0,
    sizeof ("message for err1"),
    sizeof ("message for err1")
    + sizeof ("message for err2")
};

const char *errstr (int nr) {
    return msgstr + msgidx[nr];
}
```

The content of both arrays in this code is constant at compile time. The references to `msgstr` and `msgidx` in `errstr` also do not need relocations since the definitions are known to be local. The cost of this code include three `size_t` words in read-only memory in addition to the memory for the strings. I.e., we lost all the relocations (and therefore startup costs) and moved the array from writable to read-only memory. In this respect the code above is optimal.

#### 2.4.4 Arrays of Function Pointers

The situation for function pointers is very similar to that of data pointers. If a pointer to a function is used in the initialization of a global variable the variable the result gets written to must be writable and non-sharable. For locally defined functions we get a relative relocation and for functions undefined in the DSO a normal relocation which is not lazily performed. The question is how to avoid the writable variable and the relocations. Unfortunately there is no generally accepted single answer. All we can do here is to propose a few solution. Our example code for this section is this:

<sup>6</sup>If we would write assembler code we could store offsets relative to a point in the DSO and add the absolute address of the reference point when using the array elements. This is unfortunately not possible in C.

```
static int a0 (int a) { return a + 0; }
static int a1 (int a) { return a + 1; }
static int a2 (int a) { return a + 2; }

static int (*fps[]) (int) = {
    [0] = a0,
    [1] = a1,
    [2] = a2
};

int add (int a, int b) {
    return fps[b] (a);
}
```

A solution for this problem must inevitably be different from what we did for strings where we combined all strings into one. We can do this for functions as well but it will look different:

```
int add (int a, int b) {
    switch (b) {
        case 0:
            return a + 0;
        case 1:
            return a + 1;
        case 2:
            return a + 2;
    }
}
```

Inlining the code as in the code above should certainly be the preferred solution. The compiler never generates relocations for the implementation of a `switch` statement and therefore the whole code does not need any relocation.

Inlining makes sense even if the inlined function are much larger. Compilers do not have problems with large functions and might even be able to optimize better. The problem is only the programmer. The original code was clean and intentionally written using function pointers. The transformed code might be much less readable. This makes this kind of optimization one which is not performed until the code is tested and does not need much maintenance anymore.

A similar problem, though it (unfortunately) is rather rare today, arises for the use of computed `gotos`, a `gcc` extension for C. Computed `gotos` can be very useful in computer-generated code and in highly optimized code.<sup>7</sup> The previous example using computed `gotos` might look like this:

```
int add (int a, int b) {
    static const void *labels[] = {
        &&a0, &&a1, &&a2
    }
    goto *labels[b];
}
```

<sup>7</sup>Interested readers might want to look at the `vfprintf` implementation in the GNU libc.

```

};
goto *labels[b];
a0:
return a + 0;
a1:
return a + 1;
a2:
return a + 2;
}

```

How the code works should be obvious. The array `labels` contains pointers to the places in the function where the labels are placed and the `gotos` jumps to the place picked out of the array. The problem with this code is that the array contains absolute addresses which require relative relocations in a DSO and which require that the array `labels` is writable and placed in non-sharable memory.

The above code in principal is an implementation of a `switch` statement. The difference is that the compiler never stores absolute addresses which would need relocations of position-independent code is generated. Instead the addresses are computed relative to the PIC address, producing a constant offset. This offset then has to be added to the PIC register value which is a minimal amount of extra work. To optimize the code above a similar scheme but be used.

```

int add (int a, int b) {
    static const unsigned offsets[] = {
        &a0-&a0, &a1-&a0, &a2-&a0
    };
    goto *(&a0 + offsets[b]);
a0:
return a + 0;
a1:
return a + 1;
a2:
return a + 2;
}

```

Since we do not have direct access to the PIC register at compile-time and cannot express the computations of the offsets we have to find another base address. In the code above it is simply one of the target addresses, `a0`. The array `offsets` is in this case really constant and placed in read-only memory since all the offsets are known once the compiler finished generating code for the function. No relocations are necessary.

## 2.4.5 C++ Virtual Function Tables

Virtual function tables, generated for C++ classes with member functions tagged with `virtual`, are a special case. The tables normally involve function pointer which cause, as seen above, the linker to create relocations. It is also worthwhile looking at the runtime costs of virtual

functions compared to intra- and inter-DSO calls. But first the relocation issues.

Usually the virtual function table consists of an array of function pointers or function descriptors. These representations have in common that for every slot in the virtual function table there must be one relocation and all the relocations have to be resolved at startup-time. Therefore many different virtual function tables and virtual function tables with many entries impact startup time.

One other implication is noteworthy. Even though at runtime normally only one virtual function table is used (since the name is the same the first is in the lookup scope is used) all tables must be initialized. The dynamic linker has no possibility to determine whether the table will be used at some point or not and therefore cannot avoid initializing it. Having exactly one virtual function table definition in all the participating DSOs is therefore not only useful for space conservation reasons.

The cost of each relocation is determined whether the function is defined locally and not exported or not. Only for functions which are explicitly hidden by using the visibility attributes or a version script can the linker use relative relocations which can be processed quickly. Otherwise relocations with symbol lookups have to be used. Using the visibility attributes was mentioned as a possibility to get relative relocations. But since the virtual function table and the instantiated member functions are generated by the compiler adding an attribute cannot be done without some dirty tricks. So using linker version scripts is really the only possibility.

But even this is often not possible. Since the virtual functions are not only reachable via the virtual function table there is often no way around exporting them from the DSO. For instance, the virtual function in the following example is called directly.

```

struct foo {
    virtual int virfunc () const;
};
foo var;
int bar () { return var.virfunc (); }

```

The reason is that `var` is known to have type `foo` and not a derived type from which the virtual function table is used.

If a tiny runtime overhead is acceptable the virtual function and the externally usable function interface should be separated. Something like this:

```

/* In the header. */
struct foo {
    virtual int virfunc () const;
    int virfunc_do () const;
}

```

```
};

/* In the source code file. */
virtual int foo::virfunc () const
{ return virfunc_do (); }
int foo::virfunc_do () const
{ ...do something... }
```

In this case the real implementation of the function is in `virfunc_do` and the virtual function just calls it. There is no need for the user to call the virtual function directly as in the function `bar` above since `virfunc_do` can be called instead. Therefore the linker version script could hide the symbol for the virtual function and export `virfunc_do` to be called from other DSOs.

The consequence of hiding the virtual function is that the virtual function table slot for `virfunc` can be handled with a relative relocation. This is a big gain not only because this relocation type is much faster to handle. Since virtual function tables contain data references the relocation of the virtual function table slots must happen at startup time.

The improved example above assumes that direct calls are more frequent than calls through the virtual function table since there is additional overhead (one extra function call) involved when calling `virfunc`. If this assumption is wrong and calls through the virtual function table are more frequent then the implementations of the two functions can be swapped.

In summary, the number and size of virtual function tables should be kept down since it directly impacts startup time behavior. If virtual functions cannot be avoided the implementations of the functions should not be exported.

### 3 Maintaining APIs and ABIs

When writing DSOs which are used as resources in multiple projects mastering the technical aspects of writing optimized DSOs is only part of what is needed. Maintaining the programming interface (API) and the binary interface (ABI) play an even more important role in a successful project. Without API and ABI stability the DSO would be a burden to use or even unusable. In this section we will introduce a number of rules which increase the chance of success for project which provides interfaces for other projects. We are talking specifically about library implementations in DSOs but most rules can be transferred to projects of any kind.

#### 3.1 What are APIs and ABIs?

DSOs are used both at compile time and at run-time. At compile time the linker tries to satisfy undefined refer-

ences from the definitions in the DSO. The linker then associates the reference with the definition in the DSO. In ELF objects this reference is not explicitly present since the symbol lookup allows finding different definitions at run-time. But the reference is marked to be satisfied. At run-time the program can rely on the fact that a definition is present. If this would not be the case something changed in the DSO between the time of linking the application and the time the application is executed. A change in which a symbol vanishes is usually fatal. In some cases definitions in other DSOs can take over but this is nothing which one can usually be depended on. A symbol once exported must be available at run-time in the future.

The ABI of the DSI comprises the collection of all the definitions which were available for use during the lifetime of the DSO. Maintaining ABI compatibility means that no definition, also called interface, gets lost. This is only the easy part, though.

For variable definitions it also means that the size and structure of the variable does not change in a way the application cannot handle. What this actually means depends on the situation. If any code outside the DSO directly accesses the variable the accessed part of the structure of the variable must not change. On platforms which require copy relocations to handle accesses to variables defined in DSOs in the main application (such as IA-32) the size of the variable must not change at all. Otherwise variables might increase in size.

The requirements on function definitions are even harder to check. The documented semantic of a function must not change. Defining “semantic” for any non-trivial function is not easy, though. In the next section we try to define the requirements of a stable interface. Basically stability means that correct programs which ran in the past continue to run in the future. One of the requirements therefore is that the parameters of a function do not change. This brings up an interesting point: in C++ this is ensured automatically. Functions incorporate in their mangled names. This means that any change in the signature of a function will result in link-time and run-time errors and therefore can be detected easily. This is not the case for variables; their mangled names only contain the namespace part. Another good reason to not export variables as part of the API.

#### 3.2 Defining Stability

Having said that stability of the ABI is the highest goal of DSO maintenance it is now time to define what stability means. This might be surprising for some readers as a naïve view of the problem might be that everything which worked before has to continue working in the future. Everybody who tried this before will see a problem with this.

Requiring *everything* to continue to be possible in future releases would mean that even programs, which use interfaces in an undocumented way have to be supported. Almost all non-trivial function interfaces allow parameters to specify values which are outside the documented interface and most interfaces are influenced by side effects from other functions or previous calls. Requiring that such uses of an interface are possible in future revisions means that not only the interface but also the implementation is fixed.

As an example assume the implementation of the `strtok` function in the C run-time library. The standard requires that the first call if `strtok` gets passed a non-NULL first parameter. But what happens if the first call has a NULL as the first parameter? In this case the behavior is undefined (not even implemented-defined in this case). Some implementations will in this case simply return NULL since this a common side effect of a possible implementation. But this is not guaranteed. The function call might as well cause the application to crash. Both are valid implementations but changing from one to the other in the lifetime of a DSO would mean an incompatibility.

But is it really an incompatibility? No valid program would ever be affected. Only programs which are not following the documented interface are affected. And if the change in the implementation would mean an improvement in efficiency (according to whatever measure) this would mean broken applications prevent progress in the implementation of a DSO. This is not acceptable.

Stability therefore should be defined using the *documented* interface. Legitimate uses of interfaces should not be affected by changes in the implementation; using interfaces in an undefined way void the warranty. The same is true for using completely undocumented, internal symbols. Those must not be used at all. While this definition of stability is widely accepted it does not mean that avoiding or working around changes introduced by changes to the implementation is wrong. It just is not necessary if the achievement of stability comes at a cost. And there is always a cost associated with it.

Rejecting stability of undefined functionality is one thing, but what happens if some documented behavior changes? This is happen for various reasons:

- The implementation contains a bug. Other implementations produce different results and this is what people interested in cross-platform compatibility are interested in. The old, broken behavior might be useful, too.
- Similarly, alignment with standards, revisions of them, or existing practice in other implementations can promise gains in the future and therefore making a change is useful.
- Functionality of an interface gets extended or re-

duced according to availability of underlying technology. For instance, the introduction of more advanced harddisk drives can handle requests which previous versions cannot handle and these additional requests can be exposed through function interfaces.

Not making the changes can have negative results and making them definitely will have negative results. Making the change and still maintaining ABI stability requires the use of versioning.

But these incompatible changes to a DSO are not the only changes which can cause problems. Adding a new interface does not cause problems for existing applications. But if a new application uses the new interface it will run into problems if at run-time only the old version of the DSO, the one without the added symbol, is available. The user can detect this by forcing the dynamic linker to perform all relocations at load-time by defining `LD_BIND_NOW` to a nonempty value in the environment before starting the application. The dynamic linker will abort with an error if an old DSO is used. But forcing the relocations introduces major performance penalties (which is the reason why lazy relocations were introduced in the first place). Instead the dynamic linker should detect the old DSO version without performing the relocations.

### 3.3 ABI Versioning

The term “ABI versioning” refers to the process of associating an ABI with a specific version so that if necessary more than one version of the ABI can be present at any one time. This is no new concept but it was refined over time and not all possible versioning methods are available on all systems.

The first method is the oldest and coarsest grained one. It is implemented by using a different filename for each incompatible DSO. In ELF binaries dependencies on DSOs are recorded using `DT_SONAME` entries in the dynamic segment. The string associated with the entry has to be the name of an existing DSO. Different names can point to different files which makes coexistence of different DSOs possible and easy. But while this method is easy to use and such DSOs can easily be produced it has a major drawback. For every released version of the DSO which contains an incompatible change the SONAME would have to be changed. This can lead to large numbers of versions of the DSO which each differ only slightly from each other. This wastes resources especially at run-time when the running application need more than one version of the DSO. Another problem is the case when one single application loads more than one version of the DSO. This is easily possible if dependencies (other DSOs the application needs) pull in independently these different

versions. Since the two versions of the versioned DSO do not know about each other the results can be catastrophic. The only save way to handle versioning with filenames is to avoid the described situation completely. This is most probably only possible by updating all binaries right away which means that effectively no versioning happens. The main advantage of filename versioning is that it works everywhere and can be used as a fallback solution in case no other versioning method is available.

A second method with finer grained control was developed by Sun for their Solaris OS. In this method DSOs have internal versioning methods (filename versioning is obviously available on top of them). The internal versioning allows to make compatible changes to a DSO while avoiding run-time problems with programs running in environments which have only the old version of the DSO available. Compatible changes mean adding new interfaces or defining additional behavior for existing interfaces. Each symbol is associated with a version. The versions in a file are described by a non-cyclical graph which forms a hierarchy. If a symbol is associated with a version which has a predecessor it means that the properties of the symbol associated with the predecessor version are also fulfilled. In short: a new version is defined for a new release of a DSO whenever new features are added. Only the interfaces which changed in a compatible way get the new version associated. All the others keep the version they had in the previous release.

When the linker uses the versioned DSO to satisfy a dependency it also records the version of the used symbol. This way it gets for each DSO a list of required versions. This list is recorded in the binary which is produced. Which this information available it is now easy for the dynamic linker to determine at startup-time whether all the interfaces the application needs are available in the version which was used at link-time. To do this the dynamic linker has to go through the list of all required versions and search in the list of *defined* versions in the referenced DSOs for a matching entry. If no matching entry is found the DSO used at runtime is incompatible and the program does not start up.

While Sun's extensions help to cope with parts of the stability problem the much larger problem remains to be solved: how to handle incompatible changes. Every non-trivial DSO will sooner or later in its lifetime require some incompatible changes even if they are made to correct problems. Some (broken) program might depend on the old method. So far there is only one way out: change the SONAME.

With Linux's symbol versioning mechanism this is not necessary. ABIs can normally be kept stable for as long as wanted. The symbol versioning mechanism [4] is an extension of Sun's internal versioning mechanism. The two main differences are: it is possible to have more than one definition of a given symbol (the associated version

must differ) and the application or DSO linked with the versioned DSO contains not only a list of the required version, but also records for each symbol resolved from the versioned DSO which version is needed. This information can then at runtime be used to pick the right version from all the different versions of the same interface. The only requirement is that the API (headers, DSO used for linking, and documentation) is consistent. Every versioned DSO has at most one version of every API which can be used at link-time. An API (not ABI) can also vanish completely: this is a way to deprecate APIs without affecting binary compatibility.

The only real problem of this approach is that if more than one version of the same API is used in the same application. This can only happen if the uses are in different objects, DSOs or the application itself. From inside one object only one version can be accessed. In the last 5+ years this hasn't been found to be a problem in the GNU C library development. If it becomes a problem it can potentially be worked around by changing the implementation to make it aware of it. Since both versions of the interface are implemented in the same DSO the versions can coordinate. In general most of the implementation of the different versions is shared and the actual versioned interfaces are normally wrappers around a general implementation (see below).

If possible projects implementing generally usable DSOs should use symbol versioning from day one (since the same techniques are used from symbol hiding this is very attractive). Unfortunately this versioning scheme requires changes in the dynamic linker which are currently only available on Linux and GNU Hurd.<sup>8</sup> If this is not possible use Sun's internal versioning for compatible changes (really only applies to Solaris). Otherwise there is no option but to change the SONAME for every release with incompatible and possible even releases with compatible changes. But the fact that such limited systems exist should *never* make this the only implemented way: if better mechanisms are available they should be used.

### 3.4 Restricting Exports

One of the reasons changes between revisions of a DSO appear incompatible is that users use internal interfaces of the DSO. This should never happen and usually the official interfaces are documented and the internal interfaces have special names. Still, many users choose to ignore these rules and then complain when internal interfaces change or go away entirely. There is no justification for these complaints but developers can save themselves a lot of nerves by restricting the set of interfaces which are exported from the DSO.

<sup>8</sup>Apparently some of the BSD variants "borrowed" the symbol versioning design. They never told me though.

Section 2.2 introduced the mechanisms available for this. Now that symbol versioning has been introduced we can extend this discussion a bit. Using symbol maps was introduced as one of the possibilities to restrict the exported symbols. Ideally symbol maps should be used all the time, *in addition* to the other method chosen. The reason is that this allows associating version names with the interfaces which in turn later allow incompatible changes to be made without breaking the ABI. The example map file in section 2.2.3 does not define a version name, it is an anonymous version map. The version defining a version name would look like this:

```
VERS_1.0 {
    global: index;
    local: *;
};
```

In this example `VERS_1.0` is an arbitrarily chosen version name. As far as the static and dynamic linker are concerned version names are simply strings. But for maintenance purposes it is advised that the names are chosen to include the package name and a version number. For the GNU C library project, for instance, the chosen names are `GLIBC_2.0`, `GLIBC_2.1`, etc.

### 3.5 Handling Compatible Changes (GNU)

The two basic compatible changes, extending functionality of an existing interface and introducing a new interface, can be handled similarly but not exactly the same way. And we need slightly different code to handle the Linux/Hurd and the Solaris way. To exemplify the changes we extend the example in section 2.2. The `index` function as defined cannot handle negative parameters. A version with this deficiency fixed can handle everything the old implementation can handle but not vice versa. Therefore applications using the new interface should be prevented from running if only the old DSO is available. As a second change assume that a new function `indexpl` is defined. The code would now look like this when using Linux/Hurd:

```
static int last;

static int next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index1__ (int scale) {
    return next () << (scale>0 ? scale : 0);
}

extern int index2__ (int)
    __attribute__((alias ("index1__")));
asm(".symver index1__,index@VERS_1.0");
asm(".symver index2__,index@@VERS_2.0");
```

```
int indexpl (int scale) {
    return index2__ (scale) + 1;
}
```

Several things need explaining here. First, we do not explicitly define a function `index` anymore. Instead `index1__` is defined (note the trailing underscore characters; leading underscores are reserved for the implementation). This function is defined using the new semantic. The `extern` declaration following the function definition is in fact a definition of an alias for the name `index1__`. This is gcc's syntax for expressing this. There are other ways to express this but this one uses only C constructs which are visible to the compiler. The reason for having this alias definition can be found in the following two lines. These introduce the "magic" to define a versioned symbol with more than one definition. The assembler pseudo-op `.symver` is used to define an alias of a symbol which consists of the official name, @ or @@, and a version name. The alias name will be the name used to access the symbol. It has to be the same name used in the original code, `index` in this case. The version name must correspond to the name used in the map file (see the example in the previous section).

What remains to be explained is the use of @ and @@. The symbol defined using @@ is the default definition. There must be at most one. It is the version of the symbol used in all linker runs involving the DSO. No symbol defined using @ are ever considered by the linker. These are the compatibility symbols which are considered only by the dynamic linker.

In this example we define both versions of the symbol to use the same code. We could have just as well kept the old definition of the function and added the new definition. This would have increased the code size but would provide exactly the same interface. Code which calls the old version, `index@VERS_1.0`, would have produced unspecified behavior with the old DSO and now it would return the same as a call to `index@@VERS_2.0`. But since such a call is invalid anyway nobody can expect this ABI change to not happen.

Since this code introduced a new version name the map file has to change, too.

```
VERS_1.0 {
    global: index;
    local: *;
};

VERS_2.0 {
    global: index; indexpl;
} VERS_1.0;
```

The important points to note here are that `index` is mentioned in more than one version, `indexpl` only appears

in `VERS_2.0`, the `local:` definitions only appear in the `VERS_1.0` definition, and the definition of `VERS_2.0` refers to `VERS_1.0`. The first point should be obvious: we want two versions of `index` to be available, this is what the source code says. The second point is also easy to understand: `indexpl` is a new function and was not available when version 1 of the DSO was released. It is not necessary to mark the definition of `indexpl` in the sources with a version name. Since there is only one definition the linker is able to figure this out by itself.

The omission of the catch-all `local: *` case might be a bit surprising. There is no `local:` case at all in the `VERS_2.0` definition. What about internal symbols introduced in version 2 of the DSO? To understand this it must be noted that all symbols matched in the `local:` part of the version definition do not actually get a version name assigned. They get a special internal version name representing all local symbols assigned. So, the `local:` part could appear anywhere, the result would be the same. Duplicating `local: *` could possibly confuse the linker since now there are two catch-all cases. It is no problem to explicitly mention newly introduced but local symbols in the `local:` cases of new versions but it is normally not necessary since there always should be a catch-all case.

The fourth point, the `VERS_1.0` version being referred to in the `VERS_2.0` definition, is not really important in symbol versioning. It marks the predecessor relationship of the two versions and it is done to maintain the similarities with Solaris' internal versioning. It does not cause any problem in might in fact be useful to a human reader so predecessors should always be mentioned.

### 3.6 Handling Compatible Changes (Solaris)

The code changes to the code of the last section to handle Solaris' internal versioning simplify sources and the map file. Since there can only be one definition of a symbol (and since a symbol cannot be removed there is exactly one definition) we do not need any alias and we do not have to mention `index` twice in the map file. The source code would look like this:

```
static int last;

static int next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index (int scale) {
    return next () << (scale>0 ? scale : 0);
}

int indexpl (int scale) {
    return index (scale) + 1;
}
```

Note that this only works because the previously defined semantics of the `index` function is preserved in the new implementation. If this would not be the case this change would not qualify as compatible and the whole discussion would be moot. The equally simplified map file looks like this:

```
VERS_1.0 {
    local: *;
};
VERS_2.0 {
    global: index; indexpl;
} VERS_1.0;
```

The change consists of removing the `index` entry from version `VERS_1.0` and adding it to `VERS_2.0`. This leaves no exported symbol in version `VERS_1.0` which is OK. It would be wrong to remove `VERS_1.0` altogether after moving the `local: *` case to `VERS_2.0`. Even if the move would be done the `VERS_1.0` definition must be kept around since this version is named as the predecessor of `VERS_2.0`. If the predecessor reference would be removed as well, programs linked against the old DSO and referencing `index` in version `VERS_1.0` would stop working. Just like symbols, version names must never be removed.

The code in this section has one little problem the code for the GNU versioning model in the previous section does not have: the implementation of `indexpl` references the public symbol `index` and therefore calls it with a jump to the PLT (which is slower and possibly allows interposition). The solution for this is left as an exercise to the user (see section 2.2.5).

The Solaris runtime linker uses the predecessor implementation to determine when it finds an interface not available with the version found at link-time. If a application was linked with the old DSO constructed from the code above it would reference `index@VERS_1.0`. If the new DSO is found at runtime the version found would be `index@VERS_2.0`. In case such a mismatch is found the dynamic linker looks into the list of symbols and tries all predecessors in turn until all are checked or a match is found. In our example the predecessor of `VERS_2.0` is `VERS_1.0` and therefore the second comparison will succeed.

### 3.7 Incompatible Changes

Incompatible changes can only be handled with the symbol versioning mechanism present on Linux and GNU Hurd. For Solaris one has to fall back to the filename versioning method.

Coming from the code for the compatible change the differences are not big. For illustration we pick up the ex-

---

ample code once again. This time, instead of making a compatible change to the semantics of `index` we change the interface.

```
static int last;

static int next (void) {
    return ++last;
}

int index1__ (int scale) {
    return next () << scale;
}
asm(".symver index1__,index@VERS_1.0");

int index2__ (int scale, int *result) {
    if (result < 0
        || result >= 8 * sizeof (int))
        return -1;
    *result = index1__ (scale);
    return 0;
}
asm(".symver index2__,index@@VERS_2.0");
```

The interface of `index` in version `VERS_2.0` as implemented in `index2__` (note: this is the default version as can be seen by the two `@` in the version definition) is quite different and it can easily be seen that programs which previously return some more or less sensible value now can crash because `*result` is written to. This parameter would contain garbage if the function would be used with an old prototype. The `index1__` definition is the same as the previous `index` implementation. We once again have to define the real function with an alias since the `index` names get introduced by the `.symver` pseudo-ops.

It is characteristic for incompatible changes that the implementations of the different versions require separate code. But as in this case one function can often be implemented in terms of the other (the new code using the old code as it is the case here, or vice versa).

The map file for this example looks very much like the one for the compatible change:

```
VERS_1.0 {
    global: index;
    local: *;
};

VERS_2.0 {
    global: index;
} VERS_1.0;
```

We have two definitions of `index` and therefore the name must be mentioned by the appropriate sections for the two versions.

It might also be worthwhile pointing out once again that

the call to `index1__` in `index2__` does not use the PLT and is instead a direct, usually PC-relative, jump.

With a simple function definition like the one in this example it is no problem at all if different parts of the program call different versions of the `index` interface. The only requirement is that the interface the caller saw at compile time also is the interface the linker found when handling the relocatable object file. Since the relocatable object file does *not* contain the versioning information it is not possible to keep object files around and hope the right interface is picked by the linker. Symbol versioning only works for DSOs and executables. If it is necessary to re-link relocatable object files later it is necessary to recreate the link environment the linker would have seen when the code was compiled. The header files (for C, and whatever other interface specification exists for other languages) and the DSOs as used by linking together form the API. It is not possible to separate the two steps, compiling and linking.

---

## A Counting Relocations

The following script computes the number of normal and relative relocations as well as the number of PLT entries present in a binary. In an appropriate `readelf` implementation is used it can also be used to look at all files in an archive.

```
#!/usr/bin/perl
eval "exec /usr/bin/perl -S $0 $*"
    if 0;
# Copyright (C) 2000, 2001, 2002 Red Hat, Inc.
# Written by Ulrich Drepper <drepper@redhat.com>, 2000.

# This program is free software; you can redistribute it and/or modify
# it under the terms of the GNU General Public License version 2 as
# published by the Free Software Foundation.
#
# This program is distributed in the hope that it will be useful,
# but WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY; without even the implied warranty of
# MERCHANTABILITY or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. See the
# GNU General Public License for more details.
#
# You should have received a copy of the GNU General Public License
# along with this program; if not, write to the Free Software Foundation,
# Inc., 59 Temple Place - Suite 330, Boston, MA 02111-1307, USA. */

for ($cnt = 0; $cnt <= $#ARGV; ++$cnt) {
    $relent = 0;
    $relsz = 0;
    $relcount = 0;
    $pltrelsz = 0;

    open (READELF, "readelf -d $ARGV[$cnt] |") || die "cannot open $ARGV[$cnt]";
    while (<READELF>) {
        chop;
        if (/.* \((RELENT\) *([0-9]*)\)/) {
            $relent = $1 + 0;
        } elsif (/.* \((RELSZ\) *([0-9]*)\)/) {
            $relsz = $1 + 0;
        } elsif (/.* \((RELCOUNT\) *([0-9]*)\)/) {
            $relcount = $1 + 0;
        } elsif (/.* \((PLTRELSZ\) *([0-9]*)\)/) {
            $pltrelsz = $1 + 0;
        }
    }
    close (READELF);

    printf ("%s: %d relocations, %d relative, %d PLT entries\n",
        $ARGV[$cnt], $relent == 0 ? 0 : $relsz / $relent, $relcount,
        $relent == 0 ? 0 : $pltrelsz / $relent);
}
}
```

---

## B References

- [1] *System V Application Binary Interface*, <http://www.caldera.com/developers/gabi/>, 2001.
- [2] Ulrich Drepper, *ELF Handling For Thread-Local Storage*, <http://people.redhat.com/drepper/tls.pdf>, 2002.
- [3] Ulrich Drepper, *Good Practices in Library Design, Implementation, and Maintenance*, <http://people.redhat.com/drepper/goodpractices.pdf>, 2002.
- [4] Ulrich Drepper, *ELF Symbol Versioning*, <http://people.redhat.com/drepper/symbol-versioning>, 1999.
- [5] Sun Microsystems, *Linker and Library Guide*, <http://docs.sun.com/db/doc/816-1386>, 2002.
- [6] TIS Committee, *Executable and Linking Format (ELF) Specification, Version 1.2*, <http://x86.ddj.com/ftp/manuals/tools/elf.pdf>, 1995.

## C Revision History

**2002-11-2** First public draft.

**2002-11-8** Fixed a couple of typos.

Document one more possibility for handling arrays of string pointers.

Describe PLT on IA-32 in more details.

**2002-11-14** Document implications of using C++ virtual functions.

Draft