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Declarative operations (1)

• An operation is *declarative* if whenever it is called with the same arguments, it returns the same results independent of any other computation state

• A declarative operation is:
  – *Independent* (depends only on its arguments, nothing else)
  – *Stateless* (no internal state is remembered between calls)
  – *Deterministic* (call with same operations always give same results)

• Declarative operations can be composed together to yield other declarative components
  – All basic operations of the declarative model are declarative and combining them always gives declarative components
Declarative operations (2)
Why declarative components (1)

- There are two reasons why they are important:
- *(Programming in the large)* A declarative component can be written, tested, and proved correct independent of other components and of its own past history.
  - The complexity (reasoning complexity) of a program composed of declarative components is the *sum* of the complexity of the components
  - In general the reasoning complexity of programs that are composed of nondeclarative components explodes because of the intimate interaction between components
- *(Programming in the small)* Programs written in the declarative model are much easier to reason about than programs written in more expressive models (e.g., an object-oriented model).
  - Simple algebraic and logical reasoning techniques can be used
Why declarative components (2)

- Since declarative components are mathematical functions, algebraic reasoning is possible i.e. substituting equals for equals
- The declarative model of CTM Chapter 2 guarantees that all programs written are declarative
- Declarative components can be written in models that allow stateful data types, but there is no guarantee

Given
\[ f(a) = a^2 \]
We can replace \( f(a) \) in any other equation
\[ b = 7f(a)^2 \text{ becomes } b = 7a^4 \]
The word *declarative* means many things to many people. Let’s try to eliminate the confusion.

The basic intuition is to program by defining the *what* without explaining the *how*.
Oz kernel language

The following defines the syntax of a statement, \( \langle s \rangle \) denotes a statement

\[
\langle s \rangle ::= \text{skip} \\
\mid \langle x \rangle = \langle y \rangle \\
\mid \langle x \rangle = \langle v \rangle \\
\mid \langle s_1 \rangle \langle s_2 \rangle \\
\mid \text{local } \langle x \rangle \text{ in } \langle s_1 \rangle \text{ end} \\
\mid \text{proc } '{' \langle x \rangle \langle y_1 \rangle \ldots \langle y_n \rangle }' \text{ end} \\
\mid \text{if } \langle x \rangle \text{ then } \langle s_1 \rangle \text{ else } \langle s_2 \rangle \text{ end} \\
\mid '{' \langle x \rangle \langle y_1 \rangle \ldots \langle y_n \rangle }' \\
\mid \text{case } \langle x \rangle \text{ of } \langle \text{pattern} \rangle \text{ then } \langle s_1 \rangle \text{ else } \langle s_2 \rangle \text{ end}
\]

empty statement
variable-variable binding
variable-value binding
sequential composition
declaration
procedure introduction
conditional
procedure application
pattern matching
Why the Oz KL is declarative

- All basic operations are declarative
- Given the components (sub-statements) are declarative,
  - sequential composition
  - local statement
  - procedure definition
  - procedure call
  - if statement
  - case statement

are all declarative (independent, stateless, deterministic).
What is state?

- State is a **sequence of values in time** that contains the intermediate results of a desired computation.
- Declarative programs can also have state according to this definition.
- Consider the following program:

```
fun {Sum Xs A}
  case Xs
  of X|Xr then {Sum Xr A+X}
  [] nil then A
  end
end

{Browse {Sum [1 2 3 4] 0}}
```
What is implicit state?

The two arguments Xs and A represent an implicit state:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Xs</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1 2 3 4]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 3 4]</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3 4]</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4]</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nil</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```plaintext
fun {Sum Xs A}
  case Xs
  of X|Xr then {Sum Xr A+X}
  [] nil then A
end
end
{Browse {Sum [1 2 3 4] 0}}
```
What is explicit state: Example?

An unbound variable

A cell \( C \) is created with initial value 5
\( X \) is bound to \( C \)

The cell \( C \), which \( X \) is bound to, is assigned the value 6
What is explicit state: Example?

An unbound variable

A cell $C$ is created with initial value 5

$X$ is bound to $C$

The cell $C$, which $X$ is bound to, is assigned the value 6

- The cell is a value container with a unique identity
- $X$ is really bound to the identity of the cell
- When the cell is assigned, $X$ does not change
What is explicit state?

- **X = {NewCell I}**
  - Creates a cell with initial value I
  - Binds X to the identity of the cell

- **Example:** \( X = \{\text{NewCell } 0\} \)

- **{Assign X J}**
  - Assumes X is bound to a cell C (otherwise exception)
  - Changes the content of C to become J

- **Y = {Access X}**
  - Assumes X is bound to a cell C (otherwise exception)
  - Binds Y to the value contained in C
Examples

- $X = \{\text{NewCell 0}\}$
- $\{\text{Assign X 5}\}$
- $Y = X$
- $\{\text{Assign Y 10}\}$
- $\{\text{Access X}\} == 10$ % returns true
- $X == Y$ % returns true
Examples

- \( X = \{\text{NewCell 10}\} \)
  \( Y = \{\text{NewCell 10}\} \)

- \( X \equiv Y \ % \text{ returns} \ false \)

- Because \( X \) and \( Y \) refer to different cells, with different identities

- \( \{\text{Access } X\} \equiv \{\text{Access } Y\} \) returns \text{true}
The model extended with cells

Semantic stack

\[ w = f(x) \]
\[ z = \text{person}(a:y) \]
\[ y = \alpha 1 \]
\[ u = \alpha 2 \]
\[ x \]

single assignment store

\[ \alpha 1: w \]
\[ \alpha 2: x \]
\[ .... \]
\[ .... \]

mutable store
The stateful model

\[
\langle s \rangle ::= \text{skip} \\
\mid \langle s_1 \rangle \langle s_2 \rangle \\
\mid \ldots \\
\mid \{\text{NewCell } \langle x \rangle \langle c \rangle\} \\
\mid \{\text{Exchange } \langle c \rangle \langle x \rangle \langle y \rangle\}
\]

empty statement
statement sequence
cell creation
cell exchange

Exchange: bind \( \langle x \rangle \) to the old content of \( \langle c \rangle \) and set the content of the cell \( \langle c \rangle \) to \( \langle y \rangle \)
The stateful model

| {NewCell \langle x \rangle \langle c \rangle} | cell creation |
| {Exchange \langle c \rangle \langle x \rangle \langle y \rangle} | cell exchange |

Exchange: bind \langle x \rangle to the old content of \langle c \rangle and set the content of the cell \langle c \rangle to \langle y \rangle

\begin{align*}
\text{proc} \{\text{Assign } C \ X\} \ \{\text{Exchange } C \ _ \ X\} \ \text{end} \\
\text{fun} \ {\text{Access } C} \ X \ \text{in} \{\text{Exchange } C \ X \ X\}X \ \text{end}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
C := X & \text{ is syntactic sugar for } \{\text{Assign } C \ X\} \\
@C & \text{ is syntactic sugar for } \{\text{Access } C\} \\
X=C:=Y & \text{ is syntactic sugar for } \{\text{Exchange } C \ X \ Y\}
\end{align*}
Abstract data types (revisited)

- For a given functionality, there are many ways to package the ADT. We distinguish three axes.
- **Open vs. secure ADT**: is the internal representation visible to the program or hidden?
- **Declarative vs. stateful ADT**: does the ADT have encapsulated state or not?
- **Bundled vs. unbundled ADT**: is the data kept together with the operations or is it separable?
- Let us see what our stack ADT looks like with some of these possibilities
Stack:
Open, declarative, and unbundled

• Here is the basic stack, as we saw it before:

```
fun {NewStack} nil end
fun {Push S E} E|S end
fun {Pop S E} case S of X|S1 then E=X  S1 end end
fun {IsEmpty S} S==nil end
```

• This is completely unprotected. Where is it useful? Primarily, in small programs in which expressiveness is more important than security.
Stack:
Secure, declarative, and unbundled

- We can make the declarative stack secure by using a wrapper:

```plaintext
local Wrap Unwrap
in
  {NewWrapper Wrap Unwrap}
  fun {NewStack} {Wrap nil} end
  fun {Push S E} {Wrap E|{Unwrap S}} end
  fun {Pop S E} case {Unwrap S} of X|S1 then E=X {Wrap S1} end end
  fun {IsEmpty S} {Unwrap S} ==nil end
end
```

- Where is this useful? In large programs where we want to protect the implementation of a declarative component.
Stack:
Secure, *stateful*, and unbundled

- Let us combine the wrapper with state:
  ```
  local Wrap Unwrap
  in
  {NewWrapper Wrap Unwrap}
  fun {NewStack} {Wrap {NewCell nil}} end
  proc {Push W X} C={Unwrap W} in {Assign C X|{Access C}} end
  fun {Pop W} C={Unwrap W} in
    case {Access C} of X|S then {Assign C S} X end
  end
  fun {IsEmpty W} {Access {Unwrap W}}==nil end
  end
  ```

- This version is stateful but lets us store the stack separate from the operations. The same operations work on all stacks.
Stack:
Secure, stateful, and *bundled*

- This is the simplest way to make a secure stateful stack:

```
    C={NewCell nil}
in
    proc {Push X}
        {Assign C X|{Access C}}
    end
fun {Pop}
    case {Access C} of X|S then {Assign C S} X end end
fun {IsEmpty} {Access C} ==nil end
end
```

- Compare the declarative with the stateful versions: the declarative version needs two arguments per operation, the stateful version uses higher-order programming (instantiation)

- With some syntactic support, this is *object-based programming*
Four ways to package a stack

- **Open, declarative, and unbundled**: the usual declarative style, e.g., in Prolog and Scheme
- **Secure, declarative, and unbundled**: use wrappers to make the declarative style secure
- **Secure, stateful, and unbundled**: an interesting variation on the usual object-oriented style
- **Secure, stateful, and bundled**: the usual object-oriented style, e.g., in Smalltalk and Java
- **Other possibilities**: there are four more possibilities!

**Exercise**: Try to write all of them.
Encapsulated stateful abstract datatypes ADT

• These are stateful entities that can be accessed only by the external interface
• The implementation is not visible outside
• We show two methods to build stateful abstract data types:
  – The functor based approach (record interface)
  – The procedure dispatch approach
The functor-based approach

fun \{NewCounter I\}
S = \{NewCell I\}
proc \{Inc\} S := @$S + 1 end
proc \{Dec\} S := @$S - 1 end
fun \{Get\} @$S end
proc \{Put I\} S := I end
proc \{Display\} \{Browse @$S\} end
in o(inc:\text{Inc} dec:\text{Dec} get:\text{Get} put:\text{Put} display:\text{Display})
end
The functor-based approach

fun \{NewCounter I\}

\[ S = \{\text{NewCell I}\} \]

proc \{Inc\} \( S := @S + 1 \) end

proc \{Dec\} \( S := @S - 1 \) end

fun \{Get\} \( @S \) end

proc \{Put I\} \( S := I \) end

proc \{Display\} \{Browse @S\} end

in \( \text{o(inc:Inc dec:Dec get:Get put:Put browse:Display)} \)

end

The state is collected in cell S

The state is completely encapsulated

i.e. not visible outside
The functor-based approach

fun \{NewCounter I\}

S = \{NewCell I\}
proc \{Inc\} S := @$S + 1 end
proc \{Dec\} S := @$S - 1 end
fun \{Get\} @$S end
proc \{Put I\} S := I end
proc \{Display\} \{Browse @$S\} end

in o(inc:Inc dec:Dec get:Get put:Put display:Display)
end
The functor-based approach

fun \{NewCounter \, I\} 
  \(S = \{\text{NewCell} \, I\}\)
  proc \{Inc\}  \(S := @S + 1\) end
  proc \{Dec\}  \(S := @S - 1\) end
  fun \{Get\}  \(\@S\) end
  proc \{Put \, I\}  \(S := I\) end
  proc \{Display\}  \{\text{Browse} \, S.v\} end
in  \text{o}(inc:\text{Inc} \, \text{dec}:\text{Dec} \, \text{get}:\text{Get} \, \text{put}:\text{Put} \, \text{display}:\text{Display})
end

functions that access
the state by lexical scope
Call pattern

```
declare C1 C2
C1 = {NewCounter 0}
C2 = {NewCounter 100}

{C1.inc}
{C1.display}

{C2.dec}
{C2.display}
```
Defined as a functor

functor Counter
export inc:Inc dec:Dec get:Get put:Put display:Display init:Init
define

    S
    S := @S + 1 end
    S := @S - 1 end
fun {Get} @S end
proc {Put I} S := I end
proc {Display} {Browse @S} end
end
Functors

• Functors have been used as a specification of modules
• Also functors have been used as a specification of abstract datatypes
• How to create a stateful entity from a functor?
Explicit creation of objects from functors

- Given a variable F that is bound to a functor
  
  \[ [O] = \{ \text{Module.apply [F]} \} \]

  creates stateful ADT object O that is an instance of F

- Given the functor F is stored on a file ’f.ozf’
  
  \[ [O] = \{ \text{Module.link [’f.ozf’]} \} \]

  creates stateful ADT object O that is an instance of F
functor Counter

export inc:Inc dec:Dec get:Get put:Put display:Display init:Init

define

S

proc {Init init(I)} S = {NewCell I} end
proc {Inc} S := @$S + 1 end
proc {Dec} S := @$S - 1 end
fun {Get} @$S end
proc {Put I} S := I end
proc {Display} {Browse @$S} end

end
Pattern of use

fun \{\text{New Functor Init}\}
\begin{align*}
    & M \text{ in} \\
    & [M] = \{\text{Module.apply [Functor]}\} \\
    & \{M.\text{init Init}\} \\
    & M \\
End
\end{align*}

\texttt{Generic function to create objects from functors}

\texttt{Generic function to create objects from functors}

declare C1 C2
C1 = \{\text{New Counter init(0)}\}
C2 = \{\text{New Counter init(100)}\}
\{C1.\text{inc}\} \{C1.\text{put 50}\} \{C1.\text{display}\}
\{C2.\text{dec}\} \{C2.\text{display}\}

\texttt{Object interface is a record with procedure values inside fields}

C. Varela; Adapted from S. Haridi and P. Van Roy
The procedure-based approach

fun {Counter}
  S
  proc {Inc inc(Value)} S := @S + Value end
  proc {Display display} {Browse @S} end
  proc {Init init(I)} S = {NewCell I} end
  D = o(inc:Inc display:Display init:Init)
in  proc{$ M} {D. {Label M} M} end
end
The procedure-based approach

fun {Counter}
  S
...
  D = o(inc:Inc display:Display init:Init)
in proc ${M} {D.{Label M} M} end
end

fun {New Class InitialMethod}
  O = {Class}
in {O InitialMethod} O end
Example

• The following shows how an object is created from a class using the procedure `New/3`, whose first argument is the class, the second is the initial method, and the result is the object.

• `New/3` is a generic procedure for creating objects from classes.

```
declare C = {New Counter init(0)}
{C display}
{C inc(1)}
{C display}
```

Object interface is as a procedure of one argument, which expects a record.
Object-oriented programming

• Supports
  – Encapsulation
  – Compositionality
  – Instantiation

• Plus
  – Inheritance
Inheritance

• Programs can be built in hierarchical structure from ADT’s that depend on other ADT’s (Components)
• Object-oriented programming (inheritance) is based on the idea that ADTs have so much in common
• For example, sequences (stacks, lists, queues)
• Object oriented programming enables building ADTs incrementally, through inheritance
• An ADT can be defined to inherit from another abstract data type, substantially sharing functionality with that abstract data type
• Only the difference between an abstract datatype and its ancestor has to be specified
What is object-oriented programming?

- **OOP (Object-oriented programming) = encapsulated state + inheritance**

- **Object**
  - An entity with unique identity that encapsulates state
  - State can be accessed in a controlled way from outside
  - The access is provided by means of methods (procedures that can directly access the internal state)

- **Class**
  - A specification of objects in an incremental way
  - Incrementality is achieved inheriting from other classes by specifying how its objects (instances) differ from the objects of the inherited classes
## Instances (objects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interface</td>
<td>(what methods are available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>(attributes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>(methods)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Classes (simplified syntax)

A class is a statement

class ⟨ClassVariable⟩
  attr
    ⟨AttrName1⟩
    :
    ⟨AttrNameN⟩
  meth ⟨Pattern1⟩ ⟨Statement⟩ end
  :
  meth ⟨PatternN⟩ ⟨Statement⟩ end
end
A class can also be a value that can be in an expression position

class $
    \text{attr}
        \langle \text{AttrName1} \rangle
        : \langle \text{AttrName} \rangle
    \text{meth} \langle \text{Pattern} \rangle \langle \text{Statement} \rangle \text{end}
        : \langle \text{Pattern} \rangle \langle \text{Statement} \rangle \text{end}
end
Classes in Oz

The class Counter has the syntactic form

```oz
class Counter
  attr val
  meth display
    {Browse @val}
  end
  meth inc(Value)
    val := @val + Value
  end
  meth init(Value)
    val := Value
  end
end
```
Attributes of Classes

The class Counter has the syntactic form

```plaintext
class Counter
    attr val
    meth display
        {Browse @val}
    end
    meth inc(Value)
        val := @val + Value
    end
    meth init(Value)
        val := Value
    end
end
```

val is an attribute: a modifiable cell that is accessed by the atom val
Attributes of classes

The class Counter has the syntactic form

```plaintext
class Counter
  attr val
  meth display
    {Browse @val}
end
meth inc(Value)
  val := @val + Value
end
meth init(Value)
  val := Value
end
end
```

the attribute val is accessed by the operator @val
Attributes of classes

The class Counter has the syntactic form

```plaintext
class Counter
    attr val
    meth display
        {Browse @val}
    end
    meth inc(Value)
        val := @val + Value
    end
    meth init(Value)
        val := Value
    end
end
```

the attribute val is assigned by the operator := as val := ...
Methods of classes

The class Counter has the syntactic form

```plaintext
class Counter
    attr val
    meth display
        {Browse @val}
    end
    meth inc(Value)
        val := @val + Value
    end
    meth init(Value)
        val := Value
    end
end
```

methods are statements
method head is a record (tuple) pattern
The class Counter has the syntactic form

```plaintext
class Counter
    attr val
    meth display
        {Browse @val}
    end
    meth inc(Value)
        val := @val + Value
    end
    meth init(Value)
        val := Value
    end
end
```
Example

- An object is created from a class using the procedure `New/3`, whose first argument is the class, the second is the initial method, and the result is the object (such as in the functor and procedure approaches).

- `New/3` is a generic procedure for creating objects from classes.

```latex
\textbf{declare} \; C = \{ \text{New Counter init(0)} \}
\{ C \; \text{display} \}
\{ C \; \text{inc(1)} \}
\{ C \; \text{display} \}
```
• A class $X$ is defined by:
  - `class $X$ ... end`

• Attributes are defined using the attribute-declaration part before the method-declaration part:
  - `attr $A_1$ ... $A_N$`

• Then follows the method declarations, each has the form:
  - `meth $E$ $S$ end`

• The expression $E$ evaluates to a method head, which is a record whose label is the method name.
Summary

• An attribute $A$ is accessed using $@A$.
• An attribute is assigned a value using $A := E$
• A class can be defined as a value:
  • $X = \texttt{class } \ldots \texttt{ end}$
Attribute Initialization

- Stateful (may be updated by :=)
- Initialized at object creation time, all instances have the initial balance = 0

- `class Account
  attr balance: 0
  meth ... end
  ...
  end`

  In general the initial value of an attribute could be any legal value (including classes and objects)
Attribute Initialization

• Initialization by instance

```
class Account

    attr balance

    meth init(X) balance := X end

    ...

end

• O1 = {New Account init(100)}
• O2 = {New Account init(50)}
```
Attribute Initialization

- Initialization by brand

```java
declare L=linux
class RedHat
    attr ostype:L
    meth get(X) X = @ostype end
end
class SuSE
    attr ostype:L
    meth get(X) X = @ostype end
end
class Debian
    attr ostype:L
    meth get(X) X = @ostype end
end
```
Example

class Queue

attr front back count

meth init

    Q in
    front := Q  back := Q  count := 0

end

meth put(X)

    Q in
    @back = X|Q
    back := Q
    count := @count + 1

end

...
class Queue
    attr front back count
    meth init
        Q in
        front := Q  back := Q  count := 0
    end
    meth put(X)
        Q in
        @back = X|Q
        back := Q
        count := @count + 1
    end
    ...
end
Example

class Queue

    attr front back count

    ...

    meth get(?X)
        Q in
        X|Q = @front
        front := Q
        count := @count - 1
    end

    meth count(?X) X = @count end

    ...

    end
Classes as incremental ADTs

• Object-oriented programming allows us to define a class by extending existing classes

• Three things have to be introduced
  – How to express inheritance, and what does it mean?
  – How to access particular methods in the new class and in preexisting classes
  – Visibility – what part of the program can see the attributes and methods of a class

• The notion of delegation as a substitute for inheritance
Inheritance

• Inheritance should be used as a way to specialize a class while retaining the relationship between methods
• In this way it is just an extension of an ADT
• The other view is inheritance is just a (lazy) way to construct new abstract data types!
• No relationships are preserved
Inheritance

```
class Account
    attr balance:0
    meth transfer(Amount)
        balance := @balance+Amount
    end
    meth getBal(B)
        B = @balance
    end
end

A={New Account transfer(100)}
```
The class VerboseAccount has the methods: transfer, getBal, and verboseTransfer

Conservative extension

class VerboseAccount
  from Account
  meth verboseTransfer(Amount)
    ...
    end
end
Inheritance II

Non-Conservative extension

class AccountWithFee
  from VerboseAccount
  attr fee:5
  meth transfer(Amount)
    ...
  end
end

The class AccountWithFee has the methods: transfer, getBal, and verboseTransfer
The method transfer has been redefined (overridden) with another definition
Inheritance II

Non-Conservative extension

```ruby
class AccountWithFee
  from VerboseAccount
  attr fee: 5
  method transfer(Amount)
    ...
  end
end
```

Diagram:

- Account
  - VerboseAccount
    - AccountWithFee
Polymorphism

The ability for operations to take objects (instances) of different types.

For example, the transfer method can be invoked in account object instances of three different classes.

The most specific behavior should be executed.
Dynamic binding

• Inside an object $O$ we want to invoke a method $M$

• This is written as `{self M}`, and chooses the method visible in the current object ($M$ of $D$)
Static and dynamic binding

Static binding

- Inside an object $O$ we want to invoke a method $M$ in a specific (super) class
- This is written as $C, M$ and chooses the method visible in the super class $C$ ($M$ of $C$)

$$
\text{class } C \\
\text{meth } M
$$

$$
\text{class } D \\
a \text{subclass of } C \\
\text{meth } M
$$

$$
O \\
an \text{instance of } D
$$
**Static method calls**

- Given a class and a method head \( m(\ldots) \), a static method-call has the following form:
  \( C, m(\ldots) \)

- Invokes the method defined in the class argument.

- A static method call can only be used inside class definitions.

- The method call takes the current object denoted by `self` as implicit argument.

- The method \( m \) could be defined in the class \( C \), or inherited from a super class.
Exercises

63. Do Java and C++ object abstractions completely encapsulate internal state? If so, how? If not, why?

64. Do Java and C++ enable static access to methods defined in classes arbitrarily high in the inheritance hierarchy? If so, how? If not, why?

65. Exercise CTM 7.9.1 (pg 567)

66. Exercise CTM 7.9.7 (pg 568)