

Evolution of Programming Languages: Away from Objects

Distributed Systems
Sistemi Distribuiti

Andrea Omicini
andrea.omicini@unibo.it

Dipartimento di Informatica – Scienza e Ingegneria (DISI)
ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – Università di Bologna a Cesena

Academic Year 2015/2016

Evolution of Programming Languages: The Picture

- [Ode02]

	Monolithic Programming	Modular Programming	Object-Oriented Programming	Agent Programming
Unit Behavior	Nonmodular	Modular	Modular	Modular
Unit State	External	External	Internal	Internal
Unit Invocation	External	External (CALLED)	External (message)	Internal (rules, goals)

Evolution of Programming Languages: Dimensions

Historical evolution

- Monolithic programming
- Modular programming
- Object-oriented programming
- Agent programming

Degree of modularity & encapsulation

- Unit behaviour
- Unit state
- Unit invocation

Monolithic Programming

- The basic unit of software is the whole program
- Programmer has full control
- Program's state is responsibility of the programmer
- Program invocation determined by system's operator
- Behaviour could not be invoked as a reusable unit under different circumstances
 - modularity does not apply to unit behaviour

Evolution of Programming Languages: The Picture

Monolithic Programming

Encapsulation? There is no encapsulation of anything, in the very end

	Monolithic Programming	Modular Programming	Object-Oriented Programming	Agent Programming
Unit Behavior	Nonmodular	Modular	Modular	Modular
Unit State	External	External	Internal	Internal
Unit Invocation	External	External (CALLED)	External (message)	Internal (rules, goals)

The Prime Motor of Evolution

Motivations

- Larger memory spaces and faster processor speed allowed program to become more complex

Results

- Some degree of organisation in the code was required to deal with the increased complexity

Modular Programming

- The basic unit of software are structured loops / subroutines / procedures / ...
 - this is the era of procedures as the primary unit of decomposition
- Small units of code could actually be reused under a variety of situations
 - modularity applies to subroutine's code
- Program's state is determined by externally supplied parameters
- Program invocation determined by CALL statements and the likes

Evolution of Programming Languages: The Picture

Modular Programming

Encapsulation? Encapsulation applies to *unit behaviour* only

	Monolithic Programming	Modular Programming	Object-Oriented Programming	Agent Programming
Unit Behavior	Nonmodular	Modular	Modular	Modular
Unit State	External	External	Internal	Internal
Unit Invocation	External	External (CALLED)	External (message)	Internal (rules, goals)

Object-Oriented Programming

- The basic unit of software are objects & classes
- Structured units of code could actually be reused under a variety of situations
- Objects have local control over variables manipulated by their own methods
 - variable state is persistent through subsequent invocations
 - object's state is encapsulated
- Object are passive—methods are invoked by external entities
 - modularity does not apply to unit invocation
 - object's control is not encapsulated

Evolution of Programming Languages: The Picture

Object-Oriented Programming

Encapsulation? Encapsulation applies to unit *behaviour* & *state*

	Monolithic Programming	Modular Programming	Object-Oriented Programming	Agent Programming
Unit Behavior	Nonmodular	Modular	Modular	Modular
Unit State	External	External	Internal	Internal
Unit Invocation	External	External (CALLED)	External (message)	Internal (rules, goals)

Agent-Oriented Programming

- The basic unit of software are agents
 - encapsulating everything, in principle
 - by simply following the pattern of the evolution
 - whatever an agent is
 - we do not need to define them now, just to understand their desired features
- Agents could in principle be reused under a variety of situations
- Agents have control over their own state
- Agents are active
 - they cannot be invoked
 - agent's control is encapsulated

Evolution of Programming Languages: The Picture

Agent-Oriented Programming

Encapsulation? Encapsulation applies to unit *behaviour*, *state* & *invocation*

	Monolithic Programming	Modular Programming	Object-Oriented Programming	Agent Programming
Unit Behavior	Nonmodular	Modular	Modular	Modular
Unit State	External	External	Internal	Internal
Unit Invocation	External	External (CALLED)	External (message)	Internal (rules, goals)

Features of Agents

Before we define agents...

- ... agents are *autonomous* entities
 - encapsulating their thread of control
 - they can say “Go!”
- ... agents cannot be invoked
 - they can say “No!”
 - they do not have an interface, nor do they have methods
- ... agents need to encapsulate a criterion for their activity
 - to self-govern their own thread of control

Dimensions of Agent Autonomy

Dynamic autonomy

- Agents are *dynamic* since they can exercise some degree of activity
 - they can say “Go!”
- From passive through reactive to active

Unpredictable / non-deterministic autonomy

- Agents are *unpredictable* since they can exercise some degree of deliberation
 - they can say “Go!”, they can say “No!”
 - and also because they are “opaque”—may be unpredictable to external observation, not necessarily to design
- From predictable through partially predictable to unpredictable

Objects vs. Agents: Interaction & Control

Message passing in object-oriented programming

- Data flow along with control
 - data flow cannot be designed as separate from control flow
- A too-rigid constraint for complex distributed systems. . .

Message passing in agent-oriented programming

- Data flow through agents, control does not
 - data flow can be designed independently of control
- Complex distributed systems can be designed by designing information flow

Agents Communication

Agents communicate

- Interaction between agents is a matter of exchanging information
 - toward Agent Communication Languages (ACL)
- Agents can be involved in *conversations*
 - they can be involved in associations lasting longer than the single communication act
 - differently from objects, where one message just refer to one method

Philosophical Differences [Ode02] I

Decentralisation

- Object-based systems are completely pre-determined in control. Control is essential centralised at design time
- Agent-oriented systems are essentially decentralised in control

Multiple & dynamic classification

- Once created, objects typically have an unmodifiable class
- After creation, agents can change their role, task, goal, class, . . . , according to their needs and to the ever-changing structure of the surrounding environment

Philosophical Differences [Ode02] II

Instance-level features

- Objects are class instances whose features are essentially defined by classes themselves once and for all
- Agents features can change during execution, by adaptation, learning, ...

Small in impact

- Loosing an object in an object-oriented system makes the whole system fail, or at least raise an exception
- Loosing an agent in a multi-agent system may lead to decreases in performance, but agents are not necessarily single points of failure

Philosophical Differences [Ode02] III

Small in time

- Garbage collection is an extra-mechanism in object-oriented languages for taking advantage of disappearing objects
- Disappearing agents can simply be forgotten naturally, with no need of extra-mechanisms

Small in scope

- Objects can potentially interact with the whole object space, however their interaction space is defined once and for all at design time: this defines a sort of local information space where they can retrieve knowledge from
- Agents are not omniscient and omnipotent, and typically rely on local sensing of their surrounding environment

Philosophical Differences [Ode02] IV

Emergence

- Object-based systems are essentially predictable
- Multi-agent systems are intrinsically unpredictable and non-formalisable and typically give rise to emergent phenomena

Analogies from nature and society

- Object-oriented systems have not an easy counterpart in nature
- Multi-agent systems closely resembles existing natural and social systems

Towards the Coexistence of Agents and Objects

Final issues from [Ode02]

- Should we *wrap* objects to *agentify* them?
- Could we really *extend objects* to make them agents?
- How are we going to *implement the paradigm shift*, under the heavy weight of legacy?
 - technologies, methodologies, tools, human knowledge, shared practises, ...

References



James Odell.

Objects and agents compared.

Journal of Object Technologies, 1(1):41–53, May–June 2002.

Evolution of Programming Languages: Away from Objects

Distributed Systems
Sistemi Distribuiti

Andrea Omicini
andrea.omicini@unibo.it

Dipartimento di Informatica – Scienza e Ingegneria (DISI)
ALMA MATER STUDIORUM – Università di Bologna a Cesena

Academic Year 2015/2016