Explaining OOP through Typed Lambda Calculus

Eduardo Bonelli

April 25, 2019

Foundations of OOPL

- What is OOP?
- Propose fundamental building blocks of what one considers to be an OOPL
- ► Model must be rigorous
 - Precise definitions
 - So we can compare them with others
 - So that we can prove properties about them
 - So that we can assess impact of changes

Two Paths

- 1. Translate to a "low-level" formalism that is well-understood
 - ► Eg. Lambda Calculus
- 2. Primitive formalization of representative notions
 - ► Eg. Featherweight Java

Translation to Lambda Calculus

We will use Lambda Calculus with

- functions
- records
- references
- recursion
- subtyping

In order to formalize:

- dynamic method dispatch
- state encapsulation
- inheritance
- this
- super

Example Object in Java

```
class Counter {
protected int x = 1;
int get() { return x }
void inc() { x++; }
void inc3(Counter c) {
c.inc(); c.inc(); c.inc();
Counter c = new Counter();
inc3(c);
inc3(c);
c.get();
```

Same Object in Lambda Calculus

► Let

Counter={get:Unit -> Nat, inc:Unit -> Unit}

► Then

```
c = let x = ref 1 in  \{ \text{get} = \lambda_{-} : \text{Unit. !x,} \\ \text{inc} = \lambda_{-} : \text{Unit. x:=succ(!x)} \}; \\ \implies \text{c:Counter}
```

► The notation

 $e \Longrightarrow r$

should be read

"Evaluate e yielding r as result"

Objects

```
If we declare
inc3 = \lambdac:Counter.(c.inc unit; c.inc unit; c.inc unit);
\Longrightarrow
inc3: Counter -> Unit
Then
(inc3 c; inc3 c; c.get unit);
\Longrightarrow
```

New Object Generation

```
newCounter =
  \lambda:Unit. let x = ref 1 in
                \{get = \lambda_{-}: Unit. !x,
                  inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. x:=succ(!x)};
newCounter : Unit -> Counter
For example
nc = newCounter unit;
\Longrightarrow
nc : Counter
```

Grouping Instance Variables

- Objects typically have multiple instance variables
- ▶ We can group them into records

```
\label{eq:local_contents} \begin{split} \text{newCounter} &= \\ \lambda_-: \text{Unit. let } r = \{ \text{x=ref 1} \} \text{ in} \\ \{ \text{get} &= \lambda_-: \text{Unit. !} (\text{r.x}), \\ \text{inc} &= \lambda_-: \text{Unit. r.x:=succ(!} (\text{r.x})) \}; \end{split}
```

The local variable r has type CounterRep = {x: Ref Nat}

Subtyping and Inheritance

```
class Counter {
protected int x = 1;
int get() { return x; }
void inc() { x++; }
class ResetCounter extends Counter {
void reset() { x = 1; }
ResetCounter rc = new ResetCounter();
inc3(rc);
rc.reset();
inc3(rc);
rc.get();
```

Attempt to Encode in Lambda Calculus

```
ResetCounter = {get:Unit -> Nat;
                   inc:Unit -> Unit:
                   reset:Unit -> Unit};
newResetCounter =
  \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1} in
                   \{get = \lambda_{:}Unit. ! (r.x),
                    inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. r.x:=succ(!(r.x)),
                    reset = \lambda_{-}:Unit. r.x:=1};
newResetCounter: Unit -> ResetCounter
```

Attempt to Encode in Lambda Calculus

Summary

Everything looks good

Java	Lambda Calculus
Class	Record type of the public interface
Class instantiation C	newC:Unit -> C

- We can also deal with multiple instance variables
- ► However newResetCounter does not make use of the extant implementation of the methods get and inc

```
\lambda_{-}: \text{Unit. let } r = \{x = ref 1\} \text{ in } \\ \{get = \lambda_{-}: \text{Unit. } !(r.x), \\ \text{inc } = \lambda_{-}: \text{Unit. } r.x := \text{succ}(!(r.x)), \\ \text{reset } = \lambda_{-}: \text{Unit. } r.x := 1\};
```

Towards an Encoding of Classes

- The inconvenience with the definition of newResetCounter is that it does not reuse the extant implementation of the methods get and inc
- What about this?

```
\label{eq:local_conter} \begin{split} \text{newResetCounterFromCounter} &= \\ \lambda \text{c:Counter. let } \text{r} &= \{\text{x=ref 1}\} \text{ in} \\ \{\text{get} &= \text{c.get,} \\ \text{inc} &= \text{c.inc,} \\ \text{reset} &= \lambda_-\text{:Unit. r.x:=1}\}; \end{split}
```

Towards an Encoding of Classes

- ► The inconvenience with the definition of newResetCounter is that it does not reuse the extant implementation of the methods get and inc
- What about this?

```
newResetCounterFromCounter = \lambdac:Counter. let r = {x=ref 1} in {get = c.get, inc = c.inc, reset = \lambda_-:Unit. r.x:=1};
```

▶ Does not work: reset does not have access to the local variable r of the original counter

Classes

Should allow one to

- 1. Instantiate new objects
- 2. be extended with subclasses

Encoding Classes

► In order to avoid the above mentioned problem we separate the definition of methods...

```
\begin{array}{l} \text{counterClass =} \\ \lambda \text{r:CounterRep.} \\ \{ \text{get = $\lambda_{-}$:Unit. !(r.x),} \\ \text{inc = $\lambda_{-}$:Unit. r.x:=succ(!(r.x))} \}; \\ \Longrightarrow \text{counterClass : CounterRep -> Counter} \end{array}
```

 ...from the act of associating them to a particular set of instance variables

```
\label{eq:counter} \begin{array}{ll} \text{newCounter = $\lambda_{-}$:Unit. let r = $\{x$=ref 1$\} in} \\ & \text{counterClass r;} \\ \Longrightarrow \text{newCounter : Unit -> Counter} \end{array}
```

Encoding Classes

More generally:

► A class CClass is represented as aa function

- ► Type CRep is the representation of the state (i.e. instance variables)
- ► Type C is the type of the class itself (i.e. the type of the instances of C)

Subclassing

```
resetCounterClass =
    \( \lambda r: CounterRep. \)
    let super = counterClass r in
    \( \{ get = super.get, \)
        inc = super.inc,
        reset = \( \lambda_-: Unit. \) r.x:=1\\( \};

\Rightarrow resetCounterClass : CounterRep -> ResetCounter
```

- Constructor resetCounterClass invokes the constructor counterClass
- ► Inheritance = nesting of local declarations

Subclassing

```
resetCounterClass =
  \lambdar:CounterRep.
     let super = counterClass r in
        {get = super.get,
         inc = super.inc,
         reset = \lambda_{-}:Unit. r.x:=1};
⇒ resetCounterClass : CounterRep -> ResetCounter
newResetCounter =
  \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1} in resetCounterClass r;
⇒ newResetCounter : Unit -> ResetCounter
```

 Constructor resetCounterClass invokes the constructor counterClass

Method Override and New Instance Variables

```
class Counter {
protected int x = 1;
int get() { return x; }
void inc() { x++; }
class ResetCounter extends Counter {
void reset() \{ x = 1; \}
class BackupCounter extends ResetCounter {
protected int b = 1;
void backup() { b = x; }
void reset() { x = b; }
```

Adding Instance Variables

```
BackupCounter = {get:Unit->Nat, inc:Unit->Unit,
                  reset:Unit->Unit, backup:Unit->Unit}
BackupCounterRep = {x:Ref Nat, b:Ref Nat};
backupCounterClass =
  \lambda r:BackupCounterRep.
     let super = resetCounterClass r in
       {get = super.get,
        inc = super.inc,
        reset = \lambda_{-}:Unit. r.x:=!(r.b).
        backup = \lambda_{-}:Unit. r.b:=!(r.x)};
backupCounterClass : BackupCounterRep -> BackupCounter
```

Adding Instance Variables

Note: backupCounterClass extends (with backup) and also overrides (with reset) the definition of counterClass

```
backupCounterClass =
    \( \lambda \) r:BackupCounterRep.
    let super = resetCounterClass r in
        {get = super.get,
            inc = super.inc,
            reset = \( \lambda_:\text{Unit.} \) r.x:=!(r.b),
            backup = \( \lambda_:\text{Unit.} \) r.b:=!(r.x) \( \);
```

backupCounterClass : BackupCounterRep -> BackupCounter

Adding Instance Variables

Subtyping is crucial

- resetCounterClass : CounterRep -> ResetCounter
- CounterRep = {x:Ref Nat}
- BackupCounterRep = {x:Ref Nat, b:Ref Nat}

BackupCounterRep<:CounterRep</pre>

```
backupCounterClass = \lambda r: BackupCounterRep. let super = resetCounterClass r in \{ get = super.get, \\ inc = super.inc, \\ reset = \lambda_{-}: Unit. \ r.x:=!(r.b), \\ backup = \lambda_{-}: Unit. \ r.b:=!(r.x) \};
```

Super

- Suppose we want a subclass of BackupCounterClass
- ▶ It should modify inc so that it first backs up the state before updating it

Motivating "this"

Suppose counters have methods set, get and inc

Motivating "this"

Suppose counters have methods set, get and inc

Behavior of inc could be specified via get/set

In Java

```
class SetCounter {
  protected int x = 1;
  int get() { return x; }
  int set(int i) { x=i; }
  void inc() { this.set( this.get()+1 ); }
}
```

"This" as a Fixed-Point – Motivation

Suppose we have an object instance of SetCounter

```
\label{eq:newSetCounter} \begin{array}{ll} \text{newSetCounter} &=& \lambda_-\text{:Unit. let } r = \{x = ref \ 1\} \text{ in } \\ &=& \text{setCounterClass } r; \\ &\Longrightarrow \text{newCounter : Unit -> Counter} \end{array}
```

If vr is the value of r, then newSetCounter () is the object:

```
 \{ get = \lambda_{-}: Unit. !(vr.x), \\ set = \lambda i: Nat. vr.x:=i, \\ inc = \lambda_{-}: Unit. vr.x:= succ(!(vr.x)) \}
```

Recall that we want to write inc in terms of this, just like in the Java code

"This" as a Fixed-Point – Motivation

In other words, from

we want to obtain:

and provide meaning to this in the term above

```
this = {get = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(vr.x),

set = \lambdai:Nat. vr.x:=i,

inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. this.set (succ (this.get unit))}
```

From an operational point of view, we can consider an unbounded number of unfoldings as the meaning:

```
this = {get = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(vr.x),

set = \lambdai:Nat. vr.x:=i,

inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. {get = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(vr.x),

set = \lambdai:Nat. vr.x:=i,

inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. ...set (succ

(...get unit))};.set

(succ ({get = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(vr.x),

set = \lambdai:Nat. vr.x:=i,

inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. ...set (succ (...get unit))
```

this as a Fixed Point

Unbounded unfoldings = fix

Small-step semantics of fix (from previous class)

$$\overline{fix(\lambda f:\sigma.M)} \rightarrow M\{f:=fix(\lambda f:\sigma.M)\}$$

Putting it All Together

```
setCounterClass =
  \lambda r: CounterRep.
     (\lambdathis:SetCounter.
        \{get = \lambda_{-}: Unit. ! (r.x), \}
         set = \lambdai:Nat. r.x:=i,
         inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. this.set (succ (this.get unit))});
setCounterClass : CounterRep -> SetCounter -> SetCounter
newSetCounter =
 \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1} in
             fix (setCounterClass r);
⇒ newSetCounter : Unit -> SetCounter
```

Example Continued

- We now want a new kind of counter
- ▶ It should be a subclass of setCounter
- ▶ Its instances should record the number of calls to set

```
instrCounterClass =
  \lambda r: InstrCounterRep.
    (\lambdathis:InstrCounter.
       let super = setCounterClass r this in
         {get = super.get,
          set = \lambdai:Nat. (r.a:=succ(!(r.a)); super.set i),
          inc = super.inc,
          accesses = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(r.a)};
instrCounterClass : InstrCounterRep -> InstrCounter ->
                  InstrCounter
```

```
\label{eq:local_conterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconterconter
```

- this is passed on to the superclass as argument
- Hence, every reference to this in the superclass (i.e. setCounterClass) correctly referes to InstrCounterClass
- Eg. inc and super will call the set method of instrCounterClass, which in turn calls set of the superclass

Subtyping is crucial, yet again, in the call to setCounterClass

A Problem with Object Creation

► What happens when we try to create an instance of the class instrCounterClass?

```
newInstrCounter unit
```

where

```
newInstrCounter = \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1, a=ref 0} in fix (instrCounterClass r)
```

A Problem with Object Creation

```
newInstrCounter =
 \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1, a=ref 0} in
                  fix (instrCounterClass r)
      newInstrCounter unit
 \rightarrow let r = \{x = ref 1, a = ref 0\} in fix(instrCounterClass r)
 → fix(instrCounterClass ivars)
 \rightarrow fix(\lambdaself : InstrCounter .
        let super = setCounterClass ivars self in imethods)
      let super = setCounterClass ivars (fix f) in imethods
      let super = (\lambdaself: SetCounter . smethods) (fix f) in imethods
      let super = (\lambdaself: SetCounter . smethods)
          (let super = setCounterClass ivars (fix f) in imethods)
        in imethods
```

Solution

- Delay evaluation of this placing it under an abstraction
- Use call-by-name at certain critical points in the program
- Use references to records rather than fixed points for object representation
- Set aside LC and use different formalism to model OOP

Thunks

Place term M of type σ under an abstraction:

 \mathtt{M} : σ

is replaced with

 $\texttt{M'=}\lambda_{:} \texttt{Unit.M: Unit} \; {\to} \; \sigma$

It is called with

M' unit

Thunks

```
setCounterClass =
  \lambda r: CounterRep.
    \lambdathis: Unit->SetCounter.
      \lambda:Unit.
       \{get = \lambda_{-}: Unit. ! (r.x), \}
        set = \lambdai:Nat. r.x:=i.
        inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. (this unit).set
                   (succ ((self unit).get unit))});
⇒ setCounterClass : CounterRep ->
            (Unit->SetCounter) -> (Unit->SetCounter)
newSetCounter = \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1} in
                         fix (setCounterClass r) unit;
```

Similar for instrCounterClass

```
instrCounterClass =
  \lambda r: InstrCounterRep.
    \lambdaself: Unit->InstrCounter.
      \lambda:Unit.
        let super = setCounterClass r self unit in
          {get = super.get,
           set = \lambdai:Nat. (r.a:=succ(!(r.a)); super.set i),
           inc = super.inc,
           accesses = \lambda_{-}:Unit. !(r.a)};
newInstrCounter =
 \lambda_{-}:Unit. let r = {x=ref 1, a=ref 0} in
                fix (instrCounterClass r) unit
```

Use Ref instead of fix for Objects

```
setCounterClass: CounterRep -> (Ref SetCounter) -> SetCounter
  \lambda r:CounterRep. \lambda self:Ref SetCounter.
        \{get = \lambda_{:}Unit. !(r.x),
         set = \lambdai: Nat. r.x := i,
         inc = \lambda_{-}: Unit. (!self).set(succ((!self).get unit))
dummySetCounter: SetCounter =
        \{get = \lambda_{:}Unit. 0,
         set = \lambdai:Nat. unit,
         inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. unit
newSetCounter : Unit -> SetCounter =
 \lambda:Unit. let r = {x = ref 1} in
               let cAux = ref dummySetCounter in
                   (cAux := (setCounterClass r cAux); !cAux)
```

Problem with Inheritance

```
instrCounterClass =
   \lambda r: InstrCounterRep.
     \lambdaself:Ref InstrCounter.
      let super = setCounterClass r self in
          {get = super.get,
           set = \lambdai:Nat. (r.a := succ(!(r.a)); super.set i)
           inc = super.inc,
           accesses = \lambda_{:}Unit. !(r.a)}
⇒ instrCounterClass : InstrCounterRep -> (Ref InstrCounter
                             -> InstrCounter
```

Type error: Ref InstrCounter </: Ref SetCounter

Replace Ref with Source (1/2)

Replace Ref with Source (2/2)

```
InstrCounterClass =  \lambda r : InstrCounterRep. \ \lambda self : Source \ InstrCounter.  let super = setCounterClass r self in  \{ get = super.get, \\ set = \lambda i : Nat. \ (r.a := succ(!(r.a)); \ super.set : inc = super.inc, \\ accesses = \lambda_- : Unit. \ !(r.a) \}  \Longrightarrow instrCounterClass : InstrCounterRep ->  (Source \ InstrCounter) \ -> \ InstrCounter
```

Type checks: Source InstrCounter <: Source SetCounter

Replace fix with ref

```
dummyInstrCounter: InstrCounter =
          \{get = \lambda_{-}: Unit. 0, \}
           set = \lambdai:Nat. unit.
           inc = \lambda_{-}:Unit. unit,
           accesses = \lambda_{-}:Unit. 0}
newInstrCounter : Unit -> InstrCounter =
  \lambda:Unit. let r = {x = ref 1, a = ref 0} in
                let cAux = ref dummyInstrCounter in
                 (cAux := (instrCounterClass r cAux); !cAux)
```

Recall

```
Ref T <: Source T
Ref T <: Sink T</pre>
```