



THE FOUR AGENT PERSPECTIVES

Brian Cantwell Smith: 2 lessons of logic

'First factor': what must be realised in a physical substrate if the system is to do any work

"proof theory" form

'Second factor': what the symbols are about

"model theory" content

First lesson: content can't be reduced to form

Second lesson:
first and second factors have to be related

"soundness and completeness"

Want principles to connect content and form

In computer science

semantics = unambiguous execution

BUT in this sense ...

2nd factor is "semantics of the semantics" !

cf McDERMOTT
"A CRITIQUE OF PURE REASON"

3 tenets of classical logic to be reconstructed

✓✓ CONTEXT DEPENDENCE
X use can be ignored. A sentence must represent its whole content explicitly. X

✓✓ INTERACTION OF FIRST/SECOND FACTORS
X locally first & second factors treated independently, ultimately globally related. X

CF Defn of formal

"From step to step, in a formal proof, the first-factor inference procedure can not depend on or affect second-factor semantic interpretation" X

✓✓ MORE DISCRIMINATE MODELLING
language and modelling are treated as distinct types of representation:
X linguistic reference relation non-transitive, but modelling is transitive and "free":
can use a model of X in place of X. X

X "promiscuous modelling" X

SOFTWARE

Harel: Biting the Silver Bullet - January 1992

Developments in 1-person prog 1950-75
largely eliminated the problems

"No single reason: mix of factors that prevailed"

How about reactive systems? ...
.... Brooks, Parnas pessimistic

Harel's analysis:

Behavioural models with
good mathematical semantics
=> can **execute** models

Need to be **visual**

Can do extensive **testing** with prototypes

.. in 25 years problems will have gone away ...?

? is there a fundamental distinction between
1-person programming
and
reactive systems engineering

? is there fundamental distinction between
1-person programming
and
reactive systems engineering

NO - both involve
requirements analysis + program specification
2nd factor **1st factor**

YES - requirements analysis for
reactive systems involves

- design of computational devices
from first principles
- essential interaction between 1st/2nd factors

Much more is **preconceived** in 1-person prog:

- computational devices
- requirement described off-line

PROGRAMMING

≡ TRANSFORMATIONS OF STATE + HUMAN INTERPRETATION

PROGRAMMING

Object-oriented programming: a case study

1967 Birtwistle et al: Simula

- programming = system description
- Key abstraction - the object
- Idea: identify objects in the application
build a model to reflect capabilities
to act to change state in system

=> Problems:

- propagation of state-change via content
non-computable relations:
"doodling vs signing away my house"
- principles for constructing objects unclear
- parallelism badly modelled wrt indivisibility

Object-oriented programming: a case study

1972 - Parnas et al

- objects for information hiding: 1st factor
=> objects as a **programming device**

1980 - Smalltalk

class concept / inheritance

=> Principles of Simula obscured

- Powerful mix of 1st & 2nd factor concerns
- No clear basis for prescribing parallelism

1985 - Pierre America:
Semantics for Parallel OO Language

Theorists describe POOL formally ...

Formalising limits power to link 1st/2nd factor

APPLICATIONS

Motivation for linking 1st & 2nd factors

Need to know how to:

- write programs that are easy to interpret *
- write interactive programs to adapt to user
- integrate requirements analysis and spec
- model CAD, where user introduces knowledge incrementally
- program a robot to make correspondence: between **internal model & sensory input**

Conventions to link 1st and 2nd factor aspects:

descriptive identifiers
lazy evaluation
data structures to reflect the application objects
etc

BUT

This is inadequate ... need new **principles** to deal with 1st and 2nd factor interaction

* AND DOES THIS MEAN ANYTHING

?