

Exercise 5

Behavioral Subtyping and Inheritance

October 23, 2020

Task 1

Consider the following Java code:

```
1 interface I {};  
2  
3 class C {};  
4  
5 public class Main {  
6  
7     public static C getC() {  
8         return new C();  
9     }  
10  
11     public static void main(String[] argv) {  
12         C c1 = new C();  
13         C c2 = getC();  
14  
15         I i1 = (I) c1;  
16         I i2 = (I) c2;  
17     }  
18 }
```

Try to compile it. If it compiles, try to execute it. What happens? Why? Do you expect to see the same behavior if `I` were a class, instead of an interface?

— solution —

- If `I` is an *interface*: the compiler allows the code to go through, although it cannot prove that `c1` and `c2` implement `I`. The reason is that there might be a subclass `D` of `C` such that `D` implements `I` and `c1` and `c2` might be objects of `D`. Here Java opts for the flexibility of dynamic type checking. When the code executes, a runtime exception is thrown, because `c1` does not implement `I` and this is caught by the runtime check. If we would comment out line 15, a runtime exception would be thrown in line 16, as `c2` does not implement `I` either.
- If `I` were a *class*: the code would not compile, due to type errors in lines 15 and 16. In this case, Java chooses static type checking: as it does not support multiple inheritance, it is not possible to have a subclass `D` of `C`, which also extends `I`.

Task 2

Consider the following Java classes:

```
class Number {  
    int n;
```

```

    /// requires true
    /// ensures n == p
    void set(int p) {
        n = p;
    }
}

class UndoNaturalNumber extends Number {
    int undo;

    /// requires 0 < q
    /// ensures n == q && undo == old(n)
    void set(int q) {
        undo = n;
        n = q;
    }
}

```

Is UndoNaturalNumber a behavioral subtype of Number, based on the rules from slide 62?

Now consider that we are using specification inheritance. What are the effective pre/post-conditions of the method UndoNaturalNumber.set according to the rules from slides 68 and 72?

— solution —

UndoNaturalNumber is not a behavioral subtype of Number, because it has a stronger precondition for the method set.

The effective precondition is: $\text{true} \vee (0 < q)$, which is equivalent to true .

The effective postcondition is: $(\text{old}(\text{true}) \implies n == p) \ \&\& \ (\text{old}(0 < q) \implies n == q \ \&\& \ \text{undo} == \text{old}(n))$. Note that p and q refer to the same parameter, so the effective postcondition actually is: $(\text{old}(\text{true}) \implies n == q) \ \&\& \ (\text{old}(0 < q) \implies n == q \ \&\& \ \text{undo} == \text{old}(n))$. Since for parameters we always have $\text{old}(q) == q$, the effective postcondition is equivalent to $(n == q) \ \&\& \ (0 < q \implies \text{undo} == \text{old}(n))$.

Task 3

From a previous exam.

Assume the following types in Java:

```

enum Shift {DayShift, NightShift, SpecialShift}

interface PostalWorker {
    boolean sick();

    ///ensures sick()
    void catchDisease();

    ///requires when == SpecialShift || when == DayShift
    ///requires !sick()
    int work(Shift when);
}

interface Bartender {
    boolean sick();

    ///ensures sick()
    void catchDisease();
}

```

```

    ///requires when == SpecialShift || when == NightShift
    ///requires !sick()
    int work(Shift when);
}

```

The `work()` method can be called to request the corresponding person to work the specified shift. The value returned by `work()` is the average hourly wage that was earned during the working shift including tips.

A) Now we introduce another interface:

```

interface HardWorker extends PostalWorker, Bartender {
    ///requires true
    int work(Shift when);
}

```

Assuming the rules for specification inheritance discussed in the course (slides 68 and 72), what is the effective precondition of the `work()` method of the `HardWorker` interface?

— solution —

```

///requires
    (!sick() && (when == SpecialShift || when == DayShift))
|| (!sick() && (when == SpecialShift || when == NightShift))
|| true

```

which is equivalent to

```

///requires true

```

B) Now we add postconditions to all `work()` methods. Everything else remains as before.

```

interface PostalWorker {
    ...
    ///ensures result ≥ 15 && result ≤ 25
    int work(Shift when);
}

interface Bartender {
    ...
    ///ensures result ≥ 20 && result ≤ 30
    int work(Shift when);
}

interface HardWorker extends PostalWorker, Bartender {
    ...
    ///ensures result ≥ 25 && result ≤ 50
    int work(Shift when);
}

```

Assuming the rules for specification inheritance discussed in the course (slides 68 and 72), what is the effective postcondition of the `work()` method of the `HardWorker` interface?

— solution —

```

///ensures
    ( old(!sick() && (when == SpecialShift || when == DayShift))
      ⇒ (result ≥ 15 && result ≤ 25) )
&& ( old(!sick() && (when == SpecialShift || when == NightShift))

```

```
    => (result ≥ 20 && result ≤ 30) )
&& ( old(true)
    => (result ≥ 25 && result ≤ 50) )
```

which is equivalent to

```
///ensures
( old(!sick() && when != NightShift)
  => result == 25 )
&& ( old(!sick() && when == NightShift)
  => (result ≥ 25 && result ≤ 30) )
&& ( old(sick())
  => (result ≥ 25 && result ≤ 50) )
```

C) Consider the following code:

```
///requires worker != null
///requires !worker.sick()
int foo(HardWorker worker) {
    return worker.work(Shift.SpecialShift);
}
```

What is the range of possible return values of the method `foo()`?

— solution —

Only 25 is a possible return value.

D) Change the body of the method `foo()` such that it calls the `work()` method of `worker` in a way that makes it possible for this call to return 50.

— solution —

```
int foo(HardWorker worker) {
    worker.catchDisease();
    return worker.work(Shift.SpecialShift);
}
```

Task 4

Suppose that we have a database, for which we would like to add an “automated key generation” feature. This means that each time the user inserts a new tuple, a unique key is automatically generated for the tuple by the system. A way to do this is to write a counter, which increments by 1 the value that it returns each time it is called. The method that generates a new key is called `generate`.

A) Write a Java class `IncCounter` and an accompanying specification for such a counter.

— solution —

```
class IncCounter {
    ///constraint old(key) <= key
    int key;

    IncCounter () { key = 0; }
}
```

```

    /// ensures (key == old(key) + 1) ∧ (result == old(key))
    int generate () { return key++; }
}

```

B) Annotate the following Java class with specifications and show that it is not a behavioural subtype of IncCounter.

```

class DecCounter {
    int key;
    DecCounter () { key = 0; }
    int generate () { return key--; }
}

```

— solution —

The postcondition which precisely describes the behavior of the method DecCounter.generate is $(key == \text{old}(key) - 1) \wedge (\text{result} == \text{old}(key))$. This postcondition does not refine the postcondition of IncCounter.generate. The history constraint is $\text{old}(key) \geq key$ and also does not strengthen the one of IncCounter.

C) Write an abstract class GenerateUniqueKey together with a specification, such that both IncCounter and DecCounter (with the specifications from tasks A and B) are behavioural subtypes of GenerateUniqueKey, and such that GenerateUniqueKey.generate generates unique keys. In the specification, you may use helper methods and fields.

— solution —

The abstract parent class GenerateUniqueKey can be declared using a helper *pure* method boolean used(int). Note that only pure (i.e., side-effect free) methods can be used in specifications. Informally, the helper method returns true if x has been used as a key before. Furthermore, the correctness of the class relies on the property that once a number is used, it never becomes unused again. This can be expressed using a history constraint.

The definitions of the classes follow:

```

abstract class GenerateUniqueKey {
    /// constraint  $\forall x:\text{int} \mid (\text{old}(\text{used}(x)) \Rightarrow \text{used}(x))$ 
    abstract boolean used(int);

    /// ensures  $\neg \text{old}(\text{used}(\text{result})) \wedge \text{used}(\text{result})$ 
    abstract int generate ();
}

class IncCounter { // ... and similarly for DecCounter
    /// constraint  $\text{old}(key) \leq key$ 
    int key;
    IncCounter () { key = 0; }

    boolean used (int x) { return x < key; }

    /// ensures  $key == \text{old}(key) + 1 \wedge \text{result} == \text{old}(key)$ 
    int generate () { return key++; }
}

```

Task 5

From a previous midterm.

Imagine extending the syntax of the Java language to support the following keywords:

- `subtypes`: used to declare that a class is a subtype of another class (without inheritance)
- `inherits`: used to declare that a class inherits from another class (without subtyping)

Now consider the following classes:

```
class A {
    public int foo (int n) { return n - 1; }
}

class B {
    public int foo (int n) { return n + 1; }
    public int bar (int n) { return foo(n) - 1; }
}

class C inherits A subtypes B {
    public int bar (int n) { return foo(n); }
}

class Main {
    public static void main(String[] args) {
        B b = new C();
        System.out.println( b.bar(3) );
    }
}
```

What should happen if we tried to compile the code and execute the method `main` from the class `Main`?

- The code should be rejected by the compiler
- The code should compile but the execution should fail
- CORRECT:** The code should compile and print 2
- The code should compile and print 4
- None of the above

Task 6

Consider two classes `Stack` and `Queue`, implementing the standard LIFO/FIFO data structures, both of which have methods with the following signatures:

```
void push(Object o);
Object pop();
bool isEmpty();
int size();
void reverse();
```

A) Despite having identical signatures, these two classes cannot be behavioral subtypes of each other. Why is this the case?

— solution —

The intended behavior is that a `Stack` is LIFO, while a `Queue` is FIFO. Therefore, the `pop` and `push` have different behavior, so neither can be considered a behavioral subtype of the other.

B) When implementing these two classes, is there any possibility of code reuse? If so, give details.

— solution —

Depending on the internal representation, either the `pop()` or the `push()` method (but not both) could be reused, from one implementation to the other. For example, if one implements a `Queue` by pushing to the end of a linked list, and popping from the beginning, then a `Stack` could be implemented either by pushing on the beginning of the list and reusing the `pop()` method, or by reusing the `push()` method and popping from the end of the list. Furthermore, it's likely that the `isEmpty()`, `size()` and `reverse()` methods could all be reused.

C) Describe at least one way of reusing the code in one class by the other - which programming language features are needed for this to work?

— solution —

Any mechanism which allows code reuse without subtyping, e.g., private inheritance in C++ or aggregation.

Another option would be to have a “common superclass” used by both implementations. This superclass, however, would either be too wide (allowing insertion/removal at both ends) or rather thin (allowing only insertion on one end). In the wide case, we could use a kind of linked list, for example, that can insert/remove at the beginning and at the end, and use private inheritance to expose only the relevant operations to the clients of each data structure.