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Abstract

Object-oriented programming languages, such as Smalltalk, help one to build reusable program modules. The reuse of program modules requires adequate documentation — formal or informal. Larch/Smalltalk is a formal specification language for specifying such reusable Smalltalk modules. Larch/Smalltalk firmly separates specification from implementation. In Larch/Smalltalk the unit of specification is an abstract data type, which is an abstraction of the behavior produced by one or more Smalltalk classes. A type can be a subtype of other types, which allows types to be organized based on specified behavior, and also allows for inheritance of their specifications. Larch/Smalltalk specifications are developed using specification tools integrated in the Smalltalk programming environment.

1 Introduction

Object-oriented techniques encourage code reuse and modular design. In Smalltalk [GR83], code reuse is achieved by defining one class to be a subclass of another class, called its superclass, thereby inheriting its data definitions and methods, or extending an existing class by adding new data definitions or new methods. To facilitate code reuse, the Smalltalk system provides a huge number of reusable library classes. The library is not fixed; it is constantly evolving as one writes new classes and methods, or acquires them from others. Using this library, one can develop applications with high productivity. To reuse or extend existing classes, however, one needs to understand their interfaces and behavior precisely. Unfortunately, this is a hard task. One reason is that the original intention of implementors is not formally described anywhere. To infer it, one must read the code, but in the code it is often difficult to distinguish essential from accidental aspects. Smalltalk programs, moreover, are particularly hard to understand by just reading the code. Some reasons are:

- Since type checking is dynamic, it is hard to tell what kind of objects a method expects as its arguments and what kind of object it returns as its result. The use of message

*The work of both authors is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under the Grant CCR-9108654.
An abstraction is often spread across several classes for the sake of code reuse. For example, Booleans are implemented by three classes: Boolean, True, and False, where both True and False are subclasses of Boolean.

Subclass relationships are usually structured in such a way as to give a high degree of code sharing, rather than according to conceptual relationships.

There are simply too many classes and methods that interact with one another. In many cases, (abstract) superclasses depend on yet-to-be-known subclasses methods, which sometimes requires one to read subclasses to understand superclasses. The ParcPlace Objectworks\Smalltalk system contains in excess of 280 classes with over 2,000 methods. This makes it difficult to keep all the necessary details in the mind when reading the code.

These considerations argue for stating both the interfaces and the behavioral characteristics of Smalltalk code in abstract terms, so that one may understand and reuse existing modules without inspecting the code itself. As a user of an object-oriented system, one wants to understand the relationships between classes and the operations relevant to an instance without having to study their implementation. The description must be abstract so that irrelevant implementation choices and details are not exposed to the clients. In short, in an environment supporting reusability, one needs the abstraction that can be obtained by specification. Using a formal specification language increases precision and avoids unintended ambiguity.

In Larch/Smalltalk [Che91] we have combined Larch-style specifications [GH93] and the notion of subtyping. The unit of specification is called an abstract data type or type for short. A type is an abstraction of one or more Smalltalk classes. A type specification consists of a set of method specifications. For each method, its interface (its arguments and their types) and behavior are precisely specified. The behavior of a method is specified by Hoare-style pre- and post-conditions [Hoa69]. The vocabulary for specifying pre- and post-conditions comes from the used trait, specified in a mostly equational style in the Larch Shared Language (LSL) [GH93]. The used trait describes the underlying mathematical model for the specified type. Having such a mathematical model allows one to reason about Smalltalk code without delving into the details of an object’s implementation [Hoa72] (e.g., one does not need to know what its instance variables are). The mathematical model gives each object an abstract value in a given program state. To model mutation (e.g., assignment to instance variables), the object’s abstract value may change from one state to another.

A type can be specified to be a subtype of some other types, called its supertypes. We distinguish subtyping from subclassing in that a subtype relationship is a behavioral relationship, based on type specifications, while a subclass relationship is a code relationship. Subtyping is like inheritance of behavior, while subclassing is inheritance of code. In Larch/Smalltalk a type can be a subtype of more than one supertype, while in Smalltalk each class has only one superclass. To allow sound reasoning about programs that use subtypes, each object of such a subtype should behave like some object of each of its supertypes [Lea91, Ame91]. However, as verifying such behavioral constraints is more properly part
of a verification logic than a specification language, Larch/Smalltalk does not require that specified subtype relationships be proven to be behaviorally correct. So, in practice, the subtype relationships that are stated in Larch/Smalltalk are used for organizing specifications and for inheritance of specifications. Organizing specifications according to subtype relationships allows one to see types based on their conceptual relationships. This makes it easier both for specifiers to maintain large volumes of specifications and for clients to navigate through specifications for possible reuse of program modules [LaL89, ITP86].

A Larch/Smalltalk type can be parameterized by type parameters to specify a set of related types. Type parameters can be restricted to subtypes of given types [CW85].

The process of writing formal specifications is as error-prone as the process of programming. As programming tools are of great help to programmers, specification tools, such as syntax and type checkers, will be a great help to specifiers. They help specifiers to check and maintain the consistency of formal text and assist in managing large numbers of specifications. Larch/Smalltalk provides specification browsers integrated in the Smalltalk programming system with functionality similar to the Smalltalk class browsers. Figure 1 shows Larch/Smalltalk specification browsers [CL94]. The main browsers, called type browsers, allow one to view, enter, modify, delete, and check Larch/Smalltalk specifications, and trait browsers allow one to browse traits written in SLL, either directly from type browsers or independently. Implementations (Smalltalk classes and methods) of currently viewed specifications can be browsed by making proper selections on type browsers. Like Smalltalk code, Larch/Smalltalk specifications are not just plain text, but organized material accessed through specification browsers. These tools allow specifications to be developed and practically used in the programming process.
Our experience shows that one can write unambiguous, precise, and abstract descriptions of Smalltalk modules in Larch/Smalltalk. Such specifications would be the necessary starting point for formal verification, although formal verification of Smalltalk is outside the scope of this paper.

In the next section, we give a short introduction to Larch-style specifications with a brief overview of LSL. In section 3 we introduce language constructs for specifying simple types. In section 4, we formalize the notion of subtyping and inheritance of specification in Larch/Smalltalk. In section 5, simple type specifications are extended to describe parameterized types. In section 6, we show several example specifications to give readers some flavor of our specification language. We close with a discussion and some concluding remarks.

2 The Larch Approach to Interface Specification

The Larch family of specification languages [GHW85, GH93] is related to both model-oriented specification and algebraic specification. In this style, the specification of underlying abstractions is separated from the specification of state transformations. Thus a specification of each program module consists of two components. The state transformations of the program, called the interface components, are specified in predicate logic using pre- and post-conditions, and describe the effect of operation executions on program state (e.g., changing an object's value or creating a new object). The interface specification provides the information necessary to use the specified module and to write programs that implement it. The underlying abstractions, called the shared components, are specified in an equational (algebraic) style, and describe intrinsic properties that are independent of the model of computation (e.g., a set is an unordered collection of elements without duplicates). The idea is to make the interface language dependent on a specific target programming language, and keep the shared language independent of any programming language. The interface components are specified in programming-language-specific Larch interface languages [Win87, GH91, Che91, Jon91, LC92] and the shared components are written in the Larch Shared Language (LSL) [GH93, Chapter 4].

The interface specifications are model-oriented while the shared components are equational. In the Larch family, there is a clear distinction between the specification of abstract models and the specification of interfaces of program modules. Thus, an interface specification cannot be used to build abstract values of another module, implying also that it cannot be used to write pre- and post-conditions of another interface specification. This is allowed in model-oriented specification languages like Z and VDM because they do not specify language specific interfaces. On the other hand, the vocabulary for Larch interface specifications can be arbitrary enriched as it comes from the user-written shared components. Larch provides a set of shared components (traits) in the form of LSL Handbook [GH93, Appendix A].

Shown below is an interface specification of a method remove: of the Smalltalk class Set. The shared component, trait Set, is shown in Figure 21.

---

1The connection between the interface component and the shared component is not shown here. How this connection is made is discussed in the following section.
Set(E,S): trait
includes Integer
introduces

{}:→ S
insert: S, E → S
delete: S, E → S
e \in: S, E → Bool
isEmpty: S → Bool
size: S → Int

asserts
S generated by {}, insert
S partitioned by isEmpty, ∈

forall s: S, e, e1: E
delete({},e) == {}
delete(insert(s,e),e1) == if e = e1 then delete(s,e1) else insert(delete(s,e1),e)
¬(e ∈ {}) → true
size({}) == 0
size(insert(s,e)) == if e ∈ s then size(s) else size(e) + 1
isEmpty(s) == size(s) = 0

Figure 2: A trait Set specified in LSL.

remove: e <: Elem
returns e1 <: Elem
requires e ∈ self\pre
modifies self
ensures self\post = delete(self\pre,e) ∧ e1 = e

The method takes an object of type Elem, denoted by e, and returns an object of the same type, denoted by e1. The name “self” denotes the receiver, i.e., the object to which the specified message is sent, and “self\pre” and “self\post” denote the values of the receiver just before and after the method invocation. The pre-condition in the requires clause says that e must be an element of the receiver; that is, clients are assumed to invoke the method with an element of the receiver. The post-condition in the ensures clause asserts that the value of the receiver after method evaluation is the same as (=) that of the receiver before method invocation with the argument e deleted, and the value of the returned object is the same as the value of argument. The modifies clause asserts that the method may mutate only the receiver, nothing else. The pre-condition constrains the clients while the modifies clause and the post-condition constrain the implementors. The operators appearing in the requires and ensures clauses (e.g., ∈, =, and delete) are defined precisely in the shared component (the trait Set).

Figure 2 shows the specification of the shared component, the trait Set, which describes a mathematical notion of finite sets. The following is mainly a summarization of [GH93,
Chapter 4. A trait specifies a mathematical model for interface specifications and describes intrinsic properties that are independent of the model of computation; that is, there is no concept of state, mutation, storage, etc. A trait is an equational specification with some additional constructs. It consists of two parts; operator declarations and assertions. A set of operators with their signatures is introduced first, which is followed by a set of assertions after the keyword asserts. The assertion part specifies a set of constraints on the operators by means of equations and other clauses. An equation consists of two terms of the same sort, separated by “==”; the third equation is an abbreviation for “\(\neg (e \in \{\}) == \text{true}\)”. A trait denotes a theory in typed first-order logic with equality. Each theory contains the trait’s assertions, the conventional axioms of first-order logic, everything that follows from them, and nothing else. A theory can be strengthened by some additional constructs. A generated by clause adds an inductive inference rule to a trait’s theory. For example, saying that sort \(S\) is generated by \(\{\}\) and “insert”, asserts that each term of sort “\(S\)” is equal to a ground term whose only operators are \(\{\}\) and “insert”. A partitioned by clause asserts that all distinct values of a sort can be distinguished by a given list of operators; this adds a deductive inference rule to the theory. For example, \(\text{insert(insert(\{\},0),1)}\) and \(\text{insert(insert(\{\},1),0)}\) denote the same value, i.e., the set (in the mathematical sense) with two elements “0” and “1.”

The includes clause in the second line says all of the trait Integer ([GH93, Appendix A]) is made part of the trait Set; that is, the trait Set simply adds trait functions, axioms, etc. to those in the trait Integer. This is one way of combining traits in LSL. For example, the signature and the meaning of “+” comes from the included trait Integer. Boolean operators (true, false, \(\neg\), \&\&, ||, \(\Rightarrow\), \(\Leftrightarrow\)) and some heavily overloaded operators (if-then-else, =, \(!=\)) are built into LSL; in other words, traits defining these operators are implicitly included in every trait.

3 Simple Specifications in Larch/Smalltalk

A Larch/Smalltalk type is an abstraction of a set of Smalltalk classes. As a class is the unit of modularity in Smalltalk, a type is the unit of modularity in Larch/Smalltalk. There are several reasons for specifying in terms of types, rather than Smalltalk classes:

- A Smalltalk class is a unit of implementation, rather than a unit of behavioral abstraction. As a result, an abstraction is often spread across classes. For example, Booleans are implemented by three classes: Boolean, True, and False. However, it is more intuitive to specify them as one type, say Boolean.

- A class inherits implementations, not specifications. A superclass may specify that subclasses must define a method that a particular subclass does not define, or a subclass can redefine a method to make it inaccessible. We want specification inheritance to be based on behavior (subtyping), not implementation (subclassing) [Ame91, Coo89, LaL89].

- We want multiple inheritance of specifications; that is, we want a type to be a subtype of more than one type. However, classes in Smalltalk can have only one superclass.
Smalltalk classes are typically organized in such a way to give a high degree of code sharing, not according to their logical relationships. We want to structure our specifications based on their conceptual relationships (subtyping), as opposed to the implementation relationships (subclassing). Clients find it much easier to understand and remember relationships that are logical than those that are side effects of particular implementation decisions [LaL89, LTP86].

There are two representations for Larch/Smalltalk specifications. In the Larch/Smalltalk browser, specifications are not just plain text, but organized material. A user writes a specification by editing templates given by the browsers. Two templates are provided for interface specifications: one for type specifications (the header part), and the other for method specifications. After creating a type by filling in the type template in the browser, one can add, modify, and remove its method specifications as one typically does with Smalltalk code browsers to browse classes and their methods. Because one cannot show the graphical interaction with a browser on paper, we use a textual representation for Larch/Smalltalk specifications in this paper.

Figure 3 shows a specification of type IntegerSet\(^2\) in our textual representation. The type IntegerSet models sets whose elements are integers. Syntactically the specification consists of two parts: (1) a header giving the name of the specified type and a link that connects the Smalltalk world and the LSL (mathematical) world, and (2) a body consisting of a set of method specifications. The header part is separated from the body by a horizontal line in our textual representation. In the body, two kinds of methods are specified: *instance methods* and *meta methods*. Meta method specifications and instance method specifications are separated by a horizontal line in the textual representation, and the meta method specifications precede instance method specifications. In IntegerSet, all the method specifications are instance methods except for the method \texttt{new}. An instance method defines a message that is sent to an instance of the specified type. A meta method specification defines a message that is sent to an instance of the specified type's meta type, i.e., to an object that represents the type itself, not instances of the type. A meta type corresponds to Smalltalk's meta class [GR83]. A meta method typically specifies how to create an instance of the specified type. In the specification browsers, a method specification is classified as an instance or a meta when it is entered to the system by making an appropriate selection with the mouse.

In the following two subsections, the header part and the method specifications are explained in detail.

### 3.1 The Header Part

The header of a type specification establishes a connection to its shared component called the *used trait*. After the keyword *trait* the name of used trait is given, which is followed by a *type-to-sort mapping* in parentheses (see Figure 3). The type-to-sort mapping, which maps type names in the interface specification to sort names in the used trait, identifies the set of abstract values for each type in the specification. The abstract values of a type are

\(^2\)We use a type name to denote both the specified type and specification itself. This is also true for a method name (method selector). The context should clearly tell whether we mean a type or its specification.
**type** IntegerSet

**trait** Set (IntegerSet for S, Integer for E)

**meta methods**

**new**

- **returns** s <: IntegerSet
- **ensures** $s_{post} = \{\} \land fresh(s)$

**instance methods**

**insert**: n <: Integer
- **modifies** self
- **ensures** $self_{post} = insert(self_{pre}, n)$

**remove**: n <: Integer
- **requires** $n \in self_{pre}$
- **modifies** self
- **ensures** $self_{post} = delete(self_{pre}, n)$

**includes**: n <: Integer
- **returns** b <: Boolean
- **ensures** $b = n \in self_{pre}$

**size**
- **returns** n <: Integer
- **ensures** $n = size(self_{pre})$

**isEmpty**
- **returns** b <: Boolean
- **ensures** $b = isEmpty(self_{pre})$

---

Figure 3: A Larch/Smalltalk specification of type IntegerSet. Note that some identifiers (insert, size, and isEmpty) are overloaded to refer to both method selectors and LSL operators. Since there is no syntactic context in which both can appear, there is no ambiguity. However, to make the distinction absolutely clear, we shall adopt the convention of writing selector names in a typewriter font.
the equivalence classes of the algebraic terms of the corresponding sort. For example, the
used trait of type IntegerSet is the trait Set (see Figure 2) and the type-to-sort mapping
says that the type IntegerSet is based on the sort S and the type Integer is mapped to the
sort E. Thus, the abstract values of IntegerSet are the equivalence classes of the terms “{}”,
“insert({},0)”, “insert(insert({},0),1)”, and so on — terms of sort S in the trait Set.

The abstract values specified in the used trait are purely mathematical. The domain of
abstract values of a type can be restricted in the interface level to a subset of the values
defined by the used trait. This may be needed for several reasons, e.g., to reuse existing
traits, or to cope with anticipated implementation limits and restrictions. The invariant
clause introduces a predicate that must be preserved by all methods of the specified type.
In other words, the invariant restricts the abstract values of objects. It must hold in the
initial state (just after creation) of an object and must be left invariant by each method.
That is, the invariant must be true of the object’s abstract value both before and after
invoking any methods. Consequently, an invariant will hold in all visible states that can be
reached from an initial state by means of message sending; it need not hold in all states,
since it might be violated temporarily during method evaluation. For example, if we add

\[
\text{invariant } \text{size}(\text{self}) > 0
\]

to the specification of type IntegerSet, only non-empty sets would be abstract values of the
type IntegerSet; i.e., “{}” would not be a legal value for objects of IntegerSet, though it
is a term of sort S. (One would also need to rewrite the specification of the methods new
and remove: to preserve the invariant.) In the invariant predicate, “self”, which is short
for “self\_any” (see Section 3.2 and Appendix B), denotes the abstract value of an object of
type IntegerSet. We use “self” so that the invariant can be thought of as being implicitly
conjoined to the pre- and post-conditions of all method specifications. If no invariant is
specified, “true” is assumed by default.

An object whose abstract value can change from state to state is said to be mutable;
one whose state cannot change is said to be immutable. A type is mutable if some of
its objects are mutable, otherwise it is immutable. For example, integers and booleans
are immutable objects while integer sets are mutable objects. So the types Integer and
Boolean are immutable while the type IntegerSet, as specified in Figure 3, is mutable. In
Larch/Smalltalk, a type is asserted to be mutable or immutable with a mutation clause. If
this clause is omitted, the specified type is assumed to be mutable by default. The header
part in Figure 3 is thus an abbreviation for:

\[
\text{type IntegerSet} \\
\quad \text{mutation true} \\
\quad \text{trait Set (IntegerSet for S, Integer for E)}
\]

3.2 Method Specifications

A method specification defines a message that can be successfully sent to the objects of
the specified type (or meta type in the case of meta method specification). All the method
specifications together describe the protocol of the type. The behavior of a method is
specified by the relationship between the inputs in the initial state and the output (return
value) in the final state by pre- and post-conditions [Hoa69]. As an example, consider the
method includes:

\begin{verbatim}
includes: n <: Integer
  returns b <: Boolean
  requires true
  ensures b = n \in self prer
\end{verbatim}

The method takes an integer and returns a boolean. Since the pre-condition holds
trivially, the method can be invoked in any state. The post-condition asserts that “true” is
returned if \( n \) is an element of \( \text{self}_{pr} \); otherwise, “false” is returned. The notation “self\(_{pr} \)” means the value of the receiver (i.e., the object to which the message includes: is sent) just before the method invocation. The meaning of the LSI operator \( \in \) is defined in the
used trait.

Syntactically a method specification consists of two parts: the header and the body. The
header provides the information necessary to invoke the specified method while the body
describes the behavior of the method, i.e., the effect of sending a message that invokes the
specified method. The header is similar to that of Smalltalk methods except that we dec-
orate the input arguments with their types, and optionally name the returned object and
specify its type. If the returns clause is omitted, the receiver is assumed to be returned
by default. The body consists of a pair of assertions in the first-order predicate calculus: a
\texttt{requires} clause and an \texttt{ensures} clause. A \texttt{requires} clause specifies the pre-condition that
must hold to invoke the specified method. If the pre-condition is not satisfied, nothing is
guaranteed. An omitted \texttt{requires} clause is interpreted as equivalent to \texttt{requires true};
i.e., the method can be invoked in any state. An \texttt{ensures} clause states the post-condition
that the specified method must establish upon termination; i.e., the post-condition is guar-
anteed to hold when the method evaluation is completed. The pre-condition constrains the
clients while the post-condition constrains the implementors.

The semantics of a method specification is a \textit{total correctness} semantics; that is, a method
satisfies a method specification if, when it is invoked in a state in which the pre-condition
holds, the method evaluation terminates. In general, a method specification \( M \) specifies a
nondeterministic state transformation delivering an object as its result. This is formally
modeled by a ternary relation among two states and an object. If an \( \langle s_1, s_2, o \rangle \) is an
element of that relation, we say that an implementation of \( M \) \textit{terminates} in the \textit{initial state} \( s_1 \), transforming \( s_1 \) to the \textit{final state} \( s_2 \), and returning \( o \). If for a given state \( s_1 \) there
is no state \( s_2 \) and object \( o \) such that \( \langle s_1, s_2, o \rangle \) is an element of the relation, we say that
the implementation of \( M \) does not terminate in the state \( s_1 \). Thus total correctness of an
implementation requires that for each state \( s_1 \) in which the pre-condition is satisfied, there
must be at least one \( s_2 \) and \( o \) such that \( \langle s_1, s_2, o \rangle \) is an element of the relation. In general
there may be more than one such element in the relation; that is, a method specification
need not specify a deterministic method.

The assertions in the pre- and post-conditions are stated in the first-order predicate
calculus. Boolean connectives (\( \neg, \land, \lor, \Rightarrow, \) and \( \Leftrightarrow \)), the universal quantifier (\( \forall \)), and the
existential quantifier (\( \exists \)) can be used to compose an assertion. Identifiers and names that
can be used in an assertion are:

- the implicit input argument “self”, which denotes the receiver of the specified message,
• the names of the formal arguments, the name of the formal result (the returned object),
• locally bound logic variables, e.g., \( n \in \forall(n:E)[n \in s \Leftrightarrow n \in t] \), and
• operator names from the used trait (e.g., \( \in \), insert, delete, size, etc. in the type IntegerSet).

The terms in assertions must be sort-correct in the sense that operator applications
conform to their signatures specified in the traits [Che91] (see Section 3.3). This is similar
to the notion of type-correctness in programming languages.

In the specification of a method that can mutate its arguments, it is usually necessary to
refer to the value of an object in two different states: the states before and after the method
invocation. Sometimes it is necessary to refer to the identity of an object, that is to say,
the object itself, not its value. The value of an object in the initial state is called its initial
value; the value in the final state is called its final value. Input arguments (including “self”)
can be qualified with the subscript \( _{pre} \), and both input arguments and the return argument
may be qualified with the other value qualifier: the subscript \( _{post} \). An argument subscripted
with a value qualifier denotes the value in the appropriate state (\( q_{pre} \) denotes the initial
value \( o \), and \( q_{post} \) the final value). Arguments can also be qualified with an object qualifier
(subscript \( _{obj} \)) to denote their object identities (thus \( o_{obj} \) denotes the object \( o \) as opposed
to its value). Qualifications are often redundant, so we adopt certain defaults depending on
the context in which an identifier appears. In both the requires clause and ensures clause
one usually refers to values, so identifiers are qualified with the subscript \( _{pre} \) by default;
one exception is that in the ensures clause an output argument is qualified by \( _{post} \). On the
other hand, in the modifies clause (see below) and in the special predicate fresh one refers
to objects; hence, identifiers in these contexts are qualified by the object qualifier \( _{obj} \) by
default.

In Smalltalk, a method can mutate an object; i.e., a method can change the state of
an object (for example, by assigning to the object’s instance variables). To help reasoning
about mutation, we insert an optional modifies clause in the body of a method specification.
This clause asserts that only those listed objects may be mutated as the result of method
invocation. This is a strong indirect assertion that no other objects, except for those listed,
are allowed to change their abstract values. An omitted modifies clause is equivalent to
the assertion “modifies nothing”, meaning no objects are allowed to mutate their values.

As an example, consider

\[
\text{remove: n <: Integer} \\
\quad \text{requires n} \in \text{self} \\
\quad \text{modifies self} \\
\quad \text{ensures self}_{post} = \text{delete(self, n)}
\]

The method specification says that remove: takes an integer argument, may mutate the
receiver to make its value, in the final state, equal to that of deleting the argument from
the initial value of the receiver. Since the returns clause is omitted, the receiver \((self_{obj})\) is
assumed to be returned by default. The method can change the value of the receiver, but
can mutate neither the arguments, nor any other objects. More formally, the meaning of a
method specification with a modifies clause can be given by the predicate: requires-clause
⇒ (modifies-clause ∧ ensures-clause), which must be satisfied by the relation computed by an implementation. In an immutable type, “self” must not appear in the modifies clause.

To specify object creation in the post-condition, a special predicate fresh is used. The fresh predicate asserts that its arguments are newly created as the result of the method invocation. That is to say, these objects do not exist in the initial state, but do in the final state. If there is no fresh predicate in the post-condition, the method is not allowed to create any new objects that are visible in the final state. (Technically, in addition to those listed in the fresh predicate, a method may create other new objects in the intermediate states that are not visible in the final state. These are temporary objects that exist only for the duration of the method evaluation.) The set of objects accessible in the final state must be a subset of the union of the set of objects in the initial state and all those objects listed in fresh clauses. For example, consider a method with selector union:

union: s <: IntegerSet
    returns t <: IntegerSet
    “Return the union of s and the receiver.”
    ensures fresh(t) ∧ ∀(i: Int)[i ∈ t ⇔ i ∈ s ∨ i ∈ self]

The method takes an integer set and returns another integer set. The result, t, is a new set containing only those integers which are elements of either the input argument set s, or the receiver. The result of sending the message union: to an IntegerSet object would be a newly created set that did not exist in the initial state; i.e., it is not an alias to an existing set object which happens to have the same value.

As shown in the above example, comments are given in specifications by placing them inside a pair of double quotes.

3.3 Sort-Checking

This section describes how to check well-formedness of assertions in the pre- and post-conditions. Readers may skip this section at their first reading.

Assertions in the pre- and post-conditions (also the invariants) must be sort-correct in the sense that LSL operator applications conform to their signatures specified in the traits [Win83]. Figure 4 shows the Larch/Smalltalk sort inference rules for sort-checking assertions, based on the abstract syntax for assertions (see Appendix A). An inference rule of the form:

\[
\frac{h_1, h_2}{c_1, c_2}
\]

means that the truth of conclusions \(c_1\) and \(c_2\) follow from the truth of hypotheses \(h_1\) and \(h_2\); that is, to prove \(c_1\) and \(c_2\) one needs to show that both \(h_1\) and \(h_2\) hold. The hypotheses are optional; if omitted (in which case the horizontal line is omitted too), the rule becomes an axiom.

Sort checking as stated in the inference rules uses both a sort environment \(H\) and a signature \(\Sigma\). A sort environment \(H\) can be thought of as a set of sort assumptions, pairs of identifier and sort. An assumption of the form \(x : T\) means that the identifier \(x\) has sort \(T\) and \(\overline{x} : \overline{S}\) means that each \(x_i\) has sort \(S_i\). The notation “\(H, x : T\)” means \(H\) extended
\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{ident}] & & \Sigma; H, x : S \vdash x : S, \\
[\text{bool}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}, \Sigma; H \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool} \\
[\text{neg}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E : \text{Bool} \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool} \\
[\text{logic}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 : \text{Bool}, \Sigma; H \vdash E_2 : \text{Bool} \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 \circ E_2 : \text{Bool} \\
& & \text{for } \circ \in \{\land, \lor, \Rightarrow, \Leftrightarrow\} \\
[\text{quant}] & & \Sigma; H, x : \overline{S} \vdash E : \text{Bool} \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash \forall (x : \overline{S}) [E] : \text{Bool}, \Sigma; H \vdash \exists (x : \overline{S}) [E] : \text{Bool} \\
[\text{cond}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 : \text{Bool}, \Sigma; H \vdash E_2 : S, \Sigma; H \vdash E_3 : S \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash \text{if } E_1 \text{ then } E_2 \text{ else } E_3 : S \\
[\text{equal}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 : T, \Sigma; H \vdash E_2 : T \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 = E_2 : \text{Bool}, \Sigma; H \vdash E_1 \neq E_2 : \text{Bool} \\
[\text{opapp}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E : \overline{S}, \Sigma; F : \overline{S} \rightarrow T \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash f(E) : T \\
[\text{paren}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E : S \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash (E) : S \\
[\text{quali}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E : S_{\text{obj}} \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash E_{\text{val}} : S, \Sigma; H \vdash E_{\text{obj}} : S_{\text{obj}} \\
& & \text{for } \text{val} \in \{\text{pr}, \text{post}, \text{any}\} \\
[\text{fresh}] & & \Sigma; H \vdash E : S_{\text{fbj}} \\
& & \Sigma; H \vdash \text{fresh}(E) : \text{Bool}
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 4: Sort inference rules for Larch/Smalltalk.
with the assumption \( x : T \) (where the extension replaces all assumptions about \( x \) in \( H \)). A signature \( \Sigma \) contains the signature information of all the LSL operators that can appear in assertions of interface specifications. It is a set of LSL operator signatures of the form: \( f : \bar{S} \to T \) and obtained by collecting all the operator declarations in all the used traits of the specified type, the argument types, and the return type. Thus \( \Sigma \) is static in the sense that it is fixed while sort-checking a given method specification, but different \( H \)'s are used to sort-check different sub-expressions. The notation \( \Sigma; H \vdash E : T \) means that given the signature \( \Sigma \) and the sort environment \( H \) one can prove that the expression \( E \) has sort \( T \) using the inference rules; hence \( E \) is sort-correct.

The heart of the inference rules is the rule [opapp], which tells how to sort-check LSL operator applications. If \( \bar{E} \) has sort \( \bar{S} \) and \( f \) has signature \( \bar{S} \to T \), then the application of \( f \) to \( E \), \( f(\bar{E}) \) is sort-correct and has sort \( T \). If \( f \) is an infix operator, \( f(\bar{E}) \) should be understood appropriately. The notation \( \Sigma; H \vdash f : \bar{S} \to T \) means that an LSL operator \( f \) with signature \( \bar{S} \to T \) is in the signature \( \Sigma \); this allows overloading of \( f \) with different arguments sorts as in LSL. (There is no subsorting in LSL.)

For each type there are two sorts associated with it: an object sort and a value sort. The object sort models the specified type’s objects and the value sort models the abstract values of the objects in a particular state. The introduction of an object sort is needed to treat a contained object as a part of the value of a containing object, i.e., because of object sharing and mutation. Objects are treated as a special kind of value. This is described in Figure 5, which shows the Larch/Smalltalk view of Smalltalk program states. Let \( \text{Obj} \) be a set of objects, partitioned into subsets according to their types, and let \( \text{Val} \) be a sort-indexed family of sets of abstract values. The environment component (\( \text{Env} \)) of the state maps program variable names (\( \text{VarNam} \)) to the objects (\( \text{Obj} \)) denoted by the variables, and store (\( \text{Store} \)) maps objects to their values. Since objects are also values, the store can map an object (a containing object) to another object (a contained object), which can be mapped to yet another object (a contained object of the contained object) and so on.
The sort of a term denoting the value of an object is a value sort — it can be an object sort because the object can contain other objects (i.e., an object sort is a special kind of value sort). The sort of a term denoting an object itself must be an object sort. If a type \( T \) is mapped to a sort \( S \) by the type-to-sort mapping, \( T \)'s object sort is denoted by \( S_{\text{Obj}} \), and \( T \)'s value sort is denoted by \( S_{\text{Val}} \), which is abbreviated as \( S \). The inference rule [quali] shows the relationship between object sorts and value sorts. If \( E \) is a term of sort \( S_{\text{Obj}} \), then a value-qualified \( E \) (e.g., \( E_{\text{pre}} \)) is of sort \( S \). For example, if \( x \) is a program variable of type \( T \) and \( T \) is mapped to a sort \( S \), then \( x_{\text{obj}} \) is a term of sort \( S_{\text{Obj}} \) (because \( x_{\text{obj}} \) denotes the object \( x \)), and \( x_{\text{pre}} \), \( x_{\text{post}} \) and \( x_{\text{any}} \) are of sort \( S \) (because they denote the values of the object \( x \)). In the sort inference rules we assume that terms are fully qualified. Refer to Appendix B for the default qualification rules for self and formal arguments.

4 Specification Inheritance and Subtyping

Larch/Smalltalk is the first interface specification language that permits inheritance of specifications [Che91]. Inheritance of specifications permits specifiers to construct specifications incrementally. To specify a type incrementally, one states how it differs from other types, called supertypes, by adding additional features; this makes the new type a subtype of other types. Syntactically this is done with the supertypes clause in the type header. After the keyword supertypes, all the direct supertypes of the specified type are listed; if the supertypes clause is omitted, the specified type is assumed to be a direct subtype of the type Object, the ultimate supertype of all types. For example, assuming the existence of type Collection, an abstraction of collection types such as lists and arrays, the header part of IntegerSet can be respécified as follows.

\[
\text{type IntegerSet} \\
\quad \text{supertypes Collection} \\
\quad \text{trait Set(IntegerSet for S, Integer for E)}
\]

The type IntegerSet is a direct subtype of the type Collection, thus inheriting its properties (e.g., method specifications). Aside from inherited methods, only additional methods and changed methods need to be specified in the subtype. Specifying a type in terms of its differences from its supertypes leads to shorter specifications, and such specifications are easier to maintain. To start things off, a large number of type specifications are provided in the system, structured into a hierarchy based on their conceptual relationships [Coo92], with the most general type Object at the root. The type Object specifies properties concerned with all objects; it has no method specification.

If type \( S \) is specified to be a direct subtype of type \( T \) (i.e., \( T \) is a direct supertype of \( S \)), then \( S \) inherits the specified properties of \( T \). That is, \( S \) inherits the invariant and method specifications of \( T \), if any. A subtype's invariant is the conjunction of all of its supertypes' invariants and the invariant explicitly stated in the subtype with invariant clause. An instance method with the same selector specified by more than one supertype in different subtyping chains must be re-specialized by the subtype to resolve potential conflicts; that is,

\[^{3}\text{The term } E_{\text{any}} \text{ denotes the value of } E \text{ in some unknown state; this form is used to refer to an object's value in the invariant clause.}\]
the method must be specified in the subtype. An alternative approach to resolve multiple inheritance conflicts would be to disjoin the pre-conditions, conjoin the post-conditions and intersect the modifies clauses of all the conflicting method specifications; this would automatically ensure the behavioral subtyping. However, when the objects listed in the modifies clauses of conflicting method specifications differ, such a method specification would usually be unsatisfiable, because the post-condition would require objects to change states that no longer appear in the modifies clause.

What does an inherited method specification mean? The basic problem is to ensure that the operators used in the inherited method specification, which were written for abstract values of the supertype, can be applied to the abstract values of the subtype [Lea93]. The simplest and most general answer, adopted by Larch/Smalltalk, is to view inheritance as textual expansion and to require that the subtype's used trait provide a meaning for the operators used in inherited method specifications. That is, the meaning of an inherited method specification is given by reinterpreting the text of the inherited specification with the subtype's used trait. (This technique is also the foundation of specification inheritance in Larch/C++ [LC92].) This technique requires two conditions to be satisfied by the subtype's used trait. Syntactically the signature of the subtype's used trait must be superset of that of the supertype's used trait. Semantically the theory of the subtype's used trait must include that of the supertype's used trait. If some property of the supertype's abstract values was not preserved by the subtype's used trait, such as an operation that was idempotent failing to be so in the subtype's used trait, then one could not correctly reason about the abstract values of subtype objects using the inherited specifications. Therefore, to allow such reasoning about inherited specifications, the theory of subtype's used trait should be a consistent extension of the theories of its supertypes' traits. One way to ensure this is to define the trait functions that apply to abstract values of the subtype by a homomorphic coercion function from subtype abstract values to supertype abstract values [Rey80, GM87, BW90, Ame91]. The advantage of the more general approach taken in Larch/Smalltalk is that the homomorphic coercion functions can be used whenever possible, but the specifier is not limited to this technique. (For example, one can use homomorphic relations instead of functions.)

Subtype relationships are not only useful in easing specification, but they may also be used to aid verification or informal reasoning about programs. To fulfill this role, whenever $S$ is a subtype of $T$, each object of type $S$ must act like some object of type $T$, when used from the perspective of $T$'s specification. In specification terms this means that for each method $M$ specified both in $S$ and $T$, the pre-condition of $M$ in $T$ implies the pre-condition of $M$ in $S$ and the post-condition of $M$ in $S$ implies the post-condition of $M$ in $T$. Formal requirements for such behavioral subtyping [Mey88a, IW90, Ame90, Lea91, IW93a, IW93b] involve either semantic modeling or theorem proving. The Larch proof assistant LP [GH93, Chapter 7], because it accepts LSI syntax, could be used to prove such properties. Larch/Smalltalk itself checks only for the traditional syntactic constraints, which we call the syntactic subtyping rule. The syntactic subtyping rule says that for each subtype $S$ of a supertype $T$, if an instance method $M$ is specified both in $S$ and $T$, the following conditions must hold [CW85, SCB86]:

- For every input argument of $M$ except for the implicit argument "self", its type in $T$
type Set
  parameters Elem
  trait Set (Set(Elem) for S, Elem for E)

meta methods
new
  returns s <: Set(Elem)
  ensures s.post = {} \& fresh(s)

instance methods
insert e <: Elem
  modifies self
  ensures self.post = insert(self.pre,e)

Figure 6: The parameterized type specification Set.

must be a subtype of the corresponding type in S.

- The return type of M in S must be a subtype of the return type of M in T.

That is to say, an argument type of a method can only be generalized in a subtype, whereas the result type can only be specialized. The reversal of direction for arguments is why this rule is called contravariant. Contravariance seems a bit awkward in practice, because a programmer typically wants to specialize rather than to generalize arguments. An alternative is to use covariance, which means that also argument types can be specialized. Such type systems are not statically sound and hard to reason about [Coo89]. In addition, contravariance does not seem to cause much problem at the specification level. The syntactic subtyping rule, together with specification inheritance, guarantees that a message understood by objects of a type is also understood by objects of its subtypes. However, the effects of receiving messages are not guaranteed to be the same. Semantic correctness (legal subtyping) is left in the hands of the specifiers.

In Larch/Smalltalk, a subtype does not have to be implemented by a subclass and a subclass does not have to implement a subtype. This separation of subtyping from subclassing gives a great freedom both in design and implementation. The decoupling of subtyping from subclassing is the most distinguishing feature of Larch/Smalltalk from other object-oriented specification languages.
5 Parameterized Specifications

5.1 Simple Parameterized Specification

In Section 3 we specified sets whose elements are integers. Of course, integers are not the only element types; there are many applications in which we want to have sets with elements other than integers. We would like to have a single specification that captures all these different kinds of sets. A parameterized type specification provides a simple way to do this. The major idea introduced by parameterized type specifications is that of a type parameter. For example, in the specification of Set (see Figure 6), Elem is a type parameter representing the type of element objects. A type parameter is a placeholder that is replaced by an actual type later when the specification is instantiated. It can be used freely in places where a type name is expected.

The parameterized type specification can be viewed as notational abbreviation from which specifications are generated by supplying a concrete type for the type parameters. For example, supplying Integer to the specification Set, produces type Set(Integer), the type of sets whose elements are of type Integer. Similarly, it can be instantiated to Set(Character), Set(String), and so on. All the instantiated specifications will have similar property; e.g. they have the same set of methods. In itself, Set is not a type (there are no objects of type Set), but rather a type generator in the sense that it can generate types by instantiation.

The introduction of the type parameter Elem makes it possible to specify methods that take arguments or return results of type Elem. That is, for each instantiation the argument or return type will be different depending on the actual parameter type. For example, in Set(Integer) the insert: method takes an integer as its argument, whereas in Set(String) it takes an object of type String.

5.2 Bounded Quantification

The simple parameterized type specification introduced in the previous section cannot make any assumptions about the objects of their type parameters since any type could be used for these parameters. In implementation terms, this means that a parameterized type cannot send any message to an object of its type parameters, because it is not known whether the actual types for the parameters have an appropriate method. In reasoning, this means that we cannot assert anything about the type parameters. In many applications, however, it is useful to have more information about the type parameters, for instance, the presence of certain methods. To help reason about parameterized types, one combines the idea of type parameters and subtyping into a notion called bounded quantification[CW85]. Each type parameter is bounded by a type. Only subtypes of a given type (upper bound) are allowed in place of type parameters. For example, the header part of specification Set in Figure 6 can be replaced by:

\[
\text{type Set}
\]
\[
\text{  parameters Elem } \leq \text{ObjectWithEquality}
\]
\[
\text{  supertypes ObjectWithEquality}
\]
\[
\text{  trait Set (Set(Elem) for S, Elem for E)}
\]
GraphTrait(N,G): trait
includes Set(N,SN), Set(E,SE)
G tuple of nodes: SN, edges: SE
E tuple of head: N, tail: N
introduces
   includesNode, isolatedNode: G, N → Bool
asserts
   forall g:G, sn: SN, se: SE, n,m,m1: N
      includesNode(g,n) == n ∈ g.nodes
      isolatedNode([sn,{}],n)
      isolatedNode([sn,(insert([m,m1],se))],n) ==
         -(n = m ∨ n = m1) ∧ isolatedNode([sn,se],n)

Figure 7: The trait GraphTrait.

The type parameter Elem is bounded by the type ObjectWithEquality, a direct subtype of the type Object with a specification for the binary method = (equal). Only subtypes of ObjectWithEquality are allowed as the actual types for the parameter. For example, Set(Object) is not well-formed because Object is not a subtype of ObjectWithEquality. This restriction to the type parameter is reasonable because the specification of Set assumes that two objects of type Elem can be compared for equality. By default, an unbounded type parameter is bounded by type Object; i.e., any type can be used in place of such a type parameter. Thus, the simple parameterization introduced in the previous section is a special case of bounded quantification in which all the type parameters are bounded by the type Object.

6 An Extended Example

To give some flavor of our specification language, we specify several interface modules in Larch/Smalltalk. The chosen examples are graphs. Mathematically, a graph \( G \) is an ordered tuple \( (V(G), E(G)) \), consisting of a set \( V(G) \) of vertices and a set \( E(G) \) of edges, where an edge is a pair of (not necessarily distinct) vertices of \( G \). The first element of an edge is called the head and the second element is called the tail. If the edges are ordered, the graph is directed; otherwise it is undirected. For directed graphs, we use the term arcs instead of edges.

We will specify two types, DirectedGraph and UndirectedGraph, which describe directed graphs and undirected graphs respectively. To take advantage of specification inheritance, we abstract out all those features that are common to both directed graphs and undirected graphs into an abstract type Graph, and specify the two types to be direct subtypes of the abstract type.

The underlying model for the type Graph is shown Figure 7. A graph \( G \) is a tuple of nodes and edges, where nodes is of sort SN (set of N) and edges is of sort SE (set of E). We use the term nodes instead of vertices in our specification. An edge \( E \) is again a
trait UndirectedGraph\(\text{T\(\_\text{rait}\)}\(\text{N,}\ G\(\text{T\_rait}\))\):

- includes Graph\(\text{T\_rait\(\text{N,}\ G\)}\)
- introduces
  - includesEdge: \(G, E \rightarrow \text{Bool}\)

asserts
- \(\forall g : G, e : E\)
  - \(\text{includesEdge}(g, e) = (e \in g.\text{edges}) \lor ([e.\text{tail}, e.\text{head}] \in g.\text{edges})\)

Figure 8: The trait UndirectedGraph\(\text{T\_rait}\).

trait DirectedGraph\(\text{T\_rait}\(\text{N,}\ G\(\text{T\_rait}\))\):

- includes Graph\(\text{T\_rait}\)
- introduces
  - includesArc: \(G, E \rightarrow \text{Bool}\)

asserts
- \(\forall g : G, a : E\)
  - \(\text{includesArc}(g, a) = a \in g.\text{edges}\)

Figure 9: The trait DirectedGraph\(\text{T\_rait}\).

tuple of nodes \(N\), whose first and second elements are denoted by head and tail respectively. The tuple definition is a LSL shorthand notation for introducing fixed-length tuples [GH93, Chapter 4]. For example, defining “G tuple of nodes: SN, edges: SE” introduces a tuple constructor ([_]), observer operators (_nodes, _edges), and updating operators (set_nodes and set_edges, both of which produce new tuples) with appropriate axioms.

The trait Graph\(\text{T\_rait}\) defines two operators: includes\(\text{Node}\) and isolated\(\text{Node}\). The operator includes\(\text{Node}\) tells whether a vertex is in a graph, while isolated\(\text{Node}\) tests if a vertex is isolated from others. The operator \(\in\) in the axiom for includes\(\text{Node}\) is the set membership operation, and comes from the included trait Set. The trait Set found in LSL Handbook [GH93, Appendix A] defines a mathematical model for finite sets. It is similar to the trait Set in Figure 2 except that it also defines typical set operations; \(\cup, \cap, \setminus\) (set difference), etc. A vertex is isolated if the graph has no edge at all or there is no edge between the vertex itself and some other vertex in the graph. The second and the third axioms state this.

The trait UndirectedGraph shown in Figure 8 defines an abstract model for the type UndirectedGraph. In addition to properties stated in the included trait Graph\(\text{T\_rait}\), it defines an operator includes\(\text{Edge}\). An edge \(e\) is included in an undirected graph \(g\) if the edge set of \(g\) \((g.\text{edges})\) includes \(e\) or \([e.\text{tail}, e.\text{head}]\). This is because the edge \(e\) has no direction associated with it.

A mathematical model for the type DirectedGraph, the trait DirectedGraph\(\text{T\_rait}\) is shown in Figure 9. It is similar to the trait UndirectedGraph\(\text{T\_rait}\) except that now each edge has a direction attached to it; thus, the axiom for includes\(\text{Arc}\) is “includes\(\text{Arc}(g, a) =\)
a ∈ \text{edges}(g)." 

Since we have formal models for all three types, it is time to specify the types at the interface level. Because graphs are useful with a variety of vertices, all the types are parameterized with a type parameter Node, which stands for the type of vertices. Figure 10 shows the abstract type Graph. It is an abstract type in the sense that it does not have any meta method specifications; that is, no objects of this type can be created. Its sole purpose is to be a common supertype of its two concrete subtypes, which will be specified later.

The invariant clause in Figure 10 says that both the head and tail of an edge must be nodes of the graph. That is, the abstract values of Graph are those terms of sort G in the trait GraphTrait (see Figure 7) that satisfy the invariant predicate. For example, \{\},\{\} is one possible abstract value, a graph with no nodes and no edges. However, \{n\},\{[n,m]\} cannot be an abstract value of a Graph object even though it is a term of sort G; it does not satisfy the invariant.

The type specifies five instance methods: addNode:, removeNode:, chooseNode, nodes, and numOfNodes. Terms in the pre- and post-conditions of these method specifications come from the trait GraphTrait.

Given a vertex, not included in a graph, the method addNode: adds the node to the graph. The post-condition says that self.post (final value of self) is equal to self (initial value of self) with its vertices replaced by the union of self.nodes (vertices of self in the initial state) and the vertex to be added. As there is no returns clause, self.obj is returned by default. The method removeNode: deletes an existing vertex from the graph. The pre-condition says it can be invoked only with a vertex with no edges associated with it; i.e., the vertex must be isolated. As in the method addNode:, self.obj is returned by default. The method chooseNode is interesting in that its post-condition is under-specified; that is, the specification permits non-deterministic implementation. All the specification says is that the return object is a vertex of self. It does not say which one should be returned if there is more than one vertex. The implementation may use this freedom to improve efficiency. The method nodes returns a new set containing all the vertices of self. The method size returns the number of vertices in the graph. Note that no method is concerned with edges because it is not known yet whether the edges have directions associated with them or not. These are properties to be specified by concrete subtypes.

Figure 11 shows the specification for type DirectedGraph. The type DirectedGraph is parameterized and specified to be a direct subtype of type Graph (see also Section 6.1).

The type DirectedGraph specifies a meta method new which returns an empty directed graph \{\},\{\}. Because DirectedGraph is a subtype of Graph, it inherits the invariant and all the method specifications of Graph. In addition to inherited methods, DirectedGraph specifies five new instance methods: addArcFrom:to:, removeArcFrom:to:, adjacentNodesFrom:, adjacentNodesTo:, and adjacentNodes:. The method addArcFrom:to: inserts new arc, denoted by a pair of vertices, whereas removeArcFrom:to: deletes an existing arc from the graph. The pre-condition of addNodeFrom:to: requires that both the head and tail of the arc should be vertices of the graph. Since addNodeFrom:to: is the only method that adds arcs, every object of type DirectedGraph satisfies the invariant inherited from Graph. By our convention, both addArcFrom:to: and removeArcFrom:to: return the object self.obj. The method adjacentNodesFrom: returns a new set containing all the vertices adjacent from a given vertex, while adjacentNodesTo: returns a new set containing
type Graph
  parameters Node ≤ ObjectWithEquality
trait GraphTrait (Graph(Node) for G, Set(Node) for SN, Node for N)
  invariant ∀(e:E)[e ∈ self.edges ⇒ ((e.head ∈ self.nodes) ∧ (e.tail ∈ self.nodes))]

instance methods

addNode: n <: Node
  requires −includesNode(self,n)
  modifies self
  ensures self.post = set_nodes(self, (self.nodes ∪ {n}))

removeNode: n <: Node
  requires includesNode(self,n) ∧ isolatedNode(self,n)
  modifies self
  ensures self.post = set_nodes(self, (self.nodes ⇔ {n}))

chooseNode
  returns n <: Node
  requires ¬isEmpty(self.nodes)
  ensures includesNode(self,n)

nodes
  returns s <: Set(Node)
  ensures fresh(s) ∧ s = self.nodes

numOfNodes
  returns n <: Integer
  ensures n = size(self.nodes)

Figure 10: The parameterized specification Graph.
type DirectedGraph
  supertypes Graph(Node)
  parameters Node ≤ ObjectWithEquality
  trait DirectedGraphTrait (DirectedGraph(Node) for G, Set(Node) for SN, Node for N)

meta methods

new
  returns g <: DirectedGraph(Node)
  ensures g = [{},{}] ∧ fresh(g)

instance methods

addArcFrom: n <: Node to: m <: Node
  requires includesNode(self,n) ∧ includesNode(self,m) ∧ ¬includesArc([n,m])
  modifies self
  ensures self.post = set.edges(self, self.edges ∪ {[n,m]})

removeArcFrom: n <: Node to: m <: Node
  requires includesArc(self,n,m)
  modifies self
  ensures self.post = set.edges(self, self.edges - {[n,m]})

adjacentNodesFrom: n <: Node
  returns s <: Set(Node)
  requires includesNode(self,n)
  ensures fresh(s) ∧ ∀(m:N)[m ∈ s ⇔ [n,m] ∈ self.edges]

adjacentNodesTo: n <: Node
  returns s <: Set(Node)
  requires includesNode(self,n)
  ensures fresh(s) ∧ ∀(m:N)[m ∈ s ⇔ [m,n] ∈ self.edges]

adjacentNodes: n <: Node
  returns s <: Set(Node)
  requires includesNode(self,n)
  ensures fresh(s) ∧ ∀(m:N)[m ∈ s ⇔ [n,m] ∈ self.edges ∨ [m,n] ∈ self.edges]

Figure 11: The interface specification DirectedGraph.
UndirectedGraph\(<\text{Node}\>)

type UndirectedGraph	parameters Node \leq ObjectWithEquality
supertypes Graph\(<\text{Node}\>)
trait UndirectedGraphTrait\ (UndirectedGraph\(<\text{Node}\>) \text{ for } G, \text{Set}(\text{Node}) \text{ for } SN,\text{Node for }N)

---

meta methods

new
returns g \(<\text{UndirectedGraph\(<\text{Node}\>)}\>
ensures g = [\{\},\{\}] \land \text{fresh}(g)

---

instance methods

addEdgeBetween: n \(<\text{Node}\>\text{ and } m \(<\text{Node}\>
requires \text{includesNode}(\text{self},n) \land \text{includesNode}(\text{self},m) \land \neg \text{includesEdge}[n,m]
modifies self
ensures self.post = \text{set edges}(\text{self}, \text{self.edges} \cup \{[n,m]\})

removeEdgeBetween: n \(<\text{Node}\>\text{ and } m \(<\text{Node}\>
requires \text{includesEdge}(\text{self},n,m)
modifies self
ensures self.post = \text{set edges}(\text{self}, \text{self.edges} - ([n,m] \cup [m,n]))

adjacentNodes: n \(<\text{Node}\>
returns s \(<\text{Set\(<\text{Node}\)>}\>
requires \text{includesNode}(\text{self},n)
ensures \text{fresh}(s) \land \forall(m:N)[m \in s \iff \{n,m\} \in \text{self.edges} \lor \{m,n\} \in \text{self.edges}]

---

Figure 12: The interface specification UndirectedGraph.

all the vertices adjacent to a given vertex. The method adjacentNodes: returns a new set of all the vertices adjacent to and from a given vertex.

The type UndirectedGraph, another subtype of Graph, is shown in Figure 12. Its invariant is inherited from Graph. The meta method new returns an empty undirected graph [\{\},\{\}]. The instance method addEdgeBetween: and: inserts a new edge to the receiver whereas removeEdgeBetween: and: deletes an existing edge from the receiver. The post-condition of removeEdgeBetween: and: states that it deletes both the edges [n,m] and [m,n]. Because there is no direction associated with an edge, both denote the same edge, an edge between vertices n and m. Both methods return the object self.obj by default. The method adjacentNodes: returns a new set containing all the adjacent vertices of a given vertex.
6.1 Subtyping in Parameterized Type Specifications

Both DirectedGraph and UndirectedGraph are specified to be subtypes of Graph. But strictly speaking, neither is a subtype of Graph. In fact, none of the three are types by themselves; rather they are type generators. What we mean by “DirectedGraph is a subtype of Graph” is that for each type Node, DirectedGraph(Node) is a subtype of Graph(Node). For example, DirectedGraph(Integer) is a subtype of Graph(Integer), and DirectedGraph(Character) is a subtype of Graph(Character). However, DirectedGraph(Integer) is not a subtype of Graph(Character) nor the other way around. Thus, for the three specifications, we have the following subtype hierarchy:

```
                   Graph(Node)
                     /    \
                    /      \
UndirectedGraph(Node)    DirectedGraph(Node)
```

Suppose that the type SmallInteger is a subtype of type Integer. An interesting question is whether DirectedGraph(SmallInteger) is a subtype of Graph(Integer) or vice versa. Let us assume that DirectedGraph(SmallInteger) is a subtype of Graph(Integer). The method addNode: would then require an argument of type SmallInteger in the subtype and an argument of type Integer in the supertype. But this would contradict the syntactic subtype rule, which requires that argument types can only be generalized in subtypes. Thus, DirectedGraph(SmallInteger) cannot be a subtype of Graph(Integer). Assuming that Graph(Integer) is a subtype of DirectedGraph(SmallInteger) would lead to a similar conflict with the syntactic subtyping rule. For example, the method chooseNode: returns an object of type Integer in Graph(Integer), and returns an object of type SmallInteger in DirectedGraph(SmallInteger). So, DirectedGraph(Integer) cannot be a subtype of Graph(SmallInteger) because it violates the second condition of the subtyping rule saying that the result type can only specialized in subtypes. So, in general, if S is a subtype of T, then DirectedGraph(S) is not a subtype of Graph(T) and vice versa.

Let us consider subtyping relationships between different instantiations of the same parameterized type specification. Consider the case when we substitute two parameters that are subtypes of each other. For example, is the type Graph(SmallInteger) a subtype of the type Graph(Integer)? The method addNode: requires an argument of type SmallInteger in the first type and the argument of type Integer in the second type. Therefore, for the same reason as above, Graph(SmallInteger) is not a subtype of Graph(Integer). We can easily show that the subtyping relationship the other way around also conflicts with our subtyping rule. Therefore in general we do not have a subtype relationship between different instantiations of the same parameterized type, though there are some cases where such a relationship holds [Coo89].

7 Discussion

7.1 Related Work

Recently there has been much effort in applying object-oriented concepts to formal specification and reasoning techniques, that is to say, to design object-oriented specification
languages and to specify and verify programs in object-oriented programming languages. This effort can be divided into two categories: designing new specification languages and extending existing specification languages with object-oriented concepts. Object orientation is reflected in the specification language ABEL[8] in a class-like construct which defines objects in the conventional imperative sense. ABEL contains mechanisms for constructive and nonconstructive specifications as well as applicative and imperative programming. In GSBI[CO8], an algebraic specification language, one can see full-fledged notions of objects, classes, and inheritance. In the database community, the Oblog+ language incorporates object orientation to specify information systems, especially for conceptual modeling of systems.

Sev eral object-oriented extensions have been proposed for the specification language Z [Hay87] due to its style (e.g., graphical layout of specifications, use of set theoretic and logical notations, conventions for decorating input and output variables, etc.) and its growing use in industry. Schuman and Pitt [SP86] described a semantics to accommodate object orientation based on events and histories, though they did not provide the class as a single syntactic construct. Object-Z [CDD89] introduces classes to encapsulate the description of an object’s state with its related operations. Complex specifications are then constructed through class inheritance and instantiation. Its class model is also based on the idea of history which captures the sequence of operations and state changes undergone by an instance (object) of the class. The OOZE System [AG91], based on Z and OBJ3, provides a powerful parameterization mechanism (modules, theories, views) as well as notions of objects, classes, and inheritance. Object-orientation was also attempted for the specification languages VDM [Bea88] and LOTOS [May88]. In Fresco [Wil92], a programming environment for developing object-oriented software from specifications based on VDM, a class describes a specification, an implementation, or a mixture of two. A class is specified with model variables, invariants, and operation specifications. The state of an object is captured by these model variables; i.e., it is composition of the values of these variables. This composition of model variables corresponds to the abstract value of an object in Larch/Smalltalk, which in Larch/Smalltalk is specified in LSL. Fresco also distinguishes between the class hierarchy of implementations and the type hierarchy of conformance. But the preference in Fresco seems to be to combine the two in conformant inheritance, in which the subclass also happens to implement a subtype [Mey88].

Larch/Smalltalk is the first Larch interface specification language with subtyping and specification inheritance [Che91]. Other Larch interface languages with similar features are LM3 (Larch/Modula-3) [GH93, Chapter 6] and Larch/C++ [L92, C93]. Both allow reuse of specifications in the interface level through specification inheritance. The most distinguishing features of Larch/Smalltalk compared to LM3 and Larch/C++ are its simplicity and flexibility, and separation of types from classes. The syntax and semantics of Larch/Smalltalk are much simpler than LM3 and Larch/C++, partly due to the simplicity of Smalltalk.

The most interesting feature of Larch/C++ is that a class specification can have multiple interfaces: the public interface for clients, the protected interface for subclasses, and the private interface for implementors and friends. This is a very useful feature both in programming and specification. It can be somewhat simulated in Larch/Smalltalk by disciplined and stylized use of message categories. For example, methods can be categorized
depending on whether they are public, protected, or private; in fact, this is what a sensible Smalltalk programmer does with Smalltalk methods. However, this cannot prevent clients from accessing protected or private methods if they want to.

In LM3 [Jon91], one can specify a higher-order procedure, a procedure that takes other procedures as its arguments. Similar features are also found in Larch/CLU [Win83] and LCL (Larch/C) [Tan93]. The interface (arguments and their types) and the behavior (using pre- and post-conditions) of an argument procedure are specified in the header part of the procedure which takes it as an argument. And a special notation is provided to refer to the pre- and post-conditions of the argument procedure in the pre- and post-conditions of the higher order procedure. A similar approach might be taken to specify Smalltalk blocks. LM3 also has support for specifying threads, lightweight units of concurrency in Modula-3. A non-atomic routine is specified as sequence of atomic actions [Win90]. Concurrency issues are not addressed in Larch/Smalltalk.

7.2 Future Work

7.2.1 Language Extension

In Smalltalk, methods can take or return blocks. That is, methods can be higher-order. A block is a closure; it contains parameterized code and an environment. Since Smalltalk control structures such as ifTrue:ifFalse: and whileTrue: are based on blocks, they are an essential feature of the Smalltalk system. Several approaches to specifying blocks are being examined: (1) modeling them explicitly as state transitions in ISL, (2) specifying in the interface the weakest pre- and post-conditions that the argument blocks have to satisfy [ENOS2, Jon91], (3) using free functions as proposed in LCL [Tan93], and (4) introducing new predicate operators that can model (repeated) invocation of argument blocks. An interesting fact about blocks is that they allow non-local exits; blocks are continuations. A block can exit to the place where it was defined (which may be different from where it was invoked). Since this feature is heavily used by Smalltalk programmers to handle error cases, etc., it should be properly addressed in extending Larch/Smalltalk for specifying block arguments.

Another desirable extension to the current syntax is for specifying exceptions. Smalltalk exception handling mechanisms are based on the multilevel resumption model; an exception can be propagated to multiple levels and control can later be resumed by the exception-raising module. There are some provisions in Larch interface languages such as Larch/CLU, LM3, and Larch/C++ for specifying exceptions, but all of them are for the simple termination model; an exception is propagated only to the invoking module and control cannot be resumed by the exception-raising module.

Smalltalk allows programming at the meta level in the sense that classes themselves are represented by objects, called class objects. One can refer to these class objects in instance methods, and one define methods for the class objects, which are called class methods. Classes defining class objects are called meta classes. To specify such class objects, we could specify meta types much as we specify types. The main problem is to connect the specification of a type with the specification of its meta type, because in Larch/Smalltalk a type may be implemented by more than one class. One idea is to use, a notation such as self\textsubscript{meta} to refer to the receiver's class object in the specification of instance methods; this
would allow the class object to be discussed without explicitly naming a particular class object.

7.2.2 Formal Semantics

Defining a formal semantics will be the main focus of our future research in Larch/Smalltalk. Informally, a Larch/Smalltalk specification denotes a set of Smalltalk program modules whose interfaces and behaviors conform to the specification. In this context a program module means a class or several classes collectively. One approach to giving formal semantics would be to define: (1) a common basis (some mathematical notations) between Larch/Smalltalk and Smalltalk, and (2) two translation functions, one for specifications and the other for programs. The meaning of a specification would be all the Smalltalk modules whose meaning is implied by the mathematical term to which the specification is translated. For example, let $S$ be a Larch/Smalltalk specification, $P$ be a Smalltalk program module, $T_s$ and $T_p$ be translation functions. Then the meaning of $S$, $M[[S]]$ could be:

$$M[[S]] \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ P \mid T_s[[S]] \Rightarrow T_p[[P]] \}$$

7.2.3 Verification and Reasoning

We would like to explore how to use Larch/Smalltalk as a formal basis for verifying and reasoning about Smalltalk programs. Basically we would like to design a Hoare-style proof logic adapted to object-oriented programming, something like the one discussed in [IW90, Lea91].

7.3 Summary

Behavioral specification of reusable components is more necessary in object-oriented programming than in conventional programming environment. The lack of such description techniques for Smalltalk has caused poor reuse of its huge library classes and made it hard for programmers to exchange code for possible reuse. Larch/Smalltalk answers these needs with a formal specification language specifically tailored to Smalltalk. Larch/Smalltalk is a Larch interface specification language with notions of subtyping and specification inheritance. One can precisely describe both the behavior and the interface of Smalltalk modules (classes and methods).

The main contribution of this paper is its separation of types from classes. Type is the unit of abstraction for specification. This is an interesting way of introducing a type system (at the specification level) when the underlying language is untyped, and provides natural mechanisms for specifying Smalltalk interfaces. Subtyping allows specifications to be organized according to their conceptual relationships, i.e., in subtype hierarchies, as opposed to implementation relationships. In addition, specifications can be reused at the interface level by specification inheritance. Parameterization is also allowed to specify a set of related types.

We expect ordinary Smalltalk programmers to learn and use Larch/Smalltalk easily and productively in programming. The flexibility of Larch/Smalltalk is obtained by decoupling the specification unit (type) from the implementation unit (class). Thus a Larch/Smalltalk
type can be implemented by a single Smalltalk class, several classes forming a subhierarchy in the subclassing hierarchy, or a set of classes. Also a type may have several different implementations in a program [LTP86]. The separation of types from classes gives a great freedom in design and implementation.

To allow specifications to be used practically in the programming process, Larch/Smalltalk specification browsers integrated in the Smalltalk system were implemented. A preliminary version is available by anonymous ftp from ftp.cs.iastate.edu.

A Reference Grammar

This section lists the reference grammar of Larch/Smalltalk in an extended BNF with conventions: (1) nonterminal symbols are enclosed in angle brackets (e.g. \(<\text{method-header}\>)\), (2) keywords are written in \textbf{bold} face (e.g., \texttt{requires}), (3) reserved words and other terminal symbols are written in a \texttt{typewriter} font if possible (e.g., \texttt{self}, [, ]), otherwise they will be written normally (e.g., \{, \}, \Rightarrow), (4) optional symbols are surrounded by square brackets (e.g., \[ \texttt{returns} \{\texttt{formal-declaration}\} \]), and (5) the notation \ldots means that the preceding symbol (or a group of optional symbols) can be repeated zero or more times (e.g., \{\texttt{method-specification}\} \ldots).

The lexical conventions are the same as those of Smalltalk [GR83]. For example, \texttt{identifier} is an arbitrary long sequence of letters and digits whose first character is a letter.

A.1 Type Specifications

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{type-specification} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{type-header} \rangle \langle \text{type-body} \rangle \\
\langle \text{type-header} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{type} \langle \text{identifier} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{parameters-clause} \rangle \right] \left[ \langle \text{supertypes-clause} \rangle \right] \left[ \langle \text{mutation-clause} \rangle \right] \left[ \langle \text{uses-clause} \rangle \right] \left[ \langle \text{invariant-clause} \rangle \right] \\
\langle \text{parameters-clause} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{parameters} \langle \text{type-parameter} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{type-parameter} \rangle \right] \ldots \\
\langle \text{type-parameter} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{identifier} \rangle \left[ \leq \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \right] \\
\langle \text{type-name} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{identifier} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{identifier} \rangle \left[ \leq \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \right] \ldots \right] \\
\langle \text{mutation-clause} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{mutation} \langle \text{boolean} \rangle \\
\langle \text{uses-clause} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{trait} \langle \text{trait-name} \rangle \left[ \{ \langle \text{to-sort-list} \rangle \} \right] \\
\langle \text{to-sort-list} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \textbf{for} \{\text{sort-name}\} \left[ \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \textbf{for} \{\text{sort-name}\} \right] \ldots \\
\langle \text{supertypes-clause} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{supertypes} \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{type-name} \rangle \right] \ldots \\
\langle \text{invariant-clause} \rangle & \rightarrow \textbf{invariant} \langle \text{predicate} \rangle \\
\langle \text{method-body} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{method-specification} \rangle \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

The nonterminals \langle \text{trait-name} \rangle and \langle \text{sort-name} \rangle are just \langle \text{identifier} \rangle.

A.2 Method Specifications

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \text{method-specification} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{method-header} \rangle \langle \text{method-body} \rangle \\
\langle \text{method-header} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{message-pattern} \rangle \left[ \textbf{returns} \langle \text{formal-declaration} \rangle \right] \\
\langle \text{message-pattern} \rangle & \rightarrow \langle \text{unary} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{binary} \rangle \left[ \langle \text{keywords} \rangle \right] \right]
\end{align*}
\]
\( \text{unary} \rightarrow \text{identifier} \)
\( \text{binary} \rightarrow (\text{binary-selector}) \ (\text{formal-declaration}) \)
\( \text{keywords} \rightarrow (\text{keyword}) \ (\text{formal-declaration}) \ [ (\text{keyword}) \ (\text{formal-declaration}) ] \ldots \)
\( \text{formal-declaration} \rightarrow (\text{identifier}) <: \ (\text{type-name}) \)
\( \text{method-body} \rightarrow [ \ (\text{pre-condition}) ] \ [ \ (\text{modifies-list}) ] \ (\text{post-condition}) \)
\( \text{pre-condition} \rightarrow \text{requires} \ (\text{predicate}) \)
\( \text{modifies-list} \rightarrow \text{modifies nothing} \)
\( \quad \text{modifies [at most]} (\text{identifier}) [ , \ (\text{identifier}) ] \ldots \)
\( \text{post-condition} \rightarrow \text{ensures} \ (\text{predicate}) \)

The lexical conventions for (binary-selector) and (keyword) are the same as in Smalltalk.

### A.3 Predicates

\( \text{predicate} \rightarrow (\text{boolean}) \ | \ \neg (\text{predicate}) \ | \ ( (\text{predicate}) ) \)
\( \quad \text{connectives} \ (\text{predicate}) \ | \ (\text{quantified}) \ | (\text{term}) = (\text{term}) \)
\( \text{boolean} \rightarrow \text{true} | \text{false} \)
\( \text{quantified} \rightarrow (\text{quantifier}) \ ( (\text{identifier}) : (\text{sort-name}) ) \ [ (\text{predicate}) ] \)
\( \text{quantifier} \rightarrow \forall \ | \exists \)
\( \text{term} \rightarrow (\text{special}) \ | (\text{qualified}) \ | ( (\text{term}) ) \)
\( \quad (\text{identifier}) [ ( (\text{term}) [ , (\text{term}) ] \ldots ) ] \)
\( \quad (\text{term}) \ (\text{infix-operator}) \ (\text{term}) \)
\( \quad \text{if} (\text{predicate}) \ \text{then} \ (\text{term}) \ \text{else} \ (\text{term}) \)
\( \text{special} \rightarrow (\text{literal}) \ | \text{self} \ | \text{fresh} \ ( (\text{term}) [ , (\text{term}) ] \ldots ) \)
\( \text{literal} \rightarrow (\text{number}) \ | (\text{character}) \ | (\text{string}) \ | (\text{symbol}) \)
\( \text{qualified} \rightarrow (\text{term})_{\text{pre}} \ | (\text{term})_{\text{post}} \ | (\text{term})_{\text{any}} \ | (\text{term})_{\text{obj}} \)
\( \text{connectives} \rightarrow \land \ | \lor \ | \Rightarrow \ | \Leftrightarrow \)

The nonterminal (infix-operator) stands for LSL infix trait functions. Larch/Smalltalk
literals ((literal)) are the same as those of Smalltalk.

### B Default Qualifications for Formals in Assertions

Qualifications are often redundant, so Larch/Smalltalk has certain defaults depending on
the context in which an object appears. In the invariant clause, an unqualified self is
qualified with the value qualifier \( \text{any} \) by default. In the requires and ensures clauses, self
and unqualified formal arguments are qualified with the value qualifier \( \text{pr} \). In the ensures
clause, an unqualified output formal parameter is qualified with the value qualifier \( \text{post} \). In
the modifies clause and in the Larch/Smalltalk special predicate fresh, one always refers
to objects. Hence, in these contexts, the object qualifier \( \text{obj} \) is the default qualifier.
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