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Chapter 1: Introduction

1 Introduction

Abstract

JML is a behavioral interface specification language tailored to Java(TM). Besides pre- and postconditions, it also allows assertions to be intermixed with Java code; these aid verification and debugging. JML is designed to be used by working software engineers; to do this it follows Eiffel in using Java expressions in assertions. JML combines this idea from Eiffel with the model-based approach to specifications, typified by VDM and Larch, which results in greater expressiveness. Other expressiveness advantages over Eiffel include quantifiers, specification-only variables, and frame conditions.

This paper discusses the goals of JML, the overall approach, and describes the basic features of the language through examples. It is intended for readers who have some familiarity with both Java and behavioral specification using pre- and postconditions.

JML stands for “Java Modeling Language” [Leavens-Baker-Ruby99]. JML is a behavioral interface specification language (BISL) [Wing87] designed to specify Java [Arnold-Gosling-Holmes00] [Gosling-etal00] modules. Java modules are classes and interfaces.

The main goal of our research on JML is to better understand how to make BISLs (and BISL tools) that are practical and effective for production software environments. In order to understand this goal, and the more detailed discussion of our goals for JML, it helps to define more precisely what a behavioral interface specification is. After doing this, we return to describing the goals of JML, and then give a brief overview of the tool support for JML and an outline of the rest of the paper.

1.1 Behavioral Interface Specification

As a BISL, JML describes two important aspects of a Java module:

- its interface, which consists of the names and static information found in Java declarations, and
- its behavior, which tells how the module acts when used.

BISLs are inherently language-specific [Wing87], because they describe interface details for clients written in a specific programming language. For example, a BISL tailored to C++, such as Larch/C++ [Leavens97c], describes how to use a module in a C++ program. A Larch/C++ specification cannot be implemented correctly in Java, and a JML specification cannot be correctly implemented in C++ (except for methods that are specified as native code).

JML specifications can either be written in separate files or as annotations in Java program files. To a Java compiler such annotations are comments that are ignored [Luckham-vonHenke85] [Luckham-etal87] [Rosenblum95] [Tan94] [Tan95]. This allows JML specifications, such as the specification below, to be embedded in Java program files. Consider the following simple example of a behavioral interface specification in JML, written as annotations in a Java program file, ‘IntMathOps.java’. 

---

IntMathOps.java

```java
public class IntMathOps {
    public static int add(int x, int y) {
        return x + y;
    }
}
```
public class IntMathOps { // 1

/*@ public normal_behavior // 2
@ requires y >= 0; // 3
@ assignable \nothing; // 4
@ ensures 0 <= \result // 5
@ && \result * \result <= y // 6
@ && ((0 <= (\result + 1) * (\result + 1)) // 7
@ ==> y < (\result + 1) * (\result + 1)); // 8
@*/ //10

public static int isqrt(int y) //11
{ //12
    return (int) Math.sqrt(y); //13
} //14
} //15

The specification above describes a Java class, IntMathOps that contains one static method (function member) named isqrt. The single-line comments to the far right (which start with //) give the line numbers in this specification; they are ignored by both Java and JML. Comments with an immediately following at-sign, //@, or, as on lines 3–10, C-style comments starting with /*@, are annotations. Annotations are treated as comments by a Java compiler, but JML processes the text of an annotation. The text of an annotation is either the remainder of a line following //@ or the characters between the annotation markers /*@ and @*/. In the second form, at-signs (@) at the beginning of lines are ignored; they can be used to help the reader see the extent of an annotation.

In the above specification, interface information is declared in lines 1 and 11. Line 1 declares a class named IntMathOps, and line 11 declares a method named isqrt. Note that all of Java’s declaration syntax is allowed in JML, including, on lines 1 and 11, that the names declared are public, that the method is static (line 11), that its return type is int (line 11), and that it takes one int argument.

Such interface declarations must be found in a Java module that correctly implements this specification. This is automatically the case in the file ‘IntMathOps.java’ shown above, since that file also contains the implementation. In fact, when Java annotations are embedded in ‘.java’ files, the interface specification is the actual Java source code.

To be correct, an implementation must have both the specified interface and the specified behavior. In the above specification, the behavioral information is specified in the annotation text on lines 3–10. The keywords public normal_behavior are used to say that the specification is intended for callers (hence “public”), and that when the precondition is satisfied a call must return normally, without throwing an exception (hence “normal”). In such a public specification, only names with public visibility may be used. In JML method specifications must be placed either before the method’s header, as shown above, or between the method’s header and its body. In this document, we always place the specification before the method header. This convention is followed by many Java tools, in particular by Javadoc; It has the advantage of working in all cases, even when the method has no body.

In a protected specification, both public and protected identifiers can be used. In a specification with default (i.e., no) visibility specified, which corresponds to Java’s default visibility, public and protected
4 is a precondition, which follows the keyword requires.\footnote{\text{The keyword \texttt{pre} can also be used as a synonym for \texttt{requires}.}} On line 5 is frame condition, which says that this method, when called, does not assign to any locations. On lines 6–9 is a postcondition, which follows the keyword ensures.\footnote{\text{The keyword \texttt{post} can also be used as a synonym for \texttt{ensures}.}} The precondition says what must be true about the arguments (and other parts of the state); if the precondition is true, then the method must terminate normally in a state that satisfies the postcondition. This is a contract between the caller of the method and the implementor [Hoare69] [Jones90] [Jonkers91] [Guttag-Horning93] [Meyer92a] [Meyer97] [Morgan94]. The caller is obligated to make the precondition true, and gets the benefit of having the postcondition then be satisfied. The implementor gets the benefit of being able to assume the precondition, and is obligated to make the postcondition true in that case.

In general, pre- and postconditions in JML are written using an extended form of Java expressions. In this case, the only extension visible is the keyword \texttt{\result}, which is used in the postcondition to denote the value returned by the method. The type of \texttt{\result} is the return type of the method; for example, the type of \texttt{\result in isqrt} is \texttt{int}. The postcondition says that the result is an integer approximation to the square root of \texttt{y}. The first conjunct on line 6, \texttt{0 <= \result} say that the result is non-negative. The second and third conjuncts state that the result is an integer approximation to the square root of the argument \texttt{y}. The second conjunct, on line 7, says that the result squared is no larger than the argument, \texttt{y}. The third conjunct, on lines 8–9, is an implication; it has two expressions connected by \texttt{===>}, which means implication in JML. This implication says that if the result plus one squared is non-negative, then the result plus one squared is strictly larger than \texttt{y}.\footnote{\text{The result plus one squared will become negative if the result is larger than 46340, due to integer overflow. Patrice Chalin pointed out that in an earlier version of this specification there were overflow problems [Chalin02]. In Java integer arithmetic, one plus the maximum integer is the minimum integer. This specification deals with such problems by limiting the result to be a positive integer and by the implication on lines 8-9. See the specification of \texttt{IntMathOps2} below for another way to deal with these problems.}} Note that the behavioral specification does not give an algorithm for finding the square root.

Method specifications may also be written in Java’s documentation comments. The following is an example. The part that JML sees is enclosed within the HTML “tags” <jml> and </jml>.\footnote{\text{Since HTML tags are not case sensitive, in this one place JML is also not case sensitive. That is, the syntax also permits the tags \texttt{<JML>}, \texttt{</JML>}. For compatibility with ESC/Java, JML also supports the tags \texttt{<esc>}, \texttt{</esc>}, \texttt{<ESC>}, and \texttt{</ESC>}.}} As in this example, one can use surrounding tags <pre> and </pre> to tell javadoc to ignore what JML sees, and to leave the formatting of it alone. The <pre> and </pre> tags are not required by JML tools (including jmldoc, which does a better job of formatting specifications than does javadoc).
public class IntMathOps4 {

    /** Integer square root function.
     * @param y the number to take the root of
     * @return an integer approximating
     * the positive square root of y
     * <pre><jml>
     * public normal_behavior
     * requires y >= 0;
     * assignable \nothing;
     * ensures 0 <= \result
     *   && \result * \result <= y
     *   && ((0 <= (\result + 1) * (\result + 1))
     *   ==> y < (\result + 1) * (\result + 1));
     * </jml></pre>
    **/
    public static int isqrt(int y)
    {
        return (int) Math.sqrt(y);
    }
}

Because we expect most of our users to write specifications in Java code files, most of
our examples will be given as annotations in ‘.java’ files as in the specifications above.
However, it is possible to use JML to write documentation in separate, non-Java files,
such as the file ‘IntMathOps2.jml-refined’ below. Since these files are not Java program
files, JML requires the user to omit the code for concrete methods in such a file (except
that code for “model” methods can be present, see Section 2.3.1 [Purity], page 29). The
specification below shows how this is done, using a semicolon (;), as in a Java abstract
method declaration.

//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.*;

public /**@ spec_bigint_math @**/ class IntMathOps2 {

    /**@ public normal_behavior
     * @ requires y >= 0;
     * @ assignable \nothing;
     * @ ensures -y <= \result && \result <= y;
     * @ ensures \result * \result <= y;
     * @ ensures y < (Math.abs(\result) + 1)
     *           * (Math.abs(\result) + 1);
     * @*/
    public static int isqrt(int y);
}
Besides files with suffixes of `.jml-refined` or `.jml`, JML also works with files with the suffixes `.spec` and `.spec-refined`. All these files use Java’s syntax, and one must use annotation markers just as in a `.java` file. However, since these kinds of files are not Java files, in such a file one must also omit the code for concrete, non-model methods.

The specification of IntMathOps2 below is written in spec_bigint_math mode [Chalin04]. This means that integer mathematics inside the specifications in the class IntMathOps2 are done in infinite precision arithmetic, instead of the usual Java arithmetic. This leads to a simpler specification, especially in the ensures clause.\(^7\)

The above specification also demonstrates that ensures clauses can be repeated in a specification. In IntMathOps2’s specification of isqrt, there are three ensures clauses; all of them must be satisfied. Thus the meaning is the same as the conjunction of all of the postconditions specified in the individual ensures clauses. This specification is also more underspecified than the specifications given previously, as it allows negative numbers to be returned as results.

The above specification would be implemented in the file ‘IntMathOps2.java’, which is shown below. This file contains a refine clause, which tells the reader of the `.java` file what is being refined and the file in which to find its specification.

```java
//@ refine "IntMathOps2.jml-refined";

//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.*;

public class IntMathOps2 {
    public static int isqrt(int y)
    {
        return (int) Math.sqrt(y);
    }
}
```

To summarize, a behavioral interface specification describes both the interface details of a module, and its behavior. The interface details are written in the syntax of the programming language; thus JML uses the Java declaration syntax. The behavioral specification uses pre- and postconditions.

### 1.2 Lightweight Specifications

Although we find it best to illustrate JML’s features in this paper using specifications that are detailed and complete, one can use JML to write less detailed specifications. In particular, one can use JML to write “lightweight” specifications (as in ESC/Java). The syntax of JML allows one to write specifications that consist of individual clauses, so that one can say just what is desired. More precisely, a lightweight specification is one that does not use a behavior keyword (like normal_behavior). By way of contrast, we call a specification a heavyweight specification if it uses one of the behavior keywords.

---

\(^7\) Because the current ESC/Java2 tool does not understand spec_bigint_math mode, the specification uses uses annotation markers `/**@` and `@**/`. These markers are understood by the ISU JML tools, but are considered to be comments by ESC/Java2.
For example, one might wish to specify just that \texttt{isqrt} should be called only on positive arguments, but not want to be bothered with saying anything formal about the locations that can be assigned to by the method or about the result. This could be done as shown below. Notice that the only specification given below is a single \texttt{requires} clause. Since the specification of \texttt{isqrt} has no behavior keyword, it is a lightweight specification.

\begin{verbatim}
public class IntMathOps3 {

//@ requires y >= 0;
public static int isqrt(int y)
{
    return (int) Math.sqrt(y);
}
}
\end{verbatim}

What is the access restriction, or privacy level, of such a lightweight specification? The syntax for lightweight specifications does not have a place to specify the privacy level, so JML assumes that such a lightweight specification has the same level of visibility as the method itself. (Thus, the specification below is implicitly \texttt{public}.) What about the omitted parts of the specification, such as the \texttt{ensures} clause? JML assumes nothing about these. In the example below when the precondition is met, an implementation might either signal an exception or terminate normally, so this specification technically allows exceptions to be thrown. However, the gain in brevity often outweighs the need for this level of precision.

JML has a semantics that allows most clauses to be sensibly omitted from a specification. When the \texttt{requires} clause is omitted, for example, it means that no requirements are placed on the caller. When the \texttt{assignable} clause is omitted, it means that nothing is promised about what locations may not be assigned to by the method; that is, the method may assign to all locations that it can otherwise legally assign to. When the \texttt{ensures} clause is omitted, it means that nothing is promised about the state resulting from a method call. See Appendix A [Specification Case Defaults], page 62, for the default meanings of various other clauses.

\section{1.3 Goals}

As mentioned above, the main goal of our research is to better understand how to develop BISLs (and BISL tools) that are practical and effective. We are concerned with both technical requirements and with other factors such as training and documentation, although in the rest of this paper we will only be concerned with technical requirements for the BISL itself. The practicality and effectiveness of JML will be judged by how well it can document reusable class libraries, frameworks, and Application Programming Interfaces (APIs).

We believe that to meet the overall goal of practical and effective behavioral interface specification, JML must meet the following subsidiary goals.

- JML must be able to document the interfaces and behavior of existing software, regardless of the analysis and design methods used to create it.

If JML were limited to only handling certain Java features, certain kinds of software, or software designed according to certain analysis and design methods, then some APIs would not be amenable to documentation using JML. This would mean that some
existing software could not be documented using JML. Since the effort put into writing such documentation will have a proportionally larger payoff for software that is more widely reused, it is important to be able to document existing software components.

(However, it should be noted that we make some exceptions to this goal. One is that JML requires that all subtypes be behavioral subtypes [Dhara-Leavens96] [Leavens97c] [Wing87] of their supertypes. This is done because otherwise one cannot reason modularly about programs that use subtyping and dynamic dispatch. Another is that we specify `Object`’s method `equals` as a pure method, which prohibits even benevolent side effects in any `equals` method that takes an `Object` as an argument. This is done to permit purity checking for collection classes that contain objects as members and use `equals` to compare them, as in the collection types found in `java.util`.)

- The notation used in JML should be readily understandable by Java programmers, including those with only standard mathematical training.

A preliminary study by Finney [Finney96] indicates that graphic mathematical notations, such as those found in Z [Hayes93] [Spivey92] [Woodcock-Davies96] may make such specifications hard to read, even for programmers trained in the notation. This accords with our experience in teaching formal specification notations to programmers. Hence, our strategy for meeting this goal has been to shun most special-purpose mathematical notations in favor of Java’s own expression syntax.

- The language must be capable of being given a rigorous, formal semantics, and must also be amenable to tool support.

This goal also helps ensure that the specification language does not suffer from logical problems, which would make it less useful for static analysis, prototyping, and testing tools.

We also have in mind a long range goal of a specification compiler, that would produce prototypes from specifications that happen to be constructive [Wahls-Leavens-Baker00].

Our partners at Compaq SRC and the University of Nijmegen have other goals in mind. At Compaq SRC, the goal is to make static analysis tools for Java programs that can help detect bugs. At the University of Nijmegen, the goal is to be able to do full program verification on Java programs.

As a general strategy for achieving these goals, we have tried to blend the Eiffel [Meyer92a] [Meyer92b] [Meyer97], Larch [Wing87] [Wing90a] [Guttag-Horning93] [LeavensLarchFAQ], and refinement calculus [Back88] [Back-vonWright98] [Morgan-Vickers94] [Morgan94] approaches to specification. From Eiffel we have taken the idea that assertions can be written in a language that is based on Java expressions. We also adapt the “old” notation from Eiffel, which appears in JML as `old`, instead of the Larch-style annotation of names with state functions. However, Eiffel specifications, as written by Meyer, are typically not as detailed as model-based specifications written, for example, in Larch BISLs or in VDM-SL [Fitzgerald-Larsen98] [ISO96] [Jones90]. Hence, we have combined these approaches, by using syntactic ideas from Eiffel and semantic ideas from model-based specification languages.

JML also has some other differences from Eiffel (and its cousins Sather and Sather-K). The most important is the concept of specification-only declarations. These declarations allow more abstract and exact specifications of behavior than is typically done in Eiffel; they allow one to write specifications that are similar to the spirit of VDM or Larch BISLs.
A major difference is that we have extended the syntax of Java expressions with quantifiers and other constructs that are needed for logical expressiveness, but which are not always executable. Finally, we ban side-effects and other problematic features of code in assertions.

On the other hand, our experience with Larch/C++ has taught us to adapt the model-based approach in two ways, with the aim of making it more practical and easy to learn. The first adaptation is again the use of specification-only model variables. An object will thus have (in general) several such model fields, which are used only for the purpose of describing, abstractly, the values of objects. This simplifies the use of JML, as compared with most Larch BISLs, since specifiers (and their readers) hardly ever need to know about algebraic-style specification. It also makes designing a model for a Java class or interface similar, in some respects, to designing an implementation data structure in Java. We hope that this similarity will make the specification language easier to understand. (This kind of model also has some technical advantages that will be described below.)

The second adaptation is hiding the details of mathematical modeling behind a facade of Java classes. In the Larch approach to behavioral interface specification [Wing87], the mathematical notation used in assertions is presented directly to the specifier. This allows the same mathematical notation to be used in many different specification languages. However, it also means that the user of such a specification language has to learn a notation for assertions that is different than their programming language’s notation for expressions. In JML we use a compromise approach, hiding these details behind Java classes. These classes have objects with many “pure” methods, in the sense that they do not use side-effects (at least not in any observable way). Such classes are intended to present the underlying mathematical concepts using Java syntax. Besides insulating the user of JML from the details of the mathematical notation, this compromise approach also insulates the design of JML from the details of the mathematical logic used for theorem proving.

We have generally taken features wholesale from the refinement calculus [Back88] [Back-vonWright98] [Morgan-Vickers94] [Morgan94]. Our adaptation of it consists in blending it with the idea of interface specification and adding features for object-oriented programming. We are using the adaptation of the refinement calculus by Büchi and Weck [Buechi-Weck00], which helps in specifying callbacks. However, since the refinement calculus is mostly needed for advanced specifications, in the remainder of this paper we do not discuss the JML features related to refinement, such as model programs.

1.4 Tool Support

Our partners at Compaq SRC have built a tool, ESC/Java, that does static analysis for Java programs [Leino-etal00]. ESC/Java uses a subset of the JML specification syntax, to help detect bugs in Java code. At the University of Nijmegen the LOOP tool [Huisman01] [Jacobs-etal98] is being adapted to use JML as its input language. This tool would generate verification conditions that could be checked using a theorem prover such as PVS or Isabelle/HOL. At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the Daikon invariant detector project [Ernst-etal01] is using a subset of JML to record invariants detected by runs of a program. Recent work uses ESC/Java to validate the invariants that are found.

In the rest of the section we concentrate on the tool support found in the JML release from Iowa State. Iowa State’s JML release has tool support for: static type checking of specifications, run-time assertion checking, generation of HTML pages, and generation of
unit testing harnesses. Use a web browser on the ‘JML.html’ file in the Iowa State JML release to access more detailed documentation on these tools.

### 1.4.1 Type Checking Specifications

Details on how to run the JML checker can be found in its manual page, which is part of the JML release. Here we only indicate the most basic uses of the checker. Running the checker with filenames as arguments will perform type checking on all the specifications contained in the given files. For example, one could check the specifications in the file ‘UnboundedStack.java’ by executing the following command.

```bash
jml UnboundedStack.java
```

One can also pass several files to the checker. For example, the following shows a handy pattern to catch all of the JML files in the current directory.

```bash
jml .*j* .*spec*
```

One can also pass directories to the JML checker, for example the following will check all the specifications in the current directory.

```
jml .
```

By default, the checker does not recurse into subdirectories, but this can be changed by using the `-R` option. For example, the following checks specifications in the current directory and all subdirectories.

```
jml -R .
```

To allow specifications to be split into several files and to allow documentation of code without changing existing files, the checker recognizes several filename suffixes. The checker recognizes several filename suffixes. The following are considered to be “active” suffixes: ‘.refines-java’, ‘.refines-spec’, ‘.refines-jml’, ‘.java’, ‘.spec’, and ‘.jml’; There are also three “passive” suffixes: ‘.java-refined’, ‘.spec-refined’, and ‘.jml-refined’. Files with passive suffixes can be used in refinements (see Section 1.1 [Behavioral Interface Specification], page 1) but should not normally be passed explicitly to the checker on its command line. Graphical user interface tools for JML should, by default, only present the active suffixes for selection. Among files in a directory with the same prefix, but with different active suffixes, the one whose suffix appears first in the list of active suffixes above should be considered primary by such a tool.

Files with different suffixes should be connected to each other using `refines` clauses. We give several examples in the remainder of this paper.

### 1.4.2 Generating HTML Documentation

To generate HTML documentation that can be browsed on the web, one uses the `jmldoc` tool. This tool is a replacement for `javadoc` that understands JML specifications. In addition to generating web pages for JML files and for JML annotated Java files, `jmldoc` also generates the indexes and other HTML files that surround these and provide access, in the same way that `javadoc` does.

For example, here is how we use `jmldoc` to generate the HTML pages for the MultiJava project.

---

8 The `jmldoc` tool is generously provided by David Cok; thanks David!
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rm -fr $HOME/MJ/javadocs
jmldoc -Q -private -d $HOME/MJ/javadocs \
   -link file:/cygwin/usr/local/jdk1.4/docs/api \
   -link file:/cygwin/usr/local/antlr/javadocs \
   --sourcepath $HOME/MJ \ 
   org.multijava.dis org.multijava.javadoc org.multijava.mjc \ 
   org.multijava.mjdoc org.multijava.util.org.multijava.util.backend \ 
   org.multijava.util.classfile org.multijava.util.compiler \ 
   org.multijava.util.jperf org.multijava.util.lexgen \ 
   org.multijava.util.msggen org.multijava.util.optgen \ 
   org.multijava.util.optimize org.multijava.util.testing

The options used in the above invocation of jmldoc make jmldoc be quiet (-Q), document all members (including private ones) of classes and interfaces (-private), write the HTML files relative to ‘$HOME/MJ/javadocs’ (-d), link to existing HTML files for the JDK and for ANTLR (-link), and find listed packages relative to ‘$HOME/MJ’ (--sourcepath). More details on running jmldoc are available from its manual page, which is part of the JML release.

1.4.3 Run Time Assertion Checking

The JML runtime assertion checking compiler is called jmlc. It type checks assertions (so there is no need to run jml separately), and then generates a class file with the executable parts of the specified assertions, invariants, preconditions, and postconditions (and other JML constructs) checked at run-time. Its basic usage is similar to a Java compiler, as shown in the following example.

jmlc TestUnboundedStack.java UnboundedStack.java

This will produce output telling what the compiler is doing, as well as class files ‘TestUnboundedStack.class’ and ‘UnboundedStack.class’.

To run or test a program compiled with jmlc, you should use the script jmlrac. The jmlrac script runs the resulting code with a CLASSPATH that includes various JAR files containing code needed for run-time assertion checking. The following is an example.

jmlrac org.jmlspecs.samples.stacks.TestUnboundedStack

Using the jmlrac script is necessary. If you do not use jmlrac to run the program, you will get errors, since the code that jmlc compiles expects various runtime library classes to be available.

More details on invoking jmlc and jmlrac are available from their manual pages, which are available in the JML release. See also the ‘README.html’ file in the JML release for more details and troubleshooting tips. Details on the implementation of jmlc are found in a paper by Cheon and Leavens [Cheon-Leavens02b].

1.4.4 Unit Testing with JML

The run time assertion checker is also integrated with a tool, jmlunit that can write out a JUnit [Beck-Gamma98] test oracle class for given Java files. For example, to generate the classes UnboundedStack_JML_Test and UnboundedStack_JML_TestData from UnboundedStack, one would execute the following.

jmlunit UnboundedStack.java
The file ‘UnboundedStack_JML_Test.java’ will then contain code for an abstract class to drive the tests. This class uses the runtime assertion checker to decide test success or failure. (Tests are only as good as the quality of the specifications; hence the specifications must be reasonably complete to permit reasonably complete testing.)

The file ‘UnboundedStack_JML_TestData.java’ will contain code for the superclass of UnboundedStack_JML_Test that can be used to fill in test data for such testing. You need to fill in the test data in the code for this subclass, as described in the comments. The file ‘UnboundedStack_JML_TestData.java’ is produced automatically the first time you run jmlunit as described above. However, subsequent runs of jmlunit never overwrite or change an ‘_JML_TestData.java’ file such as this if it exists. Hence it is safe to edit the file to add test data (and even additional test methods if you wish).

To run the test use the script jml-junit, as in the following example.

    jml-junit org.jmlspecs.samples.stacks.UnboundedStack_JML_TestData

More details on invoking these tools can be found in their manual pages which ship with the JML release. More discussion on this integration of JML and JUnit are explained in the ECOOP 2002 paper by Cheon and Leavens [Cheon-Leavens02].

JML also provides a tool, jtest, that combines both jmlc and jmlunit. The jtest tool both compiles a class with run-time assertion checks enabled using jmlc, and also generates the test oracle and test data classes, using jmlunit.

1.5 Outline

In the next sections we describe more about JML and its semantics. See Chapter 2 [Class and Interface Specifications], page 12, for examples that show how Java classes and interfaces are specified; this section also briefly describes the semantics of subtyping and refinement. See Chapter 3 [Extensions to Java Expressions], page 55, for a description of the expressions that can be used in specifications. See Chapter 4 [Conclusions], page 60, for conclusions from our preliminary design effort. See the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for details on the syntax of JML.
2 Class and Interface Specifications

In this section we give some examples of JML class specifications that illustrate the basic features of JML.

2.1 Abstract Models

A simple example of an abstract class specification is the ever-popular UnboundedStack type, which is presented below. It would appear in a file named ‘UnboundedStack.java’.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.stacks;
//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.*;

public abstract class UnboundedStack {
    //@ public model JMLObjectSequence theStack;
    // @ public initially theStack != null
    // @ public invariant theStack != null;
    //@ public normal_behavior
    // @ requires !theStack.isEmpty();
    // @ assignable theStack;
    // @ ensures theStack.equals(
    // @    @old(theStack.trailer()));
    // @*/

    // @ public invariant theStack != null;

    //@ public normal_behavior
    // @ requires !theStack.isEmpty();
    // @ assignable theStack;
    // @ ensures theStack.equals(
    // @    @old(theStack.insertFront(x)));
    // @*/

    public abstract void pop();

    //@ public normal_behavior
    // @ assignable theStack;
    // @ ensures theStack.equals(
    // @    @old(theStack.insertFront(x)));
    // @*/

    public abstract void push(Object x);

    //@ public normal_behavior
    // @ requires !theStack.isEmpty();
    // @ assignable @nothing;
    // @ ensures @result == theStack.first();
    // @*/
    public /*@ pure @*/ abstract Object top();
}
```

The above specification contains the declaration of a model field, an invariant, and some method specifications. These are described below.
2.1.1 Model Fields

In the fourth non-blank line of `UnboundedStack.java`, a model data field, theStack, is declared. Since it is declared using the JML modifier model, such a field is not part of the Java implementation, and must appear in an annotation; however, for purposes of the specification we treat it much like any other Java field (i.e., as a variable location). That is, we imagine that each instance of the class UnboundedStack has such a field.

The type of the model field theStack is a type designed for mathematical modeling, JMLObjectSequence. Objects of this type are sequences of objects. This type is provided by JML in the package org.jmlspecs.models, which is imported in the second non-blank line of the figure. Note that this import declaration is not part of the Java implementation, since it is modified by the keyword model. Such model imports must also appear in annotation comments. In general, any declaration form in Java can have the model modifier, with the same meaning. That is, a model declaration is only used for specification purposes, and does not have to appear in an implementation.

At the end of the model field’s declaration above is an initially clause. (Such clauses are adapted from RESOLVE [Ogden-etal94] and the refinement calculus [Back88] [Back-vonWright98] [Morgan-Vickers94] [Morgan94].) Model fields cannot be explicitly initialized (and thus cannot be final), because there is no storage directly associated with them. However, one can use an initially clause to describe an abstract initialization for a model field. Initially clauses can be attached to any field declaration, including non-model fields, and permit one to constrain the initial values of such fields. Knowing something about the initial value of the field permits data type induction [Hoare72a] [Wing83] for abstract classes and interfaces. The initially clause must be true of the field’s starting value. That is, all reachable objects of the type UnboundedStack must have been created as empty stacks and subsequently modified using the type’s methods.

2.1.2 Invariants

Following the model field declaration is an invariant. An invariant does not have to hold during the execution of an object’s methods, but it must hold, for each reachable object in each publicly visible state; i.e., for each state outside of a public method or constructor’s execution, and at the beginning and end of each public method’s execution.\(^1\) The figure’s invariant just says that the value of theStack should never be null.

2.1.3 Method Specifications

Following the invariant are the specifications of the methods pop, push, and top. We describe the new aspects of these specifications below.

---

\(^1\) In JML invariants also apply to non-public methods as well. The only exception is that a private method or constructor may be marked with the helper modifier; such methods cannot assume and do not need to establish the invariant.
2.1.3.1 The Assignable Clause

The use of the assignable clauses in the behavioral specifications of pop and push is interesting (and another difference from Eiffel). These clauses give frame conditions [Borgida-Mylopoulos-Reiter95]. In JML, the frame condition given by a method’s assignable clause only permits the method to assign to a location, loc, if:

- loc is mentioned in the method’s assignable clause,
- loc is a member of a data group mentioned in the method’s assignable clause (see Section 2.2 [Data Groups], page 19),
- loc was not allocated when the method started execution, or
- loc is local to the method (i.e., a local variable, including the method’s formal parameters).

For example, push’s specification says that it may only assign to theStack (and locations in theStack’s data group). This allows push to assign to theStack (and the members of its data group), or to call some other method that makes such an assignment. Furthermore, push may assign to the formal parameter x itself, even though that location is not listed in the assignable clause, since x is local to the method. However, push may not assign to fields not mentioned in the assignable clause; in particular it may not assign to fields of its formal parameter x, or call a method that makes such an assignment.

The design of JML is intended to allow tools to statically check the body of a method’s implementation to determine whether its assignable clause is satisfied. This would be done by checking each assignment statement in the implementation to see if what is being assigned to is a location that some assignable clause permits. It is an error to assign to any other allocated, non-local location. However, to do this, a tool must conservatively track aliases and changes to objects containing the locations in question. Also, arrays can only be dynamically checked, in general. Furthermore, JML will flag as an error a call to a method that would assign to locations that are not permitted by the calling method’s assignable clause. It can do this using the assignable clause of the called method.

In JML, a location is modified by a method when it is allocated in both the pre-state of the method, reachable in the post-state, and has a value that is different in these two states. The pre-state of a method call is the state just after the method is called and parameters have been evaluated and passed, but before execution of the method’s body. The post-state of a method call is the state just before the method returns or throws an exception; in JML we imagine that result and information about exception results is recorded in the post-state.

Since modification only involves objects allocated in the pre-state, allocation of an object, using Java’s new operator, does not itself cause any modification. Furthermore, since

---

2 For historical reasons, one can also use the keyword modifiable as a synonym for assignable. Also, for compatibility with (older versions of) ESC/Java [Leino-etal00], in JML, one can also use the keyword modifies as a synonym for assignable. In the literature, the most common keyword for such a clause is modifies, and what JML calls the “assignable clause” is usually referred to as a “modifies clause”. However, in JML, “assignable” most closely corresponds to the technical meaning, so we use that throughout this document. Users of JML may write whichever they prefer, and may mix them if they please.

3 Assuming that x is not the same object as this!

4 Thanks to Erik Poll for discussions on checking of assignable clauses.
the fields of new objects are locations that were not allocated when the method started execution, they may be assigned to freely.

The reason assignments to local variables are permitted by the assignable clause is that a JML specification takes the client’s (i.e., the caller’s) point of view. From the client’s point of view, the local variables in a method are newly-allocated, and thus assignments to such variables are invisible to the client. Hence, in JML, it is an error to list the locations corresponding to formal parameters in the assignable clause. However, the locations corresponding to fields or array elements of such formal parameters can be sensibly mentioned in the assignable clause. Furthermore, when formal parameters are used in a postcondition, JML interprets these as meaning the value initially given to the formal in the pre-state, since assignments to the formals within the method do not matter to the client.

JML’s interpretation of the assignable clause does not permit either temporary side effects or benevolent side effects. A method with a temporary side effect assigns to a location, does some work, and then assigns the original value back to that location. In JML, a method may not have temporary side effects on locations that it is not permitted to modify [Ruby-Leavens00]. A method has a benevolent side effect if it assigns to a location in a way that is not observable by clients. In JML, a method may not have benevolent side effects on locations that it is not permitted to modify [Leino95] [Leino95a].

Because JML’s assignable clauses give permission to assign to locations, it is safe for clients to assume that only the listed locations (and locations of their data group members) may have their values modified. Because locations listed in the assignable clause are the only ones that can be modified, we often speak of what locations a method can “modify,” instead of the more precise “can assign to.”

What does the assignable clause say about the modification of locations? In particular, although the “location” for a model field or model variable cannot be directly assigned to in JML, its value is determined by the concrete fields and variables that it (ultimately) depends on, specifically the members of its data group. That is, a model field or variable can be modified by assignments to the concrete members of its data group (see Section 2.2 [Data Groups], page 19). Thus, a method’s assignable clause only permits the method to modify a location if the location:

• is mentioned in the method’s assignable clause,

• is a member of a data group mentioned in the assignable clause (see Section 2.2 [Data Groups], page 19),

• was not allocated when the method started execution, or

• is local to the method.

In the specification of top, the assignable clause says that a call to top that satisfies the precondition cannot assign to any locations. It does this by using the store-ref \nothing. Unlike some formal specification languages (including Larch BISLs and older versions of JML), when the assignable clause is omitted in a heavyweight specification, the default store-ref for the assignable clause is \everything. Thus an omitted assignable clause in JML means that the method can assign to all locations (that could otherwise be assigned to by the method). Such an assignable clause plays havoc with formal reasoning, and thus if one cares about verification, one should give an assignable clause explicitly if the method is not pure (see Section 2.3.1 [Purity], page 29).
2.1.3.2 Old Values

When a method can modify some locations, they may have different values in the pre-state and post-state of a call. Often the post-condition must refer to the values held in both of these states. JML uses a notation similar to Eiffel’s to refer to the pre-state value of a variable. In JML the syntax is \( \text{old}(E) \), where \( E \) is an expression. (Unlike Eiffel, we use parentheses following \( \text{old} \) to delimit the expression to be evaluated in the pre-state explicitly. JML also uses backslashes (\) to mark the keywords it uses in expressions; this avoids interfering with Java program identifiers, such as \text{"old"}.)

The meaning of \( \text{old}(E) \) is as if \( E \) were evaluated in the pre-state and that value is used in place of \( \text{old}(E) \) in the assertion. It follows that, an expression like \( \text{old}(\text{myVar}.\text{theStack}) \) may not mean what is desired, since only the old value of \text{myVar} is saved; access to the field \text{theStack} is done in the post-state. If it is the field, \text{theStack}, not the variable, \text{myVar}, that is changing, then probably what is desired is \( \text{old}(\text{myVar}.\text{theStack}) \). To avoid such problems, it is good practice to have the expression \( E \) in \( \text{old}(E) \) be such that its type is either the type of a primitive value, such as an \text{int}, or a type with immutable objects, such as \text{JLObjectSequence}.

As another example, in \text{pop}'s postcondition the expression \( \text{old}(\text{theStack}.\text{trailer}()) \) has type \text{JLObjectSequence}, so it is immutable. The value of \( \text{theStack}.\text{trailer}() \) is computed in the pre-state of the method.

2.1.3.3 Reference Semantics

Note also that, since \text{JLObjectSequence} is a reference type, one must use \text{equals} instead of \text{==} to compare instances of this type for equality of values. For example, in the postcondition of the \text{pop} method, we use \text{equals} to compare \text{theStack} and \( \text{old}(\text{theStack}.\text{trailer}()) \), as these may yield different objects. Using \text{==} would be a mistake, since it would only compare them for object identity.

As in Java itself, most types are reference types, and hence many expressions yield references (i.e., object identities or addresses), as opposed to primitive values. This means that \text{==}, except when used to compare pure values of primitive types such as \text{boolean} or \text{int}, is reference equality. As in Java, to get value equality for reference types one uses the \text{equals} method in assertions. For example, the predicate \text{myString == yourString}, is only true if the objects denoted by \text{myString} and \text{yourString} are the same object (i.e., if the names are aliases); to compare their values one must write \text{myString.equals(yourString)}.

2.1.3.4 Correct Implementation

The specification of \text{push} does not have a \text{requires} clause. This means that the method imposes no obligations on the caller. (The meaning of an omitted \text{requires} clause is that the method’s precondition is \text{true}, which is satisfied by all states, and hence imposes no obligations on the caller.) This seems to imply that the implementation must provide a literally unbounded stack, which is surely impossible. We avoid this problem, by following Poetzsch-Heffter [Poetzsch-Heffter97] in releasing implementations from their obligations to fulfill the postcondition when Java runs out of storage. In general, a method specified with \text{normal_behavior} has a correct implementation if, whenever it is called in a state that satisfies its precondition, either

- the method terminates normally in a state that satisfies its postcondition, having assigned to only the locations permitted by its \text{assignable} clause, or
• Java signals an error, by throwing an exception that inherits from `java.lang.Error`.

We discuss the specification of methods with exceptions in the next subsection.

### 2.1.4 Models and Lightweight Specifications

In specifying existing code, one often does not want to introduce new model fields or think up new names for them. And sometimes, especially for fields with simple, atomic values, the field name itself is so “natural” that it would be difficult to think up a second good name for a model field that would be an abstraction of it. Thus JML provides two modifiers, `spec_public` and `spec_protected` that can used to make existing fields public or protected, for purposes of specification.

For example, consider the (lightweight) specification of the class `Point2D` below. In this specification the private fields, `x` and `y` are specified as `spec_public`, which allows them to be used in the public invariant clause and in the (implicitly public) specifications of the constructors and methods of `Point2D`.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.JMLDouble;

public class Point2D {
  private /*@ spec_public */ double x = 0.0;
  private /*@ spec_public */ double y = 0.0;

  //@ public invariant !Double.isNaN(x);
  //@ public invariant !Double.isNaN(y);
  //@ public invariant !Double.isInfinite(x);
  //@ public invariant !Double.isInfinite(y);

  //@ ensures x == 0.0 && y == 0.0;
  public Point2D() { }

  //@ requires !Double.isNaN(xc);
  //@ requires !Double.isNaN(yc);
  //@ requires !Double.isInfinite(xc);
  //@ requires !Double.isInfinite(yc);
  //@ assignable x, y;
  //@ ensures x == xc && y == yc;
  @*
  public Point2D(double xc, double yc) {
    x = xc;
    y = yc;
  }

  //@ ensures \result == x;
  public /*@ pure */ double getX() {
    return x;
  }
}
```
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```java
//@ ensures \result == y;
public /*@ pure @*/ double getY() {
    return y;
}

//@ requires !Double.isNaN(x+dx);
//@ requires !Double.isInfinite(x+dx);
//@ assignable x;
//@ ensures JMLDouble.approximatelyEqualTo(x,
//@ \old(x+dx), 1e-10);
//@*/
public void moveX(double dx) {
    x += dx;
}

//@ requires !Double.isNaN(y+dy);
//@ requires !Double.isInfinite(y+dy);
//@ assignable y;
//@ ensures JMLDouble.approximatelyEqualTo(y,
//@ \old(y+dy), 1e-10);
//@*/
public void moveY(double dy) {
    y += dy;
}

Note that these specifications would be illegal without the use of spec_public, since JML requires that public specifications only mention publicly-visible names (see Section 1.1 [Behavioral Interface Specification], page 1).

However, spec_public is more than just a way to change the visibility of a name for specification purposes. When applied to fields it can be considered to be shorthand for the declaration of a model field with the same name. That is, the declaration of x in Point2D can be thought of as equivalent to the following declarations, together with a rewrite of the Java code that uses x to use _x instead (where we assume _x is not used elsewhere).

```java
//@ public model int x;
private int _x; //@ in x;
//@ private represents x <- _x;
```

So in this way of thinking spec_public is not just an access modifier, but shorthand for declaration of a model field. This model field declaration is a commitment to readers that they can understand the specification using these model fields, even if the underlying private fields are changed, just as if the model field were declared explicitly. The model fields that are implicit allow such changes to be made without affecting the readers of the specification.

For example, suppose one wanted to change the implementation of Point2D, to use polar coordinates. To do that while keeping the public specification unchanged, one would declare the model fields x and y explicitly. One would then declare other fields for the
polar and rectangular coordinates (and perhaps additional model fields as well). One would then also need to give explicit declarations that the new concrete fields are members of the model fields data groups, and give appropriate represents clauses. (See Section 2.2.2.1 [Data Groups and Represents Clauses], page 24, for more on data group membership and represents clauses.) All of this is exactly analogous to what is done implicitly in the desugaring described above.

Similar remarks apply to spec_protected. The spec_public and spec_protected shorthands were borrowed from ESC/Java, but the desugaring described above is novel with JML.

2.2 Data Groups

In this subsection we present two example specifications. The two example specifications, BoundedThing and BoundedStackInterface, are used to describe how model (and concrete) fields can be related to one another, and how dependencies among them affect the meaning of the assignable clause. Along the way we also demonstrate how to specify methods that can throw exceptions and other features of JML.

2.2.1 Specification of BoundedThing

The specification in the file ‘BoundedThing.java’, shown below, is an interface specification with a simple abstract model. In this case, there are two model fields MAX_SIZE and size.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.stacks;

public interface BoundedThing {

    // public model fields
    //@ public model instance int MAX_SIZE;
    //@ public model instance int size;

    // public instance invariants
    //@ public instance invariant MAX_SIZE > 0;
    public instance invariant
        0 <= size && size <= MAX_SIZE;
    public instance constraint
        MAX_SIZE == \old(MAX_SIZE);

    // public normal_behavior
    //@ public normal_behavior
    ensures \result == MAX_SIZE;
    @*
    public /*@ pure @*/ int getSizeLimit();

    // public normal_behavior
    //@ public normal_behavior
    ensures \result ==> size == 0;
    @*
    public /*@ pure @*/ boolean isEmpty();

    // public normal_behavior
    //@ public normal_behavior
    ensures \result == size == MAX_SIZE;
```
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2.2.1.1 Model Fields in Interfaces

In the specification above, the fields MAX_SIZE and size are both declared using the modifier instance. Because of the use of the keyword instance, these fields are thus treated as normal model fields, i.e., as an instance variable in each object that implements this interface. By default, as in Java, fields are static in interfaces, and so if instance is omitted, the field declarations would be treated as class variables. The instance keyword tells the reader that the variable being declared is not static, but has a copy in each instance of a class that implements this interface.

Java does not allow non-static fields to be declared in interfaces. However, JML allows non-static model (and ghost) fields in interfaces when one uses instance. The reason for this extension is that such fields are essential for defining the abstract values and behavior of the objects being specified.\(^5\)

In specifications of interfaces that extend or classes that implement this interface, these model fields are inherited. Thus, every object that has a type that is a subtype of the BoundedThing interface is thought of, abstractly, as having two fields, MAX_SIZE and size, both of type int.

2.2.1.2 Invariants and History Constraint

Three pieces of class-level specification come after the abstract model in the above specification.

The first two are invariant clauses. Writing several invariant clauses in a specification, like this is equivalent to writing one invariant clause which is their conjunction. Both of these invariants are instance invariants, because they use the instance modifier. By default, in interfaces, invariants and history constraints are static, unless marked with the instance modifier. Static invariants may only refer to static fields, while instance invariants can refer to both instance and static fields.

The first invariant in the figure says that in every publicly visible state, every reachable object that is a BoundedThing must have a positive MAX_SIZE field. The second invariant

\(^5\) Furthermore, static model fields must have concrete implementations in the interfaces in which they are declared, if they are to have any representation at all. See Section 2.2.2.1 [Data Groups and Represents Clauses], page 24, for more on this subject.
says that, in each publicly visible state, every reachable object that is a \texttt{BoundedThing} must have a size field that is non-negative and less than or equal to \texttt{MAX\_SIZE}.

Following the invariants is a history constraint \cite{Liskov-Wing94}. Like the invariants, it uses the modifier \texttt{instance}, because it refers to instance fields. A history constraint is used to say how values can change between earlier and later publicly-visible states, such as a method’s pre-state and its post-state. This prohibits subtype objects from making certain state changes, even if they implement more methods than are specified in a given class. The history constraint in the specification above says that the value of \texttt{MAX\_SIZE} cannot change, since in every pre-state and post-state, its value in the post-state, written \texttt{MAX\_SIZE}, must equal its value in the pre-state, written \texttt{old(MAX\_SIZE)}.

### 2.2.1.3 Details of the Method Specifications

Following the history constraint are the interfaces and specifications for four public methods. Notice that, if desired, the at-signs (@) may be omitted from the left sides of intermediate lines, as we do in this specification.

The use of == in the method specifications is okay, since in each case, the things being compared are primitive values, not references. The notation <=> can be read “if and only if”. It has the same meaning for Boolean values as ==, but has a lower precedence. Therefore, the expression \texttt{\{result <=> size == 0\}} is the same as \texttt{\{result == (size == 0)\}}.

### 2.2.1.4 Adding to Method Specifications

The specification of the last method of \texttt{BoundedThing}, \texttt{clone}, is interesting. Note that it begins with the keyword \texttt{also}. This form is intended to tell the reader that the specification given is in addition to any specification that might have been given in the superclass \texttt{Object}, where \texttt{clone} is declared as a protected method. A form like this must be used whenever a specification is given for a method that overrides a method in a superclass, or that implements a method from an implemented interface.

### 2.2.1.5 Specifying Exceptional Behavior

The specification of \texttt{clone} also uses \texttt{behavior} instead of \texttt{normal\_behavior}. In a specification that starts this way, one can describe not just the case where the execution returns normally, but also executions where exceptions are thrown. In such a specification, the conditions under which exceptions can be thrown can be described by the predicate in the \texttt{signals} clauses,\footnote{The keyword “ensures” can also be used in place of \texttt{signals}.} and the conditions under which the method may return without throwing an exception are described by the \texttt{ensures} clause. In this specification, the \texttt{clone} method may always throw the exception, because it only needs to make the predicate “true” true to do so. When the method returns normally, it must make the given postcondition true.

In JML, a \texttt{normal\_behavior} specification can be thought of as a syntactic sugar for a \texttt{behavior} specification to which the following clause is added \cite{Raghavan-Leavens05}.

\begin{verbatim}
signals (java.lang.Exception) false;
\end{verbatim}

This formalizes the idea that a method with a \texttt{normal\_behavior} specification may not throw an exception when the specification’s precondition is satisfied.
JML also has a specification form `exceptional_behavior`, which can be used to specify when a method may not return normally. A specification that uses `exceptional_behavior` can be thought of as a syntactic sugar for a `behavior` specification to which the following clause is added [Raghavan-Leavens05].

```
ensures false;
```

This formalizes the idea that a method with an `exceptional_behavior` specification may not return normally when the specification’s precondition is satisfied. Thus, when the precondition of such a specification case holds, some exception must be thrown (unless the execution encounters an error or is permitted to not return to the caller).

Since, in the specification of `clone`, we want to allow the implementation to make a choice between either returning normally or throwing an exception, and we do not wish to distinguish the preconditions under which each choice must be made, we cannot use either of the more specialized forms `normal_behavior` or `exceptional_behavior`. Thus the specification of `clone` demonstrates the somewhat unusual case when the more general form of a `behavior` specification is needed.

The specification of `clone` also illustrates the `signals_only` clause. The `signals_only` clause in the example says that the method may only throw an exception that is a subtype of `CloneNotSupportedException` when the exceptional behavior’s precondition is true. This says the same thing as the following, more verbose, signals clause.

```
signals (Exception e) e instanceof CloneNotSupportedException;
```

The signals clause itself only describes what must be true when the exceptions it applies to are thrown; it does not constrain a method’s behavior with respect to exceptions that are not subtypes of the exceptions named. For example, a `signals` clause of the form

```
signals (CloneNotSupportedException) true;
```

would only say that a `CloneNotSupportedException` can always be thrown; it would not prohibit other exceptions that are not subtypes of `CloneNotSupportedException` from being thrown. For example, if `clone` were specified with such a signals clause, then an implementation could legally throw a `NullPointerException`. To prevent such a possibility, in many cases it is preferable to use a `signals_only` clause to limit what exceptions may be thrown.

Finally note that in the specification of `clone`, the normal postcondition says that the result will be a `BoundedThing` and that its size will be the same as the model field `size`. The use of the cast in this postcondition is necessary, since the type of \result is \texttt{Object}. (This also adheres to our goal of using Java syntax and semantics to the extent possible.) Note also that the conjunct \texttt{result instanceof BoundedThing} “protects” the next conjunct [Leavens-Wing97a] since if it is false the meaning of the cast does not matter.

### 2.2.2 Specification of BoundedStackInterface

The specification in the file `BoundedStackInterface.java` below gives an interface for bounded stacks that extends the interface for `BoundedThing`. Note that this specification can refer to the instance fields `MAX_SIZE` and `size` inherited from the `BoundedThing` interface.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.stacks;
//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.*;
```
public interface BoundedStackInterface extends BoundedThing {
    //@ public initially theStack != null && theStack.isEmpty();
    //@ public model instance JMLObjectSequence theStack;
    @* in size; *@
    //@ public instance represents size <- theStack.int_length();
    //@ public instance invariant theStack != null;
    @ public instance invariant_redundantly
    @ theStack.int_length() <= MAX_SIZE;
    @ public instance invariant
    @ (\forall int i; 0 <= i && i < theStack.int_length();
    @ theStack.itemAt(i) != null);
    @*/

    //@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires !theStack.isEmpty();
    @ assignable size, theStack;
    @ ensures theStack.equals(\old(theStack.trailer()));
    @ also
    @ public exceptional_behavior
    @ requires theStack.isEmpty();
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ signals_only BoundedStackException;
    @*/
    public void pop( ) throws BoundedStackException;

    //@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires theStack.int_length() < MAX_SIZE && x != null;
    @ assignable size, theStack;
    @ ensures theStack.equals(\old(theStack.insertFront(x)));
    @ ensures_redundantly theStack != null && top() == x
    @ && theStack.int_length() == \old(theStack.int_length()+1);]
    @ also
    @ public exceptional_behavior
    @ requires theStack.int_length() >= MAX_SIZE || x == null;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ signals_only BoundedStackException, NullPointerException;
    @ signals (BoundedStackException)
    @ theStack.int_length() == MAX_SIZE;
    @ signals (NullPointerException) x == null;
    @*/
    public void push(Object x )
    throws BoundedStackException, NullPointerException;

    //@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires !theStack.isEmpty();
    @ ensures \result == theStack.first() && \result != null;
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@ also
@ public exceptional_behavior
@ requires theStack.isEmpty();
@ signals_only BoundedStackException;
@ signals (BoundedStackException e)
@ \fresh(e) && e != null && e.getMessage() != null
@ && e.getMessage().equals("empty stack");
@*/
public /*@ pure @*/ Object top( ) throws BoundedStackException;
}

The abstract model for BoundedStackInterface adds to the inherited model by declaring a model instance field named theStack. This field is typed as a JMLObjectSequence.

In the following we describe how the new model instance field, theStack, is related to size from BoundedThing. We also use this example to explain more JML features.

2.2.2.1 Data Groups and Represents Clauses

The in and represents clauses that follow the declaration of theStack are an important feature in modeling with layers of model fields. They also play a crucial role in relating model fields to the concrete fields of objects, which can be considered to be the final layer of detail in a design.

When a model field is declared, a data group with the same name is automatically created; furthermore, this field is always a member of the group it creates. A data group is a set of fields (locations) referenced by a specific name, i.e., the name of the model field that created it [Leino98] [Leino-Poetzsch-Heffter-Zhou02].

When a data group (or field) is mentioned in the assignable clause for a method M, then all members (i.e., fields) in that group can be assigned to in the body of M. Fields can become a member of a data group through the data group clauses (i.e., the in and maps-into clauses) that come immediately after the field declaration, in this case the in clause. The in clause in BoundedStackInterface says that theStack is a member of the group created by the declaration of model field size; this means that theStack might change its value whenever size changes. However, another way of looking at this is that, if one wants to change size, this can be done by changing theStack. We also say that theStack is a member of size.

The maps-into clause is another way of adding members to a data group; it allows the fields of an object to be included in an existing data group. For example, if a field F is a reference or an array type, then the fields or array elements of F can be included in a data group using the maps-into clause. The following are examples.

protected ArrayList elems;
//@ maps elems.theList \into theStack;
protected java.lang.Object[] theItems;
//@ maps theItems[*] \into theStack;

7 Of course, one could specify BoundedStackInterface without separating out the interface BoundedThing, and in that case, these layers would be unnecessary. We have made this separation partly to demonstrate more advanced features of JML, and partly to make the parts of the example smaller.
In the first example, the maps-into clause says that theList field of elems is a member of theStack data group. Field elems is a concrete field of the type (i.e., it is not a model field and thus is part of the implementation). This allows model field theList of elems to change when theStack changes. Since theList is a model field and data group, this also allows concrete fields of elems to change as theStack changes. Similarly, the second example says that the elements of the array, theItems, can change when theStack changes.

Data groups have the same visibility as the model field that declared it, i.e., public, protected, private, or package visibility. A field cannot be a member of a group that is less visible than it is. For example, a public field cannot be a member of a protected group.

The in and maps-into clauses are important in “loosening up” the assignable clause, for example to permit the fields of an object that implement the abstract model to be changed [Leino95] [Leino95a]. This “loosening up” also applies to model fields that are members of other groups. For example, since theStack is a member of size, whenever size is mentioned in an assignable clause, then theStack is implicitly allowed to be modified.\(^8\) Thus it is only for rhetorical purposes that we mention both size and theStack in the assignable clauses of pop and push. Note, however, that just mentioning theStack would not permit size to be modified, because size is not a member of theStack’s group. Furthermore, it is redundant to mention theStack when size has already been mentioned (although this can help clarify the assignable clause, i.e., clarify which fields can be changed).

The represents clause in BoundedStackInterface says how the value of size is related to the value of theStack. It says that the value of size is theStack.length().

A represents clause gives additional facts that can be used in reasoning about the specification. It serves the same purpose as an abstraction function in various proof methods for abstract data types (such as [Hoare72a]).

One can only use a represents clause to state facts about a field and its data group members. To state relationships among concrete data fields or on fields that are not related by a data group membership, one should use an invariant.

### 2.2.2.2 Redundant Specification

The second invariant clause that follows the represents clause in the specification of BoundedStackInterface above is our first example of checkable redundancy in a specification [Leavens-Baker99] [Tan94] [Tan95]. This concept is signaled in JML by the use of the suffix _redundantly on a keyword (as in ensures_redundantly). It says both that the stated property is specified to hold and that this property is believed to follow from the other properties of the specification. In this case the redundant invariant follows from the given invariant, the invariant inherited from the specification of BoundedThing, and the fact stated in the represents clause. Even though this invariant is redundant, it is sometimes helpful to state such properties, to bring them to the attention of the readers of the specification.

Checking that such claimed redundancies really do follow from other information is also a good way to make sure that what is being specified is really what is intended. Such

---

\(^8\) Note that the permission to assign a field goes from the more abstract field to the one in its group (which in this case is also abstract). Müller points out that this direction is necessary for information hiding, because concrete fields are often hidden (e.g., they may be private), and as such cannot appear in public specifications, so the public specification has to mention the more abstract field, which give assignment rights to its members [Mueller02].
checks could be done manually, during reviews, or with the aid of a theorem prover. JML’s runtime assertion checker can also check such redundant specifications, but, of course, can only find examples where they do not hold.

2.2.2.3 Multiple Specification Cases

After the redundant invariant of BoundedStackInterface are the specifications of the pop, push, and top methods. These are interesting for several new features that they present. Each of these has both a normal and exceptional behavior specified. The meaning of such multiple specification cases is that, when the precondition of one of them is satisfied, the rest of that specification case must also be obeyed.

A specification with several specification cases is shorthand for one in which the separate specifications are combined [Dhara-Leavens96] [Leavens97c] [Wing83] [Wills94]. The desugaring can be thought of as proceeding in two steps (see [Raghavan-Leavens05] for more details). First, the public normal_behavior and public exceptional_behavior cases are converted into public behavior specifications as explained above. This would produce a specification for pop as shown below. The use of implies_that introduces a redundant specification that can be used, as is done here, to point out consequences of the specification to the reader. In this case the specification in question is the one mentioned in the refine clause. Note that in the second specification case of the figure below, the default signals clause has been added. This clause was omitted from the original specification, since no particular details of the exception object were important to the specifier.

```java
//@ refine "BoundedStackInterface.java";

public interface BoundedStackInterface extends BoundedThing {
  /*@ also */
  @ implies_that
  @  public behavior
  @   requires !theStack.isEmpty();
  @   assignable size, theStack;
  @   ensures theStack.equals(old(theStack.trailer()));
  @   signals (java.lang.Exception) false;
  @  also
  @  public behavior
  @   requires theStack.isEmpty();
  @   assignable \nothing;
  @   ensures false;
  @   signals_only BoundedStackException;
  @   signals (java.lang.Exception) true;
  @*/
  public void pop( ) throws BoundedStackException;
}
```

The second step of the desugaring is shown below. As can be seen from this example, public behavior specifications that are joined together using also have a precondition that is the disjunction of the preconditions of the combined specification cases. The assignable clause for the expanded specification is the union of all the assignable clauses for the cases. To compensate for this, the predicate \not_assigned, used in the exceptional behavior
specification cases to prohibit assignment to the locations (those in the data groups of size and theStack) that are now part of the assignable clause. The ensures clauses of the second desugaring step correspond to the ensures clauses for each specification case; they say that whenever the precondition for that specification case held in the pre-state, its postcondition must also hold. As can be seen in the specification below, in logic this is written using an implication between \old wrapped around the case’s precondition and its postcondition. Having multiple ensures clauses is equivalent to writing a single ensures clause that has as its postcondition the conjunction of the given postconditions. Similarly, the signals clauses in the desugaring correspond to those in the given specification cases; as for the ensures clauses, each has a predicate that says that signaling that exception can only happen when the predicate in that case’s precondition holds.

//@ refine "BoundedStackInterface.jml";
public interface BoundedStackInterface extends BoundedThing {
  /*@ also
@ implies_that
@     public behavior
@     requires !theStack.isEmpty() || theStack.isEmpty();
@     assignable size, theStack;
@     ensures \old(!theStack.isEmpty())
@       ==> theStack.equals(\old(theStack.trailer()));
@     ensures \old(theStack.isEmpty()) ==>
@       \not_assigned(size) && \not_assigned(theStack);
@     signals_only BoundedStackException;
@     signals (java.lang.Exception)
@       \old(!theStack.isEmpty()) ==> false;
@     signals (java.lang.Exception)
@       \old(theStack.isEmpty()) =>
@ @*//
@       \not_assigned(size) && \not_assigned(theStack)
@       && true;
@*/
  public void pop( ) throws BoundedStackException;
}

In the file ‘BoundedStackInterface.refines-java’ above, the precondition of pop reduces to true. However, the precondition shown is the general form of the expansion. Similar remarks apply to other predicates.

Finally, note how, as in the specification of top, one can specify more details about the exception object thrown. The exceptional behavior for top says that the exception object thrown, e, must be freshly allocated, non-null, and have the given message.

2.2.2.4 Pitfalls in Specifying Exceptions

A particularly interesting example of multiple specification cases occurs in the specification of the BoundedStackInterface’s push method. Like the other methods, this example has two specification cases; one of these is a normal_behavior and one is an exceptional_behavior. However, the exceptional behavior of push is interesting because it specifies more than one exception that may be thrown. The requires clause of the exceptional behavior says that an exception must be thrown when either the stack cannot grow larger, or when
the argument x is null. The first signals clause says that, if a `BoundedStackException` is
thrown, then the stack cannot grow larger, and the second signals clause says that, if a
`NullPointerException` is thrown, then x must be null. The specification is written in this
way because it may be that both conditions occur; when that is the case, the specification
allows the implementation to choose (even nondeterministically) which exception is thrown.

Specifiers should be wary of such situations, where two different signals clauses may both
apply simultaneously, because it is impossible in Java to throw more than one exception from
a method call. Thus, for example, if the specification of `push` had been written as follows,
it would not be implementable.9 The problem is that both exceptional preconditions may
be true, and in that case an implementation cannot throw an exception that is an instance
of both a `BoundedStackException` and a `NullPointerException`.

```java
/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ requires theStack.length() < MAX_SIZE && x != null;
  @ assignable size, theStack;
  @ ensures theStack.equals(theStack.insertFront(x));
  @ ensures_redundantly theStack != null && top() == x
    && theStack.length() == theStack.length() + 1;
  @ also
  @ public exceptional_behavior
  @ requires theStack.length() >= MAX_SIZE;
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ signals (Exception e) e instanceof BoundedStackException;
  @ also // this is wrong!
  @ public exceptional_behavior
  @ requires x == null;
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ signals (Exception e) e instanceof NullPointerException;
@*/
public void push(Object x )
  throws BoundedStackException, NullPointerException;
```

One could fix the example above by writing one of the requires clauses in the two
exceptional behaviors to exclude the other, although this would make the specification
deterministic about which exception would be thrown when both exceptional conditions
occur. In general, it seems best to avoid this pitfall by writing signals clauses that do not
exclude other exceptions from being thrown whenever there are states in which multiple
exceptions may be thrown. That is, instead of using multiple `signals_only` clauses or
using multiple `signals` clauses like:

```
signals (Exception e) e instanceof BoundedStackException;
```

which only allows a `BoundedStackException` to be thrown when the precondition is
ture, one can write a signals clause like:

```
signals (BoundedStackException);
```

which says nothing about what happens when other exceptions are thrown (see Section 2.2.1.5 [Specifying Exceptional Behavior], page 21 for more details).

---

9 Thanks to Erik Poll for pointing this out.
2.2.2.5 Redundant Ensures Clauses

Finally, there is more redundancy in the specifications of push in the original specification of BoundedStackInterface above, which has a redundant ensures clause in its normal behavior. For an ensures_redundantly clause, what one checks is that the conjunction of the precondition, the meaning of the assignable clause, and the (non-redundant) postcondition together imply the redundant postcondition. It is interesting to note that, for push, the specifications for stacks written in Eiffel (see page 339 of [Meyer97]) expresses just what we specify in push’s redundant postcondition. This conveys strictly less information than the non-redundant postcondition for push’s normal behavior, since it says little about the elements of the stack.\\footnote{Meyer’s second specification and implementation of stacks (see page 349 of [Meyer97]) is no better in this respect, although, of course, the implementation does keep track of the elements properly.}

In summary, using types like JMLObjectSequence for modeling can help the specifier give more precise specifications. We describe more about such types in the next section.

2.3 Types For Modeling

JML comes with a suite of types with immutable objects and pure methods, that can be used for defining abstract models. These are found in the package org.jmlspecs.models, which includes both collection and non-collection types (such as JMLInteger) and a few auxiliary classes (such as exceptions and enumerators).

The collection types in this package can hold either objects or values; this distinction determines the notion of equality used on their elements and whether cloning is done on the elements. The object collections, such as JMLObjectSet and JMLObjectBag, use == and do not clone. The value collections, such as JMLValueSet and JMLValueBag, use .equals to compare elements, and clone the objects added to and returned from them. The objects in a value collection are representatives of equivalence classes (under .equals) of objects; their values matter, but not their object identities. By contrast an object container contains object identities, and the values in these objects do not matter.

Simple collection types include the set types, JMLObjectSet and JMLValueSet, and sequence types JMLObjectSequence and JMLValueSequence. The binary relation and map types can independently have objects in their domain or range. The binary relation types are named JMLObjectToObjectRelation, JMLObjectToValueRelation, and so on. For example, JMLObjectToValueRelation is a type of binary relations between objects (not cloned and compared using ==) and values (which are cloned and compared using .equals). The four map types are similarly named according to the scheme JML...To...Map.

Users can also create their own types with pure methods for mathematical modeling if desired. Since pure methods may be used in assertions, they must be declared with the modifier pure and pass certain conservative checks that make sure there is no possibility of observable side-effects from their use. We discuss purity and give several examples of such types below.

2.3.1 Purity

We say a method is pure if it is either specified with the modifier pure or is a method that appears in the specification of a pure interface or class. Similarly, a constructor is pure if it is either specified with the modifier pure or appears in the specification of a pure class.
A pure method, that is not a constructor, implicitly has a specification that does not allow any side-effects. That is, its specification has the clauses

\[
\text{diverges false;}
\]
\[
\text{assignable } \text{\textbackslash nothing;}
\]

added to each specification case; if the method has no specification given explicitly, then these clauses are added as a lightweight specification. For this reason, if one is writing a pure method, it is not necessary to otherwise specify an assignable clause (see Section 2.1.3.1 [The Assignable Clause], page 13), although doing so may improve the specification’s clarity.

A pure constructor has the clauses

\[
\text{diverges false;}
\]
\[
\text{assignable this.*;}
\]

added to each specification case; if the constructor has no specification given explicitly, then these clauses are added as a lightweight specification. This specification allows the constructor to assign to the non-static fields of the class in which it appears (including those inherited from its superclasses and model and ghost instance fields from the interfaces that it implements).

Implementations of pure methods and constructors will be checked to see that they meet these conditions; i.e., that pure methods do not assign to locations that exist in the pre-state, and that pure constructors only assign to pre-existing locations that are fields of the this object. To make such checking modular, some JML tools prohibit a pure method or constructor implementation from calling methods or constructors that are not pure. However, more sophisticated tools could more directly check the intended semantics [Salcianu-Rinard05].

A pure method or constructor must also be provably terminating. Although JML does not force users to make such proofs of termination, users writing pure methods and constructors are supposed to make pure methods total in the sense that whenever, a pure method is called it either returns normally or throws some exception. This is supposed to lessen the possibility that assertion evaluation could loop forever, help make pure methods more like mathematical functions, and help the runtime assertion checker. The runtime assertion checker turns exceptions into arbitrary values of the appropriate result type [Cheon03] [Cheon-Leavens05]; it cannot do anything with infinite loops.

Furthermore, a pure method is supposed to always either terminate normally or throw an exception, even for calls that do not satisfy its precondition. Static verification tools for JML should enforce this condition, by requiring a proof that a pure method implementation satisfies the following specification

\[
\text{private behavior}
\]
\[
\text{requires true;}
\]
\[
\text{diverges false;}
\]
\[
\text{assignable } \text{\textbackslash nothing;}
\]

(and similarly for constructors, except that the assignable clause becomes assignable this.*; for constructors).

However, this implicit verification condition is a specification, and is thus cannot be used in reasoning about calls to the method, even calls from within the class itself and recursive calls from within the implementation. For this reason we recommend writing the method
or constructor specification in such a way that the effective precondition of the method is “true,” making the proof of the above implicit verification condition trivial, and allowing the termination behavior of the implementation to be relied upon by all clients.

Recursion is permitted, both in the implementation of pure methods and the data structures they manipulate, and in the specifications of pure methods. When recursion is used in a specification, the proof of well-formedness for the specification involves the use of JML’s `measured_by` clause.

Since a pure method may not go into an infinite loop, if it has a non-trivial precondition, it should throw an exception when its normal precondition is not met. This exceptional behavior does not have to be specified or programmed explicitly, but technically there is an obligation to meet the specification that the method never loops forever.

Furthermore, a pure method must be deterministic, in the sense that when called in a given state, it must always return the same value. Similarly a pure constructor should be deterministic in the sense that when called in a given state, it always initializes the object in the same way.

A pure method can be declared in any class or interface, and a pure constructor can be declared in any class. JML will specify the pure methods and constructors in the standard Java libraries as pure.

As a convenience, instead of writing `pure` on each method declared in a class and interface, one can use the modifier `pure` on classes and interfaces. This simply means that each non-static method and each constructor declared in such a class or interface is `pure`. Note that this does not mean that all methods inherited (but not declared in and hence not overridden in) the class or interface are pure. For example, every class inherits ultimately from `java.lang.Object`, which has some methods, such as `notify` and `notifyAll` that are manifestly not pure. Thus each class will have some methods that are not pure. Despite this, it is convenient to refer to classes and interfaces declared with the `pure` modifier as `pure`.

In JML the modifiers `model` and `pure` are orthogonal. (Recall something declared with the modifier `model` does not have to be implemented, and is used purely for specification purposes.) Therefore, one can have a model method that is not pure (these might be useful in JML’s model programs); conversely, a Java method can be pure (and thus not a model method). Nevertheless, usually a model method (or constructor) should be pure, since there is no way to use non-pure methods in an assertion, and model methods cannot be used in normal Java code.

By the same reasoning, model classes should, in general, also be pure. Model classes cannot be used in normal Java code, and hence their methods are only useful in assertions (and JML’s model programs). Hence it is typical, although not required, that a model class also be a pure class. We give some examples of pure interfaces, abstract classes, and classes below.

### 2.3.2 Money

The following example begins a specification of money that would be suitable for use in abstract models. Our specification is rather artificially broken up into pieces to allow each piece to have a specification that fits on a page. This organization is not necessarily
something we would recommend, but it does give us a chance to illustrate more features of JML.

Consider first the interface \texttt{Money} specified below. The abstract model here is a single field of the primitive Java type \texttt{long}, which holds a number of pennies. Note that the declaration of this field, \texttt{pennies}, again uses the JML keyword \texttt{instance}.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

import org.jmlspecs.models.JMLType;

public /*@ pure @*/ interface Money extends JMLType {

    //@ public model instance long pennies;
    //@ public instance constraint pennies == \old(pennies);

    /*@ public normal_behavior
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == pennies / 100;
    @ for_example
    @ public normal_example
    @ requires pennies == 703;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == 7;
    @ also
    @ public normal_example
    @ requires pennies == 799;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == 7;
    @ also
    @ public normal_example
    @ requires pennies == -503;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == -5;
    */
    public long dollars();

    /*@ public normal_behavior
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == pennies % 100;
    @ for_example
    @ requires pennies == 703;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result == 3;
    @ also
    @ requires pennies == -503;
    @ assignable \nothing;
```
This interface has a history constraint, which says that the number of pennies in an object cannot change.\textsuperscript{11}

The following explain more aspects of JML related to the above specification.

2.3.2.1 Redundant Examples

The interesting aspect of \texttt{Money}'s method specifications is another kind of redundancy. This new form of redundancy is examples, which follow the keyword \texttt{for_example}.

Individual examples are given by \texttt{normal_example} clauses (adapted from our previous work on Larch/C++ [Leavens96b] [Leavens-Baker99]). Any number of these\textsuperscript{12} can be given in a specification. In the specification of \texttt{Money} above there are three normal examples given for \texttt{dollars} and two in the specification of \texttt{cents}.

The specification in each example should be such that:

\begin{itemize}
  \item the example’s precondition implies the precondition of the expanded meaning of the specified behaviors,
  \item the example’s assignable clause specifies a subset of the locations that are assignable according to the expanded meaning of the specified behaviors, and
  \item assuming the example’s assignable clause, the conjunction of:
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{11} There is no use of \texttt{initially} in this interface, so data type induction cannot assume any particular starting value. But this is desirable, since if a particular starting value was specified, then by the history constraint, all objects would have that value.

\textsuperscript{12} One may also give \texttt{exceptional_example} clauses, which are analogous to \texttt{exceptional_behavior} specifications, and \texttt{example} clauses, which are analogous to \texttt{behavior} specifications. There is also a lightweight form of example, this is similar to the \texttt{example} form, except that the introductory keywords \texttt{public example} are omitted.
• the example’s precondition (wrapped by \texttt{old}()),
• the precondition of the expanded meaning of the specified behaviors (also wrapped by \texttt{old}()), and
• the postcondition of the expanded meaning of the specified behaviors
should be equivalent to the example’s postcondition.

Requiring equivalence to the example’s postcondition means that it can serve as a test oracle for the inputs described by the example’s precondition. If there is only one specified \texttt{public normal_behavior} clause and if there are no preconditions and assignable clauses, then the example’s postcondition should be equivalent to the conjunction of the example’s precondition and the postcondition of the \texttt{public normal_behavior} specification. Typically, examples are concrete, and serve to make various rhetorical points about the use of the specification to the reader. (Exercise: check all the examples given!)

### 2.3.2.2 JMLType and Informal Predicates

The interface \texttt{Money} is specified to extend the interface \texttt{JMLType}. This interface is given below. Classes that implement this interface must have pure \texttt{equals} and \texttt{clone} methods with the specified behavior. The methods specified override methods in the class \texttt{Object}, and so they use the form of specification that begins with the keyword “also”.
package org.jmlspecs.models;

/** Objects with a clone and equals method. * JMLObjectType and JMLValueType are refinements * for object and value containers (respectively). * @version $Revision: 1.19 $ * @author Gary T. Leavens * @author Albert L. Baker * @see JMLObjectType * @see JMLValueType */
//@ pure
public interface JMLType extends Cloneable, java.io.Serializable {

/** Return a clone of this object. */
//@ also
@ public normal_behavior
@ ensures \result != null;
@ ensures \result instanceof JMLType;
@ ensures ((JMLType)\result).equals(this);
@*/
//@ implies_that
//@ ensures \result != null
@ && \typeof(\result) <: \type(JMLType);
@
public /*@ pure @*/ Object clone();

/** Test whether this object’s value is equal to the given argument. */
//@ also
@ public normal_behavior
@ ensures \result ==>
@ ob2 != null
@ && (* ob2 is not distinguishable from this, except by using mutation or == *);
@ implies_that
@ public normal_behavior
@ {|
@ requires ob2 != null && ob2 instanceof JMLType;
@ ensures ((JMLType)ob2).equals(this) == \result;
@ also
@ requires ob2 == this;
@ ensures \result <=> true;
@ |}
@*/
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean equals(/*@ nullable @*/ Object ob2);

/** Return a hash code for this object. */
//@ also
public /*@ pure @*/ int hashCode();
}
The specification of JMLType is noteworthy in its use of informal predicates [Leavens96b]. In JML these start with an open parenthesis and an asterisk ('(*)') and continue until a matching asterisk and closing parenthesis ('*'). In the public specification of equals, the normal_behavior's ensures clause uses an informal predicate as an escape from formality. The use of informal predicates avoids the delicate issues of saying formally what observable aliasing means, and what equality of values means in general.\textsuperscript{13}

In the implies_that section of the specification of the equals method is a nested case analysis, between {\|} and {\|}. The meaning of this is that each pre- and postcondition pair has to be obeyed. The first of these nested pairs is essentially saying that equals has to be symmetric. The second of these is saying that it has to be reflexive.

The implies_that section of the clone method states some implications of the specification given that are useful for ESC/Java. These repeat, from the first part of clone's specification, that the result must not be null, and that the result's dynamic type, typeof(\result), must be a subtype of (written <: ) the type JMLType.

\subsection*{2.3.3 MoneyComparable and MoneyOps}

The type Money lacks some useful operations. The extensions below provide specifications of comparison operations and arithmetic, respectively.

The specification in file 'MoneyComparable.java' is interesting because each of the specified preconditions protects the postcondition from undefinedness in the postcondition [Leavens-Wing97a]. For example, if the argument m2 in the greaterThan method were null, then the expression m2.pennies would not be defined.

package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public /*@ pure @*/ interface MoneyComparable extends Money
{

    /*@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires m2 != null;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result <==> pennies > m2.pennies;
    @*/
    public boolean greaterThan(Money m2);

    /*@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires m2 != null;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result <==> pennies >= m2.pennies;
    @*/
    public boolean greaterThanOrEqualTo(Money m2);

    /*@ public normal_behavior
    @ requires m2 != null;
    @ assignable \nothing;
    @ ensures \result <==> pennies >= m2.pennies;
    @*/
    public boolean greaterThanOrEqualTo(Money m2);

13 Observable aliasing is a sharing relation between objects that can be detected by a program. Such a program, might, for example modify one object and read a changed value from the shared object. Formalizing this in general is beyond the scope of this paper, and probably beyond what JML can describe.
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```java
public boolean lessThan(Money m2); /*@
   public normal_behavior
   @  requires m2 != null;
   @  assignable \nothing;
   @  ensures \result <==> pennies <= m2.pennies;
   @*/
   public boolean lessThanOrEqualTo(Money m2);
```

The interface specified in the file ‘MoneyOps.java’ below extends the interface specified above. MoneyOps is interesting for the use of its pure model methods: inRange, can_add, and can_scaleBy. These methods cannot be invoked by Java programs; that is, they would not appear in the Java implementation. When, for example inRange is called in a predicate, it is equivalent to using some correct implementation of its specification. The specification of inRange also makes use of a local specification variable declaration, which follows the keyword “old”. Such declarations allow one to abbreviate long expressions, or, to make rhetorical points by naming constants, as is done with epsilon. These old declarations are treated as locations that are initialized to the pre-state value of the given expression. Model methods can be normal (instance) methods as well as static (class) methods.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public /*@ pure @*/ interface MoneyOps extends MoneyComparable {
   /*@
      public normal_behavior
      @  old double epsilon = 1.0;
      @  assignable \nothing;
      @  ensures \result <==> Long.MIN_VALUE + epsilon < d
      @  && d < Long.MAX_VALUE - epsilon;
      @ public model boolean inRange(double d);
      @
      @ public normal_behavior
      @  requires m2 != null;
      @  assignable \nothing;
      @  ensures \result <==> inRange((double) pennies + m2.pennies);
      @ public model boolean can_add(Money m2);
      @
      @ public normal_behavior
      @  ensures \result <==> inRange(factor * pennies);
      @ public model boolean can_scaleBy(double factor);
      @*/
```
/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires m2 != null && can_add(m2);
@ assignable \nothing;
@ ensures \result != null
@   && \result.pennies == this.pennies + m2.pennies;
@*/
public MoneyOps plus(Money m2);

/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires m2 != null
@   && inRange((double) pennies - m2.pennies);
@ assignable \nothing;
@ ensures \result != null
@   && \result.pennies == this.pennies - m2.pennies;
@*/
public MoneyOps minus(Money m2);

/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires can_scaleBy(factor);
@ assignable \nothing;
@ ensures \result != null
@   && \result.pennies == (long)(factor * pennies);
@*/
public MoneyOps scaleBy(double factor);
"

Note also that JML uses the Java semantics for mixed-type expressions. For example in the ensures clause of the above specification of plus, m2.pennies is implicitly coerced to a double-precision floating point number, as it would be in Java.
2.3.4 MoneyAC

The key to proofs that an implementation of a class or interface specification is correct lies in the use of \texttt{in}, maps-into, and \texttt{represents} clauses [Hoare72a] [Leino95].

Consider, for example, the abstract class specified in the file `MoneyAC.java` below. This class is abstract and has no constructors. The class declares a concrete field \texttt{numCents}, which is related to the model instance field \texttt{pennies} by the \texttt{represents} clause.\textsuperscript{14} The \texttt{represents} clause states that the value of \texttt{pennies} is the value of \texttt{numCents}. This allows relatively trivial proofs of the correctness of the \texttt{dollars} and \texttt{cents} methods, and is key to the proofs of the other methods.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public /*@ pure @*/ abstract class MoneyAC implements Money
{
    protected long numCents;
    //@ in pennies;
    //@ protected represents pennies <- numCents;
    //@ protected constraint_redundantly
    // @ numCents == \old(numCents); @*/

    public long dollars() {
        return numCents / 100;
    }

    public long cents() {
        return numCents % 100;
    }

    public boolean equals(/*@ nullable @*/ Object o2) {
        if (o2 instanceof Money) {
            Money m2 = (Money)o2;
            return numCents == (100 * m2.dollars() + m2.cents());
        } else {
            return false;
        }
    }

    public int hashCode() {
        return (int)numCents;
    }
}
```

\textsuperscript{14} This \texttt{represents} clause is implicitly an instance, as opposed to a static, represents clause, because it appears in a class declaration.
public Object clone() {
    return this;
}

2.3.5 MoneyComparableAC

The straightforward implementation of the pure abstract subclass MoneyComparableAC is given below. Besides extending the class MoneyAC, it implements the interface MoneyComparable. Note that the model and concrete fields are both inherited by this class.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public /*@ pure @*/ abstract class MoneyComparableAC
    extends MoneyAC implements MoneyComparable
{
    protected static /*@ pure @*/
        long totalCents(Money m2)
    {
        long res = 100 * m2.dollars() + m2.cents();
        //@ assert res == m2.pennies;
        return res;
    }

    public boolean greaterThan(Money m2)
    {
        return numCents > totalCents(m2);
    }

    public boolean greaterThanOrEqualTo(Money m2)
    {
        return numCents >= totalCents(m2);
    }

    public boolean lessThan(Money m2)
    {
        return numCents < totalCents(m2);
    }

    public boolean lessThanOrEqualTo(Money m2)
    {
        return numCents <= totalCents(m2);
    }
}
```
An interesting feature of the class \texttt{MoneyComparableAC} is the protected static method named \texttt{totalCents}. For this method, we give its code with an embedded assertion, written following the keyword \texttt{assert}.\footnote{As of JDK 1.4, \texttt{assert} is also a reserved word in Java. One can thus write assert statements either in standard Java or in JML annotations. If one writes an assert statement as a JML annotation, all of the JML extensions to the Java expression syntax see Section 3.1 \cite{Extensions to Java Expressions for Predicates}, page 55 for the predicate can be used, but no side-effects are allowed in this predicate. Such a JML \texttt{assert-statement} may also refer to model and ghost variables. In a Java assert statement, i.e., in an \texttt{assert-statement} that is not in an annotation, one cannot use JML’s extensions for assertions, because such assertions must compile with a Java compiler.}

Note that the model method, \texttt{inRange} is not implemented, and does not need to be implemented to make this class correctly implement the interface \texttt{MoneyComparable}.

2.3.6 USMoney

Finally, a concrete class implementation is given in the file ‘USMoney.java’ shown below. The class \texttt{USMoney} implements the interface \texttt{MoneyOps}. Note that specifications as well as code are given for the constructors.

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public /*@ pure @*/ class USMoney extends MoneyComparableAC implements MoneyOps {
  /*@ public normal_behavior @*/
  /*@ assignable pennies; @*/
  /*@ ensures pennies == cs; @*/
  /*@ implies_that @*/
  /*@ protected normal_behavior @*/
  /*@ assignable pennies, numCents; @*/
  /*@ ensures numCents == cs; @*/
  /*@*/
  public USMoney(long cs)
  {
    numCents = cs;
  }

  /*@ public normal_behavior @*/
  /*@ assignable pennies; @*/
  /*@ ensures pennies == (long)(100.0 * amt); @*/
  /*@ ensures_redundantly (* pennies holds amt dollars *); @*/
  /*@*/
  public USMoney(double amt)
  {
    numCents = (long)(100.0 * amt);
  }

  public MoneyOps plus(Money m2)
  {
    
```
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```java
//@ assume m2 != null;
return new USMoney(numCents + totalCents(m2));
}

public MoneyOps minus(Money m2)
{
//@ assume m2 != null;
return new USMoney(numCents - totalCents(m2));
}

public MoneyOps scaleBy(double factor)
{
    return new USMoney(numCents * factor / 100.0);
}

public String toString()
{
    return "$" + dollars() + "." + cents();
}
}
```

The constructors each mention the fields that they initialize in their assignable clause. This is because the constructor’s job is to initialize these fields. One can think of a new expression in Java as executing in two steps: allocating an object, and then calling the constructor. Thus the specification of a constructor needs to mention the fields that it can initialize in the assignable clause.

The first constructor’s specification also illustrates that redundancy can also be used in an assignable clause. A redundant assignable clause follows if the meaning of the set of locations named is a subset of the ones denoted by the non-redundant clause for the same specification case. In this example the redundant assignable clause follows from the given assignable clause and the meaning of the in clause inherited from the superclass MoneyAC.

The second constructor above is noteworthy in that there is a redundant ensures clause that uses an informal predicate [Leavens96b]. In this instance, the informal predicate is used as a comment (which could also be used). Recall that informal predicates allow an escape from formality when one does not wish to give part of a specification in formal detail.

The plus and minus methods use assume statements; these are like assertions, but are intended to impose obligations on the callers [Back-Mikhajlova-vonWright98]. The main distinction between a assume statement and a requires clause is that the former is a statement and can be used within code. These may also be treated differently by different tools. For example, ESC/Java [Leino-etal00] will require callers to satisfy the requires clause of a method, but will not enforce the precondition if it is stated as an assumption.

2.4 Use of Pure Classes

Since USMoney is a pure class, it can be used to make models of other classes. An example is the abstract class specified in the file ‘Account.jml’ below. The first model field in this
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;
public class Account {
   //@ public model MoneyOps credit;
   //@ public model String accountOwner;
   //@ public invariant accountOwner != null && credit != null
   // && credit.greaterThanOrEqualTo(new USMoney(0)); @*/
   //@ public constraint accountOwner.equals(\old(accountOwner));

   /*@ public normal_behavior
      @ requires own != null && amt != null
      @ && (new USMoney(1)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt);
      @ assignable credit, accountOwner;
      @ ensures credit.equals(amt) && accountOwner.equals(own);
      @*/
   public Account(MoneyOps amt, String own);

   /*@ public normal_behavior
      @ assignable \nothing;
      @ ensures \result.equals(credit);
      @*/
   public /*@ pure @*/ MoneyOps balance();

   /*@ public normal_behavior
      @ requires 0.0 <= rate && rate <= 1.0
      @ && credit.can_scaleBy(1.0 + rate);
      @ assignable credit;
      @ ensures credit.equals(\old(credit.scaleBy(1.0 + rate)));
      @ for_example
      @ public normal_example
      @ requires rate == 0.05
      @ && (new USMoney(4000)).equals(credit);
      @ assignable credit;
      @ ensures credit.equals(new USMoney(4200));
      @*/
   public void payInterest(double rate);

   /*@ public normal_behavior
      @ requires amt != null
      @ && amt.greaterThanOrEqualTo(new USMoney(0))
      @ && credit.can_add(amt);
      @ assignable credit;
      @ ensures credit.equals(\old(credit.plus(amt)));
      @ for_example
      @ public normal_example
      @ */
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```java
public void deposit(MoneyOps amt);
/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires amt != null
@ && (new USMoney(0)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt)
@ && amt.lessThanOrEqualTo(credit);
@ assignable credit;
@ ensures credit.equals(\old(credit.minus(amt)));
@*/
public void withdraw(MoneyOps amt);
```
package org.jmlspecs.samples.digraph;

import org.jmlspecs.models.*;

public /*@ pure @*/ interface NodeType extends JMLType {

    /*@ also
    @ public normal_behavior
    @ requires !(o instanceof NodeType);
    @ ensures result == false;
    @*/
    public boolean equals(/*@ nullable @*/ Object o);

    public int hashCode();

    /*@ also
    @ public normal_behavior
    @ ensures result instanceof NodeType
    @ && ((NodeType)result).equals(this);
    @*/
    public Object clone();
}

2.5.2 ArcType

ArcType is specified as a pure class in the file ‘ArcType.jml’ shown below. In theory, this class could have been declared with the model modifier, since it does not appear in the interface to Digraph. However, we specify it as a normal Java class for simplicity, and because model classes do not currently work in JML’s runtime assertion checker. We declare ArcType to be a pure class so that its methods can be used in assertions. The two model fields for ArcType, from and to, are both of type NodeType. We specify the equals method so that two references to objects of type ArcType are equal if and only if they have equal values in the from and to model fields. Thus, equals is specified using NodeType.equals. We also specify that ArcType has a public clone method, fulfilling the obligations of a type that implements JMLType. ArcType must implement JMLType so that its objects can be placed in a JMLValueSet. We use such a set for one of the model fields of Digraph.

package org.jmlspecs.samples.digraph;

import org.jmlspecs.models.JMLType;

/*@ pure @*/ public class ArcType implements JMLType {

    //@ public model NodeType from;
    //@ public model NodeType to;
    //@ public invariant from != null && to != null;
The use of also in the specification of ArcType's equals method is interesting. It separates two cases of the normal behavior for that method. This is equivalent to using two public normal_behavior clauses, one for each case. That is, when the argument is an instance of ArcType, the method must return true just when this and o have the same from and to fields. And when o is not an instance of ArcType, the equals method must return false.

2.5.3 Digraph

Finally, the specification of the class Digraph is given in the file ‘Digraph.jml’ shown below. This specification demonstrates how to use container classes, like JMLValueSet, combined with appropriate invariants, to specify models that are compositions of other classes. In this specification, the container class JMLValueSet is used as the type of the model fields nodes and arcs. Since JML currently only works with a non-generic version of Java, the first invariant clause restricts nodes so that every object in nodes is, in fact, of type NodeType. Similarly, the next invariant clause we restrict arcs to be a set of ArcType objects. In both
cases, since the type is JMLValueSet, membership is determined by the equals method for the type of the elements (rather than reference equality).

```java
package org.jmlspecs.samples.digraph;
//@ model import org.jmlspecs.models.*;
public class Digraph {
//@ public model JMLValueSet nodes;
//@ public model JMLValueSet arcs;
/*@ public invariant_redundantly nodes != null;
   @ public invariant (\forall JMLType n; nodes.has(n);
     @   n instanceof NodeType);
//@ public invariant_redundantly arcs != null;
//@ public invariant (\forall JMLType a; arcs.has(a);
                     @   a instanceof ArcType);
//@ public invariant
   @   (\forall ArcType a; arcs.has(a);
       @   nodes.has(a.from) & nodes.has(a.to));
//@
//@
//@ public normal_behavior
   @ assignable nodes, arcs;
//@ ensures nodes.isEmpty() & arcs.isEmpty();
//@
public Digraph();
//@
//@ public normal_behavior
   @ requires_redundantly n != null;
   @ assignable nodes;
//@ ensures nodes.equals(\old(nodes.insert(n)));
//@
public void addNode(NodeType n);
//@
//@ public normal_behavior
   @ requires unconnected(n);
   @ assignable nodes;
//@ ensures nodes.equals(\old(nodes.remove(n)));
//@
public void removeNode(NodeType n);
//@
//@ public normal_behavior
   @ requires_redundantly inFrom != null & inTo != null;
   @ assignable arcs;
//@ ensures arcs.equals(
   @   \old(arcs.insert(new ArcType(inFrom, inTo))));
//@
public void addArc(NodeType inFrom, NodeType inTo);
```
/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ requires_redundantly inFrom != null & inTo != null;
  @ requires nodes.has(inFrom) & nodes.has(inTo);
  @ assignable arcs;
  @ ensures arcs.equals(
    @ \old(arcs.remove(new ArcType(inFrom, inTo))));
  @*/
public void removeArc(NodeType inFrom, NodeType inTo);

/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ ensures \result == nodes.has(n);
  @*/
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean isNode(NodeType n);

/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ requires_redundantly inFrom != null & inTo != null;
  @ ensures \result == arcs.has(new ArcType(inFrom, inTo));
  @*/
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean isArc(NodeType inFrom,
  NodeType inTo);

/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ requires nodes.has(start) & nodes.has(end);
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ ensures \result
    @ == reachSet(new JMLValueSet(start)).has(end);
  @*/
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean isAPath(NodeType start,
  NodeType end);

/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ ensures \result <==>(!\exists ArcType a; arcs.has(a);
    @ a.from.equals(n) || a.to.equals(n));
  @*/
public /*@ pure @*/ boolean unconnected(NodeType n);

/*@ public normal_behavior
  @ assignable \nothing;
  @ requires_redundantly nodeSet != null;
  @ requires (!forall JMLType o; nodeSet.has(o));
  @ o instanceof NodeType & nodes.has(o));
  @ |
  @ assignable \nothing;
An interesting use of pure model methods appears at the end of the specification of `Digraph` in the pure model method `reachSet`. This method constructively defines the set of all nodes that are reachable from the nodes in the argument `nodeSet`. This specification uses a nested case analysis, between `{}` and `{}`. The meaning of this is again that each pre- and postcondition pair has to be obeyed, but by using nesting, one can avoid duplication of the requires clause that is found at the beginning of the specification. The measured by clause is needed because this specification is recursive; the measure given allows one to describe a termination argument, and thus ensure that the specification is well-defined. This clause defines an integer-valued measure that must always be at least zero; furthermore, the measure for a call and recursive uses in the specification must strictly decrease [Owreetal95]. The recursion in the specification builds up the entire set of reachable nodes by, for each recursive reference, adding the nodes that can be reached directly (via a single arc) from the nodes in `nodeSet`.

### 2.6 Behavioral Subtyping

As in Java, a subtype inherits members (fields and methods) from its supertypes. A subtype also inherits all the class level-specifications associated with fields and all method specifications for public and protected instance methods. This specification inheritance has the effect of making the subtype a behavioral subtype [Liskov-Wing94], in the sense that instances of the subtype obey the specifications its supertype(s) [Dhara-Leavens96] [Leavens-Weihl95].
Class-level specifications associated with fields include include invariants and history constraints (see Section 2.2.1.2 [Invariants and History Constraint], page 20), as well as initially clauses (see Section 2.1.1 [Model Fields], page 13) data group declarations (see Section 2.2 [Data Groups], page 19), and represents clauses (see Section 2.2.2.1 [Data Groups and Represents Clauses], page 24). Inheritance of invariants means that each supertype’s invariants must also hold in the subtype. Similarly, every history constraint specified in each supertype must be obeyed in the subtype. And all initially clauses specified for supertype fields must also be obeyed in all subtypes. Fields declared in a supertype retain their data group membership when inherited. Their represents clauses are also inherited.

As in Java, private fields are inherited by a subtype but not visible to it. Similarly, default privacy (i.e., package visibility) fields are not accessible if the subtype is declared in a different package than the supertype declaring the field. As in Java, these fields are present in the objects of the subtype, but not accessible to code written in the subtype. In the same way, class level specifications associated with such fields must still be obeyed by objects of the subtype. Various restrictions to JML that ensure that this is always possible are being investigated [Ruby-Leavens00].

Specifications for instance methods are also inherited in the sense that public and protected specification cases must be obeyed by all overriding methods [Dhara-Leavens96] [Leavens97c]. This inheritance of method specifications ensures that a client’s reasoning about a method call will still be valid, even if the method is overridden [America87] [America91] [Leavens-Weihl95], and thus that a subclass is a behavioral subtype of its supertypes [Dhara-Leavens96]. Note that private and default (package) visibility specification cases are not visible to subtypes, and hence do not have to be obeyed by them; not inheriting such specification cases does not cause clients reasoning problems, as these specification cases are not visible to clients making method calls (in general). Furthermore, specifications are not inherited for constructors or for static methods, since they are not involved in dynamic dispatch.

Inheritance of method specifications can be thought of textually. For each instance method, \( m \) specified in a class \( C \), one can imagine copying into the specification of \( m \) the public and protected specification cases for \( m \) given in all of \( C \)’s ancestors and in all the interfaces \( C \) implements; these specification cases would be combined using also [Dhara-Leavens96] [Raghavan-Leavens05]. (This is the reason for the use of also at the beginning of specifications in overriding methods.) By the semantics of method combination using also, these behaviors must all be satisfied by the method, in addition to any explicitly specified behaviors.

For example, consider the class PlusAccount, specified in file ‘PlusAccount.jml’ shown below. It is specified as a subclass of Account (see Section 2.4 [Use of Pure Classes], page 42). Thus it inherits the fields of Account, and Account’s public invariants, history constraints, and method specifications. (The specification of Account given above does not have any protected specification information.) Since it inherits the fields of its superclass, a textual copy of the method specification cases of Account would still be meaningful in the

---

16 When such private and default visibility specification cases are visible to callers, they may only be used in verification of a method call if the call can be shown to be executing that method, as opposed to some override.

17 However, textual copying shouldn’t be taken literally; if a subclass declares a field that hides the fields of its superclass, renaming must be done to prevent name capture.
context of PlusAccount. Thinking of such textual copies works if one adds new (model) fields to specify the subclass and relates them to the existing ones. If instead one tried to respecify the fields of a supertype with invariants and history constraints that violated the (inherited) specification of that supertype, then the resulting specification would be contradictory, and hence not be correctly implementable.

```
package org.jmlspecs.samples.prelimdesign;

public class PlusAccount extends Account {
   // @ public model MoneyOps savings, checking; in credit;

   /* @ public represents credit \such_that
      @   credit.equals(savings.plus(checking));
   */
   // @ public invariant savings != null && checking != null;
   /* @ public invariant_redundantly
      @   savings.plus(checking)
      @     .greaterThanOrEqualTo(new USMoney(0));
   */

   /* @ public normal_behavior
      @   requires sav != null && chk != null && own != null
      @     && (new USMoney(1)).lessThanOrEqualTo(sav)
      @     && (new USMoney(1)).lessThanOrEqualTo(chk);
      @   assignable credit, owner;
      @   assignable_redundantly savings, checking;
      @   ensures savings.equals(sav) && checking.equals(chk)
      @     && owner.equals(own);
      @   ensures_redundantly credit.equals(sav.plus(chk));
   */
   public PlusAccount(MoneyOps sav, MoneyOps chk, String own);

   /* @ also
      @   public normal_behavior
      @   requires 0.0 <= rate && rate <= 1.0
      @     && credit.can_scaleBy(1.0 + rate);
      @   assignable credit, savings, checking;
      @   ensures checking.equals(
      @     \old(checking.scaleBy(1.0 + rate)));
      @ for_example
      @   public normal_example
      @   requires rate == 0.05
      @     && checking.equals(new USMoney(2000));
      @   assignable credit, savings, checking;
      @   ensures checking.equals(new USMoney(2100));
   */
```
public void payInterest(double rate);

/*@ also
  @ public normal_behavior
  @ requires amt != null
  @     && (new USMoney(0)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt)
  @     && amt.lessThanOrEqualTo(savings);
  @ assignable credit, savings;
  @ ensures savings.equals(\old(savings.minus(amt)))
  @     && \not_modified(checking);
  @ also
  @ public normal_behavior
  @ requires amt != null
  @     && (new USMoney(0)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt)
  @     && amt.lessThanOrEqualTo(credit)
  @     && amt.greaterThan(savings);
  @ assignable credit, savings, checking;
  @ ensures savings.equals(new USMoney(0))
  @     && checking.equals(\old(checking.minus(amt.minus(savings)))));
  @ for_example
  @ public normal_example
  @ requires savings.equals(new USMoney(40001))
  @     && amt.equals(new USMoney(40000));
  @ assignable credit, savings, checking;
  @ ensures savings.equals(new USMoney(1))
  @     && \not_modified(checking);
  @ also
  @ public normal_example
  @ requires savings.equals(new USMoney(30001))
  @     && checking.equals(new USMoney(10000))
  @     && amt.equals(new USMoney(40000));
  @ assignable credit, savings, checking;
  @ ensures savings.equals(new USMoney(0))
  @     && checking.equals(new USMoney(1));
  @*/
public void withdraw(MoneyOps amt);

/*@ also
  @ public normal_behavior
  @ requires amt != null
  @     && amt.greaterThanOrEqualTo(new USMoney(0))
  @     && credit.can_add(amt);
  @ assignable credit, savings;
  @ ensures savings.equals(\old(savings.plus(amt)))
  @     && \not_modified(checking);
  @ for_example
@ public normal_example
@ requires savings.equals(new USMoney(20000))
@   && amt.equals(new USMoney(1));
@ assignable credit, savings, checking;
@ ensures savings.equals(new USMoney(20001));
@*/
public void deposit(MoneyOps amt);

/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires amt != null
@   && amt.greaterThanOrEqualTo(new USMoney(0))
@   && credit.can_add(amt);
@ assignable credit, checking;
@ ensures checking.equals(\old(checking.plus(amt)))
@   && \not_modified(savings);
@ for_example
@ public normal_example
@ requires checking.equals(new USMoney(20000))
@   && amt.equals(new USMoney(1));
@ assignable credit, checking;
@ ensures checking.equals(new USMoney(20001));
@*/
public void depositToChecking(MoneyOps amt);

/*@ public normal_behavior
@ requires amt != null;
@ {|
@ requires (new USMoney(0)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt)
@   && amt.lessThanOrEqualTo(checking);
@ assignable credit, checking;
@ ensures checking.equals(\old(checking.minus(amt)))
@   && \not_modified(savings);
@ also
@ requires (new USMoney(0)).lessThanOrEqualTo(amt)
@   && amt.lessThanOrEqualTo(credit)
@   && amt.greaterThan(checking);
@ assignable credit, checking, savings;
@ ensures checking.equals(new USMoney(0))
@   && savings.equals(
@       \old(savings.minus(amt.minus(checking))));
@ |}
@ for_example
@ public normal_example
@ requires checking.equals(new USMoney(40001))
@   && amt.equals(new USMoney(40000));
@ assignable credit, checking;
@ ensures checking.equals(new USMoney(1))
public void payCheck(MoneyOps amt);

Similarly, if one tried to respecify a method in a way that violated an (inherited) specification case, then the method would have to obey both specifications, and would not be correctly implementable. Thus, specification inheritance guarantees that all subtypes are behavioral subtypes in JML, and trying to avoid behavioral subtyping results in unimplementable specifications Dhara-Leavens96.

Note that in the represents clause below, instead of a left-facing arrow, \( \Leftarrow \), the connective "\textit{such that}" is used to introduce a relationship predicate. This form of the represents clause allows one to specify abstraction relations, instead of abstraction functions.
3 Extensions to Java Expressions

JML makes extensions to the Java expression syntax for two purposes. The main set of
extensions are used in predicates. But there are also some extensions used in store-refs,
which are themselves used in the assignable and represents clauses.

We give an overview of these extensions in this section. However, we only describe the
most important and useful extensions here. See the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-
JMLRef] for more extensions and for more detail.

3.1 Extensions to Java Expressions for Predicates

The expressions that can be used as predicates in JML are an extension to the side-effect
free Java expressions. Since predicates are required to be side-effect free, the following Java
operators are not allowed within predicates:

- assignment (=), and the various assignment operators (such as +=, -=, etc.)
- all forms of increment and decrement operators (++ and --),
- calls to methods that are not pure, and
- any use of operator new that would call a constructor that is not pure.

Furthermore, within method specifications that are not model programs, one cannot use super
to call a pure superclass method, because it is confusing in combination with JML’s
specification inheritance.¹

We allow the allocation of storage (e.g., using operator new and pure constructors)
in predicates, because such storage can never be referred to after the evaluation of the
predicate, and because such pure constructors have no side-effects other than initializing
the new objects so created.

JML adds the following new syntax to the Java expression syntax, for use in predi-
cates (see the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for syntactic details such as
precedence):

- Informal descriptions, which look like

  (* some text describing a Boolean-valued predicate *)

  have type boolean. Their meaning is either true or false, but is entirely determined
  by the reader. Since informal descriptions are not-executable, they may be treated
differently by different tools in different situations.

- ==> and <= for logical implication and reverse implication. For example, the formula
  raining ==> getsWet is true if either raining is false or getsWet is true. The formula
  getsWet <=!= raining means the same thing. The ==> operator associates to the right,
  but the <= operator associates to the left. The expressions on both sides of these
  operators must be of type boolean, and the type of the result is also boolean.

- <==> and <=!==> for logical equivalence and logical inequivalence, respectively. The
  expressions on either side of these operators must be of type boolean, and the type of

¹ Suppose A is the superclass of B, and B is the superclass of C. Suppose B’s specification used super
to call a method of A. The problem is that when this specification is inherited by C, if we imagine
copying B’s specification to C, then this use of super no longer refers to A, but to B. Thanks to Arnd
Poetzsch-Heffter for pointing out this problem.
the result is also boolean. Note that <=> means the same thing as == for expressions of
type boolean, and <=!=> means the same thing as != for boolean expressions; however,
<=!=> and <=!=> have a much lower precedence, and are also associative and symmetric.

- \forall and \exists, which are universal and existential quantifiers (respectively); for example,

\forall int i,j; 0 <= i & & i < j & & j < 10; a[i] < a[j]

says that a is sorted at indexes between 0 and 9. The quantifiers range over all potential
values of the variables declared which satisfy the range predicate, given between the
semicolons (;). If the range predicate is omitted, it defaults to true. Since a quantifier
quantifies over all potential values of the variables, when the variables declared are
reference types, they may be null, or may refer to objects not constructed by the
program; one should use a range predicate to eliminate such cases if they are not
desired. The type of a universal and existential quantifier is boolean.

- \max, \min, \product, and \sum, which are generalized quantifiers that return the
maximum, minimum, product, or sum of the values of the expressions given, where the
variables satisfy the given range. The range predicate must be of type boolean. The
expression in the body must be a built-in numeric type, such as int or double; the type
of the quantified expression as a whole is the type of its body. The body
of a quantified expression is the last top-level expression it contains; it is the expression following the
range predicate, if there is one. As with the universal and existential quantifiers, if the
range predicate is omitted, it defaults to true. For example, the following equations
are all true (see chapter 3 of [Cohen90]):

\sum int i; 0 <= i & & i < 5; i) == 0 + 1 + 2 + 3 + 4
\product int i; 0 < i & & i < 5; i) == 1 * 2 * 3 * 4
\max int i; 0 <= i & & i < 5; i) == 4
\min int i; 0 <= i & & i < 5; i-1) == -1

For computing the value of a sum or product, Java’s arithmetic is used. The meaning
thus depends on the type of the expression. For example, in Java, floating point
numbers use the IEEE 754 standard, and thus when an overflow occurs, the appropriate
positive or negative infinity is returned. However, Java integers wrap on overflow. Consider the following examples.

\product float f; 1.0e30f < f & & f < 1.0e38f; f) == Float.POSITIVE_INFINITY
\sum int i; i == Integer.MAX_VALUE || i == 1; i) == Integer.MAX_VALUE + 1 == Integer.MIN_VALUE

When the range predicate is not satisfiable, the sum is 0 and the product is 1; for
example:

\sum int i; false; i) == 0
\product double d; false; d*d) == 1.0

When the range predicate is not satisfiable for \max the result is the smallest number
with the type of the expression in the body; for floating point numbers, negative infinity
is used. Similarly, when the range predicate is not satisfiable for \min, the result is the
largest number with the type of the expression in the body.
• \num_of, which is “numerical quantifier.” It returns the number of values for its variables for which the range and the expression in its body are true. Both the range predicate and the body must have type boolean, and the entire quantified expression has type long. The meaning of this quantifier is defined by the following equation (see p. 57 of [Cohen90]).

\[(\num_of T x; R(x); P(x)) == (\sum T x; R(x) && P(x); 1L)\]

• Set comprehensions, which can be used to succinctly define sets; for example, the following is the JMLObjectSet that is the subset of non-null Integer objects found in the set myIntSet whose values are between 0 and 10, inclusive.

```java
new JMLObjectSet {Integer i | myIntSet.has(i)
     && i != null && 0 <= i.getInteger()
     && i.getInteger() <= 10 }
```

The syntax of JML (see the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for details) limits set comprehensions so that following the vertical bar (‘|’) is always an invocation of the has method of some set on the variable declared. (This restriction is used to avoid Russell’s paradox [Whitehead-Russell25].) In practice, one either starts from some relevant set at hand, or one can start from the sets containing the objects of primitive types found in org.jmlspecs.models.JMLModelObjectSet and (in the same Java package) JMLModelValueSet. The type of such an expression is the type named following new, which must be JMLObjectSet or JMLValueSet.

• \elemtype, which returns the most-specific static type shared by all elements of its array argument [Leino-Nelson-Saxe00]. For example, \elemtype(\type(int[])) is \type(int). The argument to \elemtype must be an expression of type \TYPE, which JML considers to be the same as java.lang.Class, and its result also has type \TYPE. If the argument is not an array type, the result is null.

• \fresh, which asserts that objects were freshly allocated; for example, \fresh(x,y) asserts that x and y are not null and that the objects bound to these identifiers were not allocated in the pre-state. The arguments to \fresh can have any reference type, and the type of the overall expression is boolean.2

• \nonnullelements, which can be used to assert that an array and its elements are all non-null. For example, \nonnullelements(myArray), is equivalent to [Leino-Nelson-Saxe00]

```java
myArray != null &&
   (\forall int i; 0 <= i && i < myArray.length;
    myArray[i] != null)
```

• \old, which can be used to refer to values in the pre-state; e.g., \old(myPoint.x) is the value of the x field of the object myPoint in the pre-state. The type of such an expression is the type of the expression it contains; for example the type of \old(myPoint.x) is the type of myPoint.x. The keyword \old can only be used in an ensures-clause, a signals-clause, or a history-constraint; it cannot be used, for example, in preconditions.

• \result, which, in an ensures clause is the value or object that is being returned by a method. Its type is the return type of the method; hence it is a type error to

---

2 Note that it is wrong to use \fresh(this) in the specification of a constructor, because Java’s new operator allocates storage for the object; the constructor’s job is just to initialize that storage.
use \texttt{result} in a void method or in a constructor. The keyword \texttt{result} can only be used in an \texttt{ensures-clause}; it cannot be used, for example, in preconditions or in signals clauses.

- \texttt{typeof}, which returns the most-specific dynamic type of an expression’s value [Leino-Nelson-Saxe00]. The meaning of \texttt{typeof}(E) is unspecified if E is null. If E has a static type that is a reference type, then \texttt{typeof}(E) means the same thing as \texttt{E.getClass()}. For example, if \texttt{c} is a variable of static type \texttt{Collection} that holds an object of class \texttt{HashSet}, then \texttt{typeof(c)} is \texttt{HashSet.class}, which is the same thing as \texttt{typeof(HashSet)}. If \texttt{E} has a static type that is not a reference type, then \texttt{typeof(E)} means the instance of \texttt{java.lang.Class} that represents its static type. For example, \texttt{typeof(true)} is \texttt{Boolean.TYPE}, which is the same as \texttt{typeof(boolean)}. Thus an expression of the form \texttt{typeof(E)} has type \texttt{TYPE}, which JML considers to be the same as \texttt{java.lang.Class}.

- \texttt{<:}, which compares two reference types and returns true when the type on the left is a subtype of the type on the right [Leino-Nelson-Saxe00]. Although the notation might suggest otherwise, this operator is also reflexive; a type will compare as \texttt{<:} with itself. In an expression of the form \texttt{E1 <: E2}, both \texttt{E1} and \texttt{E2} must have type \texttt{TYPE}; since in JML \texttt{TYPE} is the same as \texttt{java.lang.Class} the expression \texttt{E1 <: E2} means the same thing as the expression \texttt{E2.isAssignableFrom(E1)}.

- \texttt{type}, which can be used to mark types in expressions. An expression of the form \texttt{type(T)} has the type \texttt{TYPE}. Since in JML \texttt{TYPE} is the same as \texttt{java.lang.Class}, an expression of the form \texttt{type(T)} means the same thing as \texttt{T.class}. For example, in

\begin{verbatim}
 typeof(myObj) <: type(PlusAccount)
\end{verbatim}

the use of \texttt{typeof(PlusAccount)} is used to introduce the type \texttt{PlusAccount} into this expression context.

To avoid referring to the value of uninitialized locations, a constructor’s precondition can only refer to locations in the object being constructed that are not assignable. This allows a constructor to refer to instance fields of the object being constructed if they are not made assignable by the constructor’s assignable clause, for example, if they are declared with initializers. In particular, the precondition of a constructor may not mention a “blank final” instance variable that it must assign.

Since we are using Java expressions for predicates, there are some additional problems in mathematical modeling. We are excluding the possibility of side-effects by limiting the syntax of predicates, and by using type checking [Gifford-Lucassen86] [Lucassen87] [Lucassen-Gifford88] [Nielson-Nielson-Amtoft97] [Talpin-Jouvelot94] [Wright92] to make sure that only pure methods and constructors may be called in predicates.

Exceptions in expressions are particularly important, since they may arise in type casts. JML deals with exceptions by having the evaluation of predicates substitute an arbitrary expressible value of the normal result type when an exception is thrown during evaluation. When the expression’s result type is a reference type, an implementation would have to return \texttt{null} if an exception is thrown while executing such a predicate. This corresponds to a mathematical model in which partial functions are mathematically modeled by under-specified total functions [Gries-Schneider95]. However, tools sometimes only approximate this semantics. In tools, instead of fully catching exceptions for all subexpressions, many
tools only catch exceptions for the smallest boolean-valued subexpression that may throw an exception (and for entire expressions used in JML’s measured-clause and variant-function).

JML will check that errors (i.e., exceptions that inherit from Error) are not explicitly thrown by pure methods. This means that they can be ignored during mathematical modeling. When executing predicates, errors will cause run-time errors.

3.2 Extensions to Java Expressions for Store-Refs

The grammatical production store-ref (see the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for the exact syntax) is used to name locations in the assignable and represents clauses. A store-ref names a location, not an object; a location is either a field of an object, or an array element. Besides the Java syntax of names and field and array references, JML supports the following syntax for store-refs. See the JML Reference Manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for more details on the syntax.

- Array ranges, of the form A[E1 .. E2], denote the locations in the array A between the value of E1 and the value of E2 (inclusive). For example, the clause
  
  assignable myArray[3 .. 5]

  can be thought of an abbreviation for the following.

  assignable myArray[3], myArray[4], myArray[5]

- One can also name all the indexes in an array A by writing, A[ ], which is shorthand for A[0 .. A.length-1].

- Two notations allow one to refer to the fields in some particular object.
  - The syntax x.* names all of the non-static fields of the object referred to by x. For example, if p is a Point object with two fields, x and y of type BigInteger, then p.* names the fields p.x and p.y. Notice that the fields of the BigInteger objects are not named. Also, p.*.* is not allowed.
  - If a is an array of type Rocket [], then the store-ref a[*].* means all of the non-static fields of each Rocket object referred to by the elements of array a.
4 Conclusions

One area of future work for JML is concurrency. Some recent work by Rodriguez et al. [Rodriguez-etal05] has investigated the use of atomicity for specifying multi-threaded Java programs. However, these ideas are not yet implemented in most of the JML tools, and their use has not been fully explored.

JML has also been used as a research vehicle in a wide variety of other studies various papers on these ideas can be found through the JML web page ‘http://www.jmlspecs.org/’.

JML is an expressive behavioral interface specification language for Java. It combines the best features of the Eiffel and Larch approaches to specification. It allows one to write specifications that are quite precise and detailed, but also allows one to write lightweight specifications. It has examples and other forms of redundancy to allow for debugging specifications and for making rhetorical points. It supports behavioral subtyping by specification inheritance.

More information on JML, including software to aid in working with JML specifications, can be obtained from ‘http://www.jmlspecs.org/’. The JML web site also includes an up-to-date version of this document with a table of contents and an index.
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Appendix A Specification Case Defaults

As noted above (see Section 1.2 [Lightweight Specifications], page 5), specifications in JML do not need to be as detailed as most of the examples given in this document. If a spec-case does not use one of the behavior keywords (behavior, normal_behavior, or exceptional_behavior), or if an example does not use one of the example keywords (example, normal_example, exceptional_example), then it is called a lightweight specification or example. Otherwise it is a heavyweight specification or example.

When the various clauses of a spec-case or example are omitted, they have the defaults given in the table below. The table distinguishes between lightweight and heavyweight specifications and examples. In most cases the default for the lightweight form is that no assumption is made about the omitted clause. There are only two exceptions to this rule. The first is that for an omitted diverges clause defaults to false. The second is that an omitted signals_only has a default that depends on the exceptions declared in the method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omitted clause</th>
<th>lightweight</th>
<th>heavyweight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>requires</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverges</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measured_by</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignable</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>\everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working_space</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duration</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensures</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signals_only</td>
<td>see text</td>
<td>see text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>signals</td>
<td>\not_specified</td>
<td>(Exception) true</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in a heavyweight specification or example, the specifier is assumed to be giving a complete specification or example. Therefore, in a heavyweight specification the meaning of an omitted clause is given a definite default. For example, the meaning of an omitted assignable clause is that all locations (that can otherwise be legally assigned to) can be assigned. Furthermore, in a non-lightweight specification, the meaning of an omitted diverges clause is that the method may not diverge in that case. (The diverges clause is almost always omitted; it can be used to say what should be true, of the pre-state, when the specification is allowed to loop forever or signal an error.)

The defaults for omitted signals_only and signals clauses do not apply to normal_behavior specification cases, since normal_behavior specification cases cannot contain these clauses.

The default for the signals_only clause is the same in both heavyweight and lightweight specifications, but depends on the list of exceptions declared in the method. If the method declares no exceptions, then the default clause is signals_only \nothing; (which means that the method cannot throw any exceptions). However, if the method header declares that the method may throw exceptions DE1, ..., DEn, then the default signals_only clause is as follows.
 signals_only DE1, ..., DEn

This default applies whenever the `signals_only` clause is omitted from a specification case, even if the method has a `signals` clause. If this default is too strong, the effect can be changed by either writing an explicit `signals_only` clause, or by declaring further exceptions in the method’s header. Note that although Java allows runtime exceptions (subtypes of `java.lang.RuntimeException`) to be thrown without being declared in a method’s header, JML does not take make a special case for these.

A completely omitted specification is taken to be a lightweight specification. If the default (zero-argument) constructor of a class is omitted because its code is omitted, then its specification defaults to an assignable clause that allows all the locations that the default (zero-argument) constructor of its superclass assigns — in essence a copy of the superclass’s default constructor’s assignable clause. If some other frame is desired, then one has to write the specification, or at least the code, explicitly.

A method or constructor with code present has a completely omitted specification if it has no `specification-cases` and does not use annotations like `non_null` or `pure` that add implicit specifications.

If a method or constructor has code, has a completely omitted specification, and does not override another method, then its meaning is taken as the lightweight specification `diverges \not_specified;`. Thus, its meaning can be read from the lightweight column of table above, except that the diverges clause is not given its usual default. This is done so that the default specification when no specification is given truly says nothing about the method’s behavior. However, if a method with code and a completely omitted specification overrides some other method, then its meaning is taken to be the lightweight specification `also requires false;`. This somewhat counter-intuitive specification is the unit under specification conjunction with `also`; it is used so as not to change the meaning of the inherited specification.

If the code is annotated with keywords like `non_null` or `pure` that add implicit specifications, then these implicit specifications are used instead of the default. Code with such annotations is considered to have an implicit specification.

It is intended that the meaning of `\not_specified` may vary between different uses of a JML specification. For example, a static checker might treat a `requires` clause that is `\not_specified` as if it were `true`, while a verification logic might treat it as if it were `false`. However, a reasonable default for the interpretation for `\not_specified` in a lightweight specification is the most liberal possible (i.e., the one that permits the most correct implementations); this is generally the same as the heavyweight default, except for the `diverges` clause (where the most liberal interpretation would be `true`).

Note that specification statements (see the JML Reference manual [Leavens-etal-JMLRef] for details) cannot be lightweight. In addition, a `spec-statement` can specify abrupt termination. The additional clauses possible in a `spec-statement` have the following defaults. These are not liberally interpreted, but instead prohibit the statement from having abrupt behavior by default.

```
Default

Omitted clause (heayweight)
--------------------------
continues    false
```
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breaks</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returns</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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