


# Software Design, Modelling and Analysis in UML

## Lecture 19: Inheritance I

2018-01-30

Prof. Dr. Andreas Podolski, Dr. Bernd Westphal  
 Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany



What happens on... (40)

- R2
- S1, S2
- R1?
- S1, S2
- A, B, C, S, R, ?
- S1, S2, S3, S4, S5
- A, B, C, R, ?
- A, B, C, S, R, ?
- A, B, C, D, E, R, ?
- S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7
- A, B, C, D, E, R, ?
- S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7

### Contents & Goals

- Last Lecture: Live Sequence Charts Semantics

#### This Lecture:

- Educational Objectives: Capabilities for following tasks/questions
  - What's the Lifesubstitution Principle?
  - What is lifecycle binding?
  - What is the subject, what the uplink semantics of inheritance?
  - What's the effect of inheritance on LSCG, State Machines, System States?
  - What's the idea of Meta-Modeling?
- Content:
  - Quickly complete State Machine semantics
  - Inference in UML: concrete syntax
  - Lifesubstitution Principle — desired semantics
  - Two approaches to obtain desired semantics

### Junction and Choice




- Junction ("static conditional branch"):
  - good: abbreviation
  - unfolds to so many similar transitions with different guards, the unfolded transitions are then checked for enabledness
  - at best, start with trigger, branch into conditions, then apply actions
- Choice ("dynamic conditional branch")
  - evil: may get stuck
  - enters the transition **without knowing** whether there's an enabled path
  - at best, use "die!" and convince yourself that it cannot get stuck
  - maybe even better: avoid

Note: not so sure about naming and symbols, e.g. I'd guessed it was just the other way round...

### The Concept of History, and Other Pseudo-States

- Hierarchical states can be "folded" for readability (but: this can also hinder readability)
- Can even be taken from a different state-machine for re-use



## Entry and Exit Point, Submachine State, Terminate

- Hierarchical states can be “**rotter**” for readability (but: this can also hinder readability) S: 8
- Can even be taken from a different state machine for re-use.
- **Entry/exit points** O ⊗
  - Provide connection points for finer integration into the current level, than just via initial state.
  - Semantically a bit tricky:
    - **First** the exit action of the exiting state,
    - **then** the actions of the transition,
    - **then** the entry actions of the entered state,
    - **then** action of the transition from the entry point to an internal state,
    - and **then** that internal state's entry action.
- **Terminate Pseudo-State** X
  - When a terminate pseudo-state is reached the object taking the transition is immediately killed. 6:00

19 - 2012-02-01 - Sölfer

9:00

## Deferred Events in State-Machines

19 - 2012-02-01 - main

7:00

## Deferred Events: Syntax and Semantics


- **Syntactically,**
    - Each state has (in addition to the name) a set of deferred events.
    - **Default:** the empty set.
  - The **semantics** is a bit intricate, something like
    - if an event,  $E$ , is dispatched,
    - and there is no transition enabled to consume  $E$ ,
    - and  $E$  is in the deferred set of the current state configuration,
    - then add  $E$  into some “deferred events space” of the object (e.g. either (= extend  $\delta$ ) or into the local state of the object (= extend  $\sigma$ ))
    - and turn attention to the next event.
  - **Not so obvious:**
    - Is there a priority between deferred and regular events?
    - Is the order of deferred events preserved?
    - ...
- [Fischer and Schödl, 2007], e.g., claim to provide semantics for the complete Hierarchical State Machine language, including deferred events.

## Active and Passive Objects [Harel and Gery, 1997]

19 - 2012-02-01 - main

10:00

## Deferred Events: Idea

- For ages, UML state machines comprises the feature of **deferred events**. The idea is as follows:
- Consider the following state machine: 
  - Assume we're stable in  $s_1$ , and  $F_1$  is ready in the ether.
  - In the **framework of the course**,  $F_1$  is **discarded**.
  - But we **may** find it a pity to discard the poor event and may want to remember it for later processing, e.g. in  $s_2$ , in other words, **defer** it.
- General options to satisfy such needs:
- Provide a pattern how to “program” this (use self-loops and helper attributes).
  - Turn it into an original language concept. (— OMC's choice)

19 - 2012-02-01 - Sölfer

8:00

## What about non-Active Objects?

- Recall:**
- We're **still** working under the assumption that all classes in the class diagram (and thus all objects) are **active**.
  - That is, each object has its own thread of control and is (if stable) at any time ready to process an event from the ether.
- But the world doesn't consist of only active objects. For instance, in the crossing controller from the exercises we could wish to have the whole system live in one thread of control.
- So we have to address questions like:
- Can we send events to a non-active object?
  - And if so, when are these events processed?
  - etc.

19 - 2012-02-01 - Sölfer

11:00

[Harel and Gery, 1997] propose the following (orthogonal!) notions:

- A class (and thus the instances of this class) is either **active** or **passive** as declared in the class diagram.
- An active object has (in the operating system sense) an own thread or an own program counter, an own stack, etc.
- A passive object doesn't.

- A class is either **reactive** or **non-reactive**.
- A reactive class has a (non-trivial) state machine.
- A non-reactive one hasn't.

Which combinations do we understand?

	active	passive
reactive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
non-reactive	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>


So why don't we understand passive/reactive?

- Assume passive objects  $u_1$  and  $u_2$ , and active object  $u_3$ , and that there are events in the ether for all three.
- Which of them (can) start a run-to-completion step...?
- Do run-to-completion steps still interleave...?

Reasonable Approaches:

- Avoid** — for instance, by
- require that **reactive implies active** for model well-formedness,
- requiring for model well-formedness that events are **never sent** to instances of non-reactive classes.
- Explain** — here: (following [Harel and Gery, 1997])
- Delegate all dispatching of events to the active objects.

- Firstly, establish that each object  $u$  knows, via (implicit) link  $u.k.kid$ , the active object  $u_{act}$ , which is responsible for dispatching events to  $u$ .
- If  $u$  is an instance of an active class, then  $u_{act} = u$ .



Sending an event:


- Establish that of each signal we have a version  $E_{sig}$  with an association  $dest : C_{u_1}, C \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- Then  $nE$  in  $u_1 : C_1$  becomes:
- Create an instance  $u_2$  of  $E_{sig}$  and set  $u_2.dest$  to  $u_2 := \sigma(C_1)(n)$ .
- Send to  $u_2 := \sigma(C_1)(n)(u_2)(u_2)$ , i.e.,  $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(u_2, u_2)$ .

Dispatching an event:

- Observation: the ether only has events for active objects.
- Say  $u_2$  is ready in the ether for  $u_2$ .
- Then  $u_2$  asks  $\sigma(u_2)(dest) := u_2$  to proceed to send events to  $u_2$  in composition of corresponding RTC.
- $u_2$  may in particular discard event.

### And What About Methods?


- Firstly, establish that each object  $u$  knows, via (implicit) link  $u.k.kid$ , the active object  $u_{act}$ , which is responsible for dispatching events to  $u$ .
- If  $u$  is an instance of an active class, then  $u_{act} = u$ .



- In the current setting, the (local) state of objects is only modified by actions of transitions, which we abstract to transformers.
- In general, there are also **methods**.
- UML follows an approach to separate
  - the interface declaration from
  - the implementation.
- In C++ lingo: distinguish **declaration** and **definition** of method.




Note: The signal list is redundant as it can be looked up in the state machine of the class. But: certainly useful for documentation.



**Semantics:**

The **implementation** of a behavioural feature can be provided by:

- An **operation**.  
In our setting, we simply assume a transformer like  $T_f$ . It is then, e.g. clear how to adapt method calls as actions on transition: function composition of transformers (clear but tedious: non-termination). In a setting with Java as action language, operation is a method body.
- The class' **state machines** ("triggered operation").
- Calling  $f$  with  $x_1, x_2$  parameters for a stable instance of  $C$  creates an auxiliary event  $f'$  and dispatches it (bypassing the ether).
- Transition actions may fill in the return value.
- On completion of the RTC step, the call returns.
- For a non-stable instance, the caller blocks until stability is reached again.



**Visibility:**

Extend typing rules to sequences of actions such that a well-typed action sequence only calls visible methods.

- **Useful properties:**
  - **concurrency** — is thread safe
  - **guarded** — some mechanism ensures/should ensure mutual exclusion
  - **sequential** — is not thread safe, users have to ensure mutual exclusion
  - **isQuery** — doesn't modify the state space (thus thread safe)
- For simplicity, we leave the notion of steps untouched; we construct our semantics around state machines. Yet we could explain pre/post in OCL (if we wanted to).


Discussion

Semantic Variation Points

**Pessimistic view:** They are legion...


- For instance, allow absence of initial pseudo-states can then "be" in enclosing state without being in any substrate; or assume one of the children states non-deterministically
  - (implicitly) enforce determinism, e.g. by considering the order in which things have been added to the CASE tool's repository, or graphical order
  - allow true concurrency
- Exercise:** Search the standard for "semantical variation point".
- [Crane and Dingel, 2007], e.g., provide an in-depth comparison of Statemate, UML, and Papyrus state machines — the bottom line is: the **intersection is not empty** (i.e. there are pictures that mean the same thing to all three communities)
  - **none is the subset of another** (i.e. for each pair of communities exist pictures meaning different things)
- Optimistic view:** tools exist with complete and consistent code generation.

Course Map



Inheritance: Syntax

### Inheritance: Generalisation Relation



- **Read:**
  - $C$  generalises  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ ;  $C$  is a generalisation of  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ .
  - $D_1$  and  $D_2$  specialise  $C$ ;  $D_1$  is a (specialisation of)  $C$ ;  $D_2$  is a  $C$ ;  $D_2$  is a  $C$ .
- **Well-formedness rule:** No cycles in the generalisation relation.

### Abstract Syntax

**Recall:** a signature (with signals) is a tuple  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}, \text{attr}, \delta)$ .

**Now (finally)** extend to  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}, \text{attr}, \delta, \mathcal{F}, \text{meth})$

where  $\mathcal{F}/\text{meth}$  are methods, analogously to attributes and


$\triangleleft \subseteq (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{V}, \text{attr}, \delta, \mathcal{F}, \text{meth}) \cup (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})$

is a **generalisation relation** such that  $C \triangleleft^+ C'$  for no  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  ("acyclic")

$C \triangleleft D$  reads as

- $C$  is a generalisation of  $D$ ,
- $D$  is a specialisation of  $C$ ,
- $D$  inherits from  $C$ ,
- $D$  is a sub-class of  $C$ ,
- $C$  is a super-class of  $D$ ,
- ...

### Mapping Concrete to Abstract Syntax by Example



**Note:** we can have multiple inheritance.

### Reflexive, Transitive Closure of Generalisation

**Definition.** Given classes  $C_0, C_1, C_2, D \in \mathcal{C}$ , we say  $D$  inherits from  $C_0$  via  $C_1$  if and only if there are  $C_0^1, \dots, C_0^n, C_1^1, \dots, C_1^m \in \mathcal{C}$  such that

$$C_0 \triangleleft C_0^1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft C_0^n \triangleleft C_1^1 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft C_1^m \triangleleft D$$

We use  $\triangleleft^+$  to denote the reflexive, transitive closure of  $\triangleleft$ .


- In the following, we assume
- that all attribute (method) names are of the form  $C::a$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{C} \cup \delta$  ( $C::f$ ,  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ ),
  - that we have  $C::a \in \text{attr}(C)$  resp.  $C::f \in \text{meth}(C)$  if and only if  $a$  ( $f$ ) appears in an attribute (method) component of  $C$  in a class diagram.
- We still want to accept "context  $C$  inv :  $v \triangleleft 0$ ", which  $v$  is meant? Later!

### Inheritance: Desired Semantics

There is a classical description of what one expects from sub-types, which in the OO domain is closely related to inheritance:

The principle of type substitutability [Liskov, 1988; Liskov and Wing, 1994]. (Liskov Substitution Principle (LSP))

"If for each object  $o_1$  of type  $S$  there is an object  $o_2$  of type  $T$  such that for all programs  $P$  defined in terms of  $T$ , the behavior of  $P$  is unchanged when  $o_1$  is substituted for  $o_2$  then  $S$  is a subtype of  $T$ ."



## References

– 19 – 2012-07-01 – main –

106/8

## References

- [Buschtemple and Otereln, 2008] Buschtemple, R. and Otereln, J. (2008). Rich meta object facility. In Proc. 13<sup>th</sup> IEEE Int'l Workshop OML and Formal Methods.
- [Craun and Dingel, 2007] Craun, M. L. and Dingel, J. (2007). OML vs. classical vs.hapsody statecharts: not all models are created equal. *Software and Systems Modeling*, 6(4):413–435.
- [Fischer and Schöbhorn, 2007] Fischer, H. and Schöbhorn, H. (2007). UML 2.0 state machines. In Proc. 13<sup>th</sup> IEEE Int'l Workshop OML and Formal Methods, pages 44–53.
- [Fischer and Wehrheim, 2000] Fischer, C. and Wehrheim, H. (2000). Behavioral subtyping relations for object-oriented formalisms. In Pao, T., editor, *AAAST*, number 1818 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer-Verlag.
- [Harel and Gery, 1997] Harel, D. and Gery, E. (1997). Executable object modeling with statecharts. *IEEE Computer*, 30(7):31–42.
- [Liskov, 1988] Liskov, B. (1988). Data abstraction and hierarchy. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 23(5):17–34.
- [Liskov and Wing, 1994] Liskov, B. H. and Wing, J. M. (1994). A behavioral notion of subtyping. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)*, 16(9):1811–1841.
- [OMG, 2003] OMG (2003). Uml 2.0 proposal of the 2U group, version 0.2. <http://www.omg.org/uml2/uml20/>.
- [OMG, 2007a] OMG (2007a). Unified modeling language: Infrastructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-02.
- [OMG, 2007b] OMG (2007b). Unified modeling language: Superstructure, version 2.1.2. Technical Report formal/07-11-02.
- [Sahl and Volter, 2006] Sahl, T. and Volter, M. (2005). Modellierung des Softwareentwicklungsprozesses. dtm-softw-entw-herdler.

– 18 –