

AOP and the Antinomy of the Liar

F. Forster F. Steimann

Programming Systems
Department of Computer Science
University of Hagen

FOAL 2006

- 1 Famous Antinomies
- 2 Great Escapes
- 3 A Standard AOP Application
 - Tracing Problem
 - Workaround
 - Solution
- 4 Conclusion and Outlook

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 false("Theorem Two" is true)

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

❶ $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 false("Theorem Two" is true) \Rightarrow "Theorem Two" is false
- 2 false("Theorem One" is false)

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true})$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is true}$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is true}$
- 4 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem One" is false})$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is true}$
- 4 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is false}$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is true}$
- 4 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is false}$
- 5 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true})$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$
- 2 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is true}$
- 3 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is true}$
- 4 $\text{true}(\text{"Theorem One" is false}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem One" is false}$
- 5 $\text{false}(\text{"Theorem Two" is true}) \Rightarrow \text{"Theorem Two" is false}$

Famous Antinomies - 1

Theorem One

"Theorem Two" is true

Theorem Two

"Theorem One" is false

Interpretation

- 1 false("Theorem Two" is true) \Rightarrow "Theorem Two" is false
- 2 false("Theorem One" is false) \Rightarrow "Theorem One" is true
- 3 true("Theorem Two" is true) \Rightarrow "Theorem Two" is true
- 4 true("Theorem One" is false) \Rightarrow "Theorem One" is false
- 5 false("Theorem Two" is true) \Rightarrow "Theorem Two" is false
- 6 repeat indefinitely.

Famous Antinomies - 2

Aspect One

```
public aspect S1 {  
    void around(): adviceexecution() && within(S2) {  
        proceed();  
    }  
}
```

Aspect Two

```
public aspect S2 {  
    void around(): adviceexecution() && within(S1) {  
    }  
}
```


Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

$$M = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$$

Famous Antinomies - 3

Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

$$M = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$$

Assuming $M \in M$

$M \in M$ contradicts the characteristic function of M

Famous Antinomies - 3

Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

$$M = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$$

Assuming $M \in M$

$M \in M$ contradicts the characteristic function of $M \Rightarrow M \notin M$

Famous Antinomies - 3

Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

$$M = \{X | X \notin X\}$$

Assuming $M \in M$

$M \in M$ contradicts the characteristic function of $M \Rightarrow M \notin M$

Assuming $M \notin M$

$M \notin M$ fulfils the characteristic function of M

Famous Antinomies - 3

Russell's Example

The Class of all those classes which are not members of themselves.

$$M = \{X \mid X \notin X\}$$

Assuming $M \in M$

$M \in M$ contradicts the characteristic function of $M \Rightarrow M \notin M$

Assuming $M \notin M$

$M \notin M$ fulfils the characteristic function of $M \Rightarrow M \in M$

Great Escapes - Russell

Russell's Solution

Whatever involves **all** of a collection **must not be** one of the collection.

Great Escapes - Russell

Russell's Solution

Whatever involves **all** of a collection **must not be** one of the collection.

Theory of Types

Whatever contains a variable must not be a possible value of that variable.

Great Escapes - Russell

Russell's Solution

Whatever involves **all** of a collection **must not be** one of the collection.

Theory of Types

Whatever contains a variable must not be a possible value of that variable.

Theory of Types for AspectJ

$\text{someadvice}_1(\{jp_1, jp_2, \dots\}) \Rightarrow \text{joinpoints in someadvice}_1 \notin \{jp_1, jp_2, \dots\}$

Tracing - 1

Task

Trace all Methodexecution and Adviceexecution.

Tracing - 1

Task

Trace all Methodexecution and Adviceexecution.

First Go

```
public aspect Tracing {
    void around(): adviceexecution()||execution (* *(..)){
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Tracing - 1

Task

Trace all Methodexecution and Adviceexecution.

First Go

```
public aspect Tracing {
    void around(): adviceexecution()||execution (* *(..)){
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

around advice is an *adviceexecution()* *joinpoint*!

Tracing - 1

Task

Trace all Methodexecution and Adviceexecution.

First Go

```
public aspect Tracing {
    void around(): adviceexecution()||execution (* *(..)){
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

around advice is an *adviceexecution()* *joinpoint*! ⚡Theory of Types

Workaround

```
public aspect Tracing {
    pointcut guard(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && within(Tracing);
    void around(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && !cflow(guard()) {
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Tracing - 2

Workaround

```
public aspect Tracing {
    pointcut guard(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && within(Tracing);
    void around(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && !cflow(guard()) {
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

Very verbose,

Tracing - 2

Workaround

```
public aspect Tracing {
    pointcut guard(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && within(Tracing);
    void around(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && !cflow(guard()) {
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

Very verbose, error-prone,

Tracing - 2

Workaround

```
public aspect Tracing {
    pointcut guard(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && within(Tracing);
    void around(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && !cflow(guard()) {
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

Very verbose, error-prone, redundancy,

Workaround

```
public aspect Tracing {
    pointcut guard(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && within(Tracing);
    void around(): (adviceexecution()
        || execution (* *(..))) && !cflow(guard()) {
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);
        proceed();
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);
    }
}
```

Problem

Very verbose, error-prone, redundancy, runtime check.

Tracing - 3

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

Tracing - 3

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

- An aspect is of higher type level than base code.

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

- An aspect is of higher type level than base code.
- An aspect advising another aspect is of higher level than the advised aspect.

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

- An aspect is of higher type level than base code.
- An aspect advising another aspect is of higher level than the advised aspect.
- Pointcuts in an aspect only select joinpoints in the scope of aspects/classes of lower level.

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

- An aspect is of higher type level than base code.
- An aspect advising another aspect is of higher level than the advised aspect.
- Pointcuts in an aspect only select joinpoints in the scope of aspects/classes of lower level.
- Syntactical constructs to distinguish levels.

Tracing - 3

Using Russell's Theory of Types for AOP means:

- An aspect is of higher type level than base code.
- An aspect advising another aspect is of higher level than the advised aspect.
- Pointcuts in an aspect only select joinpoints in the scope of aspects/classes of lower level.
- Syntactical constructs to distinguish levels.

Solution Preview

```
public meta aspect Tracing {  
    void around(): adviceexecution() || execution (* *(..)) {  
        System.out.println("Entering:" + thisJoinPoint);  
        proceed();  
        System.out.println("Leaving: " + thisJoinPoint);  
    }  
}
```


New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2		
Level 1		
Level 0	class...	

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2		
Level 1		
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2		
Level 1	aspect...	
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2		
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2	meta aspect...	
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(),
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword `meta`

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2	<code>meta aspect...</code>	<code>adviceexecution()</code> , <code>meta < pc ></code>
Level 1	<code>aspect...</code>	<code>< pc > except adviceexecution()</code>
Level 0	<code>class...</code>	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword `meta`

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3		
Level 2	<code>meta aspect...</code>	<code>adviceexecution()</code> , <code>meta < pc > and < pc ></code>
Level 1	<code>aspect...</code>	<code>< pc > except adviceexecution()</code>
Level 0	<code>class...</code>	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(),
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(), adviceexecution(),
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(), adviceexecution(), meta ² < pc > ,
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(), adviceexecution(), meta ² < pc >, meta < pc >
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(), adviceexecution(), meta ² < pc >, meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

New Syntax and Semantics

The keyword meta

Type Level	Type Definition	Allowed Pointcuts
...
Level 3	meta ² aspect...	meta adviceexecution(), adviceexecution(), meta ² < pc >, meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 2	meta aspect...	adviceexecution(), meta < pc > and < pc >
Level 1	aspect...	< pc > except adviceexecution()
Level 0	class...	no pointcuts

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement:

Solution:

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement: Checking the LoD checker

Solution:

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement: Checking the LoD checker

Solution: meta aspect LoD
advises aspect LoD

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement: Checking the LoD checker

Solution: meta aspect LoD
advises aspect LoD

Testing Aspects [Sokenou, Hermann, 2005]

Requirement:

Solution:

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement: Checking the LoD checker

Solution: meta aspect LoD
advises aspect LoD

Testing Aspects [Sokenou, Hermann, 2005]

Requirement: "We need join points for advices to instrument aspects as well"

Solution:

Law of Demeter for Aspects [Liebherr, Lorenz, Wu, 2004]

Requirement: Checking the LoD checker

Solution: meta aspect LoD
advises aspect LoD

Testing Aspects [Sokenou, Hermann, 2005]

Requirement: "We need join points for advices to instrument aspects as well"

Solution: meta aspect AspectTester
instruments aspect ObjectAdvisor

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.
- (Slightly) more expressive pointcut language.

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.
- (Slightly) more expressive pointcut language.

Further Work

- Implementation of the type system (with abc group).

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.
- (Slightly) more expressive pointcut language.

Further Work

- Implementation of the type system (with abc group).
- Systematic migration of current AOP applications.

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.
- (Slightly) more expressive pointcut language.

Further Work

- Implementation of the type system (with abc group).
- Systematic migration of current AOP applications.
- Collect empirical data on how many levels and/or whether intermediate levels are needed.

Conclusion and Outlook

Results

- Restoration of intuitive semantics (no more paradoxes!)
- Clear separation of aspects.
- Type system prevents programming errors.
- (Slightly) more expressive pointcut language.

Further Work

- Implementation of the type system (with abc group).
- Systematic migration of current AOP applications.
- Collect empirical data on how many levels and/or whether intermediate levels are needed.
- Generalization of the type system.