



```
int ArrayList<T>.size()
// REQUIRES: true { this has at least 3 elements
// MODIFIES: nothing
// EFFECTS: returns the # of elements in this.

static public boolean moreElements(ArrayList<String> a, ArrayList<String> b)
// REQUIRES: a and b are not null & have at least 3 elements!
// MODIFIES: nothing
// EFFECTS: Returns true iff a has more elements than b.
{
    return a.size() > b.size();
}
```

ArrayList<String> a = null;  
 null.size() a.size() Is this correct?  
 all subtypes: must have size method  
 size: // REQUIRES: true { this has at least 3 elements  
 // MODIFIES: nothing  
 // EFFECTS: returns the # of elements in this

```
static public boolean moreElements(ArrayList<String> a, ArrayList<String> b)
// REQUIRES: a and b are not null
// MODIFIES: nothing
// EFFECTS: Returns true iff a has more elements than b.
{
    return a.size() > b.size();
}
```

```
public static void main(String[] args) {
// TODO Auto-generated method stub
    ArrayList<String> a;
    ArrayList<String> b;
    ...
    a.add("Hello");
    b.add("Ciao");
    b.add("Goodbye");
    System.out.println("More elements: " + moreElements(a, b));
}
```

T ⊆ ArrayList  
 a = new ArrayList<String>();  
~~b = new ArrayList<String>();~~  
 b = new ArrayList<String>();

## Dangers of Subtyping

```
public class SillyList<E> extends ArrayList<E> {
    @Override
    public int size()
    // REQUIRES: The alert level has reached DEFCON 5, all the missiles have
    // been targeted, and the President has issued a verified launch
    // command.
    // MODIFIES: Everything
    // EFFECTS: Launches the missiles. Returns the expected number of
    // elements in the object after all the computer's memory has been
    // destroyed by radiation.
    {
        launchMissiles();
        return 0;
    }
}
```

```
public static void main(String[] args) {
    ArrayList<String> a = new SillyList<String>();
    ArrayList<String> b = new SillyList<String>();
    a.add("Hello");
    b.add("Ciao");
    b.add("Goodbye");
    System.out.println("More elements: " + moreElements(a, b));
}
```



Reasoning about programs that can use unfettered subtyping is hopeless!

## How can we solve this?

```
static public String pasteTogether(String a, String b)
// REQUIRES: a and b are not null
// EFFECTS: Returns a String that is a followed by b.
{
    return a.concat(b);
}
```

try {  
 a.size();  
} catch (BadExc e) { }  
 Could pasteTogether launch the missiles?  
 public final class String extends Object implements Serializable, Comparable<String>, CharSequence { ... }

# Reasoning with Subtyping

**Easy approach #1:** don't allow subtyping!  
Make all classes **final** (like java.lang.String)

**Easy approach #2:** give up on reasoning  
Reason based on the apparent type specification and don't make any claims about what happens with subtypes.

**Hard approach:** impose constraints on subtypes to allow reasoning

## Substitution principle

# How do we know if saying B is a subtype of A is safe?

**Substitution Principle:** If B is a subtype of A, everywhere the code expects an A, a B can be used instead *and the program still satisfies its specification*

## Subtype Condition 1: Signature Rule

*int size(...)*  
*Intish size()*

We can use a subtype method where a supertype method is expected:

- Subtype must implement all of the supertype methods
- Argument types must not be more restrictive *Positive Int ⊆ Intish*
- Result type must be at least as restrictive *Positive ⊆ Intish size()*
- Subtype method must not throw exceptions that are not subtypes of exceptions thrown by supertype *void add (Graph e)*

*void add (Graph e)*  
*Positive ⊆ Intish size()*  
*Positive ⊆ Intish size() throws ReallyBadExc*  
*iff ReallyBadExc ⊆ ExcBad*

## Signature Rule

```
class A {
    public R_A m (P_A p);
}
class B extends A {
    public R_B m (P_B p);
}
```

$R_B \subseteq R_A$   
 $P_B \supseteq P_A$   
 $R_B$  must be a **subtype** of  $R_A$ :  $R_B \subseteq R_A$   
 $P_B$  must be a **supertype** of  $P_A$ :  $P_B \supseteq P_A$   
*Ersk's rule*  
*Not substitution*  
*Substitution*  
*covariant for results, contravariant for parameters*

## Subtype Condition 2: Methods Rule

**Precondition** of the subtype method must be *weaker* than the precondition of the supertype method.

$$m_A.pre \Rightarrow m_B.pre$$

**Postcondition** of the subtype method must be *stronger* than the postcondition of the supertype method.

$$m_B.post \Rightarrow m_A.post$$

## Subtype Condition 3: Properties



Subtypes must preserve all properties described in the **overview specification** of the supertype.

## Properties Example

```
public class StringSet
// Overview: An immutable set of Strings.
```

```
public class MutStringSet extends StringSet
// Overview: A mutable set of Strings.
```

**MutStringSet** cannot be a subtype of **StringSet**, since it does not satisfy property that once a **StringSet** object is created its value never changes.

Would it be okay for a subtype of a mutable type to be immutable?

## Properties Example

```
public class MutStringSet
// Overview: A mutable set of Strings.
```

```
public class ImmutableStringSet extends MutStringSet
// Overview: An immutable set of Strings.
```

**ImmutableStringSet** could be a subtype of **MutStringSet** according to the properties rule.

...but would be very difficult to satisfy the methods rule!

## Substitution Principle Summary

- **Signatures:** subtype methods must be type correct in supertype callsites: result is a subtype (covariant), parameters are supertypes (contravariant)
- **Methods:** subtype preconditions must be weaker than supertype preconditions (covariant); subtype postconditions must be stronger than supertype postconditions (contravariant)
- **Properties:** subtype must preserve all properties specified in supertype overview

## Substitution Principle Summary

<b>Param Types</b>	$P_{sub} \geq P_{super}$	<i>contravariant</i>
<b>Preconditions</b>	$pre_{sub} \Rightarrow pre_{super}$	for inputs
<b>Result Type</b>	$R_{sub} \leq R_{super}$	<i>covariant</i>
<b>Postconditions</b>	$post_{sub} \Rightarrow post_{super}$	for outputs
<b>Properties</b>	$properties_{sub} \Rightarrow properties_{super}$	

These properties ensure code that is correct using an object of supertype is correct using an object of subtype.

*MT2 mt2 = new MT4(); Set<String> s = new TreeSet<String>();*

### Substitution Mystery

... (in client code)

```
MysteryType1 mt1;
MysteryType2 mt2;
MysteryType3 mt3;
... (anything could be here)
mt1 = mt2.m (mt3);
```

*mt2 = mt4;*  
*mt2 = (MT4) mt2;*  
*((MT4) mt2).m*  
*apparent type: MT4*

If the Java compiler accepts this code, which of these are *guaranteed* to be true:

- The apparent type of mt2 is MysteryType2 *is a subtype of*
- At the last statement, the actual type of mt2 is MysteryType2 *is a subtype of*
- MysteryType2 has a method named m *is a supertype of*
- The MysteryType2.m method takes a parameter of type MysteryType3 *is a supertype of*
- The MysteryType2.m method returns a subtype of MysteryType1
- After the last statement, the actual type of mt1 is MysteryType1