



```

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 32
size() // REQUIRES: true { this has at least 3 elements
// EFFECTS: 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));
}

```

$T \subseteq \text{ArrayList}$

~~a = 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 (ReadTimeException e) {
 Could pasteTogether launch the missiles?
 RBEISBE
} catch (badExc e) { }
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

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

- Subtype must implement all of the supertype methods
 - Argument types must not be more restrictive
 - Result type must be at least as restrictive
 - Subtype method must not throw exceptions that are not subtypes of exceptions thrown by supertype
- Positive check: Int ≤ Int*
Positive check: R_B <= P_A
Result check: void add(~~Graph~~*)*
Exception check: throws ExBad
Positive check: Int size() throws ReallyBadExc
or iff ReallyBadExc ≤ ExBad

Signature Rule

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

R_B <= R_A ? *Eiffel's rule*
P_B <= P_A ? *not substitution*
P_B ≥ P_A *Substitution*

covariant for results, **contravariant** for parameters Java

Subtype Condition 2: Methods Rule

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

$$m_A.\text{pre} \Rightarrow m_B.\text{pre}$$

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

$$m_B.\text{post} \Rightarrow m_A.\text{post}$$

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

Param Types	$P_{\text{sub}} \geq P_{\text{super}}$	<i>contravariant</i>
Preconditions	$\text{pre}_{\text{sub}} \Rightarrow \text{pre}_{\text{super}}$	for inputs
Result Type	$R_{\text{sub}} \leq R_{\text{super}}$	<i>covariant</i>
Postconditions	$\text{post}_{\text{sub}} \Rightarrow \text{post}_{\text{super}}$	for outputs
Properties	$\text{properties}_{\text{sub}} \Rightarrow \text{properties}_{\text{super}}$	

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 mt2 = mt4;
... (in client code) mt2 = (MT4) mt2;
{} MysteryType1 mt1; ((MT4) mt2).m
 MysteryType2 mt2; apparent type: MT4
 MysteryType3 mt3;
 ... (anything could be here)
 mt1 = mt2.m (mt3);

- If the Java compiler accepts this code, which of these are *guaranteed* to be true:
- ✓ a. The apparent type of mt2 is MysteryType2 *is a subtype of*
 - ✗ b. At the last statement, the actual type of mt2 is MysteryType2
 - ✓ c. MysteryType2 has a method named m *and supertype of*
 - d. The MysteryType2.m method takes a parameter of type MysteryType3
 - e. The MysteryType2.m method returns a subtype of MysteryType1
 - f. After the last statement, the actual type of mt1 is MysteryType1