

Why are statically-typed OOL's so inflexible?

Java programs require lots of type casts (as do C++, Object Pascal, etc.).
Why?

The Object class in Java illustrates most of the problems.

```
public class Object{
    protected Object clone(){...}
    public boolean equal(Object other){...}
}
```

Recall not allowed to change signature of methods in extensions.

Also all classes automatically inherit from Object.

```
public class A implements Cloneable{
    protected B b = ...;
    ...
    public Object clone(){
        A other = super.clone();
        other.b = b.clone();           // type error
        return other;
    }
}
```

```
A a1 = new A();
A a2 = a1.clone();                   // type error
```

Both errors would disappear if could change
return types of methods. (OK in C++)

Suppose also want to override equals in A:

```
public boolean equal(Object other){
    if (other instanceof A){
```

```
    A aother = (A)other;
    return (b = aother.b);
else
    ???
```

Problems:

- Inconvenient (and slow) to have run-time test
No static check possible.
- What to do in else clause?
If raise exception must declare in method header.

Get similar problems if try to define doubly-linked node as subclass of linked node.

```
public void setNext(Node newNext){...}
```

Want parameter type to be doubly-linked in subclass.

Methods where parameters should be of same type (class) as receiver called "binary methods".

Source of many typing problems in OOL's.

Still other problems:

```
public class Circle{
    protected Point center;
    ...
}
```

If define ColorCircle as extension, might want center to be ColorPoint.

Can't make any of these changes in signature (types) in Java, Object Pascal, and C++
(aside from return type in C++)

Why are there these restrictions?

Is there any way to overcome them?

Look at the following example:

```
class A{
  D m(C c){...}
  void n(){... self.m(someC) ...}
}
```

```
class B{
  D' m(C' c'){...}
}
```

For which C', D' will B end up being type safe if A is?

Homework asks similar question for instance variables.

GJ: Adding F-bounded polymorphism to Java

Odersky, Wadler, et al (follow up to Pizza)

GJ adds parametric polymorphism w/ syntax like C++'s templates:

```
public class Stack<Elt> extends Vector<Elt>{
  public Elt push(Elt item){...}
  public Elt pop(){...}
  public Elt peek(){...}
  public boolean empty(){...}
  public int search(Elt o){...}
}
```

```
Stack<Point> myStack = new Stack<Point>();
Point aPoint = new Point(2,3);
myStack.push(aPoint);
```

Can also add constraints to type parameters:

```

public interface Comparing {
    public boolean equal(Comparing other);
    public boolean greaterThan(Comparing other);
    public boolean lessThan(Comparing other);
}

public class OrderedList<Elt implements Comparing>
    extends ... {
    protected Elt[] elts = new Elt[0];

    public void insert(Elt item){...
        while (elts[current].greaterThan(item))
            current ++;
        ...
    }
}

    public Elt removeFirst(){...}
    public boolean empty(){...}
    public int searchFor(Elt o){...}
}

```

How to define ordered objects?

```

public class KeyedObj implements Comparing{
    protected int key ;
    ...;
    public int getKey(){...}
    public lessThan(Comparing other){
        return this.key < other.getKey();}
}

```

Won't work: other.getKey() not well-typed!

```

    public lessThan(Comparing other){

```

```

    if (other instanceof Comparing)
        return this.key < other.getKey();
    else
        ?????

```

Same problem as earlier!

F-bounded polymorphism (1989) can help:

```

public interface Comparing <Elt>{
    boolean lessThan(Elt other);
    boolean greaterThan(Elt other);
}

public class OrderedList
    < Elt implements Comparing<Elt> >{
    protected Elt [] elts;
    public void insert(Elt newVal){
        while (elts[current].greaterThan(newVal))
            current ++;
        ...
    }
}

public class KeyedObj
    implements Comparing <KeyedObj>{
    protected int key ;
    ...;
    public int getKey(){...}
    public lessThan(KeyedObj other){
        return this.key < other.getKey();
    }
}

```

Now OrderedList<KeyedObj> is fine!

Generally works well (though confusing at first).

Still one problem -- F-bounded not preserved under subclass:

```

public class NuKeyedObj extends KeyedObj {
    protected String nuField;
    ...;
    public lessThan(KeyedObj other){
        return this.key < other.getKey() &&
            other.getNuField() ...; }
}

```

Unfortunately, NuKeyedObj does not implement
Comparing <NuKeyedObj>.

Can't be used with OrderedList!

Other info on GJ:

- Works with existing JVM -- essentially translates to original code w/Object and casts.
- Authors designed so that existing library classes can be used as though they were polymorphic.
- Because of translation, cannot get accurate info using Java's reflection facilities or debugger.
- See GJ web page available through hmwk page.

Eiffel

Designed by Bertrand Meyer in mid-80's

Class-based OOL w/multiple inheritance

Assertions: pre- and post-conditions, loop invariants and variants built into language.

Supports bounded polymorphism.

Reference semantics like Java, garbage collection, etc.

Information hiding: private, public, or could list classes visible to (like C++'s friends)

No interfaces or modules.

In subclasses, can redefine or even rename methods.

Can also change type of instance variables, parameters and return types covariantly.

Seen this can cause type-safety problems!

Introduced "anchor" types:

Can declare type to be "like" another feature:

```
x: A;  
y: like x;
```

Current is Eiffel's name for self.

Example:

```
class LINKABLE [G]  
  
feature  
  
    item: G;                -- value held  
    right: like Current;    -- Right neighbor  
  
    putRight (other: like Current) is  
        -- Put `other' to right of current cell.  
        do  
            right := other  
        ensure  
            chained: right = other  
        end;  
  
end -- class LINKABLE
```

```

class BILINKABLE [G] inherit

    LINKABLE [G]
        redefine
            putRight
        end

feature -- Access

    left: like Current;    -- Left neighbor

    putRight (other: like Current) is
        -- Put `other' to right of current cell.
    do
        right := other;
        if (other /= Void) then
            other.simplePutLeft (Current)
        end
    end;

    putLeft (other: like Current) is
        -- Put `other' to left of current cell.
    do
        left := other;
        if (other /= Void) then
            other.simplePutRight (Current)
        end
    end
    ensure
        chained: left = other
    end;

feature {BILINKABLE}

    simplePutRight (other: like Current) is
        -- set `right' to `other'

```

```

do
  right := other
end;

simplePutLeft (other: like Current) is
  -- set `left' to `other'
do
  left := other
end;

invariant

rightSymmetry:
  (right /= Void) implies (right.left = Current);
leftSymmetry:
  (left /= Void) implies (left.right = Current)

end -- class BILINKABLE

```

Notice BILINKABLE is subclass of LINKABLE.

Can't do this with Java, C++, etc.

Secret is use of "like Current" as type of instance variables and in types of methods.

Can define:

```
class LINKEDLIST[NODE -> LINKABLE] ...
```

Can be instantiated with either

- LINKABLE (and get singly-linked list) or
- BILINKABLE (and get doubly-linked list).

Very expressive w/out F-bounded polymorphism:

deferred class Comparing

feature

```
lessThan(other: like Current): boolean
                                                    is deferred
```

end

```
    greaterThan(other: like Current): boolean;  
end
```

Unfortunately, use of like Current gives rise to implicit covariant change to types of instance variables and method parameter and return types.

Thus BILINKABLE is not a subtype of LINKABLE.
Though BILINKABLE is internally consistent.