Java Generics
Detour: Rules for Method Overriding (1)

1. The argument list should be exactly the same as that of the overridden method.

2. The return type should be the same or a subtype of the return type declared in the original overridden method in the superclass.

3. The access level cannot be more restrictive than that of the overridden method. For example: if the superclass method is declared public then the overriding method in the subclass cannot be either private or protected.
Detour: Rules for Method Overriding (2)

4. Constructors cannot be overridden.
5. A method declared final cannot be overridden.
6. A method declared static cannot be overridden but can be re-declared.
7. If a method cannot be inherited, then it cannot be overridden.
Detour: Rules for Method Overriding (3)

8. A subclass within the same package as the instance's superclass can override any superclass method that is not declared private or final.

9. A subclass in a different package can only override the non-final methods declared public or protected.

10. An overriding method can throw any unchecked exceptions, regardless of whether the overridden method throws exceptions or not. However the overriding method should not throw checked exceptions that are new or broader than the ones declared by the overridden method. The overriding method can throw narrower or fewer exceptions than the overridden method.
Java Generics: History

- **Pizza**: 1996-97, extended Java with generics, function pointers, class cases and pattern matching.
- **GJ**: 1998 derivative of Pizza; Generics the only extension.
- **Java 1.5**: 2004. Modeled after GJ.
- **PolyJ**: 1997, would have required changes to JVM.
- **NextGen**: 1998, avoids oddities of type erasure, still compatible with JVM and existing binaries. Extension of GJ.
Java Generics: Motivation

Typesafe polymorphic containers

Without generics:

```java
List l = new LinkedList();
l.add(new Integer(0));
Integer x = l.iterator().next(); // need type cast
String s = (String) l.iterator().next(); // compile−time error
```

what happens without type cast?
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```java
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Typesafe polymorphic containers

Without generics:

```java
List l = new LinkedList();
l.add(new Integer(0));
Integer x = (Integer) l.iterator().next(); // need type cast
String s = (String) l.iterator().next(); // bad cast exception
```

With generics:

```java
List<Integer> l = new LinkedList<Integer>();
l.add(new Integer(0));
Integer x = l.iterator().next(); // no need for type cast
String x = l.iterator().next(); // compile-time error
```
Parameterized Classes

```java
public class Pair<T, U> { // T, : type variables, also formal type parameters
    private T a; private U b;
    public Pair(T t, U u) { a = t; b = u; }
    public T getFirst() { return a; }
    public U getSecond() { return b; }
}
Pair<Integer, String> p = new Pair<Integer, String>(0, "");
// Pair<Integer, String> is an invocation/instance of the generic type
// declaration with actual type arguments.
```

Compare to Haskell:

```haskell
data Pair a b = Pair a b
getFirst :: Pair a b -> a
getFirst (Pair x y) = x
getSecond :: Pair a b -> b
getSecond (Pair x y) = y
```
public class Pair<T, U> {
    private T a; private U b;
    public Pair(T t, U u) { a = t; b = u; }
    public T getFirst() { return a; }
    public U getSecond() { return b; }
}
Pair<Integer, String> p = new Pair<Integer, String>(0, "");

public class Pair<Object, Object> {
    private Object a; private Object b;
    public Pair(Object t, Object u) { a = t; b = u; }
    public Object getFirst() { return a; }
    public Object getSecond() { return b; }
}
Parametrized Methods

Example

```java
public class ArrayUtil {
    ...
    public static <E> void print(E[] a) {
        // generic method
        for (E e : a) System.out.print(e.toString() + " ");
        System.out.println();
    }
}
```

```java
Rectangle[] rects = ...; String[] strs = ...;
ArrayUtil.print(rects);
ArrayUtil.print(strs);
```

Explicit instantiation allowed as well:

```java
ArrayUtil.<Rectangle>print(rects);
ArrayUtil.<String>print(strs);
```
Parametric Polymorphism

Why does this work?

```java
public static <E> void print(E[] a) {
    for (E e : a) System.out.print(e.toString() + " ");
    System.out.println();
}
```

In Haskell, this did not work:

```haskell
print :: [a] -> IO ()
print ls = mapM_ (putStr . show) ls
```

But this did:

```haskell
print :: Show a => [a] -> IO ()
print ls = mapM_ (putStr . show) ls
```
Parametric Polymorphism (Cont.)

- Java, too, needs constraints to type parameters
- Without constraints, only operations that are supported for all types can be applied to values whose types are type parameters.
- If no constraints, the constraint `extends Object` is assumed:
  ```java
  public static <E extends Object> void print(E[] a) {
    for (E e : a) System.out.print(e.toString() + " ");
    System.out.println();
  }
  
  “E extends Object” justifies toString
  ```
Example of Constraints

Erroneous:

```java
public static <E>
void print(List<E> a, E threshold) {
    for (E e : a)
        if (e.compareTo(threshold) < 0) // type error !!
            System.out.print(e.toString() + " ");
    System.out.println();
}
```
Example of Constraints

OK:

```java
public static <E extends Comparable>
void print(List<E> a, E threshold) {
    for (E e : a)
        if (e.compareTo(threshold) < 0) // type error !
            System.out.print(e.toString() + " ");
    System.out.println();
}
```

`Comparable` interface itself is really parametrized, as we’ll soon discuss...
Type Parameter with Multiple Bounds

Multiple bindings for a single type parameter is allowed:

```java
class SortedList<T extends Comparable & Serializable> { . . . }
```

In `<T extends T1 & T2 & . . . & Tn>`,

- **extends** is used in a general sense to mean either “extends” (as in classes) or “implements” (as in interfaces)
- If one of the bounds is a class, it must be specified first

Compare with multiple class constraints in Haskell:

```haskell
smallToString :: (Show a, Ord a) => a -> [a] -> [String]
smallToString x xs = map show (filter (< x) xs)
```

*Main> smallToString 5 [1,2,3,4,5,6]
["1","2","3","4"]
Unnamed Type Parameters - Wildcards

```java
static void printAll (List<?> l) {
    for (Object o : l) System.out.println(o);
}
```

Wildcards are both a convenience feature (more concise syntax), and to add support for co/contravariance for type parameters (still to be discussed).
Plain Bounded Quantification

Example (in C++ like syntax)

```java
class Point { public int x; public int y; }
class ColorPoint extends Point { public int color; }
```

This establishes:

```
ColorPoint <: Point
```

class Point { public int x; public int y; }
class ColorPoint extends Point { public int color; }

Point move(Point a, int dx, int dy) {
    a.x += dx; a.y += dy; return a;
}

...  
Point p = new Point();
p.x = 0; p.y = 0;
p = move(p, 1, 2);

ColorPoint cp = new ColorPoint();
cp.x = 0; cp.y = 0; cp.color = 0;
cp = move(cp, 1, 2);
Subtyping Example

class Point { public int x; public int y; }
class ColorPoint extends Point { public int color; }
Point move(Point a, int dx, int dy) {
    a.x += dx; a.y += dy; return a; }
...
Point p = new Point();
p.x = 0; p.y = 0;
p = move(p, 1, 2);

ColorPoint cp = new ColorPoint();
cp.x = 0; cp.y = 0; cp.color = 0;
cp = move(cp, 1, 2);  // Type error!
p = move(cp, 1, 2);  // OK!

With just subtyping, the exact type of cp is lost when passed to and returned from move()
Bounded Quantification

- Subtype polymorphism in itself is not sufficient. A possible fix to this loss of type accuracy is to use parametric polymorphism (instead of subtype polymorphism):

  `<T> T move(T a, int dx, int dy)
  { a.x += dx; a.y += dy; return a; }`
Bounded Quantification

- Subtype polymorphism in itself is not sufficient. A possible fix to this loss of type accuracy is to use parametric polymorphism (instead of subtype polymorphism):
  
  ```java
  <T> T move(T a, int dx, int dy)
  { a.x += dx; a.y += dy; return a; }
  ```

- Access to members \( x \) and \( y \), and operations on them must be justified by some constraints
  
  ```java
  <T extends Point> T move(T a, int dx, int dy)
  { a.x += dx; a.y += dy; return a; }
  ```

- Simple constraint: \( T \) itself does not occur in the constraint (in the literature, this is sometimes referred to as *bounded quantification* [Cardelli, Wegner 85])

- Constraint is **fixed for all instantiations**, which turns out to be too limited
Problems with Bounded Quantification

```
interface Movable { Movable move(int x, int y); }
```

- Define function `translate` that takes any `Movable` object, and returns another one of the same type, moved one unit along both axes. `translate` should have (roughly) the type:
  \[
  \forall T <: Movable.T \rightarrow T
  \]

- First attempt (does not work):
  ```
  <T extends Movable> T translate(T m) { return m.move(1, 1); }
  ```
Problems with Bounded Quantification

interface Movable { Movable move(int x, int y); }

- Define function translate that takes any Movable object, and returns another one of the same type, moved one unit along both axes. translate should have (roughly) the type:

\[ \forall T <: \text{Movable.T} \rightarrow T \]

- First attempt (does not work):

\[ <T \text{extends Movable}> T \text{translate}(T m) \{ \text{return m.move(1, 1); } \} \]

  // type error! move is (essentially) of type (Movable, int, int) -> Movable
Problems with Bounded Quantification

interface Movable { Movable move(int x, int y); }

- Define function translate that takes any Movable object, and returns another one of the same type, moved one unit along both axes. translate should have (roughly) the type:

  ∀T <: Movable.T -> T

- First attempt (does not work):

  <T extends Movable> T translate(T m) { return m.move(1, 1); }

  // type error! move is (essentially) of type (Movable, int, int) -> Movable

- So, we again hit the problem of subtyping losing information!
Binary Method Problem

Assume the following interface:

```java
interface EqComparable {
    bool eq(EqComparable o);
}
```

Task: Define a function `noteq` to compute the negation of `eq`

This is what bounded quantification enables:

```java
<T extends EqComparable> bool noteq(T t, T u) { return !t.eq(u); }
```

Now define a class `MyInt` which is `EqComparable`

```java
class MyInt implements EqComparable {
    bool eq(MyInt o) { ... }
}
```
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Binary Method Problem

Assume the following interface:

```java
interface EqComparable { bool eq(EqComparable o); }
```

Task: Define a function `noteq` to compute the negation of `eq`

This is what bounded quantification enables:

```java
<T extends EqComparable> bool noteq(T t, T u) { return !t.eq(u); }
```

Now define a class `MyInt` which is `EqComparable`

```java
class MyInt implements EqComparable {
    bool eq(MyInt o) { ... } // not a valid override
    bool eq(EqComparable o) { ... } // meaningless comparison
}
```
F-Bounded Quantification

F-bounded quantification allows the type parameter being constrained to appear in its own bound: `<T extends A<T>>`

The unsuccessful translate example:

```
<T extends Movable> T translate(T m) { return m.move(1, 1); }
```

may now be written as:

```
interface Movable<T> { T move(int x, int y); }
<T extends Movable<T>> T translate<T>(T m) { return m.move(1, 1); }
```
Assume the following interface:

```java
interface EqComparable { 
    bool eq(EqComparable o); }
<T extends EqComparable> bool noteq(T t, T u) { return !t.eq(u); }
```

Define class `MyInt` which is `EqComparable`

```java
class MyInt implements EqComparable {
    bool eq(MyInt o) { ... } // not a valid override
    bool eq(EqComparable o) { ... } // meaningless comparison
}
```

Now, using F-bounds:

```java
interface EqComparable<T> { 
    bool eq(T); }
<T extends EqComparable<T>> bool noteq<T>(T t, T u) 
{ return !t.eq(u); }

class MyInt implements EqComparable<MyInt> {
    bool eq(MyInt) { ... }
}
```
Another Example: generic sort

```java
<T extends EqComparable<T>> void sort(T[] v)
{
    for(int i = 0; i < v.length; i++)
        for(int j = 0; j < i; j++)
            if (v[j].compareTo(v[i]) < 0) swap(v, i, j);
}
Summary

• Minor generalizations of F-bounded polymorphism are the backbone of Java, C#, and Eiffel generics.

• The essential feature in F-bounds is that bounds are generic too — they change along the argument that is being tested for.

• Subtyping is one way of expressing constraints, there are others (Haskell type classes, C++ concepts, ML signatures).