



Aspects of object orientation

Jan Niklas Rösch

Institute for Software Engineering and Programming Languages

01. February 2016



Table of contents

Introduction

Variance

Instantiation, Subtyping and Subclassing

Type systems

Conclusion

Introduction

- ▶ Many different aspects that make up a language
- ▶ Defining relationship between objects
 - ▶ Fundamental facet of OOP
- ▶ These aspects contribute to an overall behaviour of the language

Variance - Overview

- ▶ Describes behaviour of complex structures
 - ▶ Lists
 - ▶ Arrays
 - ▶ Functions
 - ▶ ...
- ▶ Covariance and Contravariance
- ▶ Invariance and Bivariance

Variance - Definitions

Complex Structure

$I\langle A \rangle$

Subtyping

$A \leq B$, $I\langle A \rangle \leq I\langle B \rangle$

Variance - Covariance

Covariance

$$A \leq B \rightarrow I\langle A \rangle \leq I\langle B \rangle$$

- ▶ Ordering of types is preserved
- ▶ Most common approach

Covariant Array

```
String [] str = new String [1];  
Object [] obj = str;
```

Variance - Broken Array Covariance

Runtime Error

```
String [] str = new String [1];  
Object [] obj = str ;  
  
obj [0] = 2 ;
```

- ▶ safe to read but not safe to write
- ▶ not caught at compile time

Variance - Contravariance

Contravariance

$$A \leq B \rightarrow I\langle B \rangle \leq I\langle A \rangle$$

- ▶ Ordering of types is reversed
- ▶ Unintuitive but comes with some benefits

Variance - Contravariance

Contravariant comparator

```
void CompareCats(IComparer<Cat> comparer){  
    var cat1 = new Cat("Mittens");  
    var cat2 = new Cat("Oliver");  
    if (comparer.Compare(cat1, cat2) > 0)  
        Console.WriteLine("Mittens wins!");  
}
```

```
IComparer<Animal> compAnimals =  
    new AnimalComparator();  
CompareCats(compAnimals);
```

- ▶ Using a base class instead of a more derived one

Variance - Invariance

Invariance

$$A \leq B \rightarrow I\langle A \rangle \not\leq I\langle B \rangle \wedge I\langle B \rangle \not\leq I\langle A \rangle$$

- ▶ Prohibits variant behaviour of complex structures
- ▶ Regardless of underlying type hierarchy
- ▶ Used to prevent type errors

Variance - Invariance

Invariant list

```
void MammalReadWrite(IList <Mammal> mammals){  
    Mammal mammal = mammals[0];  
    mammals[0] = new Tiger();  
}
```

- ▶ Covariance: List of giraffes
 - ▶ Put a tiger in it
- ▶ Contravariance: List of animals
 - ▶ Animals do not need to be mammals

Variance - Bivariate

Bivariate

$$I\langle A \rangle \leq I\langle B \rangle \quad , \quad I\langle B \rangle \leq I\langle A \rangle$$

- ▶ Either impossible or not allowed
- ▶ Only listed for the sake of completeness

Instantiation, Subtyping and Subclassing

- ▶ Instantiation
 - ▶ Creation of a new object
- ▶ Subtyping
 - ▶ Describes relationship of objects
 - ▶ Objects share a common interface
 - ▶ 'Is-a' relationship → Liskov substitution principle
- ▶ Subclassing
 - ▶ Does not alter type hierarchy
 - ▶ Reuse of code
- ▶ Class-based vs Prototype-based

Class-based Programming - Instantiation

- ▶ Classes as blueprints
 - ▶ Can not change at runtime
 - ▶ Easier to optimize compiler tasks
- ▶ Implicit/Explicit constructors
 - ▶ Creates new instance of a class
 - ▶ Allocates memory
 - ▶ Initialize all fields

Class-based Programming - Instantiation

Class-based instantiation

```
class NumBox{  
    private int number;  
  
    public numBox(int num){  
        this.number = num;  
    }  
    public int getNum(){  
        return this.number;  
    }  
}
```

```
NumBox num3 = new NumBox(3);  
print(num3.getNum());
```

Class-based Programming - Subtyping

- ▶ Type hierarchy has to be explicitly declared

Class-based subtyping

```
class NumBox { ... }
```

```
class PNatBox extends NumBox { ... }
```

- ▶ No subclassing without subtyping
- ▶ Example: Square vs Rectangle

Prototyp-based Programming - Instantiation

- ▶ No classes
- ▶ Constructor functions
 - ▶ Explicitly declared

Constructor

```
function ExampleObject () {...}
```

- ▶ Ex-nihilo
 - ▶ Using object literals

Ex-nihilo

```
var cat = {  
  name : "Tardar_Sauce",  
  follower : 8403156  
}
```

Prototype-based Programming - Subtyping

- ▶ Cloning
 - ▶ Objects inherit from objects
 - ▶ Copy fields into clone
 - ▶ Add more specialized fields
- ▶ Ex-nihilo
 - ▶ Root object

Cloning

```
function ParentClass () {...}  
function ChildClass () {...}  
  
ChildClass.prototype = new ParentClass ();
```

Prototype-based Programming - Pure Prototyping

- ▶ Prototypes and objects can be changed at runtime
- ▶ Links between prototype and clones
 - ▶ Change in prototype will update clones
- ▶ Pure prototyping
 - ▶ No delegation but much more memory is used
 - ▶ Different versions of same type

Type systems - Overview

- ▶ Ensure type safety
- ▶ Define equality and compatibility of types
- ▶ Can vary widely depending on the language
- ▶ Not exclusive to OOP

- ▶ Structural typing
- ▶ Nominal / nominative typing

Type systems - Structural Typing

- ▶ Elements with the same structure are compatible
 - ▶ Attributes with their names
 - ▶ Functions with their names and parameter/return types
- ▶ The name of the type does not matter
- ▶ Nor does the place of declaration

Type systems - Structural Typing

- ▶ Automatism of type compatibility
- ▶ Very flexible and convenient
 - ▶ Type hierarchy does not need to be declared beforehand
 - ▶ Programmer does not need to maintain the common interfaces himself

Implicit common interface

```
type A = {  
    foo ();  
    bar ();  
}
```

```
type B = {  
    foo ();  
    baz ();  
}
```

Type systems - Structural Typing

Problem with compatible types

```
record DistanceInInches{  
    double dist;  
};  
  
record DistanceInCentimeters{  
    double dist;  
};
```

- ▶ Equivalent in structure
- ▶ Different in meaning

Type systems - Nominal Typing

- ▶ Subset of structural typing
- ▶ Much more type-safe
- ▶ No accidental inheritance
- ▶ Subtyping has to be explicitly declared

Type systems - Nominal Typing

Nominal subtyping

```
class Animal{
    void feed(){...}
}

class Cat extends Animal{
    int age = 5;
}
```

- ▶ Without 'extends' these classes would be completely distinct from each other

Conclusion

- ▶ Defining relationship between objects
 - ▶ Based on many pieces
 - ▶ All come together to make up the specific language
- ▶ Flexibility vs Safety
 - ▶ Finding the right mix can be difficult
 - ▶ Trade-offs are hard to make
- ▶ In the end it comes down to personal preference



Thank you for your attention!
QUESTIONS ?