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Smalltalk class

class name                  Point
super class                 Object
class var                   
instance var               x   y
class messages and methods 
!...names and code for methods...
instance messages and methods
moveDx: dx Dy: dy ||
x <- dx+x
y <- dy + y
x
^ x
...

Commands

• Loops example:
  1 to:10 do:[i|
    Transcript show: (i asString).
  ].

• Conditional
  (x>0) ifTrue: [ x:=x+1. ] ifFalse: [ x:=0 ].
  true and false are special values like lambda calculus encodings

Run-time representations

Point class

Point object               superclass
template                  methods

class                      
x   2
y   3

Method dictionary

newX:Y:                code
move                  code

Dynamic Method Invocation

- Start with object’s class and search up superclasses.
- When call method inside, start search from self again.
- Most other OO languages do not implement dmi in this way -- too inefficient!

Key ideas of Smalltalk

- Everything is an object
- Information hiding - instance variables protected.
- Dynamic typing, so subtyping determined by whether can masquerade -- “message not understood”
- Inheritance distinct from subtyping

Smalltalk

![Smalltalk diagram](Image)

Figure 5: Interfaces versus Inheritance

C++
C++ Design Goals

- Data abstraction & OO features
- Better static type checking
- Backwards compatibility w/ C
- Efficiency: If you do not use a feature, you should not pay for it
- Explicitly hybrid language -- C w/abstraction

Additions to C

- type bool
- reference types & call by reference
- user-defined overloading
- templates
- exceptions
- public or private inheritance

Problems

- Confusing casts and conversions
- Objects allocated on stack
  - what happens w/subtyping? truncation!
- Overloading methods -- see earlier examples!
- Multiple inheritance (later)

Casts & Conversions

- Implicit conversions:
  - from short to int
  - class B { public: B (A a) {} }; A a; B b = a;
- Explicit conversions:
  - C c; D* d; d = (D*) &c; d -> DonlyMeth();
- Try to avoid problems by using new casts:
  - static_cast, dynamic_cast, reinterp_cast, const_cast
  - dynamic_cast checks using run-time type info (RTTI)
  - reinterp_cast trusts
Objects on stack

- Doesn't interact well with subtyping.
- Point p; // allocates point on stack
- ColorPoint cp(3,4,blue);
- p = cp; // slices and converts to Point
- Call by value has similar problems
- What about reference parameters to methods?

OO Features in C++

- Visibility
  - Public, protected, private
  - Friends ...
- Virtual vs. nonvirtual functions
  - don't pay the price of dynamic method invocation
- Implemented via vtable
  - no search necessary
  - static typing makes efficient rep possible
  - efficient iff subtype from inheritance!

VTable for Virtual methods

C++ vs Smalltalk implementation

- No search in C++ since offset for given method same in base and derived classes
- Smalltalk has no type declaration
  - value not known to be subtype of declared type
  - no idea where method is located
Abstract classes

- Have at least one method undefined
- “Pure” leaves all undefined
- Can't construct, but can inherit from
- Derived subclasses can be used as subtypes of abstract base class.

Multiple Inheritance

- Appealing: TA derived from Student and Teacher.
- Added to C++ and Smalltalk. In Eiffel from beginning.
- Problems conceptually and with implementation

MI in C++

```cpp
class S {...}
class T{...}
class TA: public S, public T {...}

TA* pta = new TA();
S * ps = pta;
T * pt = pta;
```

Representing MI

What if T and TA both define virtual f?
T methods expect inst vbles starting at pt
How get access to instance vbles from S?
Conceptual Problems w/ MI

Diamond Inheritance: Suppose A has virtual f and B and C override it. Which version is inherited in D?

Java Solution

• Most multiple inheritance in C++ involves pure base classes.
• Java: Single inheritance, but can implement multiple interfaces.
• Avoids problems.
• Traits (e.g., in Scala) are modern alternative.

C++ Summary

• One of most complicated languages ever
  - design by accretion
• Meets design goals but very hard to get right
  - “C makes it easy to shoot yourself in the foot. In C++ it's harder to shoot yourself in the foot, but when you do, you blow off your whole leg.” — Stroustrup
• Memory management is big problem
• Most programmers learn a subset.

C++ Humor

• C++: Hard to learn and built to stay that way.
• Java is, in many ways, C++-
• How C++ is like teenage sex:
  1. It is on everyone's mind all the time.
  2. Everyone talks about it all the time.
  3. Everyone thinks everyone else is doing it.
  4. Almost no one is really doing it.
  5. The few who are doing it are:
     A. Doing it poorly
     B. Sure it will be better next time.
     C. Not practicing it safely.
Java Design Goals

- Portability across platforms
- Reliability
- Safety (no viruses!)
- Dynamic Linking
- Multithreaded execution
- Simplicity and Familiarity
- Efficiency

Java

- Original implementations slow
  - Compiled to JVML and then interpreted
  - Now JIT
  - Garbage collection

- Safety - 3 levels:
  - Strongly typed
  - JVML bytecode also checked before execution
  - Run-time checks for array bounds, etc.

- Other safety features:
  - No pointer arithmetic, unchecked type casts, etc.
  - Super constructor called at beginning of constructor

Exceptions & Subtyping

- All non-Runtime exceptions must be caught or declared in “throws” clauses
  - void method readFiles() throws IOException {...}

- Suppose m throws NewException.

- What are restrictions on throwing exceptions if m overridden in subclass? Masquerade!
**Simplify from C++**

- Purely OO language (except for primitives)
- All objects accessed through pointers
  - reference semantics
- No multiple inheritance — trade for interfaces
- No operator overloading
- No manual memory management
- No automatic or unchecked conversions

**Interfaces**

- Originally introduced to replace multiple inheritance
- Allows pure use of subtype polymorphism w/out confusing with implementation reuse.
- Slower access to methods as method order not guaranteed

**Encapsulation**

- Classes & interfaces can belong to packages:
  ```java
  package MyPackage;
  public class C ...
  ```
- If no explicit package then in “default” package
- public, protected, private, “package” visibility
- Class-based privacy (not object-based):
  - If method has parameter of same type then get access to privates of parameter

**Problems w/Packages**

- Generally tied to directory structure.
- Anyone can add to package and get privileged access
- All classes/interfaces w/out named package in default package (so all have access to each other!)
- No explicit interface for package
- Abstraction barriers not possible for interfaces. Discourages use of interfaces for classes.