ETH
Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Exercise 8

Parametric polymorphism

November 17, 2017

Task 1

Implement a list in Java or C# with two methods:

```
public void add(int i, Object el)
public Object get(int i)
```

Implement the list and discuss the advantages and the limitations of the three different approaches below.

A) Implement the list using only one class without generics.

solution

```
public class List {
   Object[] elements;
   public void add(int i, Object el) {elements[i]=el;}
   public Object get(int i) {return elements[i];}
}
```

Advantages: short implementation.

Limitations: the type of the method result of `get` is `Object`. When using such a class, usually we have to dynamically cast the values returned by this method.

B) Implement the list using one abstract class/interface and then (some) subclasses that implement it for different types.

solution

```
public interface List {
   public void add(int i, Object el);
   public Object get(int i);
}

public class IntList implements List {
   Integer[] elements;

   public void add(int i, Object el) {elements[i]=(Integer) el;}

   public Integer get(int i) {return elements[i];}
}
```

Advantages: method `get` returns an `Integer`, thus we do not need dynamic casting of the values returned by this method.

Limitations: in Java, we have the same limitations as before (if programming against the interface), and in addition code duplication and further type casts/checks in the implementation of concrete list classes, e.g. in `add`. Moreover, we do not have behavioural subtyping, since method `add` in `IntList` may not respect the expected contracts in `List` (due to the additional cast). E.g. if we invoked `add` passing an object that is not an instance of `Integer`, the runtime environment would raise an exception and the element would not be added to our list.

C) Implement the list using generic types.

solution

```
public class List<T> {
   T[] elements;
   public void add(int i, T el) {elements[i]=el;}
   public T get(int i) {return elements[i];}
}
```

Advantages: short implementation, statically type safe.

Limitations: none! :) we have only advantages ...

Task 2

(from a previous exam)

Consider the following Java program, which is rejected by the Java compiler:

```
class Logger<T> {
    public void log(T t) {
        System.out.println(t.loggerString());
    }
}
```

A) If the code above were allowed to compile without errors, what could go wrong? To answer, write a brief code sample that uses `Logger` in a way which causes a failure at runtime.

solution

```
Logger<Object> l = new Logger<Object>();
l.log(new Object());
```

B) How can we fix the class `Logger` so that it compiles, while preserving its functionality? You should not modify the method `log`, but otherwise can change or add any code. Your solution should include all details required to check that `Logger` is a valid Java class.

solution

```
interface Loggable {
    String loggerString();
}

class Logger<T extends Loggable> { ... }
```

C) Assume that class `Logger` has been fixed to resolve the problem from point **A**. Let `A` and `B` be two classes such that `A` is a supertype of `B` and `Logger<A>` and `Logger<B>` are valid instantiations. Consider the following method:

```
void foo(Logger<A> logA) {
  Logger<B> logB = logA;
  logB.log(new B());
}
```

The Java compiler rejects this code. Is the code safe? That is, if it were allowed to compile, would it run without failure?

solution

Yes, the code is safe.

D) Suppose we relax the Java type system rules to allow contravariant generics.

- Will the method `foo` compile now?

solution

Yes.

- What are two situations that will require dynamic checks in order to enable contravariant generics in a language, without limiting what a developer can write in a generic class?

solution

  - When calling methods of generic classes, it would be necessary to check whether the dynamic type of the result is a subtype of the static type of the variable where the result is stored.
  - When reading fields of generic classes, it would be necessary to check whether the dynamic type of the field is a subtype of the static type of the variable where the object is stored.

Task 3

Consider the following Scala classes:

```
class A
class B extends A
class P1[+T]
class P2[T <: A]
```

What are the possible instantiations of `P1` and `P2`? What is the difference between `P1[A]` and `P2[A]` from the perspective of a client? Provide an example to show which class is more restrictive.

solution

Class `P1` can be instantiated with any type, while `P2` has to be instantiated with subtypes of `A`.

```
val x : P1[AnyRef] //correct
val y : P2[AnyRef] //wrong: AnyRef is not a subtype of A
```

Furthermore, class `P1` is covariant in its argument:

```
val x : P1[A]=new P1[B] //correct
val y : P2[A]=new P2[B] //wrong: found P2[B], required P2[A]
```

Task 4

(from a previous exam)

Consider the following Java code:

```
class Car<T> {
    private List<? extends T> passengers;

    public Car(List<? extends T> passengers) {
        this.passengers = passengers;
    }
}
```

Remember that `List<E>` in Java contains a method `addAll` with the following signature:

```
boolean addAll(Collection<? extends E> c)
```

Method `addAll` adds all elements of the given collection `c` to the receiver list and returns `true` if the receiver list was modified.

A) We want to add a method to `Car<T>` that takes a list of passengers `p` to board the car. After the method is executed, the field `passengers` should refer to a list containing both the previous elements and the elements of `p`.

```
public void board(List<? extends T> p)
```

The following implementation is rejected by the compiler:

```
public void board(List<? extends T> p) {
    this.passengers.addAll(p);
}
```

Assume the body of `board` is exempted from the type checker. Provide code that calls `board` and inserts a string into a list of integers. Your code has to type-check.

solution

```
List<Integer> list1 = new LinkedList<>();
Car<Object>   car   = new Car<>(list1);
List<String>  list2 = new LinkedList<>();
list2.add("");
car.board(list2);
```

B) Give a new implementation of `board` (without modifying its signature) that implements the expected functionality and type-checks.

solution

```
public void board(List<? extends T> passengers) {
    List<T> b = new LinkedList<>();
    b.addAll(this.passengers);
    b.addAll(passengers);
    this.passengers = b;
}
```

C) We now want to add a method to class `Car<T>` that transfers all passengers from this car to a given car. Fill in the blank to achieve the least restrictive but correct implementation.

```
public void transferPassengers(Car<__________> other) {
    other.board(this.passengers);
}
```

solution

```
? super T
```

Task 5

Consider the following Java method:

```
public void add(Object value, List<?> list) {
   list.add(value);
}
```

The Java compiler rejects this program, with the following message:

```
The method add(capture#1-of ?) in the type List<capture#1-of ?> is not
applicable for the arguments (Object)
```

A) Explain why we obtain such an error.

solution

We do not have any relation between the wildcard of `List`, and the types of the values that we are going to store.

B) Fix the program by using a generic type for the parameter of method `add` and constraining the wildcard appropriately.

solution

```
public <V> void add(V value, List<? super V> list) {
   list.add(value);
}
```

We have to use a lower bound constraint because we want the argument of `list.add` to be a supertype of `V`, otherwise we cannot pass it as a parameter.

C) We can use the following alternative signature for `add`:

```
public <V> void add(V value, List<V> list)
```

Is this solution more restricted than the one obtained using the wildcard?

solution

This method has exactly the same constraints of the ones obtained using a wildcard. In fact, the type of `value` can be a subtype of the type parameter of `list`, since it is a method argument. In practice, this means that the generic type of `list` is supertype of the type of `value`. For instance, consider the following program.

```
List<Object> list =...
add("x", list);
```

This program is accepted because strings are subtype of objects, thus `V=Object` is inferred by the type checker.

D) Consider the following methods:

```
public <V> void addAllX(List<V> v, List<? super V> l) {
   for(V el : v) l.add(el);
}
public <V> void addAllY(List<V> v, List<V> l) {
   for(V el : v) l.add(el);
}
```

Method `addAllX` is less restrictive than `addAllY`. Provide an example to prove this claim.

solution

```
List<String> list = new ArrayList();
List<Object> list2 = new ArrayList();
addAllX(list, list2);
addAllY(list, list2);
```

The call to `addAllX` is accepted by the compiler, while the one to `addAllY` is rejected, since it requires that the parametric type of `List` is exactly `String`. This happens because of invariance on type parameters in Java, so `V` has to be `String`, but the generic type of `list2` is `Object`.

Task 6

(from a previous exam)

A) Suppose we have a simple list interface in Java:

```
public interface List<T> {
    public int length();
    public T get(int i);
    public void add(T element);
}
```

We want to implement a class that concatenates two lists while inserting a separator of some type `A` between the two lists:

```
public class Concatenator<A> {
    public void concatenate(A separator, List<A> from, List<A> to) {
        to.add(separator);
        for (int i = 0; i < from.length(); i++) {
            to.add(from.get(i));
        }
    }
}
```

We are unsatisfied with our signature of the `concatenate` method because it too restrictive. In the following subtasks, we change the signature of the `concatenate` method, without changing its body, while making sure that the body still type-checks and that only instances of subtypes of `A` can be passed as separators.

We will try to make the signature less restrictive in the following sense. A signature s_1 of `concatenate` is *less restrictive* than another signature s_2 if the following holds: for all types T_1, T_2, T_3, if arguments of static type T_1`,List<`T_2`>,List<`T_3`>` are accepted by s_2, they are also accepted by s_1, but the same property does not hold in the opposite direction.

Do not use raw types (e.g. do not use `List` without a type variable). Do not use more than one upper bound per generic variable (e.g. do not use `X extends A & B`).

A.1) Provide the *least restrictive* signature using wildcards but no additional type parameters.

solution

```
public void concatenate(A separator,
                        List<? extends A> from,
                        List<? super A> to)
```

A.2) Provide a signature that is *less restrictive* than the original signature, without using wildcards, but with one extra type parameter to `concatenate`.

solution

Solution 1:

```
public <B extends A> void concatenate(A separator,
                                      List<B> from,
                                      List<A> to)
```

or Solution 2:

```
public <B extends A> void concatenate(B separator,
                                      List<B> from,
                                      List<B> to)
```

or Solution 3:

```
public <B extends A> void concatenate(B separator,
                                      List<B> from,
                                      List<A> to)
```

A.3) Provide the *least restrictive* signature without using wildcards, but using any number of type parameters to `concatenate`.

solution

```
public <C extends A, B extends C> void concatenate(C separator,
                                                   List<B> from,
                                                   List<C> to)
```

B) Provide the *least restrictive* signature without using wildcards or additional type parameters. For this subtask, assume that Java provides variance modifiers known from Scala. Besides modifying the signature of `concatenate`, you may add interfaces and let existing interfaces implement them.

solution

```
public interface GetList<+A> {
    public int length();
    public A get(int i);
}
public interface AddList<-A> {
    public void add(A element);
}
public interface List<A> extends AddList<A>, GetList<A> {
    //...
}
public void concatenate(A separator, GetList<A> from, AddList<A> to) {
    //...
}
```

C) In each the following subtasks (C.1-C.3), compare the restrictiveness of the given pair of signatures from the previous subtasks (A.1-B). If one signature is less restrictive than the other, provide an example of static types which are accepted by one but not the other signature.

For illustration, you can assume that we have three classes `X,Y,Z` with `X <: Y <: Z`, and we are calling `concatenate` on a class of type `Concatenator<Y>`. An example which shows differing restrictiveness then consists of a triple $T_1, T_2, T_3 \in \{$`X,Y,Z`$\}$, such that arguments of types T_1`,List<`T_2`>,List<`T_3`>` is accepted by one, but not the other signature.

C.1) Compare solutions A.1 and A.3.

solution

A.3 is incomparable to A.1:

- We can call `concatenate(Y, List<X>, List<Z>)` in solution A.1, but not in solution A.3.
- We can call `concatenate(X, List<X>, List<X>)` in solution A.3, but not in solution A.1.

C.2) Compare solutions A.2 and A.3.

solution

- For Solution 1 and 3 in A.2: A.2 is strictly more restrictive than A.3: We can call `concatenate(X, List<X>, List<X>)` in solution A.3, but not in solution A.2.
- For Solution 2 in A.2: A.2 is strictly more restrictive than A.3: We can call `concatenate(Y, List<X>, List<Y>)` in solution A.3, but not in solution A.2.

C.3) Compare solutions A.1 and B.

solution

A.1 and B have the same restrictiveness.