

CS2030S Recitation

Week 4: Problem Set 2

brian

2026-02-05

National University of Singapore

Recap

About Dynamic binding

Why do we use method descriptor? Isn't method signature not enough?

Needed for type checking (Find method descriptor → type checking)

```
1 // In A.java
2 int foo(Circle c) {
3     return 1;
4 }
5 boolean foo(Object o) {
6     return false;
7 }
8 // In main method
9 A a = new A()
10 boolean x = a.foo(new Circle(new Point(0, 0), 1));
```

java

Liskov substitution principle

- Let $\varphi(x)$ be a property provable about objects x of type T . Then $\varphi(y)$ should be true for objects y of type S where $S <: T$
- Sounds like it contradicts polymorphism
 - Not really, we only care about properties that we are interested in
 - They should still do the same thing, but maybe in a different way

Abstract classes

- Sometimes we don't have the full information to make a class but we have partial info
 - Humans all have 2 eyes, all have the same metabolic functions (methods)
 - But individual humans have different ways of talking, walking, etc
- Imagine writing an abstract `Human` class
 - For methods and fields we know, we just fill them in
 - For methods we don't know how to implement yet, leave them abstract
 - classes that extend `Human` would have to implement the abstract methods

Interfaces

- An interface has all methods abstract and *no* fields
 - These methods are always public
- It is a promise that anything that implements it has those methods
- A `LandVehicle` can be abstract with methods like `drive` etc
- Model what it can do (implementation left to implementations of the interface)

Recap: Casting an Interface

- You can almost always cast at compile time
 - Compiler can't prove that you might not have put a subclass that implements that interface so it allows it
 - Unless the CTT of whatever you are casting is `final`
 - If actually does not implement interface at run time then run time error

Problem Set

Q1 background

```
1 public class Rectangle {  
2     private double width;  
3     private double height;  
4     public Rectangle(double width, double height) {  
5         this.width = width;  
6         this.height = height;  
7     }  
8     public double getArea() {  
9         return this.width * this.height;  
10    }  
11    @Override  
12    public String toString() {  
13        return "Width: " + this.width + " Height: " + this.height;  
14    }  
15 }
```

Rectangle::getArea is expected to return the product of its width and height

We believe that `Square` inherits from `Rectangle`

`Square` instances must satisfy that the four sides are always the same length.

Create a class called `Square` with a single constructor method. Should have the following jshell output

```
1 jshell> new Square(5);
2 $.. ==> Width: 5.0 Height: 5.0
3
4 jshell> new Square(5).getArea();
5 $.. ==> 25.0
```

Q1a

```
1 public class Square extends Rectangle {  
2     public Square(double length) {  
3         super(length, length);  
4     }  
5 }
```

Now `Rectangle` has two new methods to set the height and set the width.

```
1 public void setHeight(double height) {  
2     this.height = height;  
3 }  
4 public void setWidth(double width) {  
5     this.width = width;  
6 }
```

Behaves like you would expect

```
1 jshell> Rectangle r = new Rectangle(5, 5);  
2 jshell> r.setHeight(5);  
3 jshell> r.setWidth(9);  
4 jshell> r.getArea();  
5 $.. ==> 45.0
```

Explain the undesirable effects for the `Square` class?

- Explain the undesirable effects for the `Square` class?
 - `Square` inherits `setHeight` and `setWidth` methods from `Rectangle`
 - Height and width of the `Square` can now be independently set
 - The property of having all 4 sides being the same is no longer true

Now we override these in **Square**

```
1 @Override
2 public void setHeight(double height) {
3     super.setHeight(height);
4     super.setWidth(height);
5 }
6
7 @Override
8 public void setWidth(double width) {
9     super.setHeight(width);
10    super.setWidth(width);
11 }
```

Does this make sense? Should **Square** inherit from **Rectangle**?

- Based on LSP, wherever we have a `Rectangle`, we should be able to put a `Square` and still have the same properties (that we choose)
- But if we put a `Square`, it would no longer adhere to the property of `Rectangle::getArea`
 - Example: Checking if a document is in landscape or portrait
- LSP is violated, so `Square` should not inherit from `Rectangle`

Then should **Rectangle** inherit from **Square**?

- If **Rectangle** inherited from **Square**
- property of having all 4 sides the same is violated
- LSP is violated. **Square** and **Rectangle** should not inherit from each other

We have the following code

```
1 interface Shape{  
2     double getArea();  
3 }
```

```
1 interface Printable {  
2     void print();  
3 }
```

```
1 Circle c = new Circle(new Point(0, 0), 10);  
2 Shape s = c;  
3 Printable p = c;
```

Explain the compilation error (if any) in some of the statements below

(i) `s.print()`

(ii) `p.print()`

(iii) `s.getArea()`

(iv) `p.getArea()`

- For i, `s` has compile time type `Shape` so does not have the `print` method. Thus a compilation error is thrown
- For ii, no error. `Printable` has `print` method and `p` is of compile time type `Printable`
- for iii, no error. `Shape` has `getArea` method and `s` is of compile time type `Shape`
- for iv, `p` has compile time type `Printable` so does not have the method `getArea`. Thus a compilation error is thrown

Your best friend, Ah Beng, proposes to re-implement `Shape` and `Printable` as abstract classes instead. Would this work?

- No. Java does not allow the inheritance from multiple parent classes
- Abstract classes are still classes

Can we define another interface `PrintableShape` which extends `Printable` and `Shape` and let `Circle` implement `PrintableShape` instead?

- Yes. Interfaces can inherit from multiple super-interfaces
- Note that the keyword is `extends` and not `implements` when interfaces inherit from other interfaces

Give an example to illustrate why Java cannot inherit from multiple parent classes but can implement multiple interfaces.

- Say **A** has `foo()` which prints “a”
- **B** has `foo()` which prints “b”
- Let **C** inherit from both **A** and **B**, which `foo()` does it get?
- Interfaces are fine since if **A** and **B** are interfaces, then **C** is forced to implement `foo()`

The End

bye!