How the Java code is run?

- Lets say you have created one class **A** (the file name is **A.java** of course)
- So, when you compile it, one file **A.class** will be generated. Its just a file that is being stored in the disc.
- After the compilation done, you run that **A.class** file using **java A**
  - Now, 2 things will be generated; one object of type **Class** and one **metaspace**
  - One variable will be created which will be of type **Class** ; its nothing but **A.class**
  - And one metaspace, which will contain all the metadata about the class A like *variables, methods, etc etc.*
  - That **A.class** is the reference of that **metaspace**.
  - In code, we generally perform ***reflection*** using **A.class** so it feels like **A.class** contains everything; but it is just a reference to that **metaspace**.
- So, there will be nothing like **class A** during the run time; JVM creates **A.class** which is of type **Class** and it keeps the reference of **metaspace** which contains all the metadata about the *class A*.
- **NOTE**: **class** keyword is used to create one class; **Class** is a actual class.
  - 

class (lowercase **c**) is used to define one class
  - 

    - It is an actual class which name is **Class**.
    - This is why it is being said "**Class** is itself a **class,** and every **class** in Java is an object of type **Class**"
- In case of generic type, it stores the generic information in **metaspace**.
  - 

- You need to pass raw type of type just like the above, I have passed **String** while inheriting **A** from **B**, otherwise how can it know which type is being passed.
- Because, after the compilation, the **generics of objects are gone**; the only way to preserve this is **inheriting the generic class passing the raw** (in my case *String*) **type**.
- **ParameterizedTypeReference** (abstract class) works in this way; ***we*** create an object of a anonymous subclass which inherit ParameterizedTypeReference to keep the generics preserved.
  - It provides some useful methods by default; so instead of creating our own class to preserve the generics, we use this abstract class.
-
```
System.out.println(B.class);
System.out.println(B.class.getSuperclass());
System.out.println(B.class.getGenericSuperclass());
```
-
```
class com.alok.projects.prod_ready_features.B
class com.alok.projects.prod_ready_features.A
com.alok.projects.prod_ready_features.A<java.lang.String>
```
  - output
- **getGenericSuperClass()** gives you the super class with generic type; it is of type **ParameterizedType**
- **getSuperClass()** gives you the super class only without generics; it is of type **Class**.
-
```
Type  (interface)
 ├── Class
 ├── ParameterizedType   ← YOU ARE HERE
 ├── TypeVariable
 ├── WildcardType
 └── GenericArrayType
```
  - Both **Class**, and **ParameterizedType** implements **Type** (which is an interface).
  - So, if you think like the below:
    -
```
Type c = B.class.getSuperclass();
ParameterizedType ptype = (ParameterizedType) c;
```
  - It'll not work; **why?** Read the next topic about upcasting & downcasting.
-
```
System.out.println(B.class.getSuperclass() instanceof Class); // true
System.out.println(B.class.getGenericSuperclass() instanceof ParameterizedType); // true
```
  - Both will be **true**.

- To see the **metaspace** of **B**, execute the command "**javap -v B**"
  - 

  - You'll find something like this in the output.

Downcasting during runtime

- Lets say one interface is there named as **X** and 2 classes **A** and **B** are implementing that interface.
  - 
    ```
    interface X {  2 usages  2 implementations  new *
        void m1();  no usages  2 implementations  new *
    }
    class A implements X{  no usages  new *
        public void m1() {  no usages  new *
            System.out.println("m1 method in A");
        }
        public void m2() {  no usages  new *
            System.out.println("m2 method in A");
        }
    }
    class B implements X{  no usages  new *
        public void m1() {  no usages  new *
            System.out.println("m1 method in B");
        }
        public void m3() {  no usages  new *
            System.out.println("m3 method in B");
        }
    }
    ```
  - **A** and **B** are having one extra functions each **m2** and **m3** respectively.
- Now its obvious, if we create a variable of type **X** and store the object of type **A** then we'll not be able to call the method **m2**.
  - 
    ```
    X ob = new A();
    ob.m2();
    ```
    Cannot resolve method 'm2' in 'X'
    Cast qualifier to 'com.alok.project
- So there are 2 things, **variable type** and **object type**.
  - Lets say one **interface** or **class** is there (in our example **X**)
  - So, the child class may be containing **same** or **more** number of methods.
  - So, when we store an **object of type child** in a **variable of type parent**, then the variable can ignore the methods that is not in the parent class/interface.
    - 
      ```
      // variable X
      // object A
      X obX = new A();
      ```

- But vice versa is not true; if we have a **object of type parent** and **variable of type child**, and if we try to store that object to this variable it'll not be possible;
  - Because, that object (of type parent) might be containing less number of fields and methods than the child.
  - We know, to convert **parent type to child type**, we have to do downcast; but only if the **object type is same as the child**.

➢ Consider the following examples to get a clear picture:

-
```
class X {  1 usage  2 inheritors  new *
    void m1() {  no usages  2 overrides  new *
        System.out.println("m1 in X");
    }
}
class A extends X{  no usages  new *
    public void m1() {  no usages  new *
        System.out.println("m1 method in A");
    }
    public void m2() {  no usages  new *
        System.out.println("m2 method in A");
    }
}
```
-
```
class X {  1 usage  2
}
class A extends X{
}
```
- This is my classes (parent is **X**, child is **A**)
-
```
X obX = new A();
```
  - It is completely fine; implicitly **upcasting** is happening here.
  - Object type: **A**, variable type: **X**
  - A contains all the fields and methods that is present in X.
  - So, we can access all the things from **obX**; so there is no error.
-
```
X obX = new A();
A obA = (A) obX;
```
  - It is also same; as we know **downcasting** has to be mentioned explicitely.
  - Object type: **A**, variable type: **A**

- So, **obA** can access all the variables of **A**; so no error.

```
X obX = new X();
A obA = (A) obX;
```

- It'll give **run-time** error; not compile-time.
- Object type: **X**, Variable type: **A**
- **A** might be containing more number of **methods/fields** than **X**.
- So, it'll give run-time error.

➢ So, there might be a thinking:

- Lets say **A** and **B** are inheriting **X**.
- We'll create one **object** of type **A**, and store that in a **variable** of type **X** (upcasting).
- Then we'll downcast that to **B**, so now we can convert the **A** type to **B** type; it is not possible;

```
X obX = new A();
B obB = (B) obX;
```
XXXX

- Because, even if you change the **variable type**, but the actual **object** is same only;

➢ **So, upcasting and downcasting is only possible when the object contains all the fields and methods that is being present in the type of which variable is being created.**