### **Nested and Inner Classes**

#### We'll cover the following

- Pros and cons of interfaces
- The inner keyword
- Anonymous inner class

In the previous example, you may wonder why TV didn't directly implement the Remote interface instead of having a separate class TVRemote that implements the interface. Having a separate class like TVRemote instead of directly implementing the interface has a few pros and cons. Let's discuss the pros first, then the cons, and arrive at a solution to give us the best of both options.

#### Pros and cons of interfaces #

The first benefit of having a TVRemote is that we may have multiple instances of TVRemote for a single instance of TV, much like how cars and garage doors have multiple remotes. This design capability can save relationships where each person can amiably control a TV instance without bothering someone else near a single remote to do it. Second, the instances of TVRemote may carry their internal state separate from any state contained in a TV instance. For example, a TVRemote instance used by one person may have a dim light on the remote turned on to help operate in the dark.

TVRemote that implement the Remote interface have to use the public methods of the TV. If the TV implements the interface, then we don't have to rely on any public methods, and also the implementation can efficiently use internals visible only within the class. And, instead of passing an instance of TV to the constructor of TVRemote, if we implement the interface directly in TV, we don't need the extra references kept within instances of TVRemote.

# The **inner** keyword #

An alternative design option can help us keep the pros and at the same time avoid the cons. Using inner classes we can get the benefits offered by having the separate class, but without compromising efficiency. While the solution that follows may appear esoteric at first sight, this technique is used extensively in C#, Java, and Kotlin to implement iterators on collections.

In Kotlin a class may be nested—placed inside—another class. Unlike in Java, Kotlin nested classes can't access the private members of the nesting outer class. But if you mark the nested class with the inner keyword, then they turn into inner classes and the restriction goes away.

Let's move the TVRemote class from the previous example to be an inner class of TV:

```
class TV {
  private var volume = 0

val remote: Remote
  get() = TVRemote()

override fun toString(): String = "Volume: ${volume}"

inner class TVRemote : Remote {
  override fun up() { volume++ }
  override fun down() { volume-- }

  override fun toString() = "Remote: ${this@TV.toString()}"
  }
}
```

nestedremote.kts

Unlike the TV class in the previous version, in this example the volume property of TV is private and can't be directly accessed from outside the instance of TV.

TVRemote, though, is defined as an inner class, and its methods up() and down() access volume as if it were a property of TVRemote. The inner class has direct access to the members of the outer class, including private members. The TV class now provides a public property remote that returns an instance of TVRemote.

Let's use the modified version of TVRemote:

```
val tv = TV()
val remote = tv.remote
```

```
remote.up()
println("After increasing: $tv") //After increasing: Volume: 1

remote.doubleUp()
println("After doubleUp: $tv") //After doubleUp: Volume: 3
```



A user of a TV instance can obtain a reference to a Remote for the TV instance using the remote property. The getter of this property has been designed so that each call to remote will result in a different instance, much like each call to the iterate() method on a collection will return a new iterator instance.

If a property or method in the inner class shadows a corresponding member in the outer class, you can access the member of the outer class from within a method of the inner using a special this expression. You can see this in the toString() method of TVRemote, shown here again for convenience:

```
override fun toString() = "Remote: ${this@TV.toString()}"
```

Read the syntax this@TV within the string template as "this of TV"—that is, this will refer to the TVRemote instance but this@TV refers to the instance of the outer class TV. Let's verify that the access to the outer instance from the inner instance worked:

```
// nestedremote.kts
println(remote) //Remote: Volume: 3
```

What if you want to access the <code>toString()</code> of Any—that is, the base class of TV from a method of <code>TVRemote</code>? Instead of asking for <code>this</code> of TV ask for <code>super</code> of TV—the base class of the outer class:

```
override fun toString() = "Remote: ${super@TV.toString()}"
```

Use super@Outer syntax sparingly; it's a design smell to bypass a class to get to its base class, defeating the intent of polymorphism and method overriding.

## Anonymous inner class #

If we need a special state within the nested or inner classes, we may place

properties in them much like how we keep state in outer classes. Also, instead of

creating an inner class within a class, we may create an anonymous inner class within a method as well. Let's turn the inner class from the previous example to an anonymous inner class within the <a href="remote">remote</a> property's getter:

```
class TV {
    private var volume = 0
    val remote: Remote get() = object: Remote {
        override fun up() { volume++ }
        override fun down() { volume-- }
        override fun toString() = "Remote: ${this@TV.toString()}"
    }
    override fun toString(): String = "Volume: ${volume}"
}
```

The inner keyword isn't used for anonymous inner classes. The anonymous instance implements the Remote interface and, of course, has no name. Other than those differences, the class isn't any different from the TVRemote inner class it replaced.

We've looked at ways to implement interfaces and to create nested and inner classes.

In the next lesson, let's look at extending classes.