|  |
| --- |
| Circle Language Spec |

## Relationships

### Introduction

This topic aims to introduce that the build up of classes might be viewed as a model of *relationships* between classes. *Bidirectional* relationships might be introduced along with a notation and a description of what that might mean.

### Related Classes

#### Concept

A class might specify a configuration of sub-objects. This is an attempt to summarize the kinds of relationships between classes this might create.

A sub-object inside a class might also have a class. This would relate these two classes together.

When a class would not set the a related item's class, then any type of object might be assigned to it. When a class would set the class for a related item, the related item might only become an object of that specific class.

A class might also specify related *lists*. When a class would be assigned to this related list, the related list might only contain items of this class. When no class was assigned to the related list, then the related list might contain objects of any class.

There is also the idea for a related list to be assigned *multiple* classes, which might mean that items of a fixed set of classes may be put inside this related list. In that case one related list may create two relationships between classes.

At the peril of repeating things: when a class’s related item would not have a class, that related item might not introduce a new related *class*.

#### Diagram Notation

Below an attempt to depict an object and its class.



The **Class** would contain two sub-objects, each pointing to another class. The **Object** would get contents similar to the **Class**. To 'see' the relationships between classes, it might be an idea to focus on the dashed shapes and then the dashed lines in between them. (In case of different choices in using dashed shapes, it may be more difficult to see the relationships between classes in a diagram.)

The class of a related item might not be set.



Then **Related Item** might have any class. It might be interpreted as: this related *item* does not introduce a related *class*.

A class might also have a related list: a class would then holds a list of items of another class. A multiplicity of *many* may be expressed in a diagram with a nonagon symbol:



A nonagon might be placed inside a class, which may imply that the class specifies a *list* of items:



When no class is assigned to the related list, it might imply that the related list could contain objects of any class. When a class *is* assigned to to the related list, it suggests the related list might only contain items of this class.



There is also an idea that a related list might be assigned *multiple* classes, which might mean that items of a fixed set of classes could be put in the list.



In that case one related list might define two related classes.

### Bidirectional Relationships

#### Concept

The relationships described so far would be *unidirectional*: one way only. Relationships might also be *bidirectional:* a two way street. Then if one class relates to another, then the other class might relates back to the first class again. In case of a bidirectional relationship if one class gets a sub-object of another class, the other class would also get a sub-object pointing back to the first class.

There might also be **1 🡪 n** relationships between classes. In that case one class may have a related list of items of another class. The other class might have a single related item, that connects back to the first class. There may also be **n 🡪 n** relationships, where one class would hold a related list of items of another class, and the other class might also hold a list of related items, that connects back to the first class.

#### Diagram Notation

A unidirectional relationship between one class and another might look like this:




Class A has a sub-object of **Class B**. This would create a relationship from **Class A** to **Class B**.

**Class B** does not seem to have a relationship back to **Class A** yet. The picture below would add that relationship back to **Class A**:



Because the class references back and forth seem so closely related an additional to the notation is proposed here. The two class lines may be joined together with a relational ring:




(The the relational ring's being dashed might be a stylistic choice. A solid line type or a slightly tilted ring shape might be variations.)

The picture above would express a 1 🡪 1 relationship between **Class A** and **Class B**. But other multiplicities might also be used. A multiplicity of **n** might be expressed with a nonagon:




A nonagon would represent a list of things. Instead of letting a **Class A** contain a single item of **Class B**, it may contain a list of items of **Class B**:




The picture above aims to express an **n 🡪 1** relationship between **Class A** and **Class B**.


The picture below would display a **1 🡪 n** relationship between **Class A** and **Class B**.



The picture below aims to display an **n 🡪 n** relationship between **Class A** and **Class B**.



There is an idea where one related list might contain items from multiple classes. **Class A** would have a **n 🡪 1** relationship to items of **Class B** and **Class C**, which the picture below aims to express:



#### Class Relating to Itself

A class may relate to itself. For instance, a person might relate to a parent, which could also be a person. So then a person would be related to a person, which might relates a class to itself.

A class relating to itself could look as follows in a diagram:




#### Example

Classes and their relationships might define behavior of a system, so it might be relevant to be aware of them, instead of looking at individual objects, tied to other objects.

The example below could be a piece of the class-relationship structure of a drawing program.

It aims to display the classes **Application**, **Document**, **Point** and **Line**.



Here is an attempt to describe with text the classes and relationships that would be drawn out in the picture: A running **Application** could hold multiple open **Documents**. So **Application c**ould have a **1 🡪 n** relationship with the **Document class**. Viewed in the opposite direction, this would make a **Document** opened inside a running **Application**: an **n 🡪 1** relationship between **Document** and **Application**. A **Document** might hold a collection of **Points** and a collection of **Lines**. That would make **Document** have a **1 🡪 n** relationship with **Point** and a **1 🡪 n** relationship with **Line**. Inversely, this would make collections of **Points** and **Lines** part of one **Document**. Furthermore, a **Line** would be composed of two **Points**. However, when chaining lines together to form a picture, a point might be reused as part of multiple lines. This should give the **Line class** two **1 🡪 n** relationships with a **Point**: one for the first point and one for the second point: **Point A** and **Point B**. The *inverse* relationship, could be that each point may be used in multiple lines, as either **Point A** or **Point B**. Perhaps a bit creatively, these became collections called **As Point A In Lines** and **As Point B In Lines**. It may be a bit non-obvious that it would be a **1 🡪 n** relationship, involving lists of lines.

The example aimed to display all the classes, relationships, related items and related lists of the class structure.

### Relationships Between Classes

One object may relate to another object, but that might not be what relationships usually are about. It might be about relationships between *classes*. Those may determine the configuration of how objects are connected to eachother, rather than just loosely tying together arbitrary objects.

A class might function as a blueprint for objects. The class structure may determine which *types* of objects might be connected to each other, but not yet what specific objects would be connected to eachother. Which objects might be connected to eachother may be established by the object structure. The class structure may only defines which types of objects might be connected to eachother.

<< aspect oriented idea >>

The\* class-relationship structure is the\* bonestructure of a program.

### Relationships Between Objects

#### Concept

Relationships between classes set the\* rules for how objects can\* be connected to eachother.

Relationships between *objects* are the\* actual connections.

A relationship between objects is always a relationship between *two* individual objects. If\* one object refers to another, the\* other refers back to the\* first one.

From a 1 🡪 1 perspective this seems logical, but\* from an n 🡪 n perspective this may not\* seem logical.

A relationship between two classes with each a multiplicity of **n**, creates a related list in both of the\* classes. Every object of those classes will contain a related list of related items.

Any object that as a relationship to another object, gives the\* other object *one* relationship back to the\* first object. So for each reference to an object, the\* other object contains a reference back. One reference inside an object is tied to one reference inside another object.

One object can\* relate to multiple objects, so an object *can\** have a one-to-many relationship to other objects, but\* one *related item* in one object always creates *one related item* inside the\* other object.

#### Diagram Notation

The\* main rule about relationships to object is: for each reference to an object, the\* other object contains a reference back.

When\* you\* draw out the\* separate counterparts of a relationship between two objects it looks like this:



But\* to express the\* close relationship between the\* two references, the\* two lines are merged, and disambiguated from normal object lines with a *relationship symbol*:



The\* relationship symbol is a double circle. The\* reason behind this notation, was already explained in the\* article *Relationships in a Diagram*. The\* notation is accomplished by first taking the\* original picture with one class refering to another and the\* other refering back to the\* first class:



Then\*, an imaginary reference to each class is added to the\* diagram



Next, the\* class lines are merged, but\* also the\* class symbols are merged:




The\* notation would\* still be ambiguous, if\* it weren’t for the\* double line of the\* merged object symbols. So a double circle symbolizes a relationship between objects.


For relationships between classes the\* relationship symbol is a double *dashed* circle. For relationships between objects, the\* relationship symbol is a double circle drawn with *solid* lines.

In 1 🡪 n and n 🡪 n relationships the\* rule, that each reference contains one reference back, also applies:

1 🡪 n:




n 🡪 n:



It doesn’t matter whether an object reference is part of a list or not\*: every time it is still *two* individual object references, that are tied together.

#### Object relating to itself

Sometimes an object relates to itself. In a diagram this looks as follows:



#### Counterpart out of sight

When\* the\* counterpart of the\* relationship is out of sight, a line should point out of the\* diagram. A catch there is, that you\* can\*’t see if\* the\* relationship counterpart is part of a multiplicity of **n** or not\*. Therefore, the\* multiplicity is expressed at the\* end of th line pointing out of the\* diagram as follows:



#### No reuse of merged imaginary references

If\* two imaginary references have merged, to become a relationship symbol, then\* other references to the\* same objects won’t connect to an imaginary reference that has merged to become a relationship symbol. Relationships create their own imaginary references, that aren’t reused.

Here is a relationship between two objects:



The\* two objects refer to eachother. This originally consisted of two distinct references:



Imaginary references were put on one level higher:



If\* other references to the\* same objects were also displayed in the\* diagram, then\* they would\* connect to the\* same imaginary references, put on a higher level:



When\* you\* merge the\* imaginary references to display that two references are part of a single relationship, you\* will not\* connect all

references to the\* merged imaginary reference:



You\* will keep separate imaginary references for the\* other unidirectional relationships to the\* objects:



### Relationship Synchronization

In a bidirectional relationship between classes, one class relates to another and the\* other class relates back to the\* first class.

But\* that is not\* enough to establish a full relationship.

An object of one class can\* refer to an arbitrary object of another class, which then\* refers back to an arbitrary object of the\* first class again, but\* not\* necessarily the\* object we started with.

To see to it one object relating to another always makes the\* other object relate back to the\* first object again, you\* have to keep the\* two counterparts of the\* relationship synchronized. When\* you\* make a change to a sub-object’s target, the\* other side of the\* relationship also needs to be updated. This is called *relationship synchronization*. Relationship synchronization makes something between two objects melt together to one relationship. Only when\* the\* two unidirectional relationships are synchronized, then\* it is a full bidirectional relationship between classes.

If\* two unidirectional relationships are not\* synchronized, then\* they are just two separate unidirectional relationships, that have nothing to do with eachother.

A complete bidirectional relationship consists of three parts:

- one class has a sub-object of another class

- the\* other class has a sub-object of the\* first class

- the\* two unidirectional relationships are synchronized

When\* you\* create a relationship, you\* are adding those three elements. In the\* new computer language you\* are still able to create just a unidirectional relationship. In a programming environment you\* should be able to automatically turn a unidirectional relationship to a bidirectional relationship. In a programming environment you\* should be able to turn two already defined unidirectional relationships into a single bidirectional relationship.

Relationship synchronization is not\* present in the\* class structure. Relationship synchronization happens between *objects*.

As explained in the\* article *Relationships Between Objects*, any object, that as a relationship to another object, gives the\* other object one relationship back to the\* first object. In other words: one reference inside an object is tied to one reference inside another object.

It doesn’t matter if\* any of the\* two object references resides in a list or not\*. When\* you\* let one of the\* object references link to another object, then\* the\* link from the\* old counterpart to the\* object should be broken and a link from the\* new counterpart to the\* object should be established. The\* object synchronizes the\* old counterpart *out*, and it synchronizes the\* new counterpart *in*.

Relationship synchronization means ensuring the\* integrity between the\* two counterparts of a relationship. When\* you\* assign a **Lid** to a **Jar**, the\* **Jar** is also assigned to the\* **Lid**. So whenever a **Jar** changes its **Lid**, the\* original **Lid**’s reference to the\* **Jar** is annulled, and the\* new **Lid** get a reference to its new **Jar**. This actually explains synchronization between **1 🡪 1** related objects. Synchronization happens when\* assigning a related item. When\* assigning a related item, the\* related item gets a reference back to the\* first item.

Relationship synchronization happens when\* you\* assign a related object. When\* you\* assign **Lid . Jar**, then\* synchronizing the\* relationship, consists of, in turn, assigning **Jar . Lid**.

For every relationship type it works in a different way.

There are three relationship types:

**1 🡨🡪 1**

**1 🡨🡪 n**

**n 🡨🡪 n**

But\* synchronization is managed separately for each end of the\* relationship, so synchronization is managed in the\* following four of ways:

**1 🡪 1 synchronization**

**1 🡪 n synchronization**

**n 🡪 1 synchronization**

**n 🡪 n synchronization**

#### Synchronization Types

There are four synchronization types:

**1 🡪 1 synchronization**

**1 🡪 n synchronization**

**n 🡪 1 synchronization**

**n 🡪 n synchronization**

Every synchronization type follows a slightly different procedure, to make sure that on assignment of one relationship counterpart, the\* other relationship counterpart goes along with it.

#### 1 🡪 1 Synchronization

**1 🡪 1** synchronization is quite easy. In a **Jar 🡪** **Lid** relationship, when\* assigning **Lid . Jar**, The\* old **Jar . Lid** is set to **Nothing**, while the\* new **Jar . Lid** is set to **This**.

#### Risk of infinite loop 1 🡪 1

When\* a relationship is synchronized, you\* may have a risk to an infinite loop.

When\* you\* assign **Jar** to **Lid**, then\* **Lid** is assigned to **Jar**, upon which **Jar** is assigned to **Lid** again, and so on. Fortunately, when\* a **Jar** is assigned a **Lid** it already has, the\* whole assignment is not\* executed. So it only goes as far as: **Jar** is assigned to **Lid**, upon which **Lid** is assigned to **Jar** again, upon which **Jar** is assigned to **Lid** again, but\* **Jar** already had that **Lid**, so that assignment is never executed.

#### 1 🡪 n Synchronization

In a **1 🡪 n** relationship between **Parents** and **Children**, every time you\* assign a **Child** to a **Parent**, **Child . Parent** is overwritten. The\* old **Child** is assigned **Nothing** as the\* **Parent**, and the\* new **Child** is assigned its new **Parent**.

Also, the\* original **Child**’s **ID In Parent** is yielded over to the\* new **Child. The\*** original **Child**’s **ID In Parent** is reset.

There used to be a misunderstanding, that one **Parent** could\* reference the\* same **Child** multiple times. But\* that idea was abolished, because\* when\* a **Parent** relates to a **Child** twice, the\* **Child** has to relate back to the\* **Parent** twice. A **Child** can\* only have one **Parent**, so it can\* never relate back to the\* same **Parent** twice. Something like that would\* require an **n 🡪 n** relationship, for the\* **Child** to be able to hold multiple references to the\* same **Parent**.

#### Risk of infinite loop 1 🡪 n

Infinite loops for **n 🡪 1** synchronization the\* are prevented the\* same way as for **1 🡪 1** synchronization. When\* you\* assign a **Parent** to a **Child**, The\* **Child** is added to the\* **Parent**, upon which the\* **Parent** is again assigned to the\* **Child**. But\* the\* **Child** already had that **Parent**, so the\* assignment is never executed. So that prevents an infinite loop there.

#### n 🡪 1 Synchronization

In a **Child n 🡪 1 Parent** relationship, when\* you\* change **Child . Parent**, the\* **Child** is removed from its original **Parent** and added to the\* new **Parent**. So you\* can\* never have the\* same **Child** in several **Parents**.

A **Child** can\* not\* appear multiple times in the\* same **Parent**, because\* that, in turn, should give a **Child** multiple references back to the\* **Parent**, but\* a **Child** holds only one reference to a **Parent**.

#### Risk of infinite loop n 🡪 1

When\* a **1 🡪 n** relationship is synchronized, you\* may have a risk to an infinite loop. When\* you\* add a **Child** to a **Parent**, then\* the\* **Parent** is assigned to the\* **Child**, upon which the\* **Child** is added to the\* **Parent** *again*.

An earlier solution proposed for this, is that in synchronizing the\* relationship, you\* never boldly **Add** the\* **Child** to the\* **Parent**, but\* you\* execute a **Find Or Add**, which prevents the\* **Child** from being added again, when\* it is already in the\* **Parent**’s list. This would\* have worked, but\* n 🡪 n synchronization already required a different solution, that will be more efficient for n 🡪 1 synchronization as well.

When\* you\* assign an item to a list for synchronization purposes, no synchronization is to be executed on the\* other side again.

You\*’d have to call a special **List Item Set** procedure, accessible only to the\* related class, that simply won’t synchonize back again.

#### n 🡪 n Synchronization

One *related item* in one object always creates *one related item* inside the\* other object.

Two items, related to eachother in an **n 🡪 n** relationship, are always connected to eachother, by connecting two specific list positions to eachother.

In **n 🡪 n** synchronization, **Object A**’s reference to **Object B** will be replaced by a reference to **Object C**. When\* **Object B** is removed from **Object A**’s list, then\* **Object A** is also be removed from **Object B**’s list. After that, **Object A** is added to **Object C**’s list.

An item in one list is aware of its position in the\* other list. That makes it easy for an item in one list, to remove itself from the\* other list.

#### Risk of infinite loop n 🡪 n

But\* when\* you\* add **Object A** to **Object C**’s list of related items, then\* **Object C** will try to add itself to **Object A**’s list of related items, upon which **Object A** will add itself to the\* list of **Object C** again. An infinite loop should be prevented here.

When\* synchronizing the\* relationship between two objects in an **n 🡪 n** relationship, you\* will add a position to the\* list of the\* referrer, and next assign an item to this position.

When\* you\* assign an item to a list for synchronization purposes, no synchronization is to be executed on the\* other side again.

You\*’d have to call a special **List Item Set** procedure, accessible only to the\* related class, that simply won’t synchonize back again.

Another solution opted at first, was to execute a **Find Or Add** for synchronization, instead of executing an normal **Add** command. That would\* prevent a related item from being added and added again. But\* then\* you\* have the\* problem: maybe the\* same item *should* be added twice to the\* list, because\* one item can\* relate to another item multiple times, which also requires the\* other item to relate back to the\* first item multiple times. For each reference to an item, the\* item must have a reference back to the\* referrer.

So the\* new option is better: you\* have a special **List Item Set** procedure, possibly called by a special **Add** procedure, used solely for relationship synchronization, that won’t synchronize *back* again.

#### The\* abolished multiplicity of x

Earlier I had invented a multiplicity of **x**, which is plural, but\* then\* a fixed set of items, for instance three items. But\* **x** can\* be replaced by three separate **🡪 1** relationships. **X** was abolished in particular, because\* it would\* cause a lot of unpredictable behavior when\* trying to synchronize the\* two relationship counterparts, especially in **n/x 🡪 n/x** synchronization.

#### Confusions about relationship sychronization

There used to be two points at which there was confusion about the\* workings of relationship synchronization.

##### Confusion 1

What can\* be confusing is that, when\* a **1 🡪 n** relationship is synchronized, it can\* never be used as an **n 🡪 n** relationship. In the\* relationship **Parent 1 🡪 n Child**, every time you\* add a **Child** to a **Parent**, **Child . Parent** is overwritten. When\* you\* change **Child  .  Parent**, the\* **Child** is removed from its original **Parent** and added to the\* new **Parent**. So you\* can\* never have the\* same **Child** in several **Parents**. If\* you\* want to use multiple **Parents**, you\* can\*’t.

It is often easier to define something in **1 🡪 n** relationships, without thinking about it, that the\* backward relationship might be **🡪 n** too. But\* when\* a relationship is synchronized, the\* system falls apart when\* a **1 🡪 n** is actually intended as **n 🡪 n** and you\*’re trying to *use* it that way.

This can\* be misconceived as an error in the\* new computer language, or an inability of it, while it’s really just a wrongly defined relationship.

So then\* it becomes really important to define the\* exact relationship type of something, even when\* it’s more difficult.

If\* you\* do want to use the\* **1 🡪 n** relationship as an **n 🡪 n** relationship, you\* should change the\* relationship type, but\* you\* could\* also choose to split the\* bidirectional relationship into two unsynchronized unidirectional relationships. However, you\* will be loosing out on functionality and loosing integrity and coherence of the\* system.

A system in which all relationships are bidirectional and given the\* correct relationship type, functions in perfect harmony and everything is logical, correct and solid.

##### Confusion 2

Synchronization could\* cause confusion in older versions of the\* computer language, where you\* have two bidirectional relationships to the\* same class, that are given the\* same **Item Object Name**. In that case, one relationship’s counterpart synchronizing back to the\* related object could\* affect the\* other relationship. By default it is not\* allowed to have one class **A** being **1 🡪** related to multiple classes, in which **A** has the\* same **Item Object Name**. That is only allowed if\* the\* other relationships are made unidirectional, and not\* bidirectional, or if\* *melding* is enabled. *Melding* is a topic, which makes it possible for multiple relationship classes or for instance *progressed objects (*article *Progression)*, to be referenced as a single related item, but\* it has to be stated explicitly that this is the\* intention. See the\* article *Melding*.


#### Diagram Notation

There isn’t really a display of relationship synchronization in a diagram. You\* just know, that when\* a bidirectional relationship is expressed, the\* relationship will be synchronized.

The\* procedures of relationship synchronization are part of the\* system interface of symbols. System interfaces are the\* inner workings of symbols. The\* procedures of relationship synchronization can\* be expressed in the\* diagram, if\* the\* system interfaces of the\* symbols are displayed. See the\* article *System Interface*.

This article shows diagrams to demonstrates the\* difference between *not\** synchronizing two unidirectional relationships and *synchronizing* two unidirectional relationships.

Two unidirectional relationships will not\* be synchronized to eachother. An object of Class A can\* refer to an arbitrary object of Class B, which refers to an arbitrary object of Class A again.



It doesn’t make the\* two objects refer to eachother. It just makes the\* two objects refer to an arbitrary object of the\* other class, but\* not\* necessarily to eachother.

For this, relationship synchronization is applied, so that the\* first object and the\* second object always refer to eachother.



When\* the\* two following unidirectional relationships are synchronized,



then\* the\* two class lines merge together, to form the\* picture below:



Relationships between individual objects also turn from this:



Into this:



## Loose Ideas

### Loose Ideas about the\* Relationships Section

#### ± 2004

The\* main unit in a relational structure is the\* *class*. There is a list of *classes*.

The\* classes are tied together with *relationships*. One class is tied to another.

The\* main object that defines a relational structure is the\* Structure object. The\* Structure object contains a Classes collection and a Relationships collection. If\* you\* want to add a class, you\* do that in the\* Classes collection. If\* you\* want to add a relationship, you\* do that in the\* Relationships collection.

The\* Classes collection contains objects of class Class.

The\* Relationships collection contains objects of class Relationship.

Every Class has an Attributes collection. A Person Class, for instance, could\* have a Name Attribute and an EmailAddress Attribute and more attributes such as Street, HouseNumber, ZipCode, etcetera. A Class also contains a RelatedClasses collection, which reflects all of the\* class’s related classes. You\* can\*’t add RelatedClasses to this collection. You\* have to define relationships in the\* Structure.Relationships collection and they will be *reflected* in the\* Class.RelatedClasses collection. Other members of the\* Class class are explained in other sections, covering different concepts. However, all members are briefly explained in a sub section below.

A **Relationship** consists of two **RelationClasses**. It contains two **RelationClass** objects that define the\* two classes of the\* relationship and how they relate to one another.

A **Relationship** also defines whether the\* relationship is **Bidirectional** or **Unidirectional**, by the\* **Boolean** **Bidirectional** member. If\* a **Relationship** is **Bidirectional**, then\* both classes are aware of eachother and refer to one another. If\* a **Relationship** is **Unidirectional** then\* only **RelationClassA** is aware of **RelationClassB** and refers to it, but\* **RelationClassB** is unaware of **RelationClassA** and doesn’t refer to it.

Even though a **Bidirectional** relationship would\* seem to make **RelationClassA** and **RelationClassB** equal opponents, **RelationClassB** in many cases is the\* inferior one. For instance, in writing XML files, **RelationClassB** is seen as contained in **RelationClassA** and not\* the\* other way around. In that case *direction* of the\* relationship does matter. However, still in many cases **RelationClassA** and **RelationClassB** are technically equal opponents. When\* you\* keep in mind which **RelationClass** is inferior and which one is superior, things like XML writing go well automatically. If\* you\* are sloppy with choosing if\* something is **RelationClassA** or **RelationClassB**, you\* could\* get trouble that makes you\* obliged to switch the\* two relationship classes within the\* relationship, but\* usually you\* won’t notice anything going wrong. So relax, but\* beware.

The\* two **RelationClass** objects define the\* relationship furtherly.

The\* member **Class** of **RelationClass** is very important to set, and it defines which class makes part of the\* relationship. Define the\* **Class** in both **RelationClasses** of the\* **Relationship** and you\*’ve made a relationship between the\* two classes.

A very important member of a **RelationClass** is the\* **AbstractNumber**. This defines whether a relationship class is **1**, **x** or **n**. If\* you\* define the\* **AbstractNumber** for both of the\* two relationship classes, you\* can\* for instance make a 1🡨🡪n relationship between the\* two classes or a x🡨🡪n relationship or whatever. **AbstractNumber** is **1** by default.

To define the\* quantity of x, you\* set **ExactNumber**. For instance, in a   
**Line n🡨🡪2 Point** relationship, you\* define for the\* **Point** **RelationClass** that its **AbstractNumber = x** and its **ExactNumber = 2**.

Two other important members of a **RelationClass** are **CreateObjects** and **EnsureSubObjects**. **CreateObjects** is by default **True**, exceptions not\* regarded. **CreateObjects** says that when\* a new position is created within the\* related list, an object is instantly *created* in that position (See *Objects and Object Positions*). In many cases you\* want that to happen. Sometimes you\* don’t want objects to be created, because\* you\*’d want to assign an object to that position yourself. Then\* you\* set **CreateObjects** to **False**. Furtherly, **EnsureObjects** will see to it that you\* can\*’t assign **Nothing** to the\* object position. It is **True** by default, but\* can\* be set to **False**. For more information see the\* sections *Create Objects* and *Ensure Objects*.

And then\* there’s another member of **RelationClass** that is important to mention. And that is **ListType**. **ListType** is usually set to **NormalListType**, but\* can\* also be set to **ReferenceCountedListType**, **RegistrationListType**, **SharedListType** or **SelectionListType**. The\* list then\* gets very special behavior. For more information see the\* *Specialized Lists* section. Although I don’t explain them here very thoroughly, **ListType** does mean a lot for the\* general structure of the\* system.

You\* can\* see that inside a **RelationClass** object, much more is defined than just the\* **Class**. That’s why **RelationClass** is a separate class. Many times I will speak of a relationship class, and you\* shouldn’t confuse it with just a class then\*, because\* it will be defining a class as it is in the\* context of a relationship.

The\* elements as I’ve described them in this section, form the\* following structure of Classes, Attributes and Relationships.

Structure

|

|-- Classes

| |

| |-- Class ()

| |

| |-- Attributes

| | |

| | |-- Attribute ()

| |

| |-- RelatedClasses

| |

| |-- RelationClass ()

|

|-- Relationships

|

|-- Relationship ()

|

|-- Bidirectional

|

|-- RelationClassA and RelationClassB

|

|-- Class

|-- AbstractNumber

|-- ExactNumber

|-- CreateObjects

|-- EnsureObjects

|-- ListType

Every other concept of J Data is hung up on this main structure of **Classes**, **Attributes** and **Relationships**.

For instace, the\* physical appearance in the\* user interface of a list defined in a **RelationClass** with **AbstractNumber = n**, is defined inside that **RelationClass** object. The\* whole appearance of a **List Control** is defined inside a **RelationClass**. That is an example of how the\* user interface is defined right inside the\* general structure above. The\* same way *all* of the\* application’s features are defined in the\* context of the\* relational structure of **Classes**, **Attributes** and **Relationships**.

### Loose Ideas about Bidirectional & Unidirectional

Relationships,

New thing: what I should consider in the\* future, is that a relationship counterpart can\* be completely derived from the\* other relationship counterpart. Therefore, you\* might make a relationship bidirectional, so the\* counterpart usable, but\* not\* STORE it, but\* derived it somehow. That way you\* can\* use all relationship counterparts, just not\* store the\* ridiculously large ones. > No, because\* then\* you\*’d have to scan the\* whole internet for referrers.

JJ

### Loose Ideas about Relationships in General

*The\* texts below are loose ideas yet to be turned into good documentation.*

References,

2008-11-05

It is important to exactly see

which objects can\* be accessed through an object.

You\* should see access connectors for them.

It is also very important that you\* can\* exactly see

which object access something.

You\* have too much the\* ability to not\* register

which objects actually access something.

Perhaps in practice it is not\* so bad to impose registering

dependencies always. Perhaps practically the\* consequences

are overviewable.

The\* negatives about not\* seeing ALL referrers, but\* only some,

or optionally are BAD. Because\* not\* seeing the\* connections between

all things create a lot of problems in software systems today.

Perhaps most problems with software systems today have to do

with not\* knowing what exactly makes use of what.

But\* how about commonly used classes, such as integer.

Integer objects all around can\* store a link to the\* integer class

on the\* computer language site. But\* the\* integer class

on the\* computer language site can\* not\* register all objects

around the\* globe of class integer.

Or perhaps consequences of many many references to the\* same

class can\* be MADE overviewable.

Perhaps you\* can\* make intermediate references to class integer

on your local site or local module. Then\* the\* references to class integer

on that site, reference the\* local reference to class integer.

The\* references to class integer on a site are registered in

the\* local site's shadow of class integer.

And in class integer on the\* computer language site only the\* shadow

itself is registeren.

Perhaps you\* can\* enforce such a pattern.

It is always a problem with classes widely used.

Any class could\* potentially be widely used.

You\* could\* set reference quota, though, to protect your site.

But\* class integer should be used billions and billions of times.

Perhaps to protect your site, you\* make a reference quata,

or you\* enforce shadowing.

In a shadow situation, I'd like to also see how many referrers

a shadow of class integer has. But\* you\* can\* do that.

Site computer language has class integer, which registers all

sites using class integer, and those registrations consist of

the\* registration of a shadow reference of class integer,

and the\* shadow reference of class integer returns the\* references

of the\* shadow again, but\* those references are stored on the\*

client site, not\* on the\* computer language site.

You\* still register all integers, but\* the\* registration is spread over

multiple sites, so the\* costs are spread and everybody pays

a reasonable amount of storage cost.

But\* could\* this pattern be misused?

What if\* a new internet protocol allows many many more sites,

and somebody thinks it is cool to create 1,000,000 virtual sites,

for some purpose and each site shadows class integer.

Then\* you\* have 1,000,000 more registrations in class integer.

That's where quota's come in.

But\* that can\* also be abused. An attack could\* use up the\* quota,

and new shadows to integer can\* not\* be made anymore.

Existing sites, that use class integer still work,

but\* nobody can\* program a new site of class integer then\*.

But\* there is a difference between in good practice, and in bad practice.

You\* have to ask yourself: how can\* we make it practically work when\* we

are all behaving ourselves. Some things do not\* work practically even if\*

we do behave ourselves. That's one area of problems to work on.

It is another area of problems where well behaved practice works,

but\* bad behavior overthrows the\* system.

That last part we call attacks, virusses, threats, etcetera.

That area of problems should be adressed differently.

It is a principle, that good practice should be facilitated,

and bad behavior should not\* compromise how clear you\* can\*

organize your system, so should not\* compromise your freedom.

Bad behavior should be adressed separately in the\* background.

Enough for now.

JJ

Taken out of Interfaces Articles on 2010-05-07:

Preventing class’s extension with commands:

A class can\* prevent itself from getting further extended with commands.

For instance, you\* don’t want the\* class Integer to be extended with any command that uses an integer. It is a question of it being rediculous to maintain a list of all commands that uses integers. Don’t prevent a class from being extended with commands, just because\* you\* think it makes your interfaces more reliable. Class Integer can\* also just make it a *default*, that it doesn’t get further extended with commands. Some commands that use Integer, you\* might indeed want to see added to class integer, but\* you\* need to actively choose that then\*. If\* parameters don’t extend a class with a commands, these parameters are only shown as parameters, and not\* as commands inside a class definition.

> 2008-09-06 This is actually a non-bidirectional relationship.

This is basically the\* same issue as covered in the\* section Bidirectional & Unidirectional, which explains, when\* it is ridiculous to maintain a backward relationship. For instance: relationships from class Integer back to any class, that uses an integer are rediculous to maintain as well.

And if\* changes to the\* class are ventilated to all the\* objects this happens with the\* help of events, but\* usually you\*’ll just use versioning to use an unchanging production version of a class.

a class can\* *access control* the\* fact whether bidirectional relationships can\* be established to it.

I think, that a bidirectional relationship has a source site. One end of the\* relationship has authored the\* relationship, the\* other relationship just complied.

Actually, this could\* happen dually.

JJ

Backwards relationship alternative: Site usage

2010-05-03

For ‘ridiculous to maintain’ you\* could\* also go with this approach: make the\* small thing, like Integer always referenced in a qualified way through the\* site and maintain a unique list of source sites. That would\* at least give you\* an idea of how many sites are used and if\* any sites still use it.

JJ

Relationships,

2008-11

The\* roles that symbols get when\* connecting them with lines.

JJ