

## Re: Question about synchronized

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2005-11/msg01308.html>

---

- *From:* "Chris Uppal" <[chris.uppal@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:chris.uppal@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 13 Nov 2005 11:50:21 -0000
- 

Thomas G. Marshall wrote:

> John C. Bollinger wrote:

>> Yes. You should think of synchronization as protecting sections of code

>> -- either blocks or methods -- not objects.

>

> Yes! And where were you when I was getting railed on for making such a

> claim in september '04?

I also wondered if "John" is being spoofed, or possibly has been taken over by mind-eating aliens ;-)

For the record: /I/ am still me, and so am unchanged in my opinion that talking of "protecting sections of code" is badly misleading...

-- chris

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ [\*\*Re: Question about synchronized\*\*](#)  
◇ *From:* John C. Bollinger

• *References:*

- ◆ [\*\*Question about synchronized\*\*](#)  
◇ *From:* Matthias Kaepler
- ◆ [\*\*Re: Question about synchronized\*\*](#)  
◇ *From:* John C. Bollinger

- Prev by Date: [\*\*Re: Sun Java products pricelist\*\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*\*Re: Sun Java products pricelist\*\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*\*Re: Question about synchronized\*\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*\*Re: Question about synchronized\*\*](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [\*\*Date\*\*](#)
  - ◆ [\*\*Thread\*\*](#)