

# Re: synchronized class

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Java/comp.lang.java.programmer/2006-01/msg04378.html>

---

- *From:* "Mike Schilling" <[msscottschilling@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msscottschilling@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 31 Jan 2006 22:13:06 GMT
- 

"Thomas Hawtin" <[usenet@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:usenet@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:43dfa14e\\$0\\$1491\\$ed2619ec@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:43dfa14e$0$1491$ed2619ec@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)  
> John Goche wrote:

>>  
>> I would like to know whether the "synchronized class" construct is  
>> valid in JDK 1.5 and whether it has any meaning at all in the context  
>> of multithreaded programming or whether the compiler will ignore it  
>> altogether. I have read some posts stating that "synchronized class"  
>> is not a legal way to begin a Java class definitions. Any comments  
>> on this would be sincerely appreciated.  
>  
> JDK 1.0.2 (not sure about 1.1, certainly not 1.2) allowed "synchronized  
> class". That was a bug. IIRC, it set the equivalent but unassigned bit in  
> class file. It had, and has still, absolutely no effect on runtime  
> behaviour.

It has a huge effect on runtime behavior now: if you can't compile a class,  
it won't run.

- 
- *References:*
    - ◆ [\*synchronized class\*](#)
      - ◇ *From:* John Goche
    - ◆ [\*Re: synchronized class\*](#)
      - ◇ *From:* Thomas Hawtin
  - Prev by Date: [\*Is HTTP Stateful or Stateless?\*](#)
  - Next by Date: [\*Re: Various Interest Rates\*](#)
  - Previous by thread: [\*Re: synchronized class\*](#)
  - Next by thread: [\*URL file chooser\*](#)
  - Index(es):
    - ◆ [\*Date\*](#)
    - ◆ [\*Thread\*](#)