

Lecture Topics

- extensibility: philosophy vs. reality
- templates
 - motivation & basics
 - using function templates
 - template checking and binding [remainder Thursday]
 - avoiding code explosion
 - miscellany
 - the Standard Template Library
 - specializing containers

Administrivia

- HW #2
 - out today
 - get code from web page
 - nominally due in two weeks...

Philosophy vs. Reality

- “...no type...can have operations added after its definition is complete.” (Str, p. 81)
- functions valid on a class instance
 - defined at compile time (as with Simula)
 - in contrast with Smalltalk
 - which allows use of dynamic extensions, e.g., `base_pointer->new_func_name ();`
 - can't rule out questionable uses at compile time
 - thus implies run-time checking
- extensibility
 - consider base class with some non-virtual functions
 - attractive for performance reasons
 - Can I create a derived class that overrides a non-virtual function in the code of the base class?
 - No: I have to change the base class definition (add virtual keyword).
 - Java provides “final” to allow optimization
 - same issue!
 - to make an extension
 - I have to go in and remove “final.” Not much different.
- implications of definition may be subtle
 - “operations” may be implicit in the definition
 - changing the definition may
 - implicitly change the meaning of code using the definition
 - without producing any errors or warnings
 - implicit conversions
 - single-argument constructors
 - cast operators

Templates

- Str. Ch. 15
- templates provide a general mechanism for type polymorphism
 - write one piece of code (possibly several associated pieces)
 - tailor many implementations to specific types
- most important application: container classes
 - wide variety of algorithms operate on “things”
 - require a small number of basic relations on “things”
 - e.g., a total order
 - examples: lists, sets, heaps, extensible arrays, various search trees, maps (from key to item)
- earlier alternatives for C/C++
 - build using generic types and callbacks/casting
 - example: quicksort in standard C library; arguments include
 - an array pointer
 - number of elements in the array
 - size of elements
 - a callback function for comparisons (must be deterministic!)
 - use the preprocessor
 - example
 - one in Section 2.9.2 (unnecessarily weak binding)
 - pass types, new type names, associated strings, etc. as macro parameters
 - replace in code as necessary
 - multiple instantiations not easy to manage, so more of an external code-generation facility
 - N.B. preprocessor is slightly more powerful than templates, but substantially more error-prone

- goals for templates in C++
 - easy to use
 - efficient
 - general
 - fast compilation and linking
 - simple and portable
- basic model
 - templates for classes or functions
 - parameterized by one or more types and highly-restricted constants
 - definition creates nothing
 - template is instantiated when used
 - unused pieces need not be able to compile
- typical use
 - definitions provided in header file
 - instantiated and often inlined for each compilation unit
 - appear as weak symbols, so linker keeps one copy at most
 - inlining can cause code explosion (more later)
- examples

```
// Apply Newton's method with a given precision
// to a given function, starting from a certain point
template<class F> F newton
    (F (*func) (F arg), F precision, F start) { ... }

// a doubly-linked list of a given class
template<class T> class DoubleList { ... };
```

Using Function Templates

- types can usually be omitted
 - specify a (possibly empty) prefix of necessary types
 - other types must be deduced by compiler
 - example: calling `newton` with a callback that takes and returns a `double` implies that `class F` is `double`
- deduction can sometimes require type conversion
- and thus a single template may create an overloaded function
- regardless
 - function templates participate in overloading
 - including those appearing as class members
- resolution is slightly different when template versions of a name exist
 - an otherwise **equal** match between a template and a non-template version
 - i.e., an ambiguous pair according to the matching rules
 - is silently routed to the non-template version
 - (exact matches necessary to allow specialization, but more general rule is questionable)
- note
 - you are **allowed** to include type arguments when calling a function
 - non-template versions cannot match a call with type arguments
- some things cannot be deduced
 - return type
 - internal types (example: define `newton` function to use doubles in interfaces, but use something else internally)

Template Checking and Binding

- a given template (in whole or part) may not make sense for some types
 - many argued for explicit constraint mechanism
 - What's the rationale for avoiding? constraints force code replication
 - example
 - some types may allow sorting (say, a function `sort`)
 - some functions in a template class use `sort`
 - constraints demand that any type provide it
 - forcing creation of a separate template for types without `sort`
 - instead, simply avoid using functions that require `sort` with types that don't provide it
- delaying instantiation is not without drawbacks!
 - delayed errors
 - possible unintended variations due to contextual changes (remember call stealing?)
- questions without obvious answers
 - When are templates checked?
 - When are calls bound (i.e., overload resolution)?
 - note: textbook answer and today's `g++` are not the same!
- the rules according to the textbook
 1. names that do not depend on any of the class arguments of a template: checked and bound at template definition
 2. names that depend on template's class arguments: checked and bound at first use in compilation unit (**not** at point of variable declaration, etc.)
- `g++` rules are...weird
 - #1 is always bound at instantiation, but #2 is bound in definition if the template class type is built-in (e.g., `int`)
 - run `bind-example.cc` from the web page