CSE 341:
Programming Languages

Winter 2006

Lecture 26— Static Overloading; Subtype vs. Parametric Polymorphism; Bounded Quantification

Static Overloading

Many OO languages allow methods in the same class to have the same "name" but different argument types. E.g.:

```
void show(Window w)  ...
void show(DancingBear db) ...
float distTo(Point p) ...
float distTo(3DPoint p) ...
```

This complicates slightly the semantics of message send. As before, we:

- Use the class ("run-time type") of the receiver to pick a method.
- Call the method with the receiver bound to `self`.

But now there are multiple methods with the same name, so we:

- Use the *(compile-time) types* of the arguments to pick the "best match".

A lower-level view

Here's an equivalent way to think about it:

- A method's *name* includes the types of its "formal" arguments (e.g., `show$Window`)
- A message send is rewritten with the types of its "actual" arguments after typechecking (e.g., `show(e)` becomes `show$Window(e)` if `e` has type `Window`.

This seems like an "ugly" view, but:

- It's exactly how static overloading is implemented.
- It means the overloading is really resolved "at compile-time" (long before `e` is evaluated).

But... It interacts poorly with contravariant subtyping on method argument-types, which (possibly) is why Java and C++ use invariant subtyping there.

Static Overloading vs. Multimethods

A very simple difference: Multimethods choose the method at run-time using the class of the actuals.

Example: `e.distTo((Point)(new 3DPoint(3.0,4.0,2.0)))`

The same "no best match" errors arise, but with overloading they arise at compile-time (and can be resolved with explicit subsumption).

Static Typing and Code Reuse

Key idea: Scheme and Smalltalk are different but not *that* different:

- Scheme has arbitrarily nested lexical scope (so does Smalltalk, but only within a method)
- Smalltalk has subclassing and dynamic dispatch (but easy to code up what you need in Scheme)

Java and ML are a bit more different:

- ML has datatypes; Java has classes
- The ML default is immutable
- Java does not have first-class functions (but does have anonymous inner classes)

But the key difference is the *type system*: Java has subtyping; ML has parametric polymorphism (e.g., `('a * ('a -> 'b)) -> 'b`).

What are "forall" types good for?

Some good uses for forall types:

- Combining functions:

```
(* (('a->'b)*('b->'c)) -> ('a->'c) *)
fun compose (f,g) x = g (f x)
```

- Operating on generic container types:

```
isempty : ('a list) -> bool
map : (('a list) * ('a -> 'b)) -> 'b list
```

- Passing private data (unnecessary with closures):

```
(* ('a * (('a * string) -> int)) -> int *)
let f (env, g) =
   let val s1 = getString(37)
       val s2 = getString(49)
   in g(env,s1) + g(env,s2) end
```

What is subtyping good for?

Passing in values with "extra" or "more useful" stuff

```
//can pass a Pt3D
boolean isXPos(Pt p){ return p.x > 0; }
```

But in ML, we cannot subsume record types to forget fields. We can write code that "looks like" explicit casting, but it "coerces" values by *making new values*.

end up *encoding coercions to supertypes* using regular ML functions that build new values. (See code)

What else is subtyping good for?

In addition to adding "public" fields, we can use it for private state:

```
interface J { int f(int); }
class MaxEver implements J {
   private int m = 0;
   public int f(int i) { if(i > m) m = i; return m; }
}
```

In ML, we *encode* private state using closures:

```
(* closures over mutable fields act like objects,
   but there is no dynamic dispatch here *)
type J = int -> int
val f : J =
   let val m = ref 0
   in fn i => ((if i > !m then m := i else ()); !m)
   end
```

Wanting both

Could one language support subtype polymorphism and parametric polymorphism?

- Sure; and the latest generation of OO languages does (Java [1.]5, C# 2005)
- C++ templates are sort of like parametric polymorphism, but they duplicate code, so they're a bit like macros

More interestingly, you may want *both at once*!

```
Pt withXZero(Pt p) { return new Pt(0,p.y); }
```

How could we make a version that worked for subtypes too?

Need for Bounded Quantification

Best effort in Java:

```
interface I { Pt copy(Pt p); }
Pt withXZero(Pt p, I i) {
  Pt ans = i.copy(p); ans.x = 0; return ans;
}
class A implements I {
  Pt copy(Pt p) { return new Pt3D(p.x,p.y,((Pt3D)p).z); }
  void f(Pt3D p) { Pt3D q = (Pt3D)withXZero(p,this); }
}
```

- copy method has to downcast argument.
- caller of `withXZero` has to downcast result.

Need for Bounded Quantification

Best effort in ML (Pt and Pt3D defined in lec26.sml)

```
(* withXZero : ((pt->'a) * ('a->pt) * 'a) -> 'a *)
fun withXZero (to,from,v) =
  to({x = 0, y = #y (from v)})
fun withXZeroPt p = withXZero(fn x=>x, fn x=>x, p)
fun withXZero3DPt p = withXZero(Pt3D, Pt, p)
```

- This is tricky.
- Makes 2 temporary "objects" to appease the type system.

Bounded Quantification Example

```
interface I<'a> { 'a copy('a p); }
'a withXZero('a p, I<'a> i) where 'a <: Pt {
  'a ans = i.copy(p); ans.x = 0; return ans;
}
class A implements I<Pt3D> {
  Pt3D copy(Pt3D p) { return new Pt3D(p.x,p.y,p.z); }
  void f(Pt3D p) { Pt3D q = withXZero(p,this); }
}
```

- No downcasts.
- Without the bound, `ans.x = 0` would not typecheck.
- At call-sites of `withXZero`, just check the instantiation for `'a` is a subtype of `Pt`

Bounded quantification in general

In general, in a language with subtyping (`t1<:t2`) and parametric polymorphism, a useful generalization of `forall 'a. t` is `forall 'a<:t1 . t2`. This allows fewer instantiations for `'a`.

It does raise interesting "beyond 341" questions, e.g., When is `forall 'a<:t1 . t2` a subtype of `forall 'a<:t3. t4`?