Overloading and Type Classes

(Adhoc Polymorphism)

Yu Zhang

Course web site: http://staff.ustc.edu.cn/~yuzhang/tpl

References

- D. Rémy(Cambium project-team): Type systems for PLs
  - Chapter 7 Overloading
- [Concepts in PLs] Revised Chapter 7 Type Classes
- PFPL
  - Chapter 44 Type Abstractions and Type Classes
- Papers
  - [ESOP 1988] Parametric Overloading in Polymorphic PLs
  - [POPL 2007] Modular Type Classes
- Implementation
  - Implementing, and Understanding Type Classes
  - Implementing type classes as OCaml modules

- Types and Propositions:
  - [TPHOLs 1997] Type classes and overloading in higher-order logic

Outline

- Parametric Polymorphism vs. Overloading
- Why Overloading
- Overloading Mechanisms
  - Static / dynamic resolution of overloading
- Parametric Overloading and Type Classes

  also known as bounded polymorphism, or type classes
  - Dictionary passing
  - Macro
  - Intentionally type analysis

Parametric Polymorphism vs. Overloading

- Parametric polymorphism
  - Single algorithm for *any* type

    If $f : t \rightarrow t$, then $f : \mathrm{int} \rightarrow \mathrm{int}$, $f : \mathrm{bool} \rightarrow \mathrm{bool}$, …
- Overloading
  - Single symbol may refer to different algorithms/operations.
  - Each algorithm may have different unrelated type.
  - Choice of algorithm determined by type context.
- Parametric overloading
  - The types being instances of a single type expression over some extended set of type variables

    $+$ **has types** $\mathbf{int} \rightarrow \mathbf{int} \rightarrow \mathbf{int}$, $\mathbf{float} \rightarrow \mathbf{float} \rightarrow \mathbf{float}$,

    but **not** $\boldsymbol{X} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{X} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{X}$ **for any** $\boldsymbol{X}$.

Why Overloading ?

- Many useful functions are not parametric
- Can list membership work for any type?

$$\textbf{member} : \forall \boldsymbol{X}.\boldsymbol{X}\ \textbf{list} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{X} \rightarrow \textbf{bool}$$

- Can list sorting work for any type?

$$\textbf{sort} : \forall \boldsymbol{X}.\boldsymbol{X}\ \textbf{list} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{X}\ \textbf{list}$$

Why Overloading ?

- Many useful functions are not parametric
- Can list membership work for any type?

$$\textbf{member} : \forall X. X \ \textbf{list} \rightarrow X \rightarrow \textbf{bool}$$

  - No! Only for types X that support equality.

- Can list sorting work for any type?

$$\textbf{sort} : \forall X. X \ \textbf{list} \rightarrow X \ \textbf{list}$$

  - No! Only for types X that support ordering.

Variants of Overloading

- **Static overloading**: *static* resolution strategy
  - Simple semantics: meaning determined statically
  - Does not increase expressiveness
  - Reduce verbosity, increase modularity and abstraction
- **Dynamic overloading**
  - meaning determined dynamically
  - Increase expressiveness
  - Extra mechanism to support the dynamic resolution
    - Require full or partial type info., or some type-related info.

Overloading Mechanisms

Static Overloading

- **Approach 1**: A function containing overloaded symbols
  => multiple functions
  - e.g. double x = x + x
    defines two versions: Int -> Int and Float -> Float

  But, how to resolve

  doubles (x, y, z) = (double x, double y, double z)

  - 8 possible versions!

  => *Exponential growth in number of versions*

Static Overloading

- **Approach 2** (used in SML-MLton): restrict the definition, i.e., specify one of the possible versions as the meaning
  - e.g. double x = x + x => double: Int -> Int

    double 3 ✓ double 3.2 ✖

    If you want double: Float -> Float, you need define the function explicitly specifying type.
- In Java
  - overloading a method in a class => static resolution
  - But if an argument has a runtime type that is subtype of the compile-time time => dynamic resolution

Dynamic Overloading

- Resolution with a **type passing** semantics

  Runtime type dispatch using a general *typecase* construct

  - High runtime cost of *typecase* unless type patterns are significantly restricted

- Resolution with a **type erasing** semantics

  To avoid the expensive cost of *typecase*,

  restrict the overloaded functions by using tags.

$$\textbf{let } f = \lambda x.x + x \textbf{ in } [\,]$$

e.g. Dictionary passing

can be elaborated into $\textbf{let } f = \lambda(+).\lambda x.x + x \textbf{ in } [\,]$

f **1.0 is then elaborated to** $f\ (+.)\ 1.0$

Parametric Overloading

- Overloading **Equality**
  1. Equality was overloaded as an operator.

     But *member* using '==' does not work in general

$$\textbf{member } [\,]\ y = \textbf{False}$$

$$\textbf{member } (x : xs)\ \ y = (x == y)\ ||\ \textbf{member }\ xs\ \ y$$

$$\textbf{member } [\,1, 2, 3]\ \ 32$$ ✓

$$\textbf{member "Haskell" 'k'}$$ ✖

Parametric Overloading

- Overloading Equality
  1. Equality was overloaded as an operator.

     But *member* using '==' does not work in general
  2. Make type of equality fully polymorphic (Miranda)

     (==) :: t -> t-> Bool

  thus *member* is polymorphic, member:: [t] -> t-> Bool

  If t does not provide a definition of equality, then there is a runtime error when equality applied to a value of type t.

  => Violate principle of abstraction

Parametric Overloading

- Overloading Equality
  1. Equality was overloaded as an operator.
     But *member* using '==' does not work in general
  2. Make type of equality fully polymorphic (Miranda)
  3. Make equality polymorphic in **a limited way** (used in current SML)

     (==) :: ''t -> ''t-> Bool ''t indicate t is an eqtype variable

     member has precise type, i.e. [''t] -> ''t -> Bool

     if t does not support equality, there will be a **static** error

Parametric Overloading

- Overloading Equality
  1. Equality was overloaded as an operator.

     But *member* using ‘==‘ does not work in general
  2. Make type of equality fully polymorphic (Miranda)
  3. Make equality polymorphic in **a limited way** (used in current SML)

     (==) :: “t -> “t-> Bool   “t indicate t is an eqtype variable

     member has precise type, i.e. [“t] -> “t -> Bool

     if t does not support equality, there will be a **static** error

Equality is a special case,
how can we generalize overloading?

Type Classes

- Type classes are a mechanism in Haskell
  - Generalize eqtype to user-defined collections of types (called *type classes*)

    member:: (a-> a-> Bool) -> [a] -> a-> Bool

    member cmp [] y = False

    member cmp (*x* : *xs*) y = (cmp x y) || member cmp xs y

- **Dictionary-passing** style implementation [ESOP1988]
  - Type-class declaration – dictionary
  - Name of a type class method – label in the dictionary
  - Parametric overloading
    - pass the dictionary to the function

Examples: Dictionary Passing

- Haskell

```
class Show a where
  show :: a -> String

instance Show Bool where
  show True  = “True”
  show False = “False”


instance Show Int where
  show x = Prelude.show x  -- internal


— The first parametrically
— overloaded function
print :: Show a => a -> IO ()
print x = putStrLn $ show x

— and its instantiation
test_print :: IO ()
test_print = print True
```

- OCaml

```
type 'a show = {show: 'a -> string}


let show_bool : bool show =
  {show = function
    | true  -> “True”
    | false -> “False”}


let show_int : int show =
  {show = string_of_int}


(* The first parametrically overloaded function *)
let print : 'a show -> 'a -> unit =
  fun {show=show} x -> print_endline (show x)

(* and its instantiation *)
let test_print : unit =
  print show_bool true
```

Dictionary

Label in the dictionary

More Examples

- Type class whose methods have a different of overloading: e.g. Num
- An instance with a constraint:

  e.g. a Show instance for all list types [a] where the element type a is also restricted to be a member of Show.

  show_list: ‘a show -> ‘a list show (OCaml)
- A class of comparable types

  e.g. class Eq a (Haskell) or type 'a eq (OCaml)
- Polymorphic recursion

See http://okmij.org/ftp/Computation/typeclass.html#dict

Other Implementations

- Type classes as **macros**
  - Static monomorphization (compile-time)
    - Takes the **type-checked** code with type classes
    - generates code with no type classes and no bounded polymorphism

    vs. C++ templates ? Template instantiation may produce ill-typed code

- Intentional type analysis (run-time)

  choose the appropriate overloading operation at run-time

  See http://okmij.org/ftp/Computation/typeclass.html#dict

Mod: A Module Language

- Syntax

Sig	σ	$::=$	$\mathtt{sig}\{\kappa\}(t.\tau)$	$[\![t :: \kappa\,;\,\tau]\!]$	signature
Mod	M	$::=$	X	X	variable
			$\mathtt{str}(c;e)$	$[\![c\,;\,e]\!]$	structure
			$\mathtt{seal}\{\sigma\}(M)$	$M \upharpoonright \sigma$	seal
			$\mathtt{let}\{\sigma\}(M_1;X.M_2)$	$(\mathtt{let}\ X\ \mathtt{be}\ M_1\ \mathtt{in}\ M_2) : \sigma$	definition
Con	c	$::=$	$\mathtt{stat}(M)$	$M \cdot \mathsf{s}$	static part
Exp	e	$::=$	$\mathtt{dyn}(M)$	$M \cdot \mathsf{d}$	dynamic part