

Chapter 11: Operator Overloading

Consider the following C++ code snippet:

```
vector<string> myVector(kNumStrings);
for(vector<string>::iterator itr = myVector.begin();
    itr != myVector.end(); ++itr)
    *itr += "Now longer!";
```

Here, we create a `vector<string>` of a certain size, then iterate over it concatenating “Now longer!” to each of the strings. Code like this is ubiquitous in C++, and initially does not appear all that exciting. However, let’s take a closer look at how this code is structured. First, let’s look at exactly what operations we’re performing on the iterator:

```
vector<string> myVector(kNumStrings);
for(vector<string>::iterator itr = myVector.begin();
    itr != myVector.end(); ++itr)
    *itr += "Now longer!";
```

In this simple piece of code, we’re comparing the iterator against `myVector.end()` using the `!=` operator, incrementing the iterator with the `++` operator, and dereferencing the iterator with the `*` operator. At a high level, this doesn’t seem all that out of the ordinary, since STL iterators are designed to look like regular pointers and these operators are all well-defined on pointers. But the key thing to notice is that STL iterators *aren’t* pointers, they’re *objects*, and `!=`, `*`, and `++` aren’t normally defined on objects. We can’t write code like `++myVector` or `*myMap = 137`, so why can these operations be applied to `vector<string>::iterator`?

Similarly, notice how we’re concatenating the string “Now longer!” onto the end of the string:

```
vector<string> myVector(kNumStrings);
for(vector<string>::iterator itr = myVector.begin();
    itr != myVector.end(); ++itr)
    *itr += "Now longer!";
```

Despite the fact that `string` is an object, somehow C++ “knows” what it means to apply `+=` to `strings`.

All of the above examples are instances of *operator overloading*, the ability to specify how operators normally applicable to primitive types can interact with custom classes. Operator overloading is ubiquitous in professional C++ code and, used correctly, can make your programs more concise, more readable, and more template-friendly.

There are two overarching purposes of operator overloading. First, operator overloading enables your custom classes to act like primitive types. That is, if you have a class like `vector` that mimics a standard C++ array, you can allow clients to use array notation to access individual elements. Similarly, when designing a class encapsulating a mathematical entity (for example, a complex number), you can let clients apply mathematical operators like `+`, `-`, and `*` to your type as though it were built into the language. Second, operator overloading enables your code to interact correctly with template and library code. For example, you can overload the `<<` operator to make a class compatible with the streams library, or the `<` operator to interface with STL containers.

This chapter discusses general topics in operator overloading, demonstrating how to overload some of the more common operators. It also includes tricks and pitfalls to be aware of when overloading certain operators.

A Word of Warning

I would be remiss to discuss operator overloading without first prefacing it with a warning: operator overloading is a double-edged sword. When used correctly, operator overloading can lead to intuitive, template-friendly code that elegantly performs complex operations behind the scenes. However, incorrectly overloaded operators can lead to incredibly subtle bugs. Seemingly innocuous code along the lines of `*myIter = 5` can cause serious problems if implemented incorrectly, and without a solid understanding of how to overload operators you may find yourself in serious trouble.

There is a pearl of design wisdom that is particularly applicable to operator overloading:

Theorem (*The Principle of Least Astonishment*): A function's name should communicate its behavior and should be consistent with other naming conventions and idioms.

The principle of least astonishment should be fairly obvious – you should design functions so that clients can understand what those functions do simply by looking at the functions' names; that is, clients of your code should not be “astonished” that a function with one name does something entirely different. For example, a function named `DoSomething` violates the principle of least astonishment because it doesn't communicate what it does, and a function called `ComputePrimes` that reads a grocery list from a file violates the principle because the name of the function is completely different from the operation it performs. However, other violations of the principle of least astonishment are not as blatant. For example, a custom container class whose `empty` member function erases the contents of the container violates the principle of least astonishment because C++ programmers expect `empty` to mean “is the container empty?” rather than “empty the container.” Similarly, a class that is bitwise `const` but not semantically `const` violates the principle, since programmers assume that objects can't be modified by `const` member functions.

When working with operator overloading, it is crucial to adhere to the principle of least astonishment. C++ lets you redefine almost all of the built-in operators however you choose, meaning that it's possible to create code that does something completely different from what C++ programmers might expect. For example, suppose that you are working on a group project and that one of your teammates writes a class `CustomVector` that acts like the STL `vector` but which performs some additional operations behind the scenes. Your program contains a small bug, so you look over your teammate's code and find the following code at one point:

```
CustomVector one = /* ... */ , two = /* ... */;  
one %= two;
```

What does the line `one %= two` do? Syntactically, this says “take the remainder when dividing `one` by `two`, then store the result back in `one`.” But this makes no sense – how can you divide one `CustomVector` by another? You ask your teammate about this, and he informs you that the `%=` operator means “remove all elements from `one` that are also in `two`.” This is an egregious violation of the principle of least astonishment. The code neither communicates what it does nor adheres to existing convention, since the semantics of the `%=` operator are meaningless when applied to linear data structures. This is not to say, of course, that having the ability to remove all elements from one `CustomVector` that are contained in another is a bad idea – in fact, it can be quite useful – but this functionality should be provided by a properly-named member function rather than a cryptically-overloaded operator. For example, consider the following code:

```
CustomVector one = /* ... */; two = /* ... */;
one.removeAllIn(two);
```

This code accomplishes the same task as the above code, but does so by explicitly indicating what operation is being performed. This code is much less likely to confuse readers and is far more descriptive than before.

As another example, suppose that your teammate also implements a class called `CustomString` that acts like the standard `string` type, but provides additional functionality. You write the following code:

```
CustomString one = "Hello", two = " World";
one += two;
cout << one + "!" << endl;
```

Intuitively, this should create two strings, then concatenate the second onto the end of the first. Next, the code prints out `one` followed by an exclamation point, yielding “Hello World!” Unfortunately, when you compile this code, you get an unusual error message – for some reason the code `one += two` compiles correctly, but the compiler rejects the code `one + "!"`. In other words, your teammate has made it legal to concatenate two strings using `+=`, but not by using `+`. Again, think back to the principle of least astonishment. Programmers tacitly expect that objects that can be added with `+` can be added with `+=` and vice-versa, and providing only half of this functionality is likely to confuse code clients.

The moral of this story is simple: when overloading operators, make sure that you adhere to existing conventions. If you don't, you will end up with code that is either incorrect, confusing, or both.

Hopefully this grim introduction has not discouraged you from using operator overloading. Operator overloading is extraordinarily useful and you will not be disappointed with the possibilities that are about to open up to you. With that said, let's begin discussing the mechanics behind this powerful technique.

Defining Overloaded Operators

We introduced operator overloading as a mechanism for redefining how the built-in operators apply to custom classes. Syntactically, how do we communicate to the C++ compiler that we want to redefine these operators? The answer is somewhat odd. Here's the original motivating example we had at the beginning of the chapter:

```
vector<string> myVector(kNumStrings);
for(vector<string>::iterator itr = myVector.begin();
    itr != myVector.end(); ++itr)
    *itr += "Now longer!";
```

When you provide this code to the C++ compiler, it interprets it as follows:

```
vector<string> myVector(kNumStrings);
for(vector<string>::iterator itr = myVector.begin();
    operator!=(itr, myVector.end());
    itr.operator++())
    (itr.operator*()).operator +=("Now longer!");
```

Notice that everywhere we used the built-in operator in conjunction with an object, the compiler reinterpreted the operator as a call to a specially-named function called `operator op`, where `op` is the particular operator we used. Thus `itr != myVector.end()` translated into `operator!=(itr, myVector.end())`, `++itr` was interpreted as `itr.operator++()`, etc. Although these functions may have cryptic names, they're just regular functions. Operator overloading is simply *syntax sugar*, a way of

rewriting one operation (in this case, function calls) using a different syntax (here, the built-in operators). Overloaded operators are not somehow “more efficient” than other functions simply because the function calls aren't explicit, nor are they treated any different from regular functions. They are special only in that they can be invoked using the built-in operators rather than through an explicit function call.

If you'll notice, some of the operators used above were translated into member function calls (particularly `++` and `*`), while others (`!=`) were translated into calls to free functions. With a few exceptions, any operator can be overloaded as either a free function or a member function. Determining whether to use free functions or member functions for overloaded operators is a bit tricky, and we'll discuss it more as we continue our tour of overloaded operators.

Each of C++'s built-in operators has a certain number of *operands*. For example, the plus operator (`a + b`) has two operands corresponding to the values on the left- and right-hand sides of the operator. The pointer dereference operator (`*itr`), on the other hand, takes in only one operand: the pointer to dereference. When defining a function that is an overloaded operator, you will need to ensure that your function has one parameter for each of the operator's operands. For example, suppose that we want to define a type `RationalNumber` which encapsulates a rational number (a ratio of two integers). Because it's mathematically sound to add two rational numbers, we might want to consider overloading the `+` operator as applied to `RationalNumber` so that we can add `RationalNumbers` using an intuitive syntax. What would such a function look like? If we implement the `+` operator as a member function of `RationalNumber`, the syntax would be as follows:

```
class RationalNumber
{
public:
    const RationalNumber operator+ (const RationalNumber& rhs) const;

    /* ... etc. ... */
};
```

(You might be wondering why the return type is `const RationalNumber`. For now, you can ignore that... we'll pick this up in the next section)

With `operator+` defined this way, then addition of `RationalNumbers` will be translated into calls to the member function `operator+` on `RationalNumber`. For example, the following code:

```
RationalNumber one, two;
RationalNumber three = one + two;
```

will be interpreted by the compiler as

```
RationalNumber one, two;
RationalNumber three = one.operator+(two);
```

Notice that the code `one + two` was interpreted as `one.operator+(two)`. That is, the receiver object of the `operator+` function is the left-hand operand, while the argument is the right-hand argument. This is not a coincidence, and in fact C++ will guarantee that the relative ordering of the operands is preserved. `one + two` will never be interpreted as `two.operator+(one)` under any circumstance, and our implementation of `operator+` can take this into account.

Alternatively, we could consider implementing `operator+` as a free function taking in two arguments. If we chose this approach, then the interface for `RationalNumber` would be as follows:

```

class RationalNumber
{
public:
    /* ... etc. ... */
};

const RationalNumber operator+ (const RationalNumber& lhs,
                                const RationalNumber& rhs);

```

In this case, the code

```

RationalNumber one, two;
RationalNumber three = one + two;

```

would be interpreted by the compiler as

```

RationalNumber one, two;
RationalNumber three = operator+ (one, two);

```

Again, the relative ordering of the parameters is guaranteed to be stable, and so you can assume that the first parameter to `operator+` will always be on the left-hand side of the operator.

In some cases, two operators are syntactically identical but have different meanings. For example, the `-` operator can refer either to the binary subtraction operator (`a - b`) or the unary negation operator (`-a`). If overload the `-` operator, how does the compiler know whether your overloaded operator is the unary or binary version of `-`? The answer is rather straightforward: if the function operates on two pieces of data, the compiler treats `operator-` as the binary subtraction operator, and if the function uses just one piece of data it's considered to be the unary negation operator. Let's make this discussion a bit more concrete. Suppose that we want to implement subtraction on the `RationalNumber` class. Because the binary subtraction operator has two operands, we would provide subtraction as an overloaded operator either as a free function:

```

const RationalNumber operator- (const RationalNumber& lhs,
                                const RationalNumber& rhs);

```

or, alternatively, as a member function:

```

class RationalNumber
{
public:
    const RationalNumber operator- (const RationalNumber& rhs) const;

    /* ... etc. ... */
};

```

Notice that both of these functions operate on two pieces of data. In the first case, the function takes in two parameters, and in the second, the receiver object is one piece of data and the parameter is the other. If we now want to provide an implementation of `operator-` which represents the unary negation operator, we could implement it as a free function with the following signature:

```

const RationalNumber operator- (const RationalNumber& arg);

```

Or as a member function of this form:

```

class RationalNumber
{
public:
    const RationalNumber operator- () const;

    /* ... etc. ... */
};

```

Again, don't worry about why the return type is a `const RationalNumber`. We'll address this shortly.

What Operator Overloading Cannot Do

When overloading operators, you cannot define brand-new operators like `#` or `@`. After all, C++ wouldn't know the associativity or proper syntax for the operator (is `one # two + three` interpreted as `(one # two) + three` or `one # (two + three)`?) Additionally, you cannot overload any of the following operators:

Operator	Syntax	Name
<code>::</code>	<code>MyClass::value</code>	Scope resolution
<code>.</code>	<code>one.value</code>	Member selection
<code>?:</code>	<code>a > b ? -1 : 1</code>	Ternary conditional
<code>.*</code>	<code>a.*myClassPtr;</code>	Pointer-to-member selection (beyond the scope of this text)
<code>sizeof</code>	<code>sizeof(MyClass)</code>	Size of object
<code>typeid</code>	<code>typeid(MyClass)</code>	Runtime type information operator
<code>(T)</code> <code>static_cast</code> <code>dynamic_cast</code> <code>reinterpret_cast</code> <code>const_cast</code>	<code>(int) myClass;</code>	Typecast

Note that operator overloading only lets you define what built-in operators mean when applied to *objects*. You cannot use operator overloading to redefine what addition means as applied to `ints`, nor can you change how pointers are dereferenced. Then again, by the principle of least astonishment, you wouldn't want to do this anyway.

Lvalues and Rvalues

Before we begin exploring some of the implementation issues associated with overloaded operators, we need to take a quick detour to explore two concepts from programming language theory called *lvalues* and *rvalues*. Lvalues and rvalues stand for “left values” and “right values” are so-named because of where they can appear in an assignment statement. In particular, an lvalue is a value that can be on the left-hand side of an assignment, and an rvalue is a value that can only be on the right-hand side of an assignment. For example, in the statement `x = 5`, `x` is an lvalue and `5` is an rvalue. Similarly, in `*itr = 137`, `*itr` is the lvalue and `137` is the rvalue.

It is illegal to put an rvalue on the left-hand side of an assignment statement. For example, `137 = 42` is illegal because `137` is an rvalue, and `GetInteger() = x` is illegal because the return value of `GetInteger()` is an rvalue. However, it is legal to put an lvalue on the right-hand side of an assignment, as in `x = y` or `x = *itr`.

At this point the distinction between lvalues and rvalues seems purely academic. “Okay,” you might say, “some things can be put on the left-hand side of an assignment statement and some things can’t. So what?” When writing overloaded operators, the lvalue/rvalue distinction is extremely important. Because operator overloading lets us define what the built-in operators mean when applied to objects of class type, we have to be very careful that overloaded operators return lvalues and rvalues appropriately. For example, by default the + operator returns an rvalue; that is, it makes no sense to write

```
(x + y) = 5;
```

Since this would assign the value 5 to the result of adding `x` and `y`. However, if we’re not careful when overloading the + operator, we might accidentally make the above statement legal and pave the way for nonsensical but legal code. Similarly, it *is* legal to write

```
myArray[5] = 137;
```

So the element-selection operator (the brackets operator) should be sure to return an lvalue instead of an rvalue. Failure to do so will make the above code illegal when applied to custom classes.

Recall that an overloaded operator is a specially-named function invoked when the operator is applied to an object of a custom class type. Thus the code

```
(x + y) = 5;
```

is equivalent to

```
operator+ (x, y) = 5;
```

if either `x` or `y` is an object. Similarly, if `myArray` is an object, the code

```
myArray[5] = 137;
```

is equivalent to

```
myArray.operator[] (5) = 137;
```

To ensure that these functions have the correct semantics, we need to make sure that `operator+` returns an rvalue and that `operator[]` returns an lvalue. How can we enforce this restriction? The answer has to do with the return type of the two functions. To make a function that returns an lvalue, have that function return a non-`const` reference. For example, the following function returns an lvalue:

```
string& LValueFunction();
```

Because a reference is just another name for a variable or memory location, this function hands back a reference to an lvalue and its return value can be treated as such. To have a function return an rvalue, have that function return a `const` object by value. Thus the function

```
const string RValueFunction();
```

returns an rvalue.* The reason that this trick works is that if we have a function that returns a `const` object, then code like

```
RValueFunction() = 137;
```

is illegal because the return value of `RValueFunction` is marked `const`.

Lvalues and rvalues are difficult to understand in the abstract, but as we begin to actually overload particular operators the difference should become clearer.

Overloading the Element Selection Operator

Let's begin our descent into the realm of operator overloading by discussing the overloaded element selection operator (the `[]` operator, used to select elements from arrays). You've been using the overloaded element selection operator ever since you encountered the `string` and `vector` classes. For example, the following code uses the `vector`'s overloaded element selection operator:

```
for(int i = 0; i < myVector.size(); ++i)
    myVector[i] = 137;
```

In the above example, while it looks like we're treating the `vector` as a primitive array, we are instead calling the a function named `operator []`, passing `i` as a parameter. Thus the above code is equivalent to

```
for(int i = 0; i < myVector.size(); ++i)
    myVector.operator [] (i) = 137;
```

To write a custom element selection operator, you write a member function called `operator []` that accepts as its parameter the value that goes inside the brackets. Note that while this parameter can be of any type (think of the STL `map`), you can only have a single value inside the brackets. This may seem like an arbitrary restriction, but makes sense in the context of the principle of least astonishment: you can't put multiple values inside the brackets when working with raw C++ arrays, so you shouldn't do so when working with custom objects.

When writing `operator []`, as with all overloaded operators, you're free to return objects of whatever type you'd like. However, remember that when overloading operators, it's essential to maintain the same functionality you'd expect from the naturally-occurring uses of the operator. In the case of the element selection operator, this means that the return value should be an lvalue, and in particular a reference to some internal class data determined by the index. For example, here's one possible prototype of the C++ `string`'s element selection operator:

```
class string
{
public:
    /* ... */

    char& operator [] (size_t position);
};
```

* Technically speaking any non-reference value returned from a function is an rvalue. However, when returning objects from a function, the rvalue/lvalue distinction is blurred because the assignment operator and other operators are member functions that can be invoked regardless of whether the receiver is an rvalue or lvalue. The additional `const` closes this loophole.

Here, `operator[]` takes in an `int` representing the index and returns a reference to the character at that position in the `string`. If `string` is implemented as a wrapper for a raw C string, then one possible implementation for `operator[]` might be

```
char& string::operator[] (size_t index)
{
    return theString[index]; // Assuming theString is a raw C string
}
```

Because `operator[]` returns a reference to an element, it is common to find `operator[]` paired with a `const`-overload that returns a `const` reference to an element in the case where the receiver object is immutable. There are exceptions to this rule, such as the STL `map`, but in the case of `string` we should provide a `const` overload, as shown here:

```
class string
{
public:
    /* ... */

    char& operator [] (size_t position);
    const char& operator [] (size_t position) const;
};
```

The implementation of the `const operator[]` function is identical to the non-`const` version.

When writing the element selection operator, it's completely legal to modify the receiver object in response to a request. For example, with the STL `map`, `operator[]` will silently create a new object and return a reference to it if the key isn't already in the `map`. This is part of the beauty of overloaded operators – you're allowed to perform any necessary steps to ensure that the operator makes sense.

Unfortunately, if your class encapsulates a multidimensional object, such as a matrix or hierarchical key-value system, you cannot “overload the `[] []` operator.” A class is only allowed to overload one level of the bracket syntax; it's not legal to design objects that doubly-overload `[]`.*

Overloading Compound Assignment Operators

The compound assignment operators are operators of the form `op=` (for example, `+=` and `*=`) that update an object's value but do not overwrite it. Compound assignment operators are often declared as member functions with the following basic prototype:

```
MyClass& operator += (const ParameterType& param)
```

For example, suppose we have the following class, which represents a vector in three-dimensional space:

```
class Vector3D
{
public:
    /* ... */
private:
    static const int NUM_COORDINATES = 3;
    double coordinates[NUM_COORDINATES];
};
```

* There is a technique called *proxy objects* that can make code along the lines of `myObject[x][y]` legal. The trick is to define an `operator[]` function for the class that returns another object that itself overloads `operator[]`. We'll see this trick used in the upcoming chapter on a custom `grid` class.

It is legal to add two mathematical vectors to one another; the result is the vector whose components are the pairwise sum of each of the components of the source vectors. If we wanted to define a `+=` operator for `Vector3D` to let us perform this addition, we would modify the interface of `Vector3D` as follows:

```
class Vector3D
{
public:
    /* ... */
    Vector3D& operator+= (const Vector3D& other);

private:
    static const int NUM_COORDINATES = 3;
    double coordinates[NUM_COORDINATES];
};
```

This could then be implemented as

```
Vector3D& Vector3D::operator +=(const Vector3D& other)
{
    for(int i = 0; i < NUM_COORDINATES; ++i)
        coordinates[i] += other.coordinates[i];
    return *this;
}
```

If you'll notice, `operator+=` returns `*this`, a reference to the receiver object. Recall that when overloading operators, you should make sure to define your operators such that they work identically to the C++ built-in operators. It turns out that the `+=` operator yields an lvalue, so the code below, though the quint-essence of abysmal style, is perfectly legal:

```
int one, two, three, four;
(one += two) += (three += four);
```

Since overloaded operators let custom types act like primitives, the following code should also compile:

```
Vector3D one, two, three, four;
(one += two) += (three += four);
```

If we expand out the calls to the overloaded `+=` operator, we find that this is equivalent to

```
Vector3D one, two, three, four;
one.operator+=(two).operator +=(three.operator +=(four));
```

Note that the reference returned by `one.operator+=(two)` then has its own `+=` operator invoked. Since `operator +=` is not marked `const`, had the `+=` operator returned a `const` reference, this code would have been illegal. Make sure to have any (compound) assignment operator return `*this` as a non-`const` reference.

Unlike the regular assignment operator, with the compound assignment operator it's commonly meaningful to accept objects of different types as parameters. For example, we might want to make expressions like `myVector *= 137` for `Vector3Ds` meaningful as a scaling operation. In this case, we can simply define an `operator *=` that accepts a `double` as its parameter. For example:

```

class Vector3D
{
public:
    /* ... */
    Vector3D& operator += (const Vector3D& other);
    Vector3D& operator *= (double scaleFactor);

private:
    static const int NUM_COORDINATES = 3;
    double coordinates[NUM_COORDINATES];
};

```

Despite the fact that the receiver and parameter have different types, this is perfectly legal C++. Here's one possible implementation:

```

Vector3D& Vector3D::operator*= (double scaleFactor)
{
    for(int k = 0; k < NUM_COORDINATES; ++k)
        coordinates[k] *= scaleFactor;
    return *this;
}

```

Although we have implemented `operator+=` and `operator*=` for the `Vector3D` class, C++ will not automatically provide us an implementation of `operator-=` and `operator/=`, despite the fact that those functions can easily be implemented as wrapped calls to the operators we've already implemented. This might seem counterintuitive, but prevents errors from cases where seemingly symmetric operations are undefined. For example, it is legal to multiply a vector and a matrix, though the division is undefined. For completeness' sake, we'll prototype `operator-=` and `operator/=` as shown here:

```

class Vector3D
{
public:
    /* ... */
    Vector3D& operator += (const Vector3D& other);
    Vector3D& operator -= (const Vector3D& other);

    Vector3D& operator *= (double scaleFactor);
    Vector3D& operator /= (double scaleFactor);

private:
    static const int NUM_COORDINATES = 3;
    double coordinates[NUM_COORDINATES];
};

```

Now, how might we go about implementing these operators? `operator/=` is the simplest of the two and can be implemented as follows:

```

Vector3D& Vector3D::operator /= (double scaleFactor)
{
    *this *= 1.0 / scaleFactor;
    return *this;
}

```

This implementation, though cryptic, is actually quite elegant. The first line, `*this *= 1.0 / scaleFactor`, says that we should multiply the receiver object (`*this`) by the reciprocal of `scaleFactor`. The `*=` operator is the compound multiplication assignment operator that we wrote above, so this code invokes `operator*=` on the receiver. In fact, this code is equivalent to

```

Vector3D& Vector3D::operator /= (double scaleFactor)
{
    operator* = (1.0 / scaleFactor);
    return *this;
}

```

Depending on your taste, you might find this particular syntax more readable than the first version. Feel free to use either version.

Now, how would we implement `operator--`, which performs a componentwise subtraction of two `Vector3Ds`? At a high level, subtracting one vector from another is equal to adding the inverse of the second vector to the first, so we might want to write code like this:

```

Vector3D& Vector3D::operator -= (const Vector3D& other)
{
    *this += -other;
    return *this;
}

```

That is, we add `-other` to the receiver object. But this code is illegal because we haven't defined the unary minus operator as applied to `Vector3Ds`. Not to worry – we can overload this operator as well. The syntax for this function is as follows:

```

class Vector3D
{
public:
    /* ... */
    Vector3D& operator += (const Vector3D& other);
    Vector3D& operator -= (const Vector3D& other);

    Vector3D& operator *= (double scaleFactor);
    Vector3D& operator /= (double scaleFactor);

    const Vector3D operator- () const;

private:
    static const int NUM_COORDINATES = 3;
    double coordinates[NUM_COORDINATES];
};

```

There are four pieces of information about this function that deserve attention:

- The name of the unary minus function is `operator -`.
- The function takes no parameters. This lets C++ know that the function is the *unary* minus function (I.e. `-myVector`) rather than the *binary* minus function (`myVector - myOtherVector`).
- The function returns a `const Vector3D`. The unary minus function returns an *rvalue* rather than an *lvalue*, since code like `-x = 137` is illegal. As mentioned above, this means that the return value of this function should be a `const Vector3D`.
- The function is marked `const`. Applying the unary minus to an object doesn't change its value, and to enforce this restriction we'll mark `operator -` `const`.

One possible implementation of `operator-` is as follows:

```

const Vector3D Vector3D::operator- () const
{
    Vector3D result;
    for(int k = 0; k < NUM_COORDINATES; ++k)
        result.coordinates[k] = -coordinates[k];
    return result;
}

```

Note that the return type of this function is `const Vector3D` while the type of `result` inside the function is `Vector3D`. This isn't a problem, since returning an object from a function yields a new temporary object and it's legal to initialize a `const Vector3D` using a `Vector3D`.

When writing compound assignment operators, as when writing regular assignment operators, you must be careful that self-assignment works correctly. In the above example with `Vector3D`'s compound assignment operators we didn't need to worry about this because the code was structured correctly. However, when working with the C++ `string`'s `+=` operator, since the `string` needs to allocate a new buffer capable of holding the current `string` appended to itself, it would need to handle the self-assignment case, either by explicitly checking for self-assignment or through some other means.

Overloading Mathematical Operators

In the previous section, we provided overloaded versions of the `+=` family of operators. Thus, we can now write classes for which expressions of the form `one += two` are valid. However, the seemingly equivalent expression `one = one + two` will still not compile, since we haven't provided an implementation of the lone `+` operator. C++ will not automatically provide implementations of related operators given a single overloaded operator, since in some cases this could result in nonsensical or meaningless behavior.

The built-in mathematical operators yield rvalues, so code like `(x + y) = 137` will not compile. Consequently, when overloading the mathematical operators, make sure they return rvalues as well by having them return `const` objects.

Let's consider an implementation of `operator +` for a `CString` type that encapsulates a dynamically-allocated C-style string. `CString` has the following definition:

```

class CString
{
public:
    /* ... constructor, destructor, etc ... */
    CString& operator += (const CString& other);

private:
    char* theString;
};

```

We want to write an implementation of `operator +`. Because the operator yields an rvalue, we're supposed to return a `const CString`, and based on our knowledge of parameter passing, we know that we should accept a `const CString &` as a parameter. There's one more bit we're forgetting, though, and that's to mark the `operator +` function `const`, since `operator +` creates a new object and doesn't modify either of the values used in the arithmetic statement. This results in the following code:

```

class CString
{
public:
    /* ... constructor, destructor, etc ... */

    CString& operator += (const CString& other);
    const CString operator+ (const CString& other) const;

private:
    char* theString;
};

```

However, we might run into some trouble writing `operator +` since the code for concatenating two C strings is tricky. If you'll notice, though, we already have a working version of string concatenation in the body of `operator +=`. To unify our code, we'll therefore implement `operator +` in terms of `operator +=`. The full version of this code is shown below:

```

const CString CString::operator +(const CString& other) const
{
    CString result = *this; // Make a deep copy of this CString.
    result += other;       // Use existing concatenation code.
    return result;
}

```

Now, all of the code for `operator +` is unified, which helps cut down on coding errors.

There is an interesting and common case we haven't addressed yet – what if one of the operands isn't of the same type as the class? For example, if you have a `Matrix` class that encapsulates a 3x3 matrix, as shown here:

```

class Matrix
{
public:
    /* ... */

    Matrix& operator *= (double scalar); // Scale all entries

private:
    static const int MATRIX_SIZE = 3;
    double entries[MATRIX_SIZE][MATRIX_SIZE];
};

```

Note that there is a defined `*=` operator that scales all elements in the matrix by a `double` factor. Thus code like `myMatrix *= 2.71828` is well-defined. However, since there's no defined `operator *`, currently we cannot write `myMatrix = myMatrix * 2.71828`.

Initially, you might think that we could define `operator *` just as we did `operator +` in the previous example. While this will work in most cases, it will lead to some problems we'll need to address later. For now, however, let's add the member function `operator *` to `Matrix`, which is defined as

```

const Matrix Matrix::operator *(double scalar) const
{
    MyMatrix result = *this;
    result *= scalar;
    return result;
}

```

Now, we can write expressions like `myMatrix = myMatrix * 2.71828`. However, what happens if we write code like `myMatrix = 2.71828 * myMatrix`? This is a semantically meaningful expression, but unfortunately it won't compile. When interpreting overloaded operators, C++ will always preserve the order of values in an expression.* Thus `2.71828 * myMatrix` is *not* the same as `myMatrix * 2.71828`. Remember that the reason that `myMatrix * 2.71828` is legal is because it's equivalent to `myMatrix.operator*(2.71828)`. The expression `2.71828 * myMatrix`, on the other hand, is illegal because C++ will try to expand it into `(2.71828).operator*(myMatrix)`, which makes no sense.

To fix this, we can make `operator *` a free function that accepts two parameters, a `double` and a `Matrix`, and returns a `const Matrix`. Thus code like `2.71828 * myMatrix` will expand into calls to `operator*(2.71828, myMatrix)`. The new version of `operator *` is defined below:

```
const Matrix operator*(double scalar, const Matrix& matrix)
{
    Matrix result = *matrix;
    matrix *= scalar;
    return result;
}
```

But here we run into the same problem as before if we write `myMatrix * 2.71828`, since we haven't defined a function accepting a `Matrix` as its first parameter and an `double` as its second. To fix this, we'll define a *second* free function `operator *` with the parameters reversed that's implemented as a call to the other version:

```
const Matrix operator*(const Matrix& matrix, double scalar)
{
    return scalar * matrix; // Calls operator*(scalar, matrix)
}
```

As a general rule, mathematical operators like `+` should always be implemented as free functions. This prevents problems like those described here.

One important point to notice about overloading the mathematical operators versus the compound assignment operators is that it's considerably faster to use the compound assignment operators over the standalone mathematical operators. Not only do the compound assignment operators work in-place (that is, they modify existing objects), but they also return references instead of full objects. From a performance standpoint, this means that given these three strings:

```
string one = "This ";
string two = "is a ";
string three = "string!";
```

Consider these two code snippets to concatenate all three strings:

```
/* Using += */
string myString = one;
myString += two;
myString += three;

/* Using + */
string myString = one + two + three
```

* One major reason for this is that sometimes the arithmetic operators won't be commutative. For example, given matrices **A** and **B**, **AB** is not necessarily the same as **BA**, and if C++ were to arbitrarily flip parameters it could result in some extremely difficult-to-track bugs.

Oddly, the second version of this code is considerably slower than the first because the `+` operator generates temporary objects. Remember that `one + two + three` is equivalent to

```
operator +(one, operator +(two, three))
```

Each call to `operator +` returns a new string formed by concatenating the parameters, so the code `one + two + three` creates two temporary string objects. The first version, on the other hand, generates no temporary objects since the `+=` operator works in-place. Thus while the first version is less slightly, it is significantly faster than the second.

Overloading ++ and --

Overloading the increment and decrement operators can be a bit tricky because there are two versions of each operator: *prefix* and *postfix*. Recall that `x++` and `++x` are different operations – the first will evaluate to the value of `x`, then increment `x`, while the second will increment `x` and then evaluate to the updated value of `x`. You can see this below:

```
int x = 0
cout << x++ << endl; // Prints: 0
cout << x << endl;   // Prints: 1

x = 0;
cout << ++x << endl; // Prints: 1
cout << x << endl;   // Prints: 1
```

Although this distinction is subtle, it's tremendously important for efficiency reasons. In the postfix version of `++`, since we have to return the value of the variable was before it was incremented, we'll need to make a full copy of the old version and then return it. With the prefix `++`, since we're returning the current value of the variable, we can simply return a reference to it. Thus the postfix `++` can be noticeably slower than the prefix version; this is the reason that when advancing an STL iterator it's faster to use the prefix increment operator.

The next question we need to address is how we can legally use `++` and `--` in regular code. Unfortunately, it can get a bit complicated. For example, the following code is totally legal:

```
int x = 0;
+++++++++++x; // Increments x seven times.
```

This is legal because it's equivalent to

```
++(++(++(++(++(++x))))));
```

The prefix `++` operator returns the variable being incremented as an *lvalue*, so this statement means “increment `x`, then increment `x` again, etc.”

However, if we use the postfix version of `++`, as seen here:

```
x+++++++++++; // Error
```

We get a compile-time error because `x++` returns the original value of `x` as an *rvalue*, which can't be incremented because that would require putting the *rvalue* on the left side of an assignment (in particular, `x = x + 1`).

Now, let's actually get into some code. Unfortunately, we can't just sit down and write `operator ++`, since it's unclear *which* `operator ++` we'd be overloading. C++ uses a hack to differentiate between the prefix and postfix versions of the increment operator: when overloading the prefix version of `++` or `--`, you write `operator ++` as a function that takes no parameters. To overload the postfix version, you'll overload `operator ++`, but the overloaded operator will accept as a parameter the integer value 0. In code, these two declarations look like

```
class MyClass
{
public:
    /* ... */

    MyClass& operator ++(); // Prefix
    const MyClass operator ++(int dummy); // Postfix

private:
    /* ... */
};
```

Note that the prefix version returns a `MyClass&` as an lvalue and the postfix version a `const MyClass` as an rvalue.

We're allowed to implement `++` and `--` in any way we see fit. However, one of the more common tricks is to write the `++` implementation as a wrapped call to `operator +=`. Assuming you've provided this function, we can then write the prefix `operator ++` as

```
MyClass& MyClass::operator ++()
{
    *this += 1;
    return *this;
}
```

And the postfix `operator ++` as

```
const MyClass MyClass::operator ++(int dummy)
{
    MyClass oldValue = *this; // Store the current value of the object.
    ++*this;
    return oldValue;
}
```

Notice that the postfix `operator++` is implemented in terms of the prefix `operator++`. This is a fairly standard technique and cuts down on the amount of code that you will need to write for the functions.

In your future C++ career, you may encounter versions of `operator++` that look like this:

```
const MyClass MyClass::operator ++(int)
{
    MyClass oldValue = *this; // Store the current value of the object.
    ++*this;
    return oldValue;
}
```

Although this function takes in an `int` parameter, that parameter does not have a name. It turns out that it is perfectly legal C++ code to write functions that accept parameters but do not give names to those parameters. In this case, the function acts just like a regular function that accepts a parameter, except that the

parameter cannot be used inside of the function. In the case of `operator++`, this helps give a cue to readers that the integer parameter is not meaningful and exists solely to differentiate the prefix and postfix versions of the function.

Overloading Relational Operators

Perhaps the most commonly overloaded operators (other than `operator =`) are the relational operators; for example, `<` and `==`. Unlike the assignment operator, by default C++ does not provide relational operators for your objects. This means that you must explicitly overload the `==` and related operators to use them in code. The prototype for the relational operators looks like this (written for `<`, but can be for any of the relational operators):

```
class MyClass
{
public:
    /* ... */
    bool operator < (const MyClass& other) const;

private:
    /* ... */
};
```

You're free to choose any means for defining what it means for one object to be "less than" another. However, when doing so, you must take great care to ensure that your less-than operator defines a *total ordering* on objects of your type. This means that the following must be true about the behavior of the less-than operator:

- **Trichotomy:** For any a and b , exactly one of $a < b$, $a = b$, and $b < a$ is true.
- **Transitivity:** If $a < b$ and $b < c$, then $a < c$.

These properties of `<` are important because they allow the notion of *sorted order* to make sense. If either of these conditions does not hold, then it is possible to encounter strange situations in which a collection of elements cannot be put into ascending order. For example, suppose that we have the following class, which represents a point in two-dimensional space:

```
class Point
{
public:
    Point(double x, double y);

    double getX() const;
    void setX(double value);

    double getY() const;
    void setY(double value);
}
```

Now consider the following implementation of a less-than operator for comparing `Points`:

```
bool operator< (const Point& one, const Point& two)
{
    return one.getX() < two.getX() && one.getY() < two.getY();
}
```

Intuitively, this may seem like a reasonable definition of the `<` operator: point *a* is less than point *b* if both coordinates of *a* are less than the corresponding coordinates of *b*. However, this implementation of `<` is bound to cause problems. In particular, consider the following code:

```
Point one(1, 0), two(0, 1);
cout << (one < two) << endl;
cout << (two < one) << endl;
```

Here, we create two points called `one` and `two` and compare them using the `<` operator. What will the first line print? Using the above definition of `operator<`, the comparison `one < two` will evaluate to `false` because the *x* coordinate of `one` is greater than the *x* coordinate of `two`. But what about `two < one`? In this case, `two`'s *x* coordinate is less than `one`'s, but its *y* coordinate is greater than `one`'s. Consequently, we have that `two < one` also evaluates to `false`. We have reached a precarious situation. We have found two values, `one` and `two`, such that `one` and `two` do not have equal values, but neither is less than the other. This means that we could not possibly sort a list of elements containing both `one` and `two`, since neither one precedes the other.

The problem with the above implementation of `operator<` is that it violates trichotomy. Recall from the above definition of a total ordering that trichotomy means that exactly one of $a < b$, $a = b$, $a > b$ must hold for any *a* and *b*. Our definition of `operator<` does not have this property, as illustrated above. Consequently, we have a legal implementation of `operator<` that is wholly incorrect. We'll need to redefine how `operator<` works in order to ensure that trichotomy holds.

One common strategy for implementing `operator<` is to use what's called a *lexicographical ordering*. To illustrate a lexicographical ordering, consider the words **about** and **above** and think about how you would compare them alphabetically. You'd begin by noting that the first letter of each word was the same, as was the second and the third. However, the fourth letter of the words disagree, and in particular the letter **u** from **about** precedes the letter **v** from **above**. Consequently, we would say that **about** comes lexicographically before **above**. Interestingly, though, the last letter of **about** (**t**) comes after the last letter of **above** (**e**). We don't care, though, because we stopped comparing letters as soon as we found the first mismatch in the words.

This strategy has an elegant analog for arbitrary types. Given a type, one way to implement `operator<` is as follows. Given two objects *a* and *b* of that type, check whether the first field of *a* and *b* are not the same. If so, say that *a* is smaller if its first field is smaller than *b*'s first field. Otherwise, look at the second field. If the fields are not the same, then return *a* if *a*'s second field is smaller than *b*'s and *b* otherwise. If not, then look at the third field, etc. To give you a concrete example of how this works, consider the following revision to the `Point`'s `operator<` function:

```
bool operator< (const Point& one, const Point& two)
{
    if (one.getX() != two.getX()) return one.getX() < two.getX();
    return one.getY() < two.getY();
}
```

Here, we first check whether the points disagree in their *x* coordinate. If so, we say that `one` is less than `two` only if it has a smaller *x* coordinate. Otherwise, if the points agree in their *x* coordinate, then whichever has the lower *y* coordinate is said to have the smaller value. Amazingly, this implementation strategy results in an ordering that is both trichotic and transitive, exactly the properties we want out of the `<` operator.

Of course, this strategy works on classes that have more than two fields, provided that you compare each field one at a time. It is an interesting exercise to convince yourself that a lexicographical ordering on any type obeys trichotomy, and that such an ordering obeys transitivity as well.

Once you have a working implementation of `operator<`, it is possible to define all five other relational operators solely in terms of the `operator<`. This is due to the following set of relations:

$$\begin{aligned} A < B &\Leftrightarrow A < B \\ A \leq B &\Leftrightarrow \neg (B < A) \\ A == B &\Leftrightarrow \neg (A < B \ || \ B < A) \\ A != B &\Leftrightarrow A < B \ || \ B < A \\ A \geq B &\Leftrightarrow \neg (A < B) \\ A > B &\Leftrightarrow B < A \end{aligned}$$

For example, we could implement `operator>` for the `Point` class as

```
bool operator> (const Point& one, const Point& two)
{
    return two < one;
}
```

We could similarly implement `operator<=` for `Points` as

```
bool operator<= (const Point& one, const Point& two)
{
    return !(one < two);
}
```

This is a fairly standard technique, and it's well worth the effort to remember it.

Storing Objects in STL maps

Up to this point we've avoided storing objects as keys in STL maps. Now that we've covered operator overloading, though, you have the necessary knowledge to store objects in the STL `map` and `set` containers.

Internally, the STL `map` and `set` are layered on binary trees that use the relational operators to compare elements. Due to some clever design decisions, STL containers and algorithms only require the `<` operator to compare two objects. Thus, to store a custom class inside a `map` or `set`, you simply need to overload the `<` operator and the STL will handle the rest. For example, here's some code to store a `Point` struct in a `map`:

```
struct pointT
{
    int x, y;

    bool operator < (const pointT& other) const
    {
        if(x != other.x)
            return x < other.x;
        return y < other.y;
    }
};
map<pointT, int> myMap; // Now works using the default < operator.
```

You can use a similar trick to store objects as values in a `set`.

friend

Normally, when you mark a class's data members private, only instances of that class are allowed to access them. However, in some cases you might want to allow specific other classes or functions to modify private data. For example, if you were implementing the STL `map` and wanted to provide an iterator class to traverse it, you'd want that iterator to have access to the `map`'s underlying binary tree. There's a slight problem here, though. Although the iterator is an integral component of the `map`, like all other classes, the iterator cannot access private data and thus cannot traverse the tree.

How are we to resolve this problem? Your initial thought might be to make some public accessor methods that would let the iterator modify the object's internal data representation. Unfortunately, this won't work particularly well, since then *any* class would be allowed to use those functions, something that violates the principle of encapsulation. Instead, to solve this problem, we can use the C++ `friend` keyword to grant the iterator class access to the `map` or `set`'s internals. Inside the `map` declaration, we can write the following:

```
template <typename KeyType, typename ValueType> class map
{
public:
    /* ... */

    friend class iterator;
    class iterator
    {
        /* ... iterator implementation here ... */
    };
};
```

Now, since `iterator` is a friend of `map`, it can read and modify the `map`'s private data members.

Just as we can grant other classes friend access to a class, we can give friend access to global functions. For example, if we had a free function `ModifyMyClass` that accepted a `MyClass` object as a reference parameter, we could let `ModifyMyClass` modify the internal data of `MyClass` if inside the `MyClass` declaration we added the line

```
class MyClass
{
public:
    /* ... */
    friend void ModifyMyClass(MyClass& param);
};
```

The syntax for `friend` can be misleading. Even though we're prototyping `ModifyMyClass` inside the `MyClass` function, because `ModifyMyClass` is a friend of `MyClass` it is **not** a member function of `MyClass`. After all, the purpose of the `friend` declaration is to give outside classes and functions access to the `MyClass` internals.

When using `friend`, there are two key points to be aware of. First, the `friend` declaration must precede the actual implementation of the `friend` class or function. Since C++ compilers only make a single pass over the source file, if they haven't seen a `friend` declaration for a function or class, when the function or class tries to modify your object's internals, the compiler will generate an error. Second, note that while

`friend` is quite useful in some circumstances, it can quickly lead to code that entirely defeats the purpose of encapsulation. Before you grant `friend` access to a piece of code, make sure that the code has a legitimate reason to be modifying your object. That is, don't make code a `friend` simply because it's easier to write that way. Think of `friend` as a way of extending a class definition to include other pieces of code. The class, together with all its `friend` code, should comprise a logical unit of encapsulation.

When overloading an operator as a free function, you might want to consider giving that function `friend` access to your class. That way, the functions can efficiently read your object's private data without having to go through getters and setters.

Unfortunately, `friend` does not interact particularly intuitively with template classes. Suppose we want to provide a `friend` function `PQueueFriend` for a template version of the CS106B/X `PQueue`. If `PQueueFriend` is declared like this:

```
template <typename T> void PQueueFriend(const PQueue<T>& pq)
{
    /* ... */
}
```

You'll notice that `PQueueFriend` itself is a template function. This means that when declaring `PQueueFriend` a `friend` of the template `PQueue`, we'll need to make the `friend` declaration templated, as shown here:

```
template <typename T> class PQueue
{
public:
    /* ... */
    template <typename T> friend PQueueFriend(const PQueue<T>& pq);
};
```

If you forget the `template` declaration, then your code will compile correctly but will generate a linker error. While this can be a bit of nuisance, it's important to remember since it arises frequently when overloading the stream operators, as you'll see below.

Overloading the Stream Insertion Operator

Have you ever wondered why `cout << "Hello, world!" << endl` is syntactically legal? It's through the overloaded `<<` operator in conjunction with `ostreams`.* In fact, the entire streams library can be thought of as a gigantic library of massively overloaded `<<` and `>>` operators.

The C++ streams library is designed to give you maximum flexibility with your input and output routines and even lets you define your own stream insertion and extraction operators. This means that you are allowed to define the `<<` and `>>` operators so that expressions like `cout << myClass << endl` and `cin >> myClass` are well-defined. However, when writing stream insertion and extraction operators, there are huge number of considerations to keep in mind, many of which are beyond the scope of this text. This next section will discuss basic strategies for overloading the `<<` operator, along with some limitations of the simple approach.

As with all overloaded operators, we need to consider what the parameters and return type should be for our overloaded `<<` operator. Before considering parameters, let's think of the return type. We know that it

* As a reminder, the `ostream` class is the base class for output streams. This has to do with inheritance, which we'll cover in a later chapter, but for now just realize that it means that both `stringstream` and `ofstream` are specializations of the more generic `ostream` class.

should be legal to chain stream insertions together – that is, code like `cout << 1 << 2 << endl` should compile correctly. The `<<` operator associates to the left, so the above code is equal to

```
((cout << 1) << 2) << endl);
```

Thus, we need the `<<` operator to return an `ostream`. Now, we don't want this stream to be `const`, since then we couldn't write code like this:

```
cout << "This is a string!" << setw(10) << endl;
```

Since if `cout << "This is a string!"` evaluated to a `const` object, we couldn't set the width of the next operation to 10. Also, we cannot return the stream by value, since stream classes have their copy functions marked private. Putting these two things together, we see that the stream operators should return a non-`const` reference to whatever stream they're referencing.

Now let's consider what parameters we need. We need to know what stream we want to write to or read from, so initially you might think that we'd define overloaded stream operators as member functions that look like this:

```
class MyClass
{
public:
    ostream& operator << (ostream& input) const; // Problem: Legal but incorrect
};
```

Unfortunately, this isn't correct. Consider the following two code snippets:

```
cout << myClass;
myClass << cout;
```

The first of these two versions makes sense, while the second is backwards. Unfortunately, with the above definition of `operator <<`, we've accidentally made the second version syntactically legal. The reason is that these two lines expand into calls to

```
cout.operator <<(myClass);
myClass.operator <<(cout);
```

The first of these two isn't defined, since `cout` doesn't have a member function capable of writing our object (if it did, we wouldn't need to write a stream operator in the first place!). However, based on our previous definition, the second version, while semantically incorrect, is syntactically legal. Somehow we need to change how we define the stream operator so that we are allowed to write `cout << myClass`. To fix this, we'll make the overloaded stream operator a free function that takes two parameters – an `ostream` to write to and a `myClass` object to write. The code for this is:

```
ostream& operator << (ostream& stream, const MyClass& mc)
{
    /* ... implementation ... */
    return stream;
}
```

While this code will work correctly, because `operator <<` is a free function, it doesn't have access to any of the private data members of `MyClass`. This can be a nuisance, since we'd like to directly write the con-

tents of `MyClass` out to the stream without having to go through the (possibly inefficient) getters and setters. Thus, we'll declare `operator <<` a friend inside the `MyClass` declaration, as shown here:

```
class MyClass
{
public:
    /* More functions. */
    friend ostream& operator <<(ostream& stream, const MyClass& mc);
};
```

Now, we're all set to do reading and writing inside the body of the insertion operator. It's not particularly difficult to write the stream insertion operator – all that we need to do is print out all of the meaningful class information with some formatting information. So, for example, given a `Point` class representing a point in 2-D space, we could write the insertion operator as

```
ostream& operator <<(ostream& stream, const Point& pt)
{
    stream << '(' << pt.x << ", " << pt.y << ')';
    return stream;
}
```

While this code will work in most cases, there are a few spots where it just won't work correctly. For example, suppose we write the following code:

```
cout << "01234567890123456789" << endl; // To see the number of characters.
cout << setw(20) << myPoint << endl;
```

Looking at this code, you'd expect that it would cause `myPoint` to be printed out and padded with space characters until it is at least twenty characters wide. Unfortunately, this isn't what happens. Since `operator <<` writes the object one piece at a time, the output will look something like this:

```
01234567890123456789
                (0, 4)
```

That's nineteen spaces, followed by the actual `Point` data. The problem is that when we invoke `operator <<`, the function writes a single `(` character to `stream`. It's this operation, *not the `Point` as a whole*, that will get aligned to 20 characters. There are many ways to circumvent this problem, but perhaps the simplest is to buffer the output into a `stringstream` and then write the contents of the `stringstream` to the destination in a single operation. This can get a bit complicated, especially since you'll need to copy the stream formatting information over.

Writing a correct stream extraction operator (`operator >>`) is complicated. For more information on writing stream extraction operators, consult a reference.

Overloading `*` and `->`

Consider the following code snippet:

```
for(set<string>::iterator itr = mySet.begin(); itr != mySet.end(); ++itr)
    cout << *itr << " has length " << itr->length() << endl;
```

Here, we traverse a `set<string>` using iterators, printing out each string and its length. Interestingly, even though `set` iterators are not raw pointers (they're objects capable of traversing binary trees), thanks

to operator overloading, they can respond to the `*` and `->` operators as though they were regular C++ pointers.

If you create a custom class that acts like a C++ pointer (perhaps a custom iterator or “smart pointer,” a topic we’ll return to later), you can provide implementations of the pointer dereference and member selection operators `*` and `->` by overloading their respective operator functions. The simpler of these two functions is the pointer dereference operator. To make an object that can be dereferenced to yield an object of type `T`, the syntax for its `*` operator is

```
class PointerClass
{
public:
    T& operator *() const;
    /* ... */
};
```

You can invoke the `operator *` function by “dereferencing” the custom pointer object. For example, the following code:

```
*myCustomPointer = 137;
```

is completely equivalent to

```
myCustomPointer.operator *() = 137;
```

Because we can assign a value to the result of `operator *`, the `operator *` function should return an lvalue (a non-`const` reference).

There are two other points worth noting here. First, how can C++ distinguish this `operator *` for pointer dereference from the `operator *` used for multiplication? The answer has to do with the number of parameters to the function. Since a pointer dereference is a unary operator, the function prototype for the pointer-dereferencing `operator *` takes no parameters. Had we wanted to write `operator *` for multiplication, we would have written a function `operator *` that accepts a parameter (or a free function accepting two parameters). Second, why is `operator *` marked `const`? This has to do with the difference between `const` pointers and pointers-to-`const`. Suppose that we have a `const` instance of a custom pointer class. Since the pointer *object* is `const`, it acts as though it is a `const` pointer rather than a pointer-to-`const`. Consequently, we should be able to dereference the object and modify its stored pointer without affecting its `constness`.

The arrow operator `operator ->` is slightly more complicated than `operator *`. Initially, you might think that `operator ->` would be a binary operator, since you use the arrow operator in statements like `myClassPtr->myElement`. However, C++ has a rather clever mechanism for `operator ->` that makes it a unary operator. A class’s `operator ->` function should return a pointer to the object that the arrow operator should actually be applied to. This may be a bit confusing, so an example is in order. Suppose we have a class `CustomStringPointer` that acts as though it’s a pointer to a C++ `string` object. Then if we have the following code:

```
CustomStringPointer myCustomPointer;
cout << myCustomPointer->length() << endl;
```

This code is equivalent to

```
CustomStringPointer myCustomPointer;
cout << (myCustomPointer.operator ->())->length() << endl;
```

In the first version of the code, we treated the `myCustomPointer` object as though it was a real pointer by using the arrow operator to select the `length` function. This code expands out into two smaller steps:

1. The `CustomStringPointer`'s `operator ->` function is called to determine which pointer the arrow should be applied to.
2. The returned pointer then has the `->` operator applied to select the `length` function.

Thus when writing the `operator ->` function, you simply need to return the pointer that the arrow operator should be applied to. If you're writing a custom iterator class, for example, this is probably the element being iterated over.

We'll explore one example of overloading these operators in a later chapter.

List of Overloadable Operators

The following table lists the most commonly-used operators you're legally allowed to overload in C++, along with any restrictions about how you should define the operator.

Operator	Yields	Usage
=	Lvalue	<pre>MyClass& operator =(const MyClass& other);</pre> <p>See the the earlier chapter for details.</p>
+= -= *= /= %=	Lvalue	<pre>MyClass& operator +=(const MyClass& other);</pre> <p>When writing compound assignment operators, make sure that you correctly handle "self-compound-assignment."</p>
+ - * / % (etc.)	Rvalue	<pre>const MyClass operator + (const MyClass& one, const MyClass& two);</pre> <p>These operator should be defined as a free functions.</p>
< <= == > >= !=	Rvalue	<pre>bool operator < (const MyClass& other) const; bool operator < (const MyClass& one, const MyClass& two);</pre> <p>If you're planning to use relational operators only for the STL container classes, you just need to overload the <code><</code> operator. Otherwise, you should overload all six so that users aren't surprised that <code>one != two</code> is illegal while <code>!(one == two)</code> is defined.</p>
[]	Lvalue	<pre>ElemType& operator [] (const KeyType& key); const ElemType& operator [] (const KeyType& key) const;</pre> <p>Most of the time you'll need a <code>const</code>-overloaded version of the bracket operator. Forgetting to provide one can lead to a real headache!</p>
++ --	Prefix: Lvalue Postfix: Rvalue	<p>Prefix version: <code>MyClass& operator ++();</code> Postfix version: <code>const MyClass operator ++(int dummy);</code></p>
-	Rvalue	<pre>const MyClass operator -() const;</pre>

*	Lvalue	<pre>ElemType& operator *() const;</pre> <p>With this function, you're allowing your class to act as though it's a pointer. The return type should be a reference to the object it's "pointing" at. This is how the STL iterators and smart pointers work. Note that this is the unary * operator and is not the same as the * multiplicative operator.</p>
->	Lvalue	<pre>ElemType* operator ->() const;</pre> <p>If the -> is overloaded for a class, whenever you write <code>myClass->myMember</code>, it's equivalent to <code>myClass.operator ->()->myMember</code>. Note that the function should be <code>const</code> even though the object returned can still modify data. This has to do with how pointers can legally be used in C++. For more information, refer to the chapter on <code>const</code>.</p>
<< >>	Lvalue	<pre>friend ostream& operator << (ostream& out, const MyClass& mc); friend istream& operator >> (istream& in, MyClass& mc);</pre>
()	Varies	See the chapter on functors.

Extended Example: `grid`

The STL encompasses a wide selection of associative and sequence containers. However, one useful data type that did not find its way into the STL is a multidimensional array class akin to the CS106B/X `Grid`. In this extended example, we will implement an STL-friendly version of the CS106B/X `Grid` class, which we'll call `grid`, that will support STL-compatible iterators, intuitive element-access syntax, and relational operators. Once we're done, we'll have an industrial-strength container class we will use later in this book to implement more complex examples.

Implementing a fully-functional `grid` may seem daunting at first, but fortunately it's easy to break the work up into several smaller steps that culminate in a working class.

Step 0: Implement the Basic `grid` Class.

Before diving into some of the `grid`'s more advanced features, we'll begin by implementing the `grid` basics. Below is a partial specification of the `grid` class that provides core functionality:

Figure 0: Basic (incomplete) interface for the `grid` class

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    /* Constructors, destructors. */
    grid(); // Create empty grid
    grid(size_t rows, size_t cols); // Construct to specified size

    /* Resizing operations. */
    void clear(); // Empty the grid
    void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols); // Resize the grid

    /* Query operations. */
    size_t numRows() const; // Returns number of rows in the grid
    size_t numCols() const; // Returns number of columns in the grid
    bool empty() const; // Returns whether the grid is empty
    size_t size() const; // Returns the number of elements

    /* Element access. */
    T& getAt(size_t row, int col); // Access individual elements
    const T& getAt(int row, int col) const; // Same, but const
};

```

These functions are defined in greater detail here:

<code>grid();</code>	Constructs a new, empty <code>grid</code> .
<code>grid(size_t rows, size_t cols);</code>	Constructs a new <code>grid</code> with the specified number of rows and columns. Each element in the <code>grid</code> is initialized to its default value.
<code>void clear();</code>	Resizes the <code>grid</code> to 0x0.
<code>void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols);</code>	Discards the current contents of the <code>grid</code> and resizes the <code>grid</code> to the specified size. Each element in the <code>grid</code> is initialized to its default value.
<code>size_t numRows() const;</code> <code>size_t numCols() const;</code>	Returns the number of rows and columns in the <code>grid</code> .
<code>bool empty() const;</code>	Returns whether the <code>grid</code> contains no elements. This is true if either the number of rows or columns is zero.
<code>size_t size() const;</code>	Returns the number of total elements in the <code>grid</code> .
<code>T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col);</code> <code>const T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const;</code>	Returns a reference to the element at the specified position. This function is <code>const</code> -overloaded. We won't worry about the case where the indices are out of bounds.

Because `grids` can be dynamically resized, we will need to back `grid` with some sort of dynamic memory management. Because the `grid` represents a two-dimensional entity, you might think that we need to use a dynamically-allocated multidimensional array to store `grid` elements. However, working with dynamically-allocated multidimensional arrays is tricky and greatly complicates the implementation. Fortunately, we can sidestep this problem by implementing the two-dimensional `grid` object using a single-dimensional array. To see how this works, consider the following 3x3 `grid`:

0	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8

We can represent all of the elements in this grid using a one-dimensional array by laying out all of the elements sequentially, as seen here:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

If you'll notice, in this ordering, the three elements of the first row appear in order as the first three elements, then the three elements of the second row in order, and finally the three elements of the final row in order. Because this one-dimensional representation of a two-dimensional object preserves the ordering of individual rows, it is sometimes referred to as *row-major order*.

To represent a grid in row-major order, we need to be able to convert between grid coordinates and array indices. Given a coordinate (*row*, *col*) in a grid of dimensions (*nrows*, *ncols*), the corresponding position in the row-major order representation of that grid is given by $index = col + row * ncols$. The intuition behind this formula is that because the ordering within any row is preserved, each horizontal step in the grid translates into a single step forward or backward in the row-major order representation of the grid. However, each vertical step in the grid requires us to advance forward to the next row in the linearized grid, skipping over *ncols* elements.

Using row-major order, we can back the `grid` class with a regular STL `vector`, as shown here:

```
template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    grid();
    grid(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    void clear();
    void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    size_t numRows() const;
    size_t numCols() const;
    bool empty() const;
    size_t size() const;

    T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col);
    const T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const;

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};
```

Serendipitously, implementing the `grid` with a `vector` allows us to use C++'s automatically-generated copy constructor and assignment operator for `grid`. Since `vector` already manages its own memory, we don't need to handle it manually.

Note that we explicitly keep track of the number of rows and columns in the `grid` even though the `vector` stores the total number of elements. This is necessary so that we can compute indices in the row-major ordering for points in two-dimensional space.

The above functions have relatively straightforward implementations that are given below:

```

template <typename T> grid<T>::grid() : rows(0), cols(0)
{
}

template <typename T> grid<T>::grid(size_t rows, size_t cols) :
    elems(rows * cols), rows(rows), cols(cols)
{
}

template <typename T> void grid<T>::clear()
{
    resize(0, 0);
}

template <typename T> void grid<T>::resize(size_t rows, size_t cols)
{
    /* See below for assign */
    elems.assign(rows * cols, ElemType());

    /* Explicit this-> required since parameters have same name as members. */
    this->rows = rows;
    this->cols = cols;
}

template <typename T> size_t grid<T>::numRows() const
{
    return rows;
}

template <typename T> size_t grid<T>::numCols() const
{
    return cols;
}

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::empty() const
{
    return size() == 0;
}

template <typename T> size_t grid<T>::size() const
{
    return numRows() * numCols();
}

/* Use row-major ordering to access the proper element of the vector. */
template <typename T> T& grid<T>::getAt(size_t row, size_t col)
{
    return elems[col + row * cols];
}

template <typename T> const T& grid<T>::getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const
{
    return elems[col + row * cols];
}

```

Most of these functions are one-liners and are explained in the comments. The only function that you may find interesting is `resize`, which uses the `vector`'s `assign` member function. `assign` is similar to `resize` in that it changes the size of the `vector`, but unlike `resize` `assign` discards all of the current `vector` contents and replaces them with the specified number of copies of the specified element. The use of `ElemType()` as the second parameter to `assign` means that we will fill the `vector` with copies of the default value of the type being stored (since `ElemType()` uses the temporary object syntax to create a new `ElemType`).

Step 1: Add Support for Iterators

Now that we have the basics of a `grid` class, it's time to add iterator support. This will allow us to plug the `grid` directly into the STL algorithms and will be invaluable in a later chapter.

Like the `map` and `set`, the `grid` does not naturally lend itself to a linear traversal – after all, `grid` is two-dimensional – and so we must arbitrarily choose an order in which to visit elements. Since we've implemented the `grid` in row-major order, we'll have `grid` iterators traverse the grid row-by-row, top to bottom, from left to right. Thus, given a 3x4 `grid`, the order of the traversal would be

0	1	2
3	4	5
6	7	8
9	10	11

This order of iteration maps naturally onto the row-major ordering we've chosen for the `grid`. If we consider how the above grid would be laid out in row-major order, the resulting array would look like this:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----

Thus this iteration scheme maps to a simple linear traversal of the underlying representation of the `grid`. Because we've chosen to represent the elements of the `grid` using a `vector`, we can iterate over the elements of the `grid` using `vector` iterators. We thus add the following definitions to the `grid` class:

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    grid();
    grid(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    void clear();
    void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    size_t numRows() const;
    size_t numCols() const;
    bool empty() const;
    size_t size() const;

    T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col);
    const T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const;

    typedef typename vector<T>::iterator iterator;
    typedef typename vector<T>::const_iterator const_iterator;

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

```

Now, clients of `grid` can create `grid<int>::iterators` rather than `vector<int>::iterators`. This makes the interface more intuitive and increases encapsulation; since `iterator` is a `typedef`, if we later decide to replace the underlying representation with a dynamically-allocated array, we can change the `typedefs` to

```

typedef ElemType* iterator;
typedef const ElemType* const_iterator;

```

And clients of the `grid` will not notice any difference.

Notice that in the above `typedefs` we had to use the `typename` keyword to name the type `vector<ElemType>::iterator`. This is the pesky edge case mentioned in the chapter on templates and somehow manages to creep into more than its fair share of code. Since `iterator` is a nested type inside the template type `vector<ElemType>`, we have to use the `typename` keyword to indicate that `iterator` is the name of a type rather than a class constant.

We've now defined an `iterator` type for our `grid`, so what functions should we export to the `grid` clients? We'll at least want to provide support for `begin` and `end`, as shown here:


```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    grid();
    grid(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    void clear();
    void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    size_t numRows() const;
    size_t numCols() const;
    bool empty() const;
    size_t size() const;

    T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col);
    const T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const;

    typedef typename vector<T>::iterator iterator;
    typedef typename vector<T>::const_iterator const_iterator;

    iterator begin();
    const_iterator begin() const;
    iterator end();
    const_iterator end() const;
private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

```

We've provided two versions of each function so that clients of a `const grid` can still use iterators. These functions are easily implemented by returning the value of the underlying `vector`'s `begin` and `end` functions, as shown here:

```

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::iterator grid<T>::begin()
{
    return elems.begin();
}

```

Notice that the return type of this function is `typename grid<ElemType>::iterator` rather than just `iterator`. Because `iterator` is a nested type inside `grid`, we need to use `grid<ElemType>::iterator` to specify which iterator we want, and since `grid` is a template type we have to use the `typename` keyword to indicate that `iterator` is a nested type. Otherwise, this function should be straightforward.

The rest of the functions are implemented here:

```

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::const_iterator grid<T>::begin() const
{
    return elems.begin();
}

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::iterator grid<T>::end()
{
    return elems.end();
}

```

```

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::const_iterator grid<T>::end() const
{
    return elems.end();
}

```

Because the `grid` is implemented in row-major order, elements of a single row occupy consecutive locations in the vector. It's therefore possible to return iterators delineating the start and end of each row in the `grid`. This is useful functionality, so we'll provide it to clients of the `grid` through a pair of member functions `row_begin` and `row_end` (plus `const` overloads). These functions are declared here:

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    grid();
    grid(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    void clear();
    void resize(size_t rows, size_t cols);

    size_t numRows() const;
    size_t numCols() const;
    bool empty() const;
    size_t size() const;

    T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col);
    const T& getAt(size_t row, size_t col) const;

    typedef typename vector<ElemType>::iterator iterator;
    typedef typename vector<ElemType>::const_iterator const_iterator;

    iterator begin();
    const_iterator begin() const;
    iterator end();
    const_iterator end() const;

    iterator row_begin(size_t row);
    const_iterator row_begin(size_t row) const;
    iterator row_end(size_t row);
    const_iterator row_end(size_t row) const;

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

```

Before implementing these functions, let's take a minute to figure out exactly where the iterations we return should point to. Recall that the element at position $(row, 0)$ in a grid of size $(rows, cols)$ can be found at position $row * cols$. We should therefore have `row_begin(row)` return an iterator to the $row * cols$ element of the vector. Since there are $cols$ elements in each row and `row_end` should return an iterator to one position past the end of the row, this function should return an iterator to the position $cols$ past the location returned by `row_begin`. Given this information, we can implement these functions as shown here:

```

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::iterator grid<T>::row_begin(int row)
{
    return begin() + numCols() * row;
}

template <typename T>
    typename grid<T>::const_iterator grid<T>::row_begin(int row) const
{
    return begin() + numCols() * row;
}

template <typename T> typename grid<T>::iterator grid<T>::row_end(int row)
{
    return row_begin(row) + numCols();
}

template <typename T>
    typename grid<T>::const_iterator grid<T>::row_end(int row) const
{
    return row_begin(row) + numCols();
}

```

We now have an elegant `iterator` interface for the `grid` class. We can iterate over the entire container as a whole, just one row at a time, or some combination thereof. This enables us to interface the `grid` with the STL algorithms. For example, to zero out a `grid<int>`, we can use the `fill` algorithm, as shown here:

```
fill(myGrid.begin(), myGrid.end(), 0);
```

We can also sort the elements of a row using `sort`:

```
sort(myGrid.row_begin(0), myGrid.row_end(0));
```

With only a handful of functions we're now capable of plugging directly into the full power of the algorithms. This is part of the beauty of the STL – had the algorithms been designed to work on containers rather than iterator ranges, this would not have been possible.

Step 2: Add Support for the Element Selection Operator

When using regular C++ multidimensional arrays, we can write code that looks like this:

```
int myArray[137][42];
myArray[2][4] = 271828;
myArray[9][0] = 314159;
```

However, with the current specification of the `grid` class, the above code would be illegal if we replaced the multidimensional array with a `grid<int>`, since we haven't provided an implementation of `operator []`.

Adding support for element selection to linear classes like the `vector` is simple – we simply have the brackets operator return a reference to the proper element. Unfortunately, it is much trickier to design `grid` such that the bracket syntax works correctly. The reason is that if we write code that looks like this:

```
grid<int> myGrid(137, 42);
int value = myGrid[2][4];
```

By replacing the bracket syntax with calls to `operator []`, we see that this code expands out to

```
grid<int> myGrid(137, 42);
int value = (myGrid.operator[] (2)).operator[] (4);
```

Here, there are *two* calls to `operator []`, one invoked on `myGrid` and the other on the value returned by `myGrid.operator[] (2)`. To make the above code compile, the object returned by the `grid`'s `operator[]` must *itself* define an `operator []` function. It is this returned object, rather than the `grid` itself, which is responsible for retrieving the requested element from the `grid`. Since this temporary object is used to perform a task normally reserved for the `grid`, it is sometimes known as a *proxy object*.

How can we implement the `grid`'s `operator []` so that it works as described above? First, we will need to define a new class representing the object returned by the `grid`'s `operator []`. In this discussion, we'll call it `MutableReference`, since it represents an object that can call back into the `grid` and mutate it. For simplicity and to maximize encapsulation, we'll define `MutableReference` inside of `grid`. This results in the following interface for `grid`:

```
template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    /* ... previously-defined functions ... */

    class MutableReference
    {
    public:
        friend class grid;
        T& operator[] (size_t col);

    private:
        MutableReference(grid* owner, size_t row);

        grid* const owner;
        const size_t row;
    };

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};
```

The `MutableReference` object stores some a pointer to the `grid` that created it, along with the index passed in to the `grid`'s `operator []` function when the `MutableReference` was created. That way, when we invoke the `MutableReference`'s `operator []` function specifying the *col* coordinate of the `grid`, we can pair it with the stored *row* coordinate, then query the `grid` for the element at (*row*, *col*). We have also made `grid` a friend of `MutableReference` so that the `grid` can call the private constructor necessary to initialize a `MutableReference`.

We can implement `MutableReference` as follows:

```
template <typename T>
    grid<T>::MutableReference::MutableReference(grid* owner, int row) :
        owner(owner), row(row)
    {
    }

template <typename T>
    T& grid<T>::MutableReference::operator[] (int col)
    {
        return owner->getAt(row, col);
    }
```

Notice that because `MutableReference` is a nested class inside `grid`, the implementation of the `MutableReference` functions is prefaced with `grid<ElemType>::MutableReference` instead of just `MutableReference`. However, in this particular case the pesky `typename` keyword is not necessary because we are prototyping a function inside `MutableReference` rather than using the type `MutableReference` in an expression.

Now that we've implemented `MutableReference`, we'll define an `operator []` function for the `grid` class that constructs and returns a properly-initialized `MutableReference`. This function accepts an `row` coordinate, and returns a `MutableReference` storing that row number and a pointer back to the `grid`. That way, if we write

```
int value = myGrid[1][2];
```

The following sequences of actions occurs:

1. `myGrid.operator[]` is invoked with the parameter 1.
2. `myGrid.operator[]` creates a `MutableReference` storing the `row` coordinate 1 and a means for communicating back with the `myGrid` object.
3. `myGrid.operator[]` returns this `MutableReference`.
4. The returned `MutableReference` then has its `operator[]` function called with parameter 2.
5. The returned `MutableReference` then calls back to the `myGrid` object and asks for the element at position (1, 2).

This sequence of actions is admittedly complex, but is transparent to the client of the `grid` class and runs efficiently.

`operator[]` is defined and implemented as follows:

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    /* ... previously-defined functions ... */

    class MutableReference
    {
    public:
        friend class grid;
        T& operator[] (size_t col);

    private:
        MutableReference(grid* owner, size_t row);

        grid* const owner;
        const size_t row;
    };
    MutableReference operator[] (int row);

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

template <typename T>
typename grid<T>::MutableReference grid<T>::operator[] (int row)
{
    return MutableReference(this, row);
}

```

Notice that we've only provided an implementation of the non-const version of `operator[]`. But what if we want to use `operator[]` on a `const grid`? We would similarly need to return a proxy object, but that object would need to guarantee that `grid` clients could not write code like this:

```

const grid<int> myGrid(137, 42);
myGrid[0][0] = 2718; // Oops! Modified const object!

```

To prevent this sort of problem, we'll have the `const` version of `operator[]` return a proxy object of a different type, called `ImmutableReference` which behaves similarly to `MutableReference` but which returns `const` references to the elements in the `grid`. This results in the following interface for `grid`:

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    /* ... previously-defined functions ... */

    class MutableReference
    {
    public:
        friend class grid;
        T& operator[] (size_t col);

private:
        MutableReference(grid* owner, size_t row);

        grid* const owner;
        const size_t row;
    };
    MutableReference operator[] (int row);

    class ImmutableReference
    {
    public:
        friend class grid;
        const T& operator[] (size_t col) const;

private:
        MutableReference(const grid* owner, size_t row);

        const grid* const owner;
        const size_t row;
    };
    ImmutableReference operator[] (size_t row) const;

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

```

ImmutableReference and the const version of operator[] are similar to MutableReference and the non-const version of operator[], and to save space we won't write it here. The complete listing of the grid class at the end of this chapter contains the implementation if you're interested.

Step 3: Define Relational Operators

Now that our grid has full support for iterators and a nice bracket syntax that lets us access individual elements, it's time to put on the finishing touches. As a final step in the project, we'll provide implementations of the relational operators for our grid class. We begin by updating the grid interface to include the following functions:

```

template <typename T> class grid
{
public:
    /* ... previously-defined functions ... */

    bool operator < (const grid& other) const;
    bool operator <= (const grid& other) const;
    bool operator == (const grid& other) const;
    bool operator != (const grid& other) const;
    bool operator >= (const grid& other) const;
    bool operator > (const grid& other) const;

private:
    vector<T> elems;
    size_t rows;
    size_t cols;
};

```

Note that of the six operators listed above, only the `==` and `!=` operators have intuitive meanings when applied to `grid`s. However, it also makes sense to define a `<` operator over `grid`s so that we can store them in STL `map` and `set` containers, and to ensure consistency, we should define the other three operators as well.

Because there is no natural interpretation for what it means for one `grid` to be “less than” another, we are free to implement these functions in any way that we see fit, provided that we obey transitivity and trichotomy. As mentioned earlier it is possible to implement all six of the relational operators in terms of the less-than operator. One strategy for implementing the relational operators is thus to implement just the less-than operator and then to define the other five as wrapped calls to `operator <`. But what is the best way to determine whether one `grid` compares less than another? One general approach is to define a *lexicographical ordering* over `grid`s. We will compare each field one at a time, checking to see if the fields are equal. If so, we move on to the next field. Otherwise, we immediately return that one `grid` is less than another without looking at the remaining fields. If we go through every field and find that the `grid`s are equal, then we can return that neither `grid` is less than the other. This is similar to the way that we might order words alphabetically – we find the first mismatched character, then return which word compares first. We can begin by implementing `operator <` as follows:

```

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator < (const grid& other) const
{
    /* Compare the number of rows and return if there's a mismatch. */
    if(rows != other.rows)
        return rows < other.rows;

    /* Next compare the number of columns the same way. */
    if(cols != other.cols)
        return cols < other.cols;

    /* ... */
}

```

Here, we compare the `rows` fields of the two objects and immediately return if they aren't equal. We can then check the `cols` fields in the same way. Finally, if the two `grid`s have the same number of rows and columns, we need to check how the elements of the `grid`s compare. Fortunately, this is straightforward thanks to the STL `lexicographical_compare` algorithm. `lexicographical_compare` accepts four iterators delineating two ranges, then lexicographically compares the elements in those ranges and returns if the first range compares lexicographically less than the second. Using `lexicographical_compare`, we can finish our implementation of `operator <` as follows:


```

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator < (const grid& other) const
{
    /* Compare the number of rows and return if there's a mismatch. */
    if(rows != other.rows)
        return rows < other.rows;

    /* Next compare the number of columns the same way. */
    if(cols != other.cols)
        return cols < other.cols;

    return lexicographical_compare(begin(), end(), other.begin(), other.end());
}

```

All that's left to do now is to implement the other five relational operators in terms of `operator <`. This is done below:

```

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator >=(const grid& other) const
{
    return !(*this < other);
}

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator ==(const grid& other) const
{
    return !(*this < other) && !(other < *this);
}

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator !=(const grid& other) const
{
    return (*this < other) || (other < *this);
}

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator >(const grid& other) const
{
    return other < *this;
}

template <typename T> bool grid<T>::operator <=(const grid& other) const
{
    return !(other < *this);
}

```

At this point we're done! We now have a complete working implementation of the `grid` class that supports iteration, element access, and the relational operators. To boot, it's implemented on top of the `vector`, meaning that it's slick and efficient. This class should be your one-stop solution for applications that require a two-dimensional array.

More to Explore

Operator overloading is an enormous topic in C++ and there's simply not enough space to cover it all in this chapter. If you're interested in some more advanced topics, consider reading into the following:

1. **Overloaded `new` and `delete`:** You are allowed to overload the `new` and `delete` operators, in case you want to change how memory is allocated for your class. Note that the overloaded `new` and `delete` operators simply change how memory is allocated, not what it means to write `new MyClass`. Overloading `new` and `delete` is a complicated task and requires a solid understanding of how C++ memory management works, so be sure to consult a reference for details.
2. **Conversion functions:** In an earlier chapter, we covered how to write conversion constructors, functions that convert objects of other types into instances of your new class. However, it's possible to use operator overloading to define an implicit conversion from objects of your class into objects of other types. The syntax is `operator Type()`, where `Type` is the data type to convert your object to. Many professional programmers advise against conversion functions, so make sure that they're really the best option before proceeding.

Practice Problems

Operator overloading is quite difficult because your functions must act as though they're the built-in operators. Here are some practice problems to get you used to overloading operators:

1. What is an overloaded operator?
2. What is an lvalue? An rvalue? Does the `+` operator yield an lvalue or an rvalue? How about the pointer dereference operator?
3. Are overloaded operators inherently more efficient than regular functions?
4. Explain how to implement `operator +` in terms of `operator +=`.
5. What is the signature of an overloaded operator for subtraction? For unary negation?
6. How do you differentiate between the prefix and postfix versions of the `++` operator?
7. What does the `->` operator return?
8. What is a friend function? How do you declare one?
9. How do you declare an overloaded stream insertion operator?
10. What is trichotomy and why is it important to C++ programmers?
11. What is transitivity and why is it important to C++ programmers?
12. In Python, it is legal to use negative array indices to mean “the element that many positions from the end of the array.” For example, `myArray[-1]` would be the last element of an array, `myArray[-2]` the penultimate element, etc. Using operator overloading, it's possible to implement this functionality for a custom array class. Do you think it's a good idea to do so? Why or why not? Think about the principle of least astonishment when answering.

13. Why is it better to implement `+` in terms of `+=` instead of `+=` in terms of `+`? (Hint: Think about the number of objects created using `+=` and using `+`.)
14. Consider the following definition of a `Span` struct:

```
struct Span
{
    int start, stop;
};
```

The `Span` struct allows us to define the range of elements from `[start, stop)` as a single variable. Given this definition of `Span` and assuming `start` and `stop` are both non-negative, provide another bracket operator for `CString` that accepts a `Span` by reference-to-const and returns another `CString` equal to the substring of the initial `CString` from `start` to `stop`.

15. Consider the following interface for a class that iterates over a container of `ElemTypes`:

```
class iterator
{
public:
    bool operator== (const iterator& other);
    bool operator!= (const iterator& other);

    iterator operator++ ();

    ElemType* operator* () const;
    ElemType* operator-> () const;
};
```

There are several mistakes in the definition of this iterator. What are they? How would you fix them?

16. The implementation of the `grid` class's `operator==` and `operator!=` functions implemented those operators in terms of the less-than operator. This is somewhat inefficient, since it's more direct to simply check if the two `grid`s are equal or unequal rather than to use the comparison operators. Rewrite the `grid`'s `operator==` function to directly check whether the `grid`s are identical. Then rewrite `operator!=` in terms of `operator==`.