

18.11 — Printing inherited classes using operator<<

ALEX AUGUST 26, 2021

Consider the following program that makes use of a virtual function:

```
1 #include <iostream>
2 class Base
3 {
4 public:
5     virtual void print() const { std::cout << "Base"; }
6 };
7
8 class Derived : public Base
9 {
10 public:
11     void print() const override { std::cout <<
12 "Derived"; }
13 };
14
15 int main()
16 {
17     Derived d{};
18     Base& b{ d };
19     b.print(); // will call Derived::print()
20
21     return 0;
22 }
```

By now, you should be comfortable with the fact that `b.print()` will call `Derived::print()` (because `b` is pointing to a `Derived` class object, `Base::print()` is a virtual function, and `Derived::print()` is an override).

While calling member functions like this to do output is okay, this style of function doesn't mix well with `std::cout`:

```
1 #include <iostream>
2
3 int main()
4 {
5     Derived d{};
6     Base& b{ d };
7
8     std::cout << "b is a ";
9     b.print(); // messy, we have to break our print statement to call this
10    function
11    std::cout << '\n';
12
13    return 0;
14 }
```

In this lesson, we'll look at how to override `operator<<` for classes using inheritance, so that we can use `operator<<` as expected, like this:

```
1 | std::cout << "b is a " << b << '\n'; // much  
  | better
```

The challenges with operator<<

Let's start by overloading operator<< in the typical way:

```
1 | #include <iostream>
2 |
3 | class Base
4 | {
5 | public:
6 |     virtual void print() const { std::cout << "Base"; }
7 |
8 |     friend std::ostream& operator<<(std::ostream& out, const Base& b)
9 |     {
10 |         out << "Base";
11 |         return out;
12 |     }
13 | };
14 |
15 | class Derived : public Base
16 | {
17 | public:
18 |     void print() const override { std::cout << "Derived"; }
19 |
20 |     friend std::ostream& operator<<(std::ostream& out, const Derived&
21 |     d)
22 |     {
23 |         out << "Derived";
24 |         return out;
25 |     }
26 | };
27 |
28 | int main()
29 | {
30 |     Base b{};
31 |     std::cout << b << '\n';
32 |
33 |     Derived d{};
34 |     std::cout << d << '\n';
35 |
36 |     return 0;
37 | }
```

Because there is no need for virtual function resolution here, this program works as we'd expect, and prints:

```
Base
Derived
```

Now, consider the following main() function instead:

```

1 | int main()
  | {
2 |     Derived d{};
3 |     Base& bref{ d };
  |     std::cout << bref <<
  |     '\n';
4 |     return 0;
  | }

```

This program prints:

```
Base
```

That's probably not what we were expecting. This happens because our version of `operator<<` that handles `Base` objects isn't virtual, so `std::cout << bref` calls the version of `operator<<` that handles `Base` objects rather than `Derived` objects.

Therein lies the challenge.

Can we make `Operator <<` virtual?

If this issue is that `operator<<` isn't virtual, can't we simply make it virtual?

The short answer is no. There are a number of reasons for this.

First, only member functions can be virtualized -- this makes sense, since only classes can inherit from other classes, and there's no way to override a function that lives outside of a class (you can overload non-member functions, but not override them). Because we typically implement `operator<<` as a friend, and friends aren't considered member functions, a friend version of `operator<<` is ineligible to be virtualized. (For a review of why we implement `operator<<` this way, please revisit [lesson 13.5 -- Overloading operators using member functions](#)).

Second, even if we could virtualize `operator<<` there's the problem that the function parameters for `Base::operator<<` and `Derived::operator<<` differ (the `Base` version would take a `Base` parameter and the `Derived` version would take a `Derived` parameter). Consequently, the `Derived` version wouldn't be considered an override of the `Base` version, and thus be ineligible for virtual function resolution.

So what's a programmer to do?

The solution

The answer, as it turns out, is surprisingly simple.

First, we set up `operator<<` as a friend in our base class as usual. But instead of having `operator<<` do the printing itself, we delegate that responsibility to a normal member function that *can* be virtualized!

Here's the full solution that works:

```

1  #include <iostream>
2
3  class Base
4  {
5  public:
6  // Here's our overloaded operator<<
7  friend std::ostream& operator<<(std::ostream& out, const Base& b)
8  {
9  // Delegate printing responsibility for printing to member function print()
10     return b.print(out);
11 }
12
13 // We'll rely on member function print() to do the actual printing
14 // Because print is a normal member function, it can be virtualized
15 virtual std::ostream& print(std::ostream& out) const
16 {
17     out << "Base";
18     return out;
19 }
20 };
21
22 class Derived : public Base
23 {
24 public:
25 // Here's our override print function to handle the Derived case
26 std::ostream& print(std::ostream& out) const override
27 {
28     out << "Derived";
29     return out;
30 }
31 };
32
33 int main()
34 {
35     Base b{};
36     std::cout << b << '\n';
37
38     Derived d{};
39     std::cout << d << '\n'; // note that this works even with no operator<< that explicitly handles Derived
40                             // objects
41
42     Base& bref{ d };
43     std::cout << bref << '\n';
44
45     return 0;
46 }

```

The above program works in all three cases:

```

Base
Derived
Derived

```

Let's examine how in more detail.

First, in the Base case, we call `operator<<`, which calls virtual function `print()`. Since our Base reference parameter points to a Base object, `b.print()` resolves to `Base::print()`, which does the printing. Nothing too special here.

In the Derived case, the compiler first looks to see if there's an `operator<<` that takes a Derived object. There isn't one, because we didn't define one. Next the compiler looks to see if there's an `operator<<` that takes a Base object. There is, so the compiler does an implicit upcast of our Derived object to a Base& and calls the function (we could have done this upcast ourselves, but the compiler is helpful in this regard). This function then calls virtual `print()`, which resolves to `Derived::print()`.

Note that we don't need to define an operator<< for each derived class! The version that handles Base objects works just fine for both Base objects and any class derived from Base!

The third case proceeds as a mix of the first two. First, the compiler matches variable bref with operator<< that takes a Base. That calls our virtual print() function. Since the Base reference is actually pointing to a Derived object, this resolves to Derived::print(), as we intended.

Problem solved.



Next lesson

18.x Chapter 18 comprehensive quiz



Back to table of contents



Previous lesson

18.10 Dynamic casting

Leave a comment... Put C++ code between triple-backticks (markdown style):````Your C++ code here````

 Name*

 Email* 

Avatars from <https://gravatar.com/> are connected to your provided email address.

Notify me about replies:



POST COMMENT

DP N N FOUT

Newest ▼

