CSE 333
Lecture 15 - inheritance

Hal Perkins
Department of Computer Science & Engineering
University of Washington
No sections tomorrow(!)

- We’re half-way between topics so....
- Use the time to catch up on ______________ .
- Could have staff in 006 lab during that time. Interested?

HW3 due a week from tomorrow
Midterm

Returned at end of hour

Pretty good showing: mean 74.8, stdev 12.8

- <insert “what does this do to my grade?” speech here>

Regrading

- We’ll fix anything that’s wrong, but first...
- Please wait at least overnight and compare to solutions first
  ‣ (unless it’s trivial or clerical; that we can fix right away)
- Then probably best to write a note and attach it to front of exam and return to instructor
Today

C++ inheritance

- Review of basic idea (pretty much the same as 143),
- What’s different in C++ (compared to Java)
  ‣ Static vs dynamic dispatch - virtual functions and vtables
  ‣ Pure virtual functions, abstract classes, why no Java “interfaces”
  ‣ Assignment slicing, using class hierarchies with STL
- Casts in C++

• Credits: Thanks to Marty Step for stock portfolio example
Let’s build a stock portfolio

A portfolio represents a person’s financial investments

- each asset has a cost (how much was paid for it) and a market value (how much it is worth)
  ‣ the difference is the profit (or loss)

- different assets compute market value in different ways
  ‣ **stock**: has a symbol (“GOOG”), a number of shares, share price paid, and current share price
  ‣ **dividend stock**: is a stock that also has dividend payments
  ‣ **cash**: money; never incurs profit or loss.  (hah!)
One possible design

One class per asset type

- Problem: redundancy
- Problem: cannot treat multiple investments the same way
  - e.g., cannot put them in a single array or Vector
see initial_design/
Inheritance

A parent-child “is-a” relationship between classes

- a child (derived class) extends a parent (base class)

Benefits:

- code reuse: subclasses inherit code from superclasses
- polymorphism
  ‣ ability to redefine existing behavior but preserve the interface
  ‣ children can override behavior of parent
  ‣ others can make calls on objects without knowing which part of the inheritance tree it is in
- extensibility: children can add behavior
Better design

Stock
symbol_
total_shares_
total_cost_
current_price_
GetMarketValue() 
GetProfit() 
GetCost() 

DividendStock
symbol_
total_shares_
total_cost_
current_price_
dividends_
GetMarketValue() 
GetProfit() 
GetCost() 

Asset (abstract)
GetMarketValue() 
GetProfit() 
GetCost() 

Cash
amount_
GetMarketValue() 

Mutual Fund
symbol_
total_shares_
total_cost_
current_price_
assets_ []
GetMarketValue() 
GetProfit() 
GetCost()
Like Java: Access specifiers

**public:** visible to all other classes

**protected:** visible to current class and its subclasses

**private:** visible only to the current class

declare members as **protected** if:

- you don’t want random customers accessing them
  - you want to be subclassed and let subclasses access them
Like Java: Public inheritance

- "public" inheritance
  - anything that is [public, protected] in the base is [public, protected] in the derived class - interface + implementation inheritance

- derived class inherits **almost** all behavior from the base class
  - not constructors and destructors
  - not the assignment operator or copy constructor

- (Yes there is "private" inheritance — don’t ask and don’t use)
## Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C++, etc.</th>
<th>Java, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>base class</td>
<td>superclass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derived class</td>
<td>subclass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means the same. You’ll hear both.
Revisiting the portfolio example

Without inheritance (separate class per type)

- lots of redundancy
- no type relationship between the classes
Revisiting the portfolio example

A derived class:

- **inherits** the behavior and state of the base class
- **overrides** some of the base class’s member functions
- **extends** the base class with new member functions, variables
(implement better_design/ )
Like Java: Dynamic dispatch

Usually, when a derived function is available to an object, we want that derived function to be invoked by it

- as we will see, this requires a runtime decision of what code to invoke

When a member function is invoked on an object...

- the code that is invoked is decided at run time, and is the most-derived function accessible to the object’s visible type
How to use dynamic dispatch

If you want a member function to use dynamic dispatch, prefix its declaration with the “virtual” keyword

- derived (child) functions don’t need to repeat the virtual keyword, but it is good style to do so

( see even_better_design/ )
Dynamic dispatch

When a member function is invoked on an object

- the code that is invoked is decided at run time, and is the most-derived function accessible to the object’s visible type

```cpp
double DividendStock::GetMarketValue() const {
    return get_shares() * get_share_price() + _dividends;
}

double DividendStock::GetProfit() const {
    return DividendStock::GetMarketValue() - GetCost();
}
```

```cpp
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();
}

double Stock::GetProfit() const {
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();
}
```
Dynamic dispatch

```cpp
DividendStock dividend();
DividendStock *ds = &dividend;
Stock *s = &dividend;

// invokes Stock::GetProfit(), since that function is
// inherited (i.e., not overridden). Stock::GetProfit()
// invokes Dividend::GetMarketValue(), since that is
// the most-derived accessible function.
ds->GetProfit();

// invokes DividendStock::GetMarketValue()
ds->GetMarketValue();

// invokes DividendStock::GetMarketValue()
s->GetMarketValue();
```
Dynamic dispatch

Here’s what “most derived” means:

class A {
  public:
    // Foo will use dynamic dispatch
    virtual void Foo();
};

class B : public A {
  public:
    // B::Foo overrides A::Foo
    virtual void Foo();
};

class C : public B {
  public:
    // C inherits B::Foo()
};

void function() {
  A *a_ptr;
  C c;

  // Why is this OK?
  a_ptr = &c;

  // Whose Foo() is called?
  a_ptr->Foo();
}
Dynamic dispatch

A more extreme version

class A {
  public:
    virtual void Foo();
};
class B : public A {
  public:
    virtual void Foo();
};
class C : public B {
};
class D : public C {
  public:
    virtual void Foo();
};
class E : public C {
};

void function() {
  A *a_ptr;
  C c;
  E e;

  // Whose Foo() is called?
  a_ptr = &c;
  a_ptr->Foo();

  // Whose Foo() is called?
  a_ptr = &e;
  a_ptr->Foo();
}
But how can this possibly work??

The compiler produces Stock.o from Stock.cc

- while doing this, it can’t know that DividendStock exists
  - so, how does the code emitted for Stock::GetProfit() know to invoke Stock::GetMarketValue() some of the time, and DividendStock::GetMarketValue() other times??!!?

```cpp
virtual double Stock::GetMarketValue() const;
virtual double Stock::GetProfit() const;
```

```cpp
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();
}

double Stock::GetProfit() const {
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();
}
```

---

// 05-14-13 // Perkins
vtables and the vptr

If a member function is virtual, the compiler emits:

- a “vtable”, or virtual function table, for the class
  - it contains a function pointer for each virtual function in the class
  - the pointer points to the most-derived function for that class
- a “vptr”, or virtual table pointer, for each object instance
  - the vptr is a pointer to a virtual table, and it is essentially a hidden member variable inserted by the compiler
  - when the object’s constructor is invoked, the vptr is initialized to point to the virtual table for the object’s class
  - thus, the vptr “remembers” what class the object is
vtable/vptr example

```cpp
class Base {  
    public:  
        virtual void fn1() {};  
        virtual void fn2() {};  
};
class Dr1: public Base {  
    public:  
        virtual void fn1() {};  
};
class Dr2: public Base {  
    public:  
        virtual void fn2() {};  
};

// what needs to work
Base b;
Dr1 d1;
Dr2 d2;
Base *bptr = &b;
Base *d1ptr = &d1;
Base *d2ptr = &d2;
bptr->fn1();   // Base::fn1()  
bptr->fn2();   // Base::fn2()  
d1ptr->fn1();  // Dr1::fn1()  
d1ptr->fn2();  // Base::fn2()  
d2.fn1();      // Base::fn1()  
d2ptr->fn1();  // Base::fn1()  
d2ptr->fn2();  // Dr2::fn2();
```
// what happens
Base b;
Dr1 d1;
Dr2 d2;
Base *d2ptr = &d2;
d2.fn1();
// d2.vptr -->
// Dr2.vtable.fn1 -->
// Base::fn1()
d2ptr->fn2();
// d2ptr -->
// d2.vptr -->
// Dr2.vtable.fn2 -->
// Dr2::fn2()
Let's compile this and use objdump to see what g++ emits!

- g++ -g vtable.cc
- objdump -CDSRTtx a.out | less
Static dispatch - What if we omit “virtual”?  

When a member function is invoked on an object...

- the code that is invoked is decided at compile time, based on the compile-time visible type of the callee

```cpp
double DividendStock::GetMarketValue() const {
    return get_shares() * get_share_price() + _dividends;
}

double DividendStock::GetProfit() const {
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();
}
```

```cpp
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();
}

double Stock::GetProfit() const {
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();
}
```
Static dispatch

```cpp
DividendStock dividend();
DividendStock *ds = &dividend;
Stock *s = &dividend;

// invokes Stock::GetProfit(), since that function is
// inherited (i.e, not overridden).  Stock::GetProfit()
// invokes Stock::GetMarketValue(), since C++ uses
// static dispatch by default.
    ds->GetProfit();

// invokes DividendStock::GetMarketValue()
    ds->GetMarketValue();

// invokes Stock::GetMarketValue()
    s->GetMarketValue();
```
Why not always use “virtual”?

Two (fairly uncommon) reasons:

- Efficiency:
  - non-virtual function calls are a tiny bit faster (no indirect lookup)
  - if the class has no virtual functions, objects will not have a vptr field

- Control: If \texttt{f()} calls \texttt{g()} in class \texttt{X} and \texttt{g} is not virtual, we’re guaranteed to call \texttt{X::g()} and not \texttt{g()} in some subclass
  - Particularly useful for framework design

In Java, all functions (methods) are virtual; in C++ and C# you can pick what you want
  - But omitting “virtual” often causes obscure bugs
Virtual is “sticky”

If `X::f()` is declared virtual, then a vtable will be created for class `X` and for all of its subclasses. The vtables will include function pointers for (the correct version of) `f`.

`f()` will be called using dynamic dispatch even if overridden but not explicitly specified as `virtual` in a subclass.
Pure virtual fcns, abstract classes

Sometimes we want to include a function in a class but only implement it in subclasses. In Java we would use an abstract method. In C++ we use a “pure virtual” function.

- Example: `virtual string noise() = 0;`  // see zoo.cc

A class that contains a pure virtual method is abstract

- Can’t create instances of an abstract class (like Java)
- Extend abstract classes and override methods to use it (like Java)

A class containing only pure virtual methods is the same as a Java interface (⊔: no separate “interface” thingys in C++)

- Pure type specification without implementations
Inheritance and constructors

A derived class **does not inherit** the base class’s constructor

- the derived class **must** have its own constructor
  - if you don’t provide one, C++ synthesizes a default constructor for you
    - it initializes derived class’s non-POD member variables to zero-equivalents and invokes the default constructor of the base class
    - if the base class has no default constructor, a compiler error
  - a constructor of the base class is invoked before the constructor of the derived class
    - you can specify which base class constructor in the initialization list of the derived class, or C++ will invoke default constructor of base class
Examples

// Base has no default constructor
class Base {
  public:
    Base(int x) : y(x) { }
    int y;
};

// Compiler error when you try
// to instantiate a D1, as D1's
// synthesized default constructor
// needs to invoke Base's default
// constructor.
class D1 : public Base {
  public:
    int z;
};

// Works.
class D2 : public Base {
  public:
    D2(int z) :
        Base(z+1) {
            this->z = z;
        }
    int z;
};

// Base has a default constructor.
class Base {
  public:
    int y;
};

// Works.
class D1 : public Base {
  public:
    int z;
};

// Works.
class D2 : public Base {
  public:
    D2(int z) {
        this->z = z;
    }
    int z;
};
Destructors

When the destructor of a derived class is invoked...
- the destructor of the base class is invoked after the destructor of the derived class finishes

Note that static dispatch of destructors is almost always a mistake!
- good habit to always define a destructor as virtual
  - empty if you have no work to do

```cpp
class Base {
  public:
  Base() { x = new int; }
  ~Base() { delete x; }
  int *x;
};
class D1 : public Base {
  public:
  D1() { y = new int; }
  ~D1() { delete y; }
  int *y;
};
Base *b = new Base;
Base *dptr = (Base *) new D1;
delete b;    // ok
delete dptr; // leaks D1::y
```
C++ allows you to...
- assign to...
  ♦ an instance of a base class...
  ♦ the value of a derived class
Given this, STL containers?? :(

STL stores **copies of values** in containers, not pointers to object instances

- so, what if you have a class hierarchy, and want to store mixes of object types in a single container?
  - e.g., Stock and DividendStock in the same list
  - you get sliced! :(

```cpp
class Stock {
    ...
};

class DivStock : public Stock {
    ...
};

main() {  
    Stock        s;
    DivStock    ds;
    list<Stock> li;

    li.push_back(s);   // OK
    li.push_back(ds);  // OUCH!
}
```
STL + inheritance: use pointers?

Store pointers to heap-allocated objects in STL containers
- no slicing :)
  ‣ you have to remember to delete your objects before destroying the container :( 
  ‣ sort() does the wrong thing :( :( 

Use smart pointers!

```cpp
#include <list>
using namespace std;

class Integer {
    public:
        Integer(int x) : x_(x) { }
    private:
        int x_{};
};

main() {
    list<Integer *> li;
    Integer *i1 = new Integer(2);
    Integer *i2 = new Integer(3);
    li.push_back(i1);
    li.push_back(i2);
    li.sort(); // waaaaaah!!
}
```
Explicit casting in C

C’s explicit typecasting syntax is simple

\[ \text{lhs} = \text{(new type)} \text{ rhs}; \]

- C’s explicit casting is used to...
  - convert between pointers of arbitrary type
  - forcibly convert a primitive type to another
    - e.g., an integer to a float, so that you can do integer division

```c
int x = 5;
int y = 2;
printf("%d\n", x / y);        // prints 2
printf("%f\n", ((float) x) / y); // prints 2.5
```
C++

You can use C-style casting in C++, but C++ provides an alternative style that is more informative:

- static_cast<to_type>(expression)
- dynamic_cast<to_type>(expression)
- const_cast<to_type>(expression)
- reinterpret_cast<to_type>(expression)
static_cast

C++’s static_cast can convert:
- pointers to classes of related type
  - get a compiler error if you attempt to static_cast between pointers to non-related classes
  - dangerous to cast a pointer to a base class into a pointer to a derived class
- non-pointer conversion
  - float to int, etc.

static_cast is checked at compile time

class Foo {
    public:
        int x_
    
};
class Bar {
    public:
        float x_
    
};
class Wow : public Bar {
    public:
        char x_
    
};

int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    Foo a, *aptr;
    Bar b, *bptr;
    Wow c, *cptr;

    // compiler error
    aptr = static_cast<Foo *>(&b);

    // OK
    bptr = static_cast<Bar *>(&c);

    // compiles, but dangerous
    cptr = static_cast<Wow *>(&b);
    return 0;
}
C++’s `dynamic_cast` can convert:
- pointers to classes of related type
- references to classes of related type

`dynamic_cast` is checked at both compile time and run time:
- casts between unrelated classes fail at compile time
- casts from base to derived fail at run-time if the pointed-to object is not a full derived object

class Base {
  public:
    virtual int foo() { return 1; }
    float x_; 
};

class Deriv : public Base {
  public:
    char x_; 
};

int main(int argc, char **argv) {
  Base b, *bptr = &b;
  Deriv d, *dptr = &d;

  // OK (run-time check passes).
  bptr = dynamic_cast<Base*>(&d);
  assert(bptr != NULL);

  // OK (run-time check passes).
  dptr = dynamic_cast<Deriv*>(bptr);
  assert(dptr != NULL);

  // Run-time check fails, so the cast returns NULL.
  bptr = &b;
  dptr = dynamic_cast<Deriv*>(bptr);
  assert(dptr != NULL);

  return 0;
}
const_cast

Is used to strip or add const-ness

- dangerous!

```cpp
void foo(int *x) {
    *x++;
}

void bar(const int *x) {
    foo(x);  // compiler error
    foo(const_cast<int *>(x));  // succeeds
}

main() {
    int x = 7;
    bar(&x);
}
```
reinterpret_cast

casts between incompatible types

- storing a pointer in an int, or vice-versa
  - works as long as the integral type is “wide” enough
- converting between incompatible pointers
  - dangerous!
Implicit conversion

The compiler tries to infer some kinds of conversions

- when you don’t specify an explicit cast, and types are not equal, the compiler looks for an acceptable implicit conversion

```cpp
void bar(std::string x);

void foo() {
    int x = 5.7; // implicit conversion float -> int
    bar("hi"); // implicit conversion, (const char *) -> string
    char c = x; // implicit conversion, int -> char
}
```
Sneaky implicit conversions

How did the (const char *) --> string conversion work??

- if a class has a constructor with a single parameter, the compiler will exploit it to perform implicit conversions
- at most one user-defined implicit conversion will happen
  ‣ can do int --> Foo
  ‣ can’t do int --> Foo --> Baz

```cpp
class Foo {
public:
  Foo(int x) : x_(x) { }
  int x_;  
};

int Bar(Foo f) {
  return f.x_;  
}

int main(int argc, char **argv) {
  // The compiler uses Foo's (int x) constructor to make an implicit conversion from the int 5 to a Foo.
  // equiv to return Bar(Foo(5));
  // !!!
  return Bar(5);
}
```
Avoiding sneaky implicits

Declare one-argument constructors as “explicit” if you want to disable them from being used as an implicit conversion path

- usually a good idea

```cpp
class Foo {
    public:
        explicit Foo(int x) : x_(x) {}
        int x_;  
};

int Bar(Foo f) {
    return f.x_;  
}

int main(int argc, char **argv) {
    // compiler error
    return Bar(5);  
}
```
Exercise 1

Design a class hierarchy to represent shapes:
- examples of shapes: Circle, Triangle, Square

Implement methods that:
- construct shapes
- move a shape (i.e., add \((x, y)\) to the shape position)
- returns the centroid of the shape
- returns the area of the shape
- Print\(()\), which prints out the details of a shape
Exercise 2

Implement a program that:

- uses your exercise 1
  ‣ constructs a vector of shapes
  ‣ sorts the vector according to the area of the shape
  ‣ prints out each member of the vector

- notes:
  ‣ to avoid slicing, you’ll have to store pointers in the vector
  ‣ to be able to sort, you’ll have to implement a wrapper for the pointers, and you’ll have to override the “<“ operator
See you on Monday!