

# CSE 333

## Lecture 15 - inheritance

**Hal Perkins**

Department of Computer Science & Engineering

University of Washington



# Administrivia

HW3 due a week from Thursday

- You did get started over the weekend, didn't you?

No new exercise today

- There goes the last excuse for not starting HW3 :)

Midterms won't be graded for another day or three

# Administrivia (Wed.)

HW3 due a week from tomorrow(!)

- <panic>if not started yet</panic>

No new exercise – nothing due before class Friday(!!)

Midterms returned at end of class today

# Midterm

Stats: mean 86.1, stdev 7.7

- Lots of very high scores - great!
- #include ““what does this do to my grade?’ speech here”

## Regrading

- We'll fix anything that's wrong, but first...
- Please wait (overnight?) and compare to solutions
  - (unless it's trivial or clerical; that we'll fix right away)
- Then probably best to write a note and attach it to front of exam and return to instructor — after talking to one of us

# Administrivia (Fri.)

HW3 due a week from yesterday(!)

- <panic>if not started yet</panic>

New exercise out today, due before class Monday

Unclaimed midterms are in Perkins' office - drop by any time to pick up

# HW3 tip

HW3 writes some pretty big index files

- Hundreds of thousands of write operations
- No problem for today's fast machines and disks!!

Except...

- If you're running on attu or a CSE lab linux workstation, every write to your personal directories is to a network file server(!)
  - ▶ ∴ Lots of really slow network packets compared to relatively slow disk
    - 4 min. to write enron index vs. 3-4 sec. locally!!!!
  - ▶ Suggestion: write index files to /tmp/... . That's a local scratch disk and is very fast. But please clean up when you're done.

# 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 Stepp 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



# 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, but...
  - ▶ you want to be subclassed and let subclasses access them

# Like Java: Public inheritance

```
#include "BaseClass.h"

class Name : public BaseClass {
    ...
};
```


- “public” inheritance
  - ▶ anything that is [*public, protected*] in the base is [*public, protected*] in the derived class - interface (specification) + 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

<b>C++, etc.</b>	<b>Java, etc.</b>
<i>base class</i>	<i>superclass</i>
<i>derived class</i>	<i>subclass</i>

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

```
double DividendStock::GetMarketValue() const {  
    return get_shares() * get_share_price() + _dividends;  
}  
  
double DividendStock::GetProfit() const {  
    return DividendStock::GetMarketValue() - GetCost();  
}  
DividendStock.cc
```

```
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {  
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();  
}  
  
double Stock::GetProfit() const {  
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();  
}  
Stock.cc
```

# Dynamic dispatch

```
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

```
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 {
};
```

A more extreme version

```
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???!?

```
virtual double Stock::GetMarketValue() const;  
virtual double Stock::GetProfit() const; Stock.h
```

```
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {  
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();  
}  
  
double Stock::GetProfit() const {  
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();  
}  
Stock.cc
```

# vtables and the vptr

If a member function is virtual, the compiler emits:

- a “vtable”, or virtual function table, **for the class**
  - ▶ it contains an 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

```
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();
```

# vtable/vptr example

```
// 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()
```

compiled code



# actual code

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

class Dr1: public Base {
public:
    virtual void fn1() {};
};

main() {
    Dr1    d1;
    d1.fn1();
    Base *ptr = &d1;
    ptr->fn1();
}
```

vtable.cc

Let's compile this and use objdump to see what g++ emits!

- g++ -g vtable.cc

- objdump -CDSRTx 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

```
double DividendStock::GetMarketValue() const {  
    return get_shares() * get_share_price() + _dividends;  
}  
  
double DividendStock::GetProfit() const {  
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();  
}  
DividendStock.cc
```

```
double Stock::GetMarketValue() const {  
    return get_shares() * get_share_price();  
}  
  
double Stock::GetProfit() const {  
    return GetMarketValue() - GetCost();  
}  
Stock.cc
```

# Static dispatch

```
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  $f()$  calls  $g()$  in class  $X$  and  $g$  is not virtual, we're guaranteed to call  $X::g()$  and not  $g()$  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

- But it's good style to help reader by using `virtual` in subclasses

# 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;
};
```

badcons.cc

```
// 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;
};
```

goodcons.cc

# 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

baddestruct.cc

```
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
```

# Slicing -- C++'s revenge

C++ allows you to...

- assign to...
  - ▶ an instance of a base class...
  - ▶ ...the value of a derived class

```
slicing.cc
class Base {
public:
    Base(int x) : x_(x) { }
    int x_;
};

class Dr : public Base {
public:
    Dr(int y) : Base(16), y_(y) { }
    int y_;
};

main() {
    Base b(1);
    Dr d(2);
    b = d;    // what happens to y_?
    // d = b; // compiler error
}
```

# 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! :(

```
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!

```
#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

```
lhs = (new type) 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

```
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

```
staticcast.cc
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;
}
```

# dynamic\_cast

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

```
dynamiccast.cc
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!

```
void foo(int *x) {                                     constcast.cc
    *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!
    - But used (carefully) in HW3!!

# 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

```
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`

```
class Foo {                                     implicit.cc
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

explicit.cc

```
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!