

Summary

- Inheritance
- Virtual methods
- ► How virtual methods are modeled by C++ compiler
- Covariance
- Abstract classes (Interfaces)
- Memory alignment in case of inheritance

- Inheritance is a process that transfer class proprieties (methods and members) from one class (often called the base class to another that inherits the base class - called derived class). The derive class may extend the base class by adding additional methods and/or members.
- Such an example will be the class Automobile, where we can define the following properties:
 - Number of doors
 - Number of wheels
 - Size
- From this class we can derive a particularization of the Automobile class (for example electrical machines) that besides the properties of the base class (doors, wheels, size, etc) has its own properties (battery lifetime).

- Inheritance in case of C++ classes can be simple or multiple:
 - Simple Inheritance



Multiple Inheritance

Multiple	
class < class_name >:	<pre><access modifier=""> <base 1="" class=""/> , <access modifier=""> <base 2="" class=""/> , <access modifier=""> <base 3="" class=""/> ,</access></access></access></pre>
{ }	<pre> <access modifier=""> <base class="" n=""/> ,</access></pre>

- The access modifier is optional and can be one of the following: (public / private or protected).
- ▶ If it is not specified, the default access modifier is private.

Class "Derived" inherits members and methods from class "Base". That is why we can call methods SetX and SetY from an instance of "Derived" class.

App.cpp

```
class Base
public:
     int x;
     void SetX(int value);
};
class Derived : public Base
{
     int y;
public:
      void SetY(int value);
};
void main()
     Derived d;
     d.SetX(100);
     d.x = 10;
     d.SetY(200);
```

The following code will not compile. Class "Derived" inherits class "Base", but member "x" from class Base is private (this means that it can not be accessed in class "Derived").

App.cpp



The solution for this case is to use the "protected" access modifier. A protected member is a member that can be access by classes that inherits current class, but it can not be accessed from outside the class.

```
App.cpp
class Base
protected:
     int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
     int y;
public:
      void SetY(int value);
      void SetX(int value);
};
void Derived::SetX(int value)
     x = value;
void main()
      Derived d;
      d.SetX(100);
      d.SetY(200);
```

The code below will not compile. "x" is declared as protected - this means that it can be accessed in method SetX from a derived class, but it can not be accessed outside it's scope (class).

App.cpp

```
class Base
protected:
     int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
     int y;
public:
      void SetY(int value);
     void SetX(int value);
};
void Derived::SetX(int value)
     x = value;
void main()
     Derived d;
                              error C2248: 'Base::x': cannot access protected member declared
     d.SetX(100);
                              in class 'Base'
     d.x = 100;
                              note: see declaration of 'Base::x'
                              note: see declaration of 'Base'
```

The following table shows if a member with a specific access modifier can be access and in what conditions:

Access modifier	In the same class	In a derived class	Outside it's scope	Friend function in the base class	Friend function in the derived class
public	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
protected	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
private	Yes	No	No	Yes	No

The code below will not compile. "x" is a private member of "Base" therefor a friend function defined in "Derived" class can not access it.

```
App.cpp
class Base
private:
     int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
{
     int y;
public:
     void SetY(int value);
     void friend SetX(Derived &d);
};
void SetX(Derived &d)
     d.x = 100;
}
void main()
     Derived d;
     SetX(d);
```

The solution is to change the access modifier of data member "x" from class "Base" from private to protected.

```
App.cpp
class Base
protected:
     int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
{
     int y;
public:
     void SetY(int value);
     void friend SetX(Derived &d);
};
void SetX(Derived &d)
     d.x = 100;
void main()
     Derived d;
     SetX(d);
```

Be careful where you define the friend function. In the example below SetX friend function is declared in the "Derived" class. This means that it can access methods and data members from instances of "Derived" class and not other classes (e.g. Base class). The code will not compile.

App.cpp

```
class Base
private:
      int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
      int y;
public:
      void SetV(int value).
     void friend SetX(Base &d);
};
void SetX(Base &d)
      d.x = 100;
void main()
      Derived d;
```

This code will work properly because the friend function is defined in class "Base".

```
App.cpp
class Base
{
private:
      int x;
publi<u>c:</u>
     void friend SetX(Base &d);
};
class Derived : public Base
{
      int y;
public:
      void SetY(int value);
};
void SetX(Base &d)
      d.x = 100;
void main()
      Derived d;
```

- Access modifiers can also be applied to the inheritance relation.
- As a result, the members from the base class change their original access modifier in the derived class.

Арр.срр
class Base
{
public:
int x;
};
class Derived : public Base
{
int y;
public:
<pre>void SetY(int value) { }</pre>
};
void main()
{
Derived d;
d.x = 100;
}

In this case, because "x" is public in the "Base" class, and the inheritance relation is also public, "x" will be public as well in the "Derived" class and will be accessible from outside the class scope.

- Access modifiers can also be applied to the inheritance relation.
- As a result, the members from the base class change their original access modifier in the derived class.

Арр.срр
class Base
{
public:
int x;
};
class Derived : private Base
{
int y;
public:
<pre>void SetY(int value) { }</pre>
};
void main()
{
Derived d;
d.x = 100;
}

- This code will not compile. "x" is indeed public in class "Base", but since the inherit relation between class "Base" and class "Derived" is private, "x" will change its access modifier from public to private in class Derived and will not be accessible from outside its scope.
- However, if we are to create an instance of type "Base" we will be able to access "x" for that instance outside its scope.

The rules that show how an access modifier is change if we change the access modifier of the inheritance relation are as follows:

Access modifier used for the inheritance relation →	public	private	protected
Access modifier used for a data member or method			
public	public	private	protected
private	private	private	private
protected	protected	private	protected

private > protected > public

Let's consider the following case:

<pre>class A { public: A() { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); } ~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); } }; class B: public A { public: B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } ~B() { printf("dtor: R is called !\n"); } </pre>
<pre>public: B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } R() { printf("dtop: B is called !\n"); }</pre>

Let's consider the following case:

Арр.срр		Output
class A		odepae
{		
public:	push	ebp
A() { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); }	mov	ebp, esp
<pre>~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); }</pre>	sub	esp,44h
};	/	
class B: public A	mov	dword ptr [this].ecx
	mov	ecx.dword ptr [this]
public:		$\Delta::\Delta$ (0DB14B5h)
B() { printf(ctor: B is called !\n); }		
$\sim B() \{ \text{ princt(ucor: B is called !(n)} \}$	nush	offset string "ctor. B is called l/n'
j, int main()	call	printf (0DR14A6h)
{	add	$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}$
B b:	mov	oox dwond ntn [this]
return 0;	mov	
}	mov	
		esp, eup
	рор	eop

The cod in YELLOW reflects the execution of the base constructor.

Let's consider the following case:

is called ! is called ! is called ! is called ! is called ! is called ! is called !

In case of multiple inheritance, the order of base classes is used when the constructor is called (in this case - first class B, then class A and finally class C)

Let's consider the following case:

	Output
<pre>{ public: A() { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); } ~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); } ; class B </pre>	ctor: B is called ! ctor: A is called ! dtor: A is called ! dtor: B is called !
<pre>bublic: B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } ~B() { printf("dtor: B is called !\n"); } ; class C: public B, public A { bublic: }; int main() {</pre>	

If no constructor is defined in class C, but there are at least one constructor defined in one of the class from which C is derived from, the compiler will create a default constructor that calls the constructor of class B followed by the constructor of class A.

Let's consider the following case:

App.cpp

```
class A
public:
   A(int x) { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); }
   ~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); }
};
class B
public:
   B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); }
   ~B() { printf("dtor: B is called !\n"); }
};
class C: public B, public A
{
public:
                              error C2280: 'C::C(void)': attempting to reference a deleted function
};
                              note: compiler has generated 'C::C' here
int main() +
                              note: 'C::C(void)': function was implicitly deleted because a base class
 Cc;
                              'A' has either no appropriate default constructor or overload resolution
   return 0;
                              was ambiguous
                              note: see declaration of 'A'
```

This code will fail, as there is no explicit call to A::A(int) constructor.

Let's consider the following case:

Арр.срр	Output
<pre>class A { public: A(int x) { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); }</pre>	ctor: B is called !
<pre>~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); } }; class B</pre>	ctor: C is called ! dtor: C is called !
<pre>{ public: B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } ~B() { printf("dtor: B is called !\n"); }</pre>	dtor: A is called ! dtor: B is called !
<pre>}; class C: public B, public A { public:</pre>	
<pre>C() : A(100) { printf("ctor: C is called !\n"); } ~C() { printf("dtor: C is called !\n"); } };</pre>	
<pre>int main() { C c; return 0;</pre>	

reti }

The solution is to explicitly call the constructor of A in the member initializer list for C::C()

Let's consider the following case:

Арр.срр	Output	
<pre>class A { public: A(int x) { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); } ~A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); } }; class B { public: B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } ~B() { printf("dtor: B is called !\n"); } }; </pre>	ctor: B is called ! ctor: A is called ! ctor: C is called ! dtor: C is called ! dtor: A is called ! dtor: B is called !	
<pre>class C: public B, public A { public: C() : A(100), B() { printf("ctor: C is called !\n"); } ~C() { printf("dtor: C is called !\n"); } }; int main() { C c; return 0; }</pre>	Using this method <i>WILL NOT</i> <i>CHANGE</i> the order of the constructors (in this case, even if we call A(100) followed by B(), the compiler	
	will still call <i>B::B()</i> first and then <i>A::A(int)</i>	

Let's consider the following case:

App.cpp	
class A {	Output
public:	ctor: B is called I
<pre>A(int x) { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); }</pre>	
~A() { printt(dtor: A is called !\n); } }:	ctor: A is called !
class B {	ctor: C is called !
public:	ctor [•] D is called !
<pre>B() { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } .R() { printf("dtop: B is called !\n"); }</pre>	dtor: D is called I
$() \{ prince(ucor, b is carred ((i)), \}$	dtor. D is called !
class C {	dtor: C is called !
public:	dtor: A is called !
$C(bool n) \{ printf(ctor: C is called !\n); \}$ ~C() { printf("dtor: C is called !\n"): }	dtor: B is called 1
<pre>};</pre>	
class D: public B, public A	
public:	
<pre>D(): c(true), A(100),B() { printf("ctor: D is called !\n"); } ~D() { printf("dtor: D is called !\n"); }</pre>	
<pre>}; int main() [</pre>	
D d;	
return 0;	
}	

}

Let's	consider the following case:	Output
Арр	o.cpp	ctor: B is called I
struc A ~	t A { .(int x) { printf("ctor: A is called !\n"); } A() { printf("dtor: A is called !\n"); }	ctor: A is called ! ctor: C is called !
}; struc B ~	t B { () { printf("ctor: B is called !\n"); } B() { printf("dtor: B is called !\n"); }	ctor: D is called ! v1 is initialized
}; struc C	<pre>t C { (bool n) { printf("ctor: C is called !\n"); } </pre>	v2 is initialized ctor: E is called !
~ }; struc D	t D { (bool n) { printf("ctor: D is called !\n"); }	dtor: E is called ! dtor: D is called !
<pre>~ }; class</pre>	<pre>D() { printf("dtor: D is called !\n"); } E: public B, public A {</pre>	dtor: C is called ! dtor: A is called ! dtor: B is called !
publi ~	<pre>c; nt v1, v2; c: (): d(true), A(100), c(true), B(), v2(100), v1(20) { printf("ct E() { printf("dtor: E is called !\n"); }</pre>	<pre>cor: E is called !\n"); }</pre>
}; void E	<pre>main() { e;</pre>	

- When inheriting from multiple classes, the general rule for calling constructors and destructors is as follows:
- 1. First all of the constructors from the base classes are called in the order of their inheriting definition (left-to-right)
- 2. All of the constructors from data members are called (again in their definition order top-to-bottom)
- 3. Then the constructor initialization value for data members (basic types, references, constants) are used in the order they are defined in that class.
- 4. Finally, the code of the constructor of the class is called.
- Destructors are called in a reverse way (starting from point 4 to point 1).

Tested with:

- ▶ cl.exe: 19.16.27030.1
- Params: /permissive- /GS- /analyze- /W3 /Zc:wchar_t /ZI /Gm- /Od /sdl /Fd"Debug\vc141.pdb" /Zc:inline /fp:precise /D "WIN32" /D "_DEBUG" /D "_CONSOLE" /D "_UNICODE" /D "UNICODE" /errorReport:prompt /WX- /Zc:forScope /RTCu /arch:IA32 /Gd /Oy- /MDd /FC /Fa"Debug\" /nologo /Fo"Debug\" /Fp"Debug\TestCpp.pch" /diagnostics:classic

App.cpp

```
class A
{
  public:
        int a1, a2, a3;
        void Set() { printf("A"); }
};
class B: public A
{
   public:
        int b1, b2;
        void Set() { printf("B"); }
};
void main()
{
        B b;
        b.Set();
}
```

- This code prints "B" on the screen. From the inheritance point of view, both A and B class have the same method called Set
- In this case it is said that class B hides method Set from class A

App.cpp

```
class A
{
  public:
        int a1, a2, a3;
        void Set() { printf("A"); }
};
class B: public A
{
   public:
        int b1, b2;
        void Set() { printf("B"); }
};
void main()
{
        B b;
        A* a = &b;
        a->Set();
}
```

- In this case, the code will print "A" on the screen, because we are using a pointer of type A*
- ♦ However, in reality, "a" pointer points to an object of type $B \rightarrow$ so the expected result should be that the product will print "B" and not "A"
- So ... what can we do to change this behavior ?

- The solution is to use "virtual" keyword in
 from of a method definition
- If we do this, the program will print "B"
- In this case, it is said that class B <u>overrides</u> method Set from class A
- Using virtual keyword makes a method to be part of the instance !

Virtual methods can be used for:

- Polymorphism
- Memory deallocation (virtual destructor)
- Anti-debugging techniques

Polymorphism = the ability to access instances of different classes through the same interface. In particular to C++, this translates into the ability to automatically convert (cast) a pointer to a certain class to its base class.

App-1.cpp

- After the execution this code will print on the screen "Circle" and "Square".
- If we haven't uses virtual specifier, the program would have printed "Figure" twice !

In practice, in many cases, polymorphism is used to create a *plugin* or an add-on for an existing software.



In particular for C++ language, *virtual* specifier can be used as a specifier for destructors.

Let's analyze the following case:

App-1.cpp

```
class Figure {
    public: virtual void Draw() { printf("Figure"); }
   public: ~Figure() { printf("Delete Figure\n"); }
};
class Circle: public Figure {
    public: void Draw() { printf("Circle"); }
   public: ~Circle() { printf("Delete Circle"); }
};
class Square: public Figure {
    public: void Draw() { printf("Square"); }
   public: ~Square() { printf("Delete Square"); }
};
void main() {
      Figure *f[2];
      f[0] = new Circle();
      f[1] = new Square();
      for (int index = 0;index<2;index++)</pre>
            delete (f[index]);
```

- After this code gets executed, the following texts will be printed on the screen:
 "Delete Figure".
- What would happen if both Circle and Square classes allocate some memory ?

In particular for C++ language, *virtual* specifier can be used as a specifier for destructors.

Let's analyze the following case:

App-1.cpp

```
class Figure {
    public:_virtual_void Draw() { printf("Figure"); }
   public: virtual ~Figure() { printf("Delete Figure\n"); }
};
class Circle: public Figure {
    public: void Draw() { printf("Circle"); }
   public: ~Circle() { printf("Delete Circle"); }
};
class Square: public Figure {
    public: void Draw() { printf("Square"); }
   public: ~Square() { printf("Delete Square"); }
};
void main() {
      Figure *f[2];
      f[0] = new Circle();
      f[1] = new Square();
      for (int index = 0;index<2;index++)</pre>
            delete (f[index]);
```

- The solution is to declare de destructor as virtual. As a result, the destructor for actual class will be called, fallowed by the destructor of the base class
- The following text will be printed:
 Delete Circle
 Delete Figure
 Delete Square
 Delete Figure
Let's analyze the following case:

App-1.cpp

class A

```
{
    public:
        virtual bool Odd(int x) { return x % 2 == 0; }
};
class B : public A
{
    public:
        virtual bool Odd(char x) { return x % 3 == 0; }
};
int main() {
        A* a = new B();
        printf("%d\n", a->Odd(3));
        return 0;
}
```

Odd is a virtual function - however, class B does not override it (as it uses char as the first parameter instead of int). As a result, class B will have 2 Odd methods and a->Odd will call the one with an int parameter. Upon execution, value false (0) is written to the screen.

Let's analyze the following case:



Odd is a virtual function - however, class B does not override it (as it uses char as the first parameter instead of int). As a result, class B will have 2 Odd methods and a->Odd will call the one with an int parameter. Upon execution, value false (0) is written to the screen.

Let's analyze the following case:



Assuming that , in reality, the intent was to override Odd method, then one way of making sure that this kind of mistakes will not happen is to use the override keyword (added with C++11 standard). As a result, this code will not compile as it is expected that method Odd to have the same signature !!!

Let's analyze the following case:

App-1.cpp

class A

```
{
public:
    virtual bool Odd(int x) { return x % 2 == 0; }
};
class B : public A
{
    public:
        virtual bool Odd(int x) override { return x % 3 == 0; }
};
int main() {
        A* a = new B();
        printf("%d\n", a->Odd(3));
        return 0;
}
```

Now the code compiles and prints "1" (true) on the screen.

Let's consider the following code:

App-1.cpp

```
struct A {
    virtual bool Odd(int x) = 0;
};
struct B : public A {
    virtual bool Odd(int x) { return x % 2 == 0; }
};
struct C : public B {
    virtual bool Odd(int x) { return x % 3 == 0; }
};
int main() {
    A* a = new C();
    printf("%d\n", a->Odd(3));
    return 0;
}
```

- ▶ This program runs and prints value 1 (True) \rightarrow even if 3 is not an odd number.
- The reason why this could happen is that method Odd was overridden in class C (keep in mind that we have used struct in this example to show that the behavior is identical to the one from class).
- What can we do if we want to make sure that Odd method from class B can not be overridden ?

Let's consider the following code:



The solution is to use the specifier *final* after the declaration of a virtual function. This tells the compiler that other classes that inherit current class can not override that method.

Let's consider the following code:

App-1.cpp

```
struct A {
    virtual bool Odd(int x) = 0;
};
struct B : public A {
    virtual bool Odd(int x) override final { return x % 2 == 0; }
};
struct C : public B {
};
int main() {
    A* a = new C();
    printf("%d\n", a->Odd(3));
    return 0;
}
```

- It is possible to use both override and final specifiers when declaring a method.
- In this case their meaning is:
 - ► override → The purpose of this method is to override the existing method from the base class (in this case, it overrides A::Odd)
 - ▶ final \rightarrow Other classes that might inherit class B can not override this method.

Let's consider the following code:



- final specifier can also be used directly in the class/struct definition. In this case, it's meaning is that inheritance from class B is NOT possible.
- This code will not compile !

Let's analyze the following two programs. Their only difference is the usage of *virtual* in case of APP-2.



When executed, APP-1 will print "12" and App-2 will print "16" (for x86 architecture). If we run the same App-2 on x64 it will print "24"

Why ?







Арр-1.срр	
class A	•••
public: int a1, a2, a3;	A:::
<pre>void Set() { printf("A"); } };</pre>	•••
<pre>void main() {</pre>	mai
A a; }	•••
	C 1

Me	mory
•••	
A::	Set()
ma	in()
•••	
<st< td=""><td>ack></td></st<>	ack>
•••	









Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to be certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically.

In this case, there no default constructor defined and no need for the compiler to provide one automatically (e.g. virtual methods, const or reference data members, etc).

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically.



* In this case, there is a constructor that will be called when "a" is created.

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically

Арр.срр	Disasm (A::A)	
<pre>class A { public: int x, y; int Calcul() { return x+y; } A() { x = y = 0; } }; void main() { A a; a.x = 1; a.y = 2; }</pre>	push mov mov mov mov mov mov mov pop ret	<pre>ebp ebp,esp dword ptr [ebp-8],ecx // EBP-8=this eax,dword ptr [ebp-8] dword ptr [eax+4],0 // this->y = 0 ecx,dword ptr [ebp-8] dword ptr [ecx],0 // this->x = 0 eax,dword ptr [ebp-8] ebp</pre>

In this case, there is a default constructor and the code from the default constructor will be called when object "a" is created.

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically



In this case, even if no constructor is defined, the compiler will automatically create one to initialize the *vfptr* pointer (this is required because *Calcul* is a virtual method).

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically

Арр.срр	Disasm
class A	A a;
public:	lea ecx, ebp-20
<pre>int x, y; virtual int Calcul() {return ;</pre>	$\{x_i\}$
<pre>}; void main() Disasm</pre>	ebp-16],1
{ Aa; push ebp	ebp-12],2
a.x = : mov ebp,e	p
a.y = 2 mov dword	ptr [ebp-8],ecx Memory address where a list of
_ [}] mov eax,d	ord ptr [ebp-8]
mov dword	ptr [eax], A-virtual-fnc-list
mov eax,d	ord ptr [ebp-8] (In this case only one method:
mov esp,e	p <i>Calcul</i>)
рор еbр	
ret	

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically

Арр.срр	Disasm
<pre>class A { rublic:</pre>	A a; lea ecx,[ebp-20]
int x, y;	call A::A
<pre>virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;} A() { x = y = 0; } };</pre>	<pre>a.x = 1; mov dword ptr [ebp-16],1</pre>
<pre>void main() {</pre>	a.y = 2; mov dword ptr [ebp-12],2
A a; a.x = 1; a.y = 2;	

If a constructor exists, it will be modified (in a similar manner to the change that is done for const/references data members).

Whenever a virtual method is added, the compiler needs to make certain that vfptr pointer is set correctly. As such, any constructor is modified to include the code that sets up the vfptr pointer. If no constructor is present, the default one will be created automatically.

	Disasm A::A	
Αμγιζάμ	push	ebp
class A	mov	ebp,esp
t public:	mov	dword ptr [ebp-8],ecx
int x, y;	mov	eax,dword ptr [ebp-8]
<pre>virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;}</pre>	mov	dword ptr [eax],addr virt fnc
$A() \{ x = y = 0; \}$	mo∨	eax,dword ptr [ebp-8]
void main()	mo∨	dword ptr [eax+8],0
{	∽ mo∨	ecx,dword ptr [ebp-8]
A a;	mo∨	dword ptr [ecx+4],0
a.x = 1; a.y = 2;	mov	eax,dword ptr [ebp-8]
}	mov	esp,ebp
The code colored in blue is the	рор	ebp
code added by the compiler to	ret	

initialize the **vfptr** pointer.

The code added by the compiler to initialize the *vfptr* pointer will be added for every defined constructor.

App.cpp class A public: int x, y; virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;} $A() \{ x = y = 0; \}$ A(const A& a) { x = a.x; y = a.y; } }; void main() A a: $A = a^2$ In this case the code for *vfptr* initialization will be added for both the default constructor and the copy constructor.

However, in case of the assignment operator the compiler will not add any special code to initialize the vfptr pointer.

App.cpp

```
class A
{
  public:
        int x, y;
        virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;}
        A() { x = y = 0; }
        A& operator = (A &a) { x = a.x; y = a.y; return *this;}
};
void main()
{
        A a;
        A a2;
        a2 = a;
}
```

A virtual method is called using its reference from the *vfptr* table only if the object is a pointer.

Арр.срр	Disasm
<pre>class A { public: int x, y; virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;} A() { x = y = 0; } };</pre>	<pre>A a; lea ecx,[a] call A::A a.x = 1; mov dword ptr [ebp-10h],1</pre>
<pre>void main() {</pre>	<pre>mov dword ptr [ebp-0Ch],2 a.Calcul(); lea ecx,[a] call A::Calcul</pre>

In this case, even if *Calcul* method is *virtual* as it called directly with an object, the compiler will not generate code that will find out its address from the *vfptr* table (it will use the method *Calcul* exact address).

A virtual method is called using its reference from the *vfptr* table only if the object is a pointer.

Арр.срр	Disasm
class A	A a;
<pre>{ public: int x, y; virtual int Calcul() {return x+y;}</pre>	<pre>lea ecx,[a] call A::A a.x = 1;</pre>
A() { x = y = 0; } }; void main()	<pre>mov dword ptr [ebp-10h],1 a.y = 2; </pre>
{ A a; a.x = 1;	mov dword ptr [ebp-0cn],2 $A^* a2 = &a$ lea eax.[a]
a.y = 2; A* a2 = &a a2->Calcul();	<pre>mov dword ptr [a2],eax a2->Calcul();</pre>
}	<pre>mov eax,dword ptr [a2] mov edx,dword ptr [eax] EDX = address of VFPTR</pre>
n this case <i>vfptr</i> is used to	<pre>mov ecx,dword ptr [a2] mov eax,dword ptr [edx]</pre> EAX = address of first
find out <i>Calcul</i> method address.	call eax function from VFPTR
















};

Арр.срр
class A
{
public:
int x;
<pre>virtual int Calcul() {return 0;}</pre>
$A() \{ x = 0; \}$
};
<pre>void main()</pre>
{
Aa;
a.x = 1;
a.y = 2;
A* a2 = &a
a2->Calcul();
}

Pseudo C/C++ Code struct A_VirtualFunctions {

int (*Calcul) (); class A { public: A VirtualFunctions *vfPtr; int x; int A_Calcul() { return 0; } A() { vfPtr = &Global_A_vfPtr; $\mathbf{x} = 0;$

```
};
```

A_VirtualFunctions Global_A_vfPtr; Global A vfPtr.Calcul = &A::A Calcul;

```
void main()
```

A a; a.x = 1;a.y = 2; $A^* a^2 = &a;$

_	\sim	<u> </u>	\sim	\sim



* Keep in mind the *vfptr* is just a pointer. As such, it can be changed during execution

App.cpp class A public: int x; virtual void Print() { printf("A"); } }; class B public: int x: virtual void Print() { printf("B"); } }; void main() A a; B b; $A^* a2 = &a;$ a.Print(); a2->Print();

This code will print "AA" on the screen. First time when method Print is called directly ("a.Print()"), second time when method Print is called using the vfptr pointer ("a2->Print()")

* Keep in mind the *vfptr* is just a pointer. As such, it can be changed during execution

App.cpp

```
class A
public:
      int x;
      virtual void Print() { printf("A"); }
};
class B
public:
      int x:
      virtual void Print() { printf("B"); }
};
void main()
      A a;
      memcpy(&a, &b, sizeof(void*));
     A* a2 = &a;
      a.Print();
      a2->Print();
```

This code will however print "AB". Using memcpy function allow us to overwrite the actual vfptr-ul of object "a" with the one from object "b". As method Print has the same signature in both classes (A and B) the result will be "AB"

* Keep in mind the *vfptr* is just a pointer. As such, it can be changed during execution

App.cpp

```
class A
public:
      int x;
      virtual void Print() { printf("A"); }
};
class B
public:
      int x:
      virtual void Print() { printf("B"); }
};
void main()
      A a;
      B b;
      memcpy(&a, &b, sizeof(void*));
      A^* a2 = &a;
      A = (*a2);
      A *a4 = &a3;
      a4->Print();
```

- Every constructor called will set the vfptr to its correct value. In this case, "A a3=(*a2)" will call the copy constructor for class A and will set the vfptr for local variable a3 correctly.
- As a result, this code will print "A" on the screen, even if "a2" has the vfptr of "b"

* A virtual function can be overwritten in the derived class.

```
App.cpp
class A
public:
      int x, y;
      virtual int Suma() { return x + y; }
      virtual int Diferenta() { return x - y; }
      virtual int Produs() { return x*y; }
};
class B : public A
public:
      int Suma() { return 1; }
};
void main()
      Bb;
      b.x = 1;
      b.y = 2;
      A* a;
      a = \&b;
      int x = a->Suma();
```

- In this case, "x" will be 1 as "a" is in fact an object of type "b" that has overwrite method "Suma"
- For the rest of the methods (*Diferenta* and *Produs*) the behavior will be identical to the one from the base class (A).



* A derived class can also add other (new) virtual methods .

```
App.cpp
class A
{
  public:
     int x, y;
     virtual int Suma() { return x + y; }
     virtual int Diferenta() { return x - y; }
     virtual int Produs() { return x*y; }
};
class B : public A
{
  public:
     int Suma() { return 1: }
     virtual int Modul() { return 0; }
};
void main()
{
}
```

- In this case, class *B* also have a new virtual method called
 "Module") that is not present on class *A*.
- This means that any class that will be derived from B will have this method as well.



Instance of type B

Address of VFTable B

A::x

A::y

VFTable for class A

Address of A::Suma

Address of A::Diferenta

Address of A::Produs

RTTI

VFTable for class B

Address of B::Suma

Address of A::Diferenta

Address of A::Produs

Address of B::Modul

RTTI

When a class is derived from two(or more) classes that have virtual functions, the compiler creates multiple *vfptr* pointers (one for each base class).

Арр.срр	Disasm	
<pre>class A { public: int a1; virtual int Suma() { return 1; } virtual int Diferenta() { return 2; } }; class B { public: int b1,b2; virtual int Inmultire() { return 3; } virtual int Impartire() { return 4; } }; class C : public A, public B { public: int x, y; }; void main() {</pre>	<pre>cptr->I mov add mov mov call cptr->D mov mov mov call cptr->D mov mov call</pre>	<pre>impartire(); ecx,dword ptr [cptr] ecx,8 //this for type B eax,dword ptr [cptr] edx,dword ptr [eax+8] eax,dword ptr [edx+4] eax Diferenta(); eax,dword ptr [cptr] edx,dword ptr [cptr] edx,dword ptr [cptr] eax,dword ptr [cptr] eax,dword ptr [edx+4] eax</pre>
<pre>C c; C *cptr = &c cptr->Impartire(); cptr->Diferenta();</pre>		
	<pre>App.cpp class A { public: int a1; virtual int Suma() { return 1; } virtual int Diferenta() { return 2; } }; class B { public: int b1,b2; virtual int Inmultire() { return 3; } virtual int Impartire() { return 4; } }; class C : public A, public B { public: int x, y; }; void main() { C c; C *cptr = &c cptr->Impartire(); cptr->Diferenta(); </pre>	<pre>App.cpp class A { public: int a1; virtual int Suma() { return 1; } virtual int Diferenta() { return 2; } }; class B { public: int b1,b2; virtual int Inmultire() { return 3; } virtual int Impartire() { return 4; } }; class C : public A, public B { public: int x, y; }; void main() { C c; C *cptr = &c cptr->Diferenta(); Cotaction Cotaction</pre>

When a class is derived from two(or more) classes that have virtual functions, the compiler creates multiple *vfptr* pointers (one for each base class).



The same memory alignment is used for classes derived out of class C (e.g. in this example, class D)

Арр.срр					
class A {				VFTable for class A	
<pre>int a1; virtual int Suma() { return 1; }</pre>				Address of A::Suma	
<pre>virtual int Diferenta() { return 2; } };</pre>	Offset	Field		Address of A::Diferer	nta
class B { public:	+ 0	A::vfptr		RTTI	
<pre>int b1,b2; virtual int Inmultire() { return 3; }</pre>	+ 4	A::a1			
<pre>virtual int Impartire() { return 4; } };</pre>	+ 8	B::vfptr		VFTable for class B	
class C : public A, public B { public:	+ 12	B::b1	\backslash	Address of B::Inmult	ire
<pre>int x, y; }; </pre>	+ 16	B::b2		Address of B::Impart	ire
public:	+ 20	C::x		RTTI	
};	+ 24	C::y			
	+ 28	D::d1			

Let's analyze the following code:

ptrB = b->clone();

App.cpp class A { public: int a1, a2; virtual A* clone() { return new A(); } }; class B : public A { public: int b1, b2; virtual A* clone() { return new B(); } }; void main() { B *b = new B(); B *ptrB; } } error C2440: '

This code will not compile. However, in reality "b->clone()" returns an object of type B so it should work.

error C2440: '=': cannot convert from 'A *' to 'B *'
note: Cast from base to derived requires dynamic_cast
or static_cas

Let's analyze the following code:

```
App.cpp
class A
{
    public:
        int a1, a2;
        virtual A* clone() { return new A(); }
};
class B : public A
    {
    public:
        int b1, b2;
        virtual A* clone() { return new B(); }
};
void main()
{
        B *b = new B();
        B *ptrB;
        ptrB = b->clone();
}
```

We have two solutions for this problem:

Let's analyze the following code:



- We have two solutions for this problem:
- 1. Use an explicit cast and convert the pointer from *A** to *B**

Let's analyze the following code:

```
App.cpp
class A
{
    public:
        int a1, a2;
        virtual A* clone() { return new A(); }
};
class B : public A
    {
    public:
        int b1_b2;
        virtual B* dene() { return new B(); }
};
void main()
    {
        B *b = new B();
        B *ptrB;
        ptrB = b->clone();
}
```

- We have two solutions for this problem:
- 1. Use an explicit cast and convert the pointer from *A** to *B**
- 2. Use <u>covariance</u>. This means that we can modify the return type of the method *clone* in class *B* to return a *B* pointer* instead of an *A* pointer*.

* Let's analyze the following code:

App.cpp

```
class A
public:
      int a1, a2;
      virtual A* clone() { return new A(); }
};
class B : public A
public:
      int b1, b2;
      virtual B* clone() { return new B(); }
};
void main()
      B *b = new B();
      B *ptrB;
      ptrB = b->clone();
      A *a = (A*)b;
      ptrB = (B*)a->clone();
```

- We have two solutions for this problem:
- 1. Use an explicit cast and convert the pointer from *A** to *B**
- Use <u>covariance</u>. This means that we can modify the return type of the method *clone* in class *B* to return a *B* pointer* instead of an *A* pointer*.

Covariance is related to the pointer type. In this case, even if the compiler calls "*B::clone*", the expected value is A^* (specific to a A^* pointer that is "*a*" \rightarrow "*A::clone*")

Let's analyze the following code:

App.cpp

```
class A
public:
      int a1, a2;
      virtual A* clone() { return new A(); }
};
class B : public A
public:
      int b1, b2;
      virtual B* clone() { return new B(); }
};
void main()
      B *b = new B();
      B *ptrB;
      ptrB = b->clone();
      A *a = (A*)b;
      ptrB = a->clone();
```

- We have two solutions for this problem:
- 1. Use an explicit cast and convert the pointer from *A** to *B**
- Use <u>covariance</u>. This means that we can modify the return type of the method *clone* in class *B* to return a *B* pointer* instead of an *A* pointer*.

That is why this code will **NOT** compile, as the result for *a*->*clone* is *A** and not *B**. During execution, "*B*::*clone*" will be call, nevertheless.

Let's analyze the following code:

App.cpp

```
class A
{
  public:
        int a1, a2;
        virtual A* clone() { return new A(); }
};
class B : public A
{
   public:
        int b1, b2;
        virtual int* clone() { return new int(); }
};
void main()
{
        ...
   }
   error C2555: 'B::clone': ov
   virtual function return type
}
```

This code will not compile. The return type for virtual functions can be changed, but only to a type that is derived from the return type of the virtual method described in the base class. In this case, int* is not derived from A*

error C2555: 'B::clone': overriding virtual function return type differs and is not covariant from 'A::clone'

- In C++ we can define a virtual method without a body (it is called a pure virtual method and it is defined by adding "=0" at the end of its definition).
- If a class contains a pure virtual method, that class is an abstract class (a class that can not be instantiated). In other languages this concept is <u>similar</u> to the concept of an interface.
- Having a pure virtual method forces the one that implements a derived class to implement that method as well if he/she would like to create an instance from the newly created class.



In C++ we can define a virtual method without a body (it is called a pure virtual method and it is defined by adding "=0" at the end of its definition).

App.cpp

This code will compile because class B has an implementation for method Set

In order to be able to create an instance of a class, all of its pure virtual methods (defined in that class or obtained via inheritance) MUST be implemented !

In C++ we can define a virtual method without a body (it is called a pure virtual method and it is defined by adding "=0" at the end of its definition).

	_
Ann chr	
~~~~	J

```
class A
{
    public:
        int a1, a2, a3;
        virtual void Set() = 0;
};
class B: A
{
    public:
        int a1, a2, a3;
        void Set(){... };
}
void main()
{
        B b;
        A* a;
}
```

This code will however compile. It is possible (and recommended whenever working with polymorphism) to create a pointer towards an abstract class (in this case an A* pointer).

- Other languages (such as Java or C#) have a similar concept called *interface* (primarily used in these languages to avoid multiple inheritance).
- interfaces are however different from an abstract class. An interface CAN NOT have data members, or methods that are not pure virtual. An abstract class is a class that has <u>at least one pure virtual method</u>. An abstract class can have methods, constructors, destructor or data members.
- In C++ it is often easier to use *struct* instead of class to describe in interface due to the fact that the default access modifier is *public*
- Cl.exe (Microsoft) has a keyword (___interface) that works like an interface (allows you to create on). However, this is not part of the standard.









#### Memory alignment in case of inheritance class C:public B,A ł class A class B: public: **int** c1,c2; public: public: }; **int** a1,a2,a3; **int** b1,b2; sizeof(C) = 28}; }; sizeof(A) = 12sizeof(B) = 8Offset Field **C1 C2 C3** + 0 | B::b1 When building a derived class in memory, B if the inheritance is does not contain the + 4 | B::b2 virtual specifier, will be done using the + 8 | A::a1 left-to-right rule for any base classes. + 12 | A::a2 + 16 | A::a3 +20 | C::c1 +24 C::c2

#### warning C4584: 'C' : base-class 'A' is already a baseclass of 'B'.

Multiple inheritance can create ambiguous situations. For example, in this case the fields from class *A* are copied twice in class *C*.
 Offset Field C1 C2 C3

Арр.срр
class A
{
public:
int a1, a2, a3;
};
class B: public A
{
public:
<b>int</b> b1, b2;
};
class C : public A, public
{
public:
<b>int</b> c1, c2;
};
<pre>void main()</pre>
{
}
J

В

Offset	Field	C1	C2	C3
+0	A::a1			
+4	A::a2	Α		
+8	A::a3			
+12	B::A::a1			
+16	B::A::a2	<b>B::A</b>		<b>C</b>
+20	B::A::a3		B	
+24	B::b1			
+28	B::b2			
+32	C::c1			
+36	C::c2			

Multiple inheritance can create ambiguous situations. For example, in this case the fields from class A are copied twice in class C.



This is an ambiguous case. "*c.a1* = 10" can refer to the member "*a1*" from the direct inheritance of class A, or the member "*a1*" from the direct inheritance of class B that in terms inherits class A.

#### This code will NOT compile !!!

warning C4584: 'C': base-class 'A' is already a base-class of 'B' note: see declaration of 'A' note: see declaration of 'B'

error C2385: ambiguous access of 'a1' note: could be the 'a1' in base 'A' note: or could be the 'a1' in base 'A

Multiple inheritance can create ambiguous situations. For example, in this case the fields from class A are copied twice in class C.

```
App.cpp
class A {
public:
      int a1, a2, a3;
};
class B: public A {
public:
      int b1, b2;
};
class C : public A, public B {
public:
      int c1, c2;
};
void main()
      C c;
      c.A::a1 = 10;
      c.B::A::a1 = 20;
```

- The solution is to describe any field/data member using its full scope. For example:
  - "c.A::a1" means data member "a1" from the direct inheritance of "A" in class "C"
  - "c.B::A::a1" means data member "a1" from the inheritance of "A" in class "B" that is directly inherit by class "C"
- What can we do if we want to have only one copy of the fields from class "A" in our object ?
- This problem is also known as the "Diamond Problem"

Multiple inheritance can create ambiguous situations. For example, in this case the fields from class A are copied twice in class C.



- One solution to this problem is to use the virtual specifier when deriving from a class. In this case, class "A" is inherited virtually (meaning that its fields must be added once).
- For this code to work, both "C" and "B" class need to inherit class "A" using virtual keyword.
Just like in the case of virtual methods, if no constructor is present, one will be created by the compiler. However, this constructor is a little bit different than the others (as it has one parameter of type bool).

Арр.срр	Disasm		
class A {	Сс;		
public:	push	1	TRUF
int a1, a2, a3;	lea	ecx,[c]	TROL
class B: public virtual A {	call	C::C	
public:	c.al =	= 10;	•
int b1, b2;	mov	eax,dword	ptr [c]
;	mov	ecx,dword	ptr [eax+4]
public:	mov	dword ptr	[c+ecx],10
int c1, c2;	c.b1 =	= 20;	
<pre>}; void main()</pre>	mov	dword ptr	[c+20],20
C c;			/
c.al = 10;			
c.bl = 20;			

The first parameter, tells the constructor if a special table with indexes needs to be created or not !

Add.cdd	Disasm C::C	
	push	ebp
public:	mov	ebp,esp
int a1, a2, a3;	mov	dword ptr [this],ecx
};	стр	dword ptr [ebp+8],0
class B: public virtual A {	je	DONT_SET_VAR_PTR
<b>int</b> b1, b2;	mov	eax,dword ptr [this]
};	mov	dword ptr [eax],addr_index
class C : public virtual A, public B	DONT_SET_VAR_PT	R:
<b>int</b> c1, c2:	push	0
};	mov	ecx,dword ptr [this]
<pre>void main()</pre>	call	B::B
{	mov	eax,dword ptr [this]
c.al = 10;	mov	esp,ebp
c.b1 = 20;	рор	ebp
}	ret	4

Once the constructor is called, an object that has virtual inheritance will look as follows:



Accessing a data member / field that benefits from the *virtual* inheritance, is done in 3 steps (not in one) in the following way:



In the first step, EAX register gets the pointer to the table where offsets of data member/fields from A class are stored



Second step - ECX gets the value from the second index in that table (+4), more exactly value 20 (that reflects the offset of "A" from the beginning of "C")



Last step, we use "ECX" register as an offset to access A::a1 from the beginning of local variable "c".



Fields/Data members that are obtained via virtual inheritance are usually added at the end of the class alignment.

	Арр.срр		Offset	Field
	class A		+ 0	ptr class C virtual members offsets
	<pre>class B: public vii { }</pre>	rtual A	+ 4	C::B::b1
	<pre>class C : public virtual A,</pre>		+ 8	C::B:: <b>b2</b>
			+ 12	C::c1
			+ 16	C::c2
Offse	t Offset rela	tive to C	+ 20	A::a1 (virtual A from C)
+	0		+ 24	A::a2 (virtual A from C)
+	4 Virtual A	20	+ 28	A::a3 (virtual A from C)

If we use virtual inheritance when deriving "C" from "B" (in addition to the usage of virtual inheritance for class "A") we will obtain the following alignment:

	Арр.срр		Offset	Field
	class A		+ 0	ptr class C virtual members offsets
	<pre>class B: public vi { }</pre>	irtual A	+ 4	C::c1
	<pre>class C : public virtual A,</pre>		+ 8	C::c2
			t + 12	A::a1 (virtual A from C)
	/			A::a2 (virtual A from C)
Offse	fset Offset relative to C		+ 20	A::a3 (virtual A from C)
+	0		+ 24	ptr class B virtual members offsets
+	4 Virtual A	12	+ 28	B::b1 (virtual B from C)
+	8 Virtual B	24	+ 32	B::b2 (virtual B from C)
		- 1		

In case of the index table for class "B", the offset "-12" refers to the position of "A" class (also obtain via virtual inheritance) relative to B with respect to C class (24 (offset of B) - 12 = 12 (offset of A))

	Ap	op.cpp		Offset	Field	
	cla {	ass A		+ 0	ptr class C virtual members offsets	
	cla {	ass B: public vi	irtual A	+ 4	C::c1	
	cla	ass C : public y public y	virtual A, virtual B	+ 8	C::c2	
	{	. }		+ 12	A::a1 (virtual A from C)	-
				+ 16	A::a2 (virtual A from C)	
ffse	ət	Offset rela	ative la B	+ 20	A::a3 (virtual A from C)	
+	- 0	onsecret	0 4	+ 24	ptr class B virtual members offsets	
+	- 4	Virtual A	-12	+ 28	B::b1 (virtual B from C)	
	•		12	+ 32	B::b2 (virtual B from C)	
						7

If we make only the inheritance of B from C to be virtual, the memory alignment is as follows:

Δ			Offset	Field
			+ 0	A::a1
$\{ \dots \}$			+ 4	A::a1
<pre>{ } class C : public A,</pre>		+ 8	A::a3	
		+ 12	ptr class C virtual members offsets	
		+ 16	C::c1	
			+ 20	C::c2
Offset	Offset rela	tive la C	+ 24	B::A::a1
± 0		-12	+ 28	B::A::a2
. 4	Virtual D	12	+ 32	B::A::a3
+ 4	virtual B	١Z	+ 36	B::b1
			+ 40	B::b2

If we make only the inheritance of B from C to be virtual, the memory alignment is as follows:

٨r			Offset	Field
			+ 0	A::a1
{ cla	. } ass B: public A		+ 4	A::a1
{ cla	. } ass C : public A.		+ 8	A::a3
{	public virtual B		+ 12	ptr class C virtual members offsets
	· ,		+ 16	C::c1
			First	t index (+0 offset, value -12) represents the
Offset	Offset relative la	С	lt i	s usually 0 (as this table is the first entry),
+ 0		12	h	owever in this case it is a negative value.
+ 4	Virtual B	12	+ 32	B::A::a3
			+ 36	B::b1
			+ 40	B::b2

If we make only the inheritance of B from C to be virtual, the memory alignment is as follows:

			Offset	Field
			+ 0	A::a1
{ . cla	} ass B: public A		+ 4	A::a1
{ . cla	} ass C : public A		+ 8	A::a3
{ .	public v	irtual B	+ 12	ptr class C virtual members offsets
			+ 16	C::c1
			+ 20	C::c2
Offset	Offset rela	ative la C	Th	e second offset (+4, value +12) reflects the
+ 0		-12	pos	ition of B relative to the offset of the index
+ 4	Virtual B	12	7	table (12+12=24).
			+ 20	D.:DI
			+ 40	B::b2

