CSE 333

Lecture 11 - constructor insanity

Hal Perkins

Department of Computer Science & Engineering

University of Washington

Administrivia

HW2 due next Thursday

Midterm the following Monday

- Everything up to C++ basics (e.g., exercises)
- Topic list on web site (will update as needed next week depending on where we get to by then)

New exercise posted today, due Monday before class

Today’s goals

More details on constructors, destructors, operators

Walk through *complex_example/*

- pretty hairy and complex
- a lesson on why using a **subset of C++** is often better

new / delete / delete[ ]

- *str/* example

Constructors

A *constructor* initializes a newly instantiated object

- a class can have multiple constructors
    - ‣ they differ in the arguments that they accept
    - ‣ which one is invoked depends on how the object is instantiated

You can write constructors for your object

- but if you don't write any, C++ might automatically synthesize a *default constructor* for you
    - ‣ the default constructor is one that takes no arguments and that calls default constructors on all non-POD member variables
    - ‣ C++ does this iff your class has no const or reference data members, and no other user-defined constructors

Example of synthesis

see SimplePoint.cc, SimplePoint.h

Constructors, continued

You might choose to define multiple constructors:

```
Point::Point() {
  x_ = 0;
  y_ = 0;
}

Point::Point(const int x, const int y) {
  x_ = x;
  y_ = y;
}

void foo() {
  Point x;  // invokes the default (argument-less) constructor
  Point y(1,2);  // invokes the two-int-arguments constructor
}
```

Constructors, continued

You might choose to define only one:

```
Point::Point(const int x, const int y) {
  x_ = x;
  y_ = y;
}

void foo() {
  // Compiler error; if you define any constructors, C++ will
  // not automatically synthesize a default constructor for you.
  Point x;

  // Works.
  Point y(1,2);  // invokes the two-int-arguments constructor
}
```

Initialization lists

As shorthand, C++ lets you declare an initialization list as part of your constructor declaration

- initializes fields according to parameters in the list
- the following two are (nearly) equivalent:

```
Point::Point(const int x, const int y) : x_(x), y_(y) {
  std::cout << "Point constructed: (" << x_ << ",";
  std::cout << y_ << ")" << std::endl;
}
```

```
Point::Point(const int x, const int y) {
  x_ = x;
  y_ = y;
  std::cout << "Point constructed: (" << x_ << ",";
  std::cout << y_ << ")" << std::endl;
}
```

Initialization vs. construction

When a new object is created using some constructor:

- first, the initialization list is applied to members
  - in the order that those members appear within the class definition, not the order in the initialization list (!)
- next, the constructor is invoked, and any statements within it that affect members are executed

Prefer initializations to assignment

- Objects are initialized by some constructor before they can be assigned - initializer avoids two separate steps

Initialization vs. construction

```
#ifndef _POINT_H_
#define _POINT_H_

class Point {
 public:
  Point(const int x, const int y, const int z)
      : x_(x), y_(y) {
    z_ = z;
  }

 private:
  int x_, y_, z_;
};  // class Point

#endif  // _POINT_H_
```

Initialization vs. construction

```
#ifndef _POINT_H_
#define _POINT_H_

class Point {
 public:
  Point(const int x, const int y, const int z)
    : x_(x), y_(y) {
    z_ = z;
  }

 private:
  int x_, y_, z_;
};  // class Point

#endif  // _POINT_H_
```

first, initialization list is applied

Initialization vs. construction

next, constructor is executed

```
#ifndef _POINT_H_
#define _POINT_H_

class Point {
 public:
  Point(const int x, const int y, const int z)
      : x_(x), y_(y) {
    z_ = z;
  }

 private:
  int x_, y_, z_;
};  // class Point

#endif  // _POINT_H_
```

Copy constructors

C++ has the notion of a **copy constructor**

- used to **create a new object** as a copy of an existing object

```
Point::Point(const int x, const int y) : x_(x), y_(y) { }

Point::Point(const Point &copyme) {  // copy constructor
  x_ = copyme.x_;
  y_ = copyme.y_;
}

void foo() {
  // invokes the two-int-arguments constructor
  Point x(1,2);

  // invokes the copy constructor to construct y as a copy of x
  Point y(x);  // could also write as “Point y = x;”
}
```

When do copies happen?

The copy constructor is invoked if:

- you pass an object as an parameter to a call-by-value function

```
void foo(Point x) { ... }

Point y;  // default cons.
foo(y);   // copy cons.
```

- you return an object from a function

```
Point foo() {
  Point y;  // default cos.
  return y; // copy cons.
}
```

- you initialize an object from another object of the same type

```
Point x;    // default cons.
Point y(x);  // copy cons.
Point z = y; // copy cons.
```

But...the compiler is smart...

It sometimes uses a “return by value optimization” to eliminate unnecessary copies

- sometimes you might not see a constructor get invoked when you expect it

```
Point foo() {
  Point y;  // default constructor.
  return y; // copy constructor?  optimized?
}

Point x(1,2);     // two-ints-argument constructor.
Point y = x;      // copy constructor.
Point z = foo();  // copy constructor? optimized?
```

Synthesized copy constructor

If you don’t define your own copy constructor, C++ will synthesize one for you

- it will do a shallow copy of all of the fields (i.e., member variables) of your class
- sometimes the right thing, sometimes the wrong thing

see SimplePoint.cc, SimplePoint.h

assignment != construction

The “=” operator is the assignment operator

- assigns values to an existing, already constructed object
- you can overload the “=” operator

```
Point w;             // default constructor.
Point x(1,2);        // two-ints-argument constructor.
Point y = w;         // copy constructor.
y = x;               // assignment operator.
```

Overloading the “=” operator

You can choose to overload the “=” operator

- but there are some rules you should follow

```
Point &Point::operator=(const Point& rhs) {
  if (this != &rhs) {  // always check against this
    x_ = rhs.x_;
    y_ = rhs.y_;
  }
  return *this;  // always return *this from =
}

Point a;      // default constructor
a = b = c;    // works because “=” returns *this
a = (b = c);  // equiv to above, as “=” is right-associative
(a = b) = c;  // works because “=” returns a non-const
```

Synthesized assignment oper.

If you don't overload the assignment operator, C++ will synthesize one for you

- it will do a shallow copy of all of the fields (i.e., member variables) of your class
- sometimes the right thing, sometimes the wrong thing

see SimplePoint.cc, SimplePoint.h

Destructors

C++ has the notion of a **destructor**

- invoked automatically when a class instance is deleted / goes out of scope, etc.
- place to put cleanup code - free any dynamic storage or other resources owned by the object
- standard C++ idiom for managing dynamic resources

```
Point::~Point() {  // destructor
  // do any cleanup needed when a Point object goes away
  // (nothing to do here since we have no dynamic resources)
}
```

*see complex_example/**

Dealing with the insanity

C++ style guide tip

- if possible, disable the copy const. and assignment operator
  - *not possible if you want to store objects of your class in an STL container, unfortunately*

```
class Point {
 public:
  Point(int x, int y) : x_(x), y_(y) { }

 private:
  // disable copy cons. and "=" by declaring but not defining
  Point(Point &copyme);
  Point &operator=(Point &rhs);
};

Point w;        // compiler error
Point x(1,2);   // OK
Point y = x;    // compiler error
x = w;          // compiler error
```

Dealing with the insanity

C++ style guide tip

- if you disable them, then you should instead have an explicit “CopyFrom” function

Point.cc, h

```
class Point {
 public:
  Point::Point(int x, int y) : x_(x), y_(y) { }
  void CopyFrom(const Point &copy_from_me);

 private:
  // disable copy cons. and "=" by declaring but not defining
  Point(const Point &copyme);
  Point &operator=(const Point &rhs);
};
```

sanepoint.cc

```
Point x(1,2);          // OK
Point y(3,4);          // OK
x.CopyFrom(y);         // OK
```

new

To allocate on the heap using C++, you use the “new” keyword instead of the “malloc( )” stdlib.h function

- you can use new to allocate an object
- you can use new to allocate a primitive type

To deallocate a heap-allocated object or primitive, use the “delete” keyword instead of the “free( )” stdlib.h function

- if you’re using a legacy C code library or module in C++
  - if C code returns you a malloc( )’d pointer, use free( ) to deallocate it
  - **never** free( ) something allocated with new
  - **never** delete something allocated with malloc( )

new / delete

see heappoint.cc

Dynamically allocated arrays

To dynamically allocate an array

- use “`type *name = new type[size];`”

To dynamically deallocate an array

- use “`delete[] name;`”
- it is an error to use “`delete name;`” on an array
  - the compiler probably won’t catch this, though!!!
  - it can’t tell if it was allocated with “`new type[size];`” or “`new type;`”

see arrays.cc

malloc vs. new

	malloc( )	**new**
what is it	a function	an operator and keyword
how often used in C	often	never
how often used in C++	rarely	often
allocates memory for	anything	arrays, structs, objects, primitives
returns	a (void *) *(needs a cast)*	appropriate pointer type *(doesn't need a cast)*
when out of memory	returns NULL	throws an exception
deallocating	free	delete or delete[ ]

Overloading the “=” operator

Remeber the rules we should follow?

- here’s why; hugely subtle bug

```
Foo::Foo(int val) { Init(val); }
Foo::~Foo() { delete my_ptr_; }

void Foo::Init(int val) { my_ptr_ = new int; *my_ptr_ = val; }

Foo &Foo::operator=(const Foo& rhs) {
  // bug...we forgot our "if (self == &rhs) { ... }" guard
  delete my_ptr_;
  Init(*(rhs.my_ptr_));  // might crash here (see below)
  return *this;  // always return *this from =
}

void bar() {
  Foo a(10);  // default constructor
  Foo b(20);  // default constructor
  a = a;      // crash above; dereference delete’d pointer!!
}
```

Overloading the “=” operator

Remeber the rules we should follow?

- here’s why; hugely subtle bug

This is yet another reason for disabling the assignment operator, when possible!!

*see str/**

Exercise 1

Modify your 3D Point class from lec10 exercise 1

- disable the copy constructor and assignment operator
- attempt to use copy & assign in code, and see what error the compiler generates
- write a CopyFrom( ) member function, and try using it instead

Exercise 2

Write a C++ class that:

- is given the name of a file as a constructor argument
- has a “GetNextWord( )” method that returns the next whitespace or newline-separate word from the file as a copy of a “string” object, or an empty string once you hit EOF.
- has a destructor that cleans up anything that needs cleaning up

Exercise 3

Write a C++ function that:

- uses new to dynamically allocate an array of strings
    - ‣ and uses delete[ ] to free it
- uses new to dynamically allocate an array of pointers to strings
    - ‣ and then iterates through the array to use new to allocate a string for each array entry and to assign to each array element a pointer to the associated allocated string
    - ‣ and then uses delete to delete each allocated string
    - ‣ and then uses delete[ ] to delete the string pointer array
    - ‣ (whew!)

See you on Monday!