601.220 Intermediate Programming

```
// wirt dtor.h:
class Base {
public:
    Base() : base_memory(new char[1000]) { }
    ~Base() { delete[] base_memory; }
private:
    char *base_memory;
1:
class Derived : public Base {
public:
    Derived() : Base(), derived_memory(new char[1000]) { }
    ~Derived() { delete[] derived_memory; }
private:
    char *derived_memory;
};
```

```
// virt_dtor.cpp:
#include "virt_dtor.h"

int main() {
    // Note use of base-class pointer
    Base *obj = new Derived();
    delete obj; // calls what destructor(s)?
    return 0;
}
```

new Derived() calls Derived default constructor, which in turn
calls Base default constructor; that's good

Which destructor is called?

- Destructor is not virtual
- Does that mean ~Base is called but not ~Derived?

```
$ g++ -o virt_dtor virt_dtor.cpp
$ valgrind ./virt dtor
==608== Memcheck, a memory error detector
==608== Copyright (C) 2002-2017, and GNU GPL'd, by Julian Seward et al.
==608== Using Valgrind-3.15.0 and LibVEX; rerun with -h for copyright info
==608== Command: ./virt dtor
==608==
==608==
==608== HEAP SUMMARY:
            in use at exit: 1,000 bytes in 1 blocks
==608==
==608== total heap usage: 4 allocs, 3 frees, 74,720 bytes allocated
==608==
==608== I.EAK SIIMMARY:
==608==
        definitely lost: 1,000 bytes in 1 blocks
==608== indirectly lost: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
==608==
             possibly lost: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
==608==
          still reachable: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
==608==
                suppressed: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
==608== Rerun with --leak-check=full to see details of leaked memory
==608==
==608== For lists of detected and suppressed errors, rerun with: -s
==608== ERROR SUMMARY: 0 errors from 0 contexts (suppressed: 0 from 0)
```

~Derived is not called; derived_memory is leaked

```
// wirt dtor2.h:
class Base {
public:
    Base() : base_memory(new char[1000]) { }
    // Now *** virtual ***
    virtual ~Base() { delete[] base memory: }
private:
    char *base_memory;
};
class Derived : public Base {
public:
    Derived(): Base(), derived memory(new char[1000]) { }
    // Now *** virtual ***
    virtual ~Derived() { delete[] derived memory; }
private:
    char *derived_memory;
};
```

```
// virt_dtor2.cpp:
#include "virt_dtor2.h"

int main() {
    // Note use of base-class pointer
    Base *obj = new Derived();
    delete obj; // calls what destructor(s)?
    return 0;
}
```

```
$ g++ -o virt dtor2 virt dtor2.cpp
$ valgrind ./virt dtor2
==618== Memcheck, a memory error detector
==618== Copyright (C) 2002-2017, and GNU GPL'd, by Julian Seward et al.
==618== Using Valgrind-3.15.0 and LibVEX; rerun with -h for copyright info
==618== Command: ./virt dtor2
==618==
==618==
==618== HEAP SUMMARY:
==618== in use at exit: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
==618== total heap usage: 4 allocs, 4 frees, 74,728 bytes allocated
==618==
==618== All heap blocks were freed -- no leaks are possible
==618==
==618== For lists of detected and suppressed errors, rerun with: -s
==618== ERROR SUMMARY: 0 errors from 0 contexts (suppressed: 0 from 0)
```

Fixed; thanks to dynamic binding, delete obj calls ~Derived, which in turn calls ~Base

Derived-class destructor always implicitly calls base-class destructor at the end

To avoid this in general: Any class with virtual member functions should also have a virtual destructor, even if the destructor does nothing

Quiz!

Assume class C is derived from classes A and B and class D is derived from B. At the very least, the destructors of which classes must be virtual?

- A. C and D
- B. A and B
- C. A, B and C
- D. A, B, C and D
- E. D only