Multiple Inheritance

- Mechanism: a class may declare multiple superclasses (C++)
- Java: may implement multiple interfaces, may inherit code from only one superclass
- Two problems: multiple supertypes, multiple superclasses
- What are implications of multiple supertypes in compiler?

Semantic problems

- Problem 1: ambiguity
  ```
  class A { int m(); }
  class B { int m(); }
  class C extends A, B {} // which m?
  ```
- All methods must be uniquely defined
- Problem 2: field replication
  ```
  class A { int x; }
  class B1 extends A { … }
  class B2 extends A { … }
  class C extends B1, B2 { … }
  ```

Dispatch vectors break

```java
interface Shape {
  void setCorner(int w, Point p); 0
}
interface Color {
  float get(int rgb); 0
  void set(int rgb, float value); 1
}

class Blob implements Shape, Color { … }
```

DV alternatives

- Option 1: search with inline cache (Smalltalk, Java)
  - For each class, interface, have table mapping method names to method code. Recursively walk upward in hierarchy looking for method name
  - Optimization: at call site, store class and code pointer in call site code (inline caching). On call, check whether class matches cache.

Inline cache code

- Let \( r_o \) be the receiver object:
  ```
  mov t1, [r_o]
  cmp t1, [cacheClass434]
  jnz miss
  call [cacheCode434]
  miss: call slowDispatch
  ```

90% of calls from a site go to same code as last call from same site
Option 2: Sparse dispatch vectors

- Make sure that two methods never allocated same offset: give Shape offset 0, Color offsets 1 and 2. Allow holes in DV!
- Some methods can be given same offset since they never occur in the same DV
- Graph coloring techniques can be used to compute method indices in reasonably optimal way (finding optimum is NP-complete!)

Sparse Dispatch Vectors

interface Shape {
  void setCorner(int w, Point p); 0
}
interface Color {
  float get(int rgb); 1
  void set(int rgb, float value); 3
}
class Blob implements Shape, Color { … }

- Advantage: same fast dispatch code as SI case
- Disadvantage: requires knowledge of entire type hierarchy (incompatible with separate compilation, dynamic loading)

Option 3: Hash tables

- Idea: don’t try to give all method unique indices; resolve conflicts by checking that entry is the right one
- Use hashing to generate method indices
- Hash values can be pre-computed

interface Shape {
  void setCorner(int w, Point p); 11
}
interface Color {
  float get(int rgb); 4
  void set(int rgb, float value); 7
}
class Blob implements Shape, Color { … }

Dispatch with Hash tables

- What if there’s a conflict? Entries containing several methods point to resolution code
- Basic dispatch code is (almost) identical!
- Advantage: simple, reasonably fast
- Disadvantage: some wasted space in DV, extra argument for resolution, slower dispatch if conflict

Option 4: Multiple DVs (C++)

- Idea: allow methods to have same offset in DV, have more than one DV when they clash

interface Shape {
  void setCorner(int w, Point p);
}
interface Color {
  float get(int rgb);
  void set(int rgb, float value);
}
class Blob implements Shape, Color { … }

Multiple DV’s

- Multiple possible pointers to object!
- Pointer chosen is determined by static type of object reference
- Changing static type requires addition of constant; casting downward problematic

Blob x;
Color y = x;
MOVE(y, x+4)
Option 5: Binary decision trees

- Idea: use conditional branches, not indirect jumps
- Each class assigned a unique integer index
- Range tests used to select among \( n \) possible classes at call site in \( \log n \) time

```
Shape x;
  x.SetCorner(…)
mov ebx, [eax]
cmp ebx, 1
  jle L1
cmp ebx, 2
  je Circle$setCorner
  jmp Egg$setCorner
L1: cmp ebx, 0
  je Blob$setCorner
  jmp Rect$setCorner
```

**Decision tree**

- Works well if distribution of classes is highly skewed: branch prediction hardware eliminates branch stall of ~10 cycles
  - Can use profiling to identify common paths for each call site individually
  - 90%/10%: usually a common path to put at top of decision tree
- Like sparse DVs: need whole-program analysis
- Indirect jump can have better expected execution time for >2 classes: at most one mispredict

Multiple DV’s

- Multiple possible pointers to object!
- Pointer chosen is determined by static type of object reference
- Changing static type requires addition of constant; casting downward problematic

```
Blob x;
Color y = x;
MOVE(y, x+4)
```

**Field offsets in DV**

- Another approach: put offset to all fields in DV (offset to field is essentially a method of the class)
  - `${r:4}`, `${g:8}`, `${b:12}` (with sparse dispatch vectors)
- Java finesses the whole problem: doesn’t allow MI

Multiple Inheritance

- Multiple inheritance means *fields* also can conflict as well as methods
- Location of object fields no longer can be constant offset from start of object

```
class Color {
  float r /*4*/, g/*8*/, b/*12*/;
}
class Shape {
  Point LL/*4*/, UR/*8*/;
}
class ColoredShape extends Color, Shape {
  int z;…
}
```

**C++ approach**

- Add pointers to superclass fields
- Extra indirection required to access superclass fields
- Needed even with single superclass
- Pointers needed to avoid field replication problem

```
class Color { float r /*4*/, g/*8*/, b/*12*/; }
class Shape { Point LL/*4*/, UR/*8*/; }
class ColoredShape extends Color, Shape { int z;… }
```
Multimethods/generic functions

- Most OO languages (e.g. Java): dispatching on a single receiver object
- Dylan, CLOS, Cecil: multimethods (generic functions) exist independent of classes
- Calls dispatched to (dynamically) best matching function definition
  
  ```
  setColor(Shape s, Color c)
  setColor(Circle s, Color c)
  setColor(Shape s, RGBColor c)
  ```

- Semantic problem: ambiguity
- Implementation problem: DV's don't work as well (multi-dimensional); binary decision trees are best option

Summary

- Multiple inheritance is expensive!
- Multiple supertypes: inline caching, sparse vectors, hashing, multiple DV's, binary decision trees
- Multiple superclasses: extra indirection for field accesses via inline pointer or DV field offset