
Subject: Re: C++11

Posted by [mirek](#) on Mon, 03 Dec 2012 10:04:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Lance wrote on Sun, 02 December 2012 15:00

A class not written with `pick_` in mind will(or may?) not work correctly with `Upp::Vector<>`, even if it meets all the interface requirements superficially.

Actually, that is not true. `pick_` is in no way related with generic requirement of Vector elements (only 2-3 methods require it).

Please note that `pick` semantics and `Moveable` are two very different things.

`pick` indeed is a variant of `rvalue` and it might have sense to replace it with `r-value`. Unfortunately, `rvalue` lacks composition rules, which means that it has to be reimplemented for any composite type, while `pick` generates compiler generated composite `pick` operations without problems. How much more code it would mean in practice is something that I plan to test in some branch in future. But e.g. for something like `RichTxt::Para`, it will be nasty.

Anyway, `pick` is not used for performance reasons in `Vector`. `Moveable` is. And that is still a bit ahead than `pick/amp&`.

`Pick` is rather interface issue, allows you to pass objects from place to place without copying them (which do not even has to be available).

Mirek
