Subject: Re: Should the pick semantics be changed?
Posted by piotr5 on Sun, 09 Mar 2014 12:28:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

well, to formalize a bit more concretely what I said, I believe return statement should at compile-time distinguish between return values local to the function which are not static, and all the return-values which remain in scope after the end of this function respectively could get into scope again (like static values or private members and such). and then based on this distinction the actual return-value should either be constructed with implicit cast to r-value or with the persistent const-l-value-reference constructor.

but then, I'm no it-scientist, so maybe someone else should better post this proposal to the c++ standard committee and to gcc -- if it hasn't already been proposed. I am quite certain gcc could easily implement such a language-change, without waiting for the standards-commitee's decision, I doubt it is explicitly disallowed in c++11...

oh, and thanks for the c++11 branch, looking for this was the reason I started this thread.