

---

Subject: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [Didier](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 18:33:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi all,

While doing some corrections for MSC on code developped using GCC I noticed that MSC gives an error when we forget to return a value in a function that requires one.

```
int myFunction()  
{  
    printf("Hello World !!");  
    // no return value  
}
```

This code does not compile in MSC while it compile perfectly in GCC when using Theide.

I think we should add the following option to GCC config:

-Werror=return-type

With this GCC and MSC have the same compilation behaviour.

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 19:08:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Good idea. Will happen...

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 19:46:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IMHO it would be much more helpful to use "-Wall", but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++... I am using Clang and even with the default settings for warnings it outputs so many that theide nearly halts just from parsing all the output Clang produces

OTOH Clang could be used to fix the warnings, as it produces hints how to fix each warning and also has option to produce this output in machine readable form, which could be used to automatically correct the sources (with human review afterwards, of course).

Best regards,  
Honza

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 19:48:48 GMT

---

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

---

dolik.rce wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 14:46IMHO it would be much more helpful to use "-Wall", but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++...

...and inside 3rd party sources...

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [Didier](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 20:10:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++  
Yes I am perfectly aware of that

Quote: theide nearly halts just from parsing all the output  
That's why -Wall may not be such a good idea.

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 20:52:25 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Didier wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 21:10Quote: theide nearly halts just from parsing all the output  
That's why -Wall may not be such a good idea.This happens to me on default setting WITHOUT -Wall...

Quote:...and inside 3rd party sources...  
Even fixing only the U++ sources would be great improvement. I don't really care about how many warnings is in sources of plugin/\* packages. What drives me mad is the warnings that come from the headers that I include in my package, because they are making it harder to notice warnings regarding my code. I believe (but I might be wrong) that there will not be many warnings in the 3rd party headers, at least compared to U++ headers (because there is so many of them in single compilation unit, esp. with BLITZ).

I am well aware that this discussion happened already many times on this forum and that nothing will probably happen this time as usual... but I have to at least try to convince you

Honza

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 22:01:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

```
/home/cxl/upp.src/uppsrc/Core/CharSet.h:119:54: warning: '&&' within '||'
[-Wlogical-op-parentheses]
inline bool IsAlpha(int c)      { return c >= 'A' && c <= 'Z' || c >= 'a' && c <= 'z'; }
                               ~~~~~^~~~~~ ~~~~~
```

/home/cxl/upp.src/uppsrc/Core/CharSet.h:119:54: note: place parentheses around the '&&' expression to silence this warning

Go to hell with this... I am not going to make the code unreadable.

Plus, I have a very intense feeling that even if I would screw the code and added parenthesis in this situation, one or two years later somebody would get a nice idea that there are more needed around `c >= 'A'` etc...

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 22:21:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

dolik.rce wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 15:52  
I am well aware that this discussion happened already many times on this forum and that nothing will probably happen this time as usually... but I have to at least try to convince you

Honza

It is not true that nothing happened in the past. A couple of years ago, U++ was made GCC/-Wall (mostly) free. Since then -Wall was extended...

(I have also refused to fix 3rd party sources).

It is also BTW impossible to activate full MSC warnings, because they demand "safe" replacement for standard C library functions like `strcpy`, but those replacements are MSC specific.

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 14 Feb 2013 22:31:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hm, now I have checked and I am actually compiling with

-Wall -Wno-parentheses

so except that (&&) warning, which I consider really way too stupid, we are -Wall compliant.

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2013 06:41:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mirek wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 23:31Hm, now I have checked and I am actually compiling with

-Wall -Wno-parentheses

so except that (&&) warning, which I consider really way too stupid, we are -Wall compliant.  
OK, I could live with blacklisting the parentheses warnings. Other than that, my gcc 4.7.2 reports only one error in theide:Quote:

With clang, it is bit worse:

```
$ umk uppsrc AllFor18n CLANG -ba | grep 'warning:' | sort -u | grep -o '\[-W.*\]' | sort | uniq -c |  
sort -rn"  
88 [-Wlogical-op-parentheses] *  
40 [-Wdangling-else] *  
16 [-Woverloaded-virtual]  
3 [-Wunused-private-field]  
1 [-Wbitwise-op-parentheses] *  
1 [-Wbool-conversion] *  
1 [-Winvalid-source-encoding] *  
1 [-Wmismatched-tags] *  
1 [-Wtautological-compare]  
1 [-Wunneeded-internal-declaration] Items marked with * are present by default, even without  
-Wall option. Numbers represents unique occurrences, the actual counts of the errors in output is  
even higher.
```

At least some of them should be fixed. I'll gladly volunteer

Honza

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2013 07:33:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

dolik.rce wrote on Fri, 15 February 2013 01:41mirek wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 23:31Hm,  
now I have checked and I am actually compiling with

-Wall -Wno-parentheses

so except that (&&) warning, which I consider really way too stupid, we are -Wall compliant. OK, I could live with blacklisting the parentheses warnings. Other than that, my gcc 4.7.2 reports only one error in theide:Quote:

With clang, it is bit worse:

Which IMO nicely demonstrates my point. We can "fix" them, but are we going to forever keep changing standard compliant and fairly tested code only because some compiler developer has a little bit different taste for what deserves warning?

(That said, I will go through CLANG warnings anyway to see if there is something I am willing to fix...)

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [unodgs](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2013 10:11:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

mirek wrote on Fri, 15 February 2013 02:33  
Which IMO nicely demonstrates my point. We can "fix" them, but are we going to forever keep changing standard compliant and fairly tested code only because some compiler developer has a little bit different taste for what deserves warning?

Some warnings are simply stupid and this one particularly (one is not using parenthesis because operator precedence rule exists). It should rather be moved to "--best-practices" compiler switch if it existed

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [Didier](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2013 16:50:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi all,

I didn't expect so much passion over such a simple post

But my first post was more about converting a warning into an error rather than warnings

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 15 Feb 2013 18:25:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I have tried to fix warnings for clang 3.0 (which is default package version for my distro), except that one terror and 3rd party, so for me

clang -Weverything -Wno-parentheses

now compiles without warnings.

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 16 Feb 2013 10:16:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

dolik.rce wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 14:46IMHO it would be much more helpful to use "-Wall", but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++... I am using Clang and even with the default settings for warnings it outputs so many that theide nearly halts just from parsing all the output Clang produces

Well, one positive outcome is that I have investigated this choking and optimized it out

Mirek

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [nneilson](#) on Sat, 16 Feb 2013 16:29:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Didier wrote on Fri, 15 February 2013 08:50But my first post was more about converting a warning into an error rather than warnings

If a function should return a value and does not it should throw an error. A default value in a user's code if the function for some reason does not come up with one.

I don't understand other options in this thread but it makes my head hurt.

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 16 Feb 2013 17:28:53 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Didier wrote on Fri, 15 February 2013 11:50Hi all,

I didn't expect so much passion over such a simple post

But my first post was more about converting a warning into an error rather than warnings

Well, in fact, it is rather a configuration issue, you can configure your build method now. (But I plan to make such config default..)

---

---

Subject: Re: Gcc compile option proposal  
Posted by [dolik.rce](#) on Sun, 17 Feb 2013 16:50:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

mirek wrote on Sat, 16 February 2013 11:16: dolik.rce wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 14:46: IMHO it would be much more helpful to use "-Wall", but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++... I am using Clang and even with the default settings for warnings it outputs so many that the IDE nearly halts just from parsing all the output Clang produces

Well, one positive outcome is that I have investigated this choking and optimized it out

Mirek

Great, thank you. It is really appreciated...

mirek wrote on Sat, 16 February 2013 11:16: dolik.rce wrote on Thu, 14 February 2013 14:46: IMHO it would be much more helpful to use "-Wall", but for that we would have to fix tons of warnings inside U++... I am using Clang and even with the default settings for warnings it outputs so many that the IDE nearly halts just from parsing all the output Clang produces

Well, one positive outcome is that I have investigated this choking and optimized it out

Mirek

... as well as this one.

Best regards,  
Honza

---