# What I learned about language and 

 library design by working on SwiftDave Abrahams | Principal Scientist | STLab

## Elise Swopes

New York City-based photographer and graphic designer Elise Swopes manipulates the everyday into unexpected works of art. With her mobile phone, Adobe Photoshop, and Adobe Photoshop Lightroom, she creates whimsical, weird, dreamlike scenes. This piece was inspired from a recent visit to Copenhagen, where the bold colors and shapes of Danish architecture made quite an impression. A brilliant yellow apartment building inspired Swopes to create another entry in her surrealistic series featuring giraffes in unusual settings.
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...and to share


## A fly in the ointment

### 6.12.2 Exception Handling

The STL almost never checks for logical errors Therefore, almost no exceptions are generated by the STL itself owing to a logical problem. In fact, there are only two function calls for which the standard requires that it might cause an exception directly: the at () member function, which is the checked version of the subscript operator, and reserve() if the passed size of elements exceeds max_size(). Other than that, the standard requires that only the usual standard exceptions may occur, such as bad_alloc for lack of memory or exceptions of user-defined operations.

When are exceptions generated, and what happens to STL components when they are? For a long time during the standardization process of $\mathrm{C}++98$, there was no defined behavior about this. In fact, every exception resulted in undefined behavior. Even the destruetion of an STL container resulted in undefined behavior if an exception was thrown duning one of its operations. Thus, the STL was useless when you needed guaranteed and defined behavior, because it was not even possible to unwind the stack.
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### 6.12.2 Exception Handling

The STL almost never checks for logical errors. Therefore, almost no exceptions are generated by the STL itself owing to a logical problem. In fact, there are only two function calls for which the standard requires that it might cause an exception directly: the at () member function, which is the checked version of the subscript operator, and reserve() if the passed size of elements exceeds max_size(). Other than that, the standard requires that only the usual standard exceptions may occur, such as bad_alloc for lack of memory or exceptions of user-defined operations.
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N1690 | A Proposal to Add an Rvalue Reference to the C++ Language | H. Hinnant,D. Abrahams,P. Dimov | 2004-09-07

- N1691 | Explicit Namespaces | David Abrahams | 2004-09-07
- N1770 | A Proposal to Add an Rvalue Reference to the C++ Language: Proposed Wording | H. Hinnant, D. Abrahams, J. Adamczyk, P. Dimov, A. Hommel | 2005-03-05
- N1771 | Impact of the rvalue reference on the Standard Library
- H. Hinnant, D. Abrahams, P. Dimov, D. Gregor, A. Hommel, A. Meredith | 2005-03-03
- N1773 | Proposal to add Contract Programming to C++ (revision 2) | D. Abrahams, L. Crowl, T. Ottosen, J. Widman | 2005-03-04
- N1855 | A Proposal to Add an Rvalue Reference to the C++ Language: Proposed Wording | D. Abrahams, P. Dimov, H. Hinnant, A. Hommel | 2005-08-25
- N1873 | The Cursor/Property Map Abstraction | D. Kühl, D. Abrahams | 2005-08-26
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- N2918 | Exported Concept Maps | D. Abrahams, D. Gregor | 2009-06-22
- N2983 | Allowing Move Constructors to Throw | D. Abrahams, R. Sharoni, D. Gregor | 2009-11-09
- N3050 | Allowing Move Constructors to Throw (Rev. 1) | D. Abrahams, R. Sharoni, D. Gregor | 2010-03-12
- N3153 | Implicit Move Must Go | Dave Abrahams | 2010-10-17
- N3418 | Proposal for Generic (Polymorphic) Lambda Expressions | F. Vali, H. Sutter, D. Abrahams | 2012-09-21
- N3490 | ADL Control for C++ | Dave Abrahams | 2012-10-31
- N3559 | Proposal for Generic (Polymorphic) Lambda Expressions
- F. Vali, H. Sutter, D. Abrahams | 2013-03-17
- N3560 | Proposal for Assorted Extensions to Lambda Expressions | F. Vali, H. Sutter, D. Abrahams | 2013-03-17
- N3649 Generic (Polymorphic) Lambda Expressions (Revision 3) | F. Vali, H. Sutter, D. Abrahams | 2013-04-19

Brainchild of Beman Dawes
I was a co-founder
Spun off BoostPro Computing
Started BoostCon/C++Now conference


I was a total C++-head...

...and I was starting over


## The (rest of the) design team

Dave Zarzycki
Doug Gregor
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## Immutable string is less spooky

| intro $=$ "hello" | intro $\longrightarrow$ "hello" |
| :--- | :--- |
| message $=$ intro |  |

## Immutable string is less spooky

```
intro = "hello" intro }\longrightarrow\mathrm{ "hello"
message = intro
message = message.concat(", world")
intro }\longrightarrow\mathrm{ "hello" 
```
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A deeper idea than I thought.

## Philosophy of value semantics

Maybe the problem isn't mutation by itself, but mutation of shared state?
A deeper idea than I thought.
Problems with the immutable string scheme:

- Creating a new string buffer for every mutation step is expensive $-\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{N}^{2}\right)$.
- Add StringBuilder to manage mutating string buffers in place.
- StringBuilder ends up duplicating string's non-mutating API.
- One more type for the user to learn.


## Dave's declaration

## "Over my dead body will Swift hove a StringBuilder!"
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## Array

Was a hack for testing the compiler, but not a design.
Had reference semantics!
Copy/assignment operators not implemented... yet?
Time to bother Doug
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## Doug Gregor's declaration

"No rule-of-five progromming for you!"
"Use copy-on-write."
"Go owoy and don't bother me; I need to code."
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Why COW was deemed ungood for std：：string

## Why COW was deemed ungood for std：：string．

COW，short for copy on write，is a way to implement mutable strings so that creating strings and logically copying strings，is reduced to almost nothing；conceptually they become free operations like no－ops．

Basic idea：to share a data buffer among string instances，and only make a copy for a specific instance（the copy on write）when that instance＇s data is modified．The general cost of this is only an extra indirection for accessing the value of a string，so a COW

## No rule of five | Consequences

All variable-sized value types use CoW
Copy and assignment never have to allocate memory
Copy and assignment is always $\mathrm{O}(1)$
Copy and assignment can never fail
Optimizer was taught to remove redundant reference counting.
Optimizer was taught to hoist uniqueness checks
We fearlessly pass arrays, strings, and dictionaries by value

## Chris Lattner's Observation

## "C++ has value semantics, but nobody uses it."

## Say what you mean? | Sincere parameter passing

// Returns the sum of elements in `x` and calls `dump` on each one. auto sumAndDump(std: :vector<int> const $x$, void(*dump)(int)) -> int \{ ranges: :for_each(x, dump);
return std::accumulate(x.begin(), x.end(), 0); \}
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```
// Returns the sum of elements in `x` and calls `dump` on each one.
auto sumAndDump(std::vector<int> const x, void(*dump)(int)) -> int {
    ranges::for_each(x, dump);
    return std::accumulate(x.begin(), x.end(), 0);
}
std::vector x = {0, 1, 2, 3};
void d(int) { x[e] += 1; }
int main() {
    std::cout << f(x, d); // Prints "6"
}
```
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## Say what you mean? | Facetious parameter passing

```
// Returns the sum of elements in `x` and calls `dump` on each one.
auto sumAndDump(std::vector<int> const& x, void(*dump)(int)) -> int {
    ranges::for_each(x, dump);
    return std::accumulate(x.begin(), x.end(), 0);
}
std::vector x = {0, 1, 2, 3};
void d(int) { x[e] += 1; }
int main() {
    std::cout << f(x, d); // Prints "10", not "6"
}
```


## Mutation <br> ```Facetious | Pass by reference```

X y ;
auto frob(X\& y) -> void \{
foo();
$\operatorname{bar}(\mathrm{y})$;
\}
frob(y);
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> X y;
auto frob(X\& y) -> void \{
foo();
$\operatorname{bar}(\mathrm{y})$;
\}
frob(y);

## Sincere | Functional update

```
X y;
auto frob(X y) -> X {
    foo();
    bar(y);
    return y;
}
y = frob(y);
```


## Mutation in Swift

```
var y: X;
func frob(_ y: inout X) -> Void {
    foo();
    bar(&y);
}
frob(y);
```


## Dave's last theorem

Swift's model of parameter passing can be extended to allow noncopyable types to be efficently passed "by value" or by move with minimal complexity, and the model could be applied to a future version of $C++$.



[^0]:    When are exceptions generated, and what happens to STL components when they are? For a long time during the standardization process of $\mathrm{C}++98$, there was no defined behavior about this. In fact, every exception resulted in undefined behavior. Even the destruction of an STL container resulted in undefined behavior if an exception was thrown during one of its operations. Thus, the STL was useless when you needed guaranteed and defined behavior, because it was not even possible to unwind the stack.

