Pass same object as const and non-const reference

Asked 7 years, 8 months ago Modified 7 years, 8 months ago Viewed 1k times

The following code compiles with g++ v4.8.1 and outputs 45, but is its compilation guaranteed based on the standard? Would other compilers complain?

#include <iostream>
#include <vector>

void test(const std::vector<int>& a, std::vector<int>& b) {
 b[0] = 45;
}

I understand that there's nothing inherently wrong with the function definition, but when calling test with the same object, v, I somewhat expected a warning that I was passing a single object as both a const and non-const reference.

c++ constants

int main() {

test(v, v);

std::vector<int> v(1,0);

std::cout << v[0] << std::endl;</pre>

Share Edit Follow Flag

edited Jul 28, 2014 at 16:48

asked Jul 28, 2014 at 16:20

glinka
313 • 3 • 11

Perhaps it would spot that I pass the same object as both a const and non-const reference, which seems contradictory. – glinka Jul 28, 2014 at 16:23

@glinka: There's no contradiction. It's perfectly safe and sensible to make a const reference to a mutable object, preventing modification via that reference, so the language allows that. The converse, making a mutable reference to a const object, wouldn't be safe, so that's not allowed. – Mike Seymour Jul 28, 2014 at 16:24

Yes, I understand this; however, I feel the compiler might/should prevent me from making such contradictory claims about an object by passing v as both arguments to test. – glinka Jul 28, 2014 at 16:28

you make no claims and this is a common scenario. Btw, the compiler may want to warn that the variable a is defined but not used in test(). – Walter Jul 28, 2014 at 16:30

There is no problem becuase the compiler consideres these two parameters as different references. To understand the code consider the following

3 Answers

Sorted by: Highest score (default)

example

int i = 10;

const int &cr = i;
int &r = i;
r = 20;

std::cout << cr << std::endl;

Share Edit Follow Flag



You are the only one who's answered the question I was trying to ask, thank you. I believe you mean int i in the first line though. I cannot edit it. – glinka Jul 28, 2014 at 16:33

@glinka Thanks. It was a typo.:) – Vlad from Moscow Jul 28, 2014 at 16:33

@glinka: If your question is more specific than what's actually written in your post, then you should edit your post. – Benjamin Lindley Jul 28, 2014 at 16:40

1 A I thought the title might suffice, but I can see where the confusion arose. Especially as a poster with a paltry 17 rep, you run into these "dumbifications" a lot. – glinka

Jul 28, 2014 at 16:44

Jul 28, 2014 at 16:44

Yes, it is correct. A const reference can be bound to a non-const object. This is of course the case, because why would a non-const object care if a function doesn't modify it, which is what the const ensures? (at least, it ensures that the object is not modified through that particular reference, though it may be modified through another, non-const reference)

The reverse, however, is not true. You cannot bind a non-const reference to a const object. A const object does in fact care if a function modifies it, which a non-const reference would allow.

Share Edit Follow Flag

edited Jul 28, 2014 at 16:28



+1 Your answer explains the behavior concisely, and precisely. – πάντα ῥεῖ Jul 28, 2014 at 16:29

There is no reason this shouldn't compile. Your vector is not const, you can then use it in a const or mutable context.

The same way this works:

int i = 42;
const int& const_ref = i;
int& ref = i;

Wether you bind the same object or not does not have any incidence here.

You should look at this as if there was a lion in a zoo, the visitors behind windows cannot touch him whereas the trainers can feed him, but it is still the same lion.

Share Edit Follow Flag

edited Jul 28, 2014 at 16:26

answered Jul 28, 2014 at 16:21

Drax
11.9k • 6 • 39 • 79