Document number:P2721R0Date:2024-02-14Project:Programming Language C++Audience:LEWGReply-to:Michael Florian Hava1 < mfh.cpp@gmail.com>

Deprecating function

Abstract

This paper proposes deprecating function (and associated entities) as it has unresolvable API design issues and has recently been superseded by copyable_function.

Revisions

R0: Initial version

Motivation

C++11 added function, a type-erased function wrapper that can represent any *copyable* callable matching a given function signature. Since its introduction, there have been identified several issues with its design (see [N4159]) – including the famous constness-bug:

As function was incompatible (and could not be made compatible) with *non-copyable* functors, [P0288] introduced move_only_function. The design of which not only drops the *copyable* requirement but also fixes bugs present in function, removes RTTI dependence and adds support for const-, noexcept- and ref-qualifiers.

Semi-concurrently [P0792] introduced function_ref as a non-owning reference to a functor. Like move_only_function it does not depend on RTTI and supports const- and noexcept-qualifiers².

After move_only_function was approved for C++23 and with function_ref targeting C++26, there were serious inconsistencies between the *polymorphic function wrappers* of the standard library. Whilst some of the new features³ could have been back-ported to function, it was impossible to reach feature parity without an API break. To improve the situation, [P2548] introduced copyable_function (design consistent with move_only_function) as a replacement of function.

¹ RISC Software GmbH, Softwarepark 32a, 4232 Hagenberg, Austria, michael.hava@risc-software.at

² There is no support for ref-qualifiers as function_ref itself is a reference type.

³ Primarily noexcept- and ref-qualifier support.

With the adoption of copyable_function for C++26 there remains little reason to keep function in the blessed part of the standard library. Furthermore it has been pointed out multiple times (both by [P3023] and <u>externally</u>) that the current state of *polymorphic function wrappers* in the standard library is complicated - growing from one to four distinct classes within two standard cycles. Deprecating function would lead to a more unified standard library design.

Why now? (Isn't it too soon?)

Going forward our message to users should be clear: "Avoid function for new code! Instead use the appropriate 'modern' *polymorphic function wrappers*." Deprecating function in the same standard cycle as the introduction of copyable_function will reduce confusion. Such timing is not entirely novel, it happened before in C++11 with the introduction of unique_ptr and the deprecation of auto_ptr.

Impact on the Standard

Several classes are moved to Annex D without a change in functionality.

Proposed Wording

Wording for the deprecation of function and ancillary entities will be provided in a future revision.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to <u>RISC Software GmbH</u> for supporting this work. Thanks to Zhihao Yuan for providing feedback on an initial draft. Thanks to Peter Kulczycki for proof reading R0.