Generalized PODs '11

Chapter 2 Conditionally Safe Features

```
int x1 = a.i;
                            // Bug (UB), cannot refer to new object through a
    int x2 = pa->i;
                            // OK, can access through value returned from new
    assert(x2 == 2);
                            // OK, const member S::i was overwritten.
    int i1 = 1, i2 = 2;
    Bc = \{ i1 \}, d = \{ i2 \};
    B* pc = new (&c) B(d); // OK, copy construction
                           // Bug (UB), cannot refer to new object through c
    int& y1 = c.r;
                           // OK, can access through return value of new
    int& y2 = pc->r;
                           // OK, reference member B::r was rebound.
    assert(&y2 == &i2);
}
void copy2c() // using std::memcpy
{
   S a = { 1 }, b = { 2 };
    std::memcpy(&a, &b, sizeof b); // OK, bitwise copy
    int x = a.i;
                          // Bug (UB), cannot refer to new object through a
    int i1 = 1, i2 = 2;
    Bc = \{ i1 \}, d = \{ i2 \};
    std::memcpy(&c, &d, sizeof d); // OK, bitwise copy
    int& y = c.r;
                           // Bug (UB), cannot refer to new object through c
}
```

In copy2a, the assignment operation fails at compile time. In copy2b, using copy construction and placement **new** works. Moreover, it is valid to access the newly created object via the value returned from placement ::operator new, but not directly through the original name — even though they refer to the same address. In copy2c, it is also valid to std::memcpy from one object to another of the same trivially copyable type. Attempting to access the data members via the original names, however, leads similarly to UB, but, unlike with placement new, there is no valid new pointer available to use to access the newly created object. Hence, although it is not undefined behavior to use std::memcpy, it can serve no well-defined useful purpose.

Note, however, that as of C++20, reusing the name, reference, or pointer to an object that was destroyed and re-created (e.g., via std::memcpy or placement std::operator new) is now considered valid, even if the object contains a *nonstatic* member of const-qualified or reference-qualified type, thus eliminating the undefined behavior in both copy2b and copy2a, yet std::memcpy remains effectively unusable on such types in C++11 and C++14 (and C++17) as originally specified; see Annoyances — The C++ Standard has not yet stabilized in this area on page 521.

As a workaround on older compilers, one might try to mitigate such dangerous optimization in the implementation by combining std::is_trivially_copyable with std::is_assignable to prevent applying std::memcpy to types like S having const subobjects:

 \oplus