

---

Subject: Re: Still missing features in IDL 8  
Posted by [penteado](#) on Wed, 03 Nov 2010 00:05:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Nov 1, 3:17 pm, Paulo Penteado <pp.pente...@gmail.com> wrote:  
> On Nov 1, 1:30 pm, Chris Torrence <gorth...@gmail.com> wrote:  
>  
>> Yes, that is exactly what I was thinking.  
>  
>> Back to your original thread - if we added this way of subscribing,  
>> does that eliminate the need to convert a list to/from a pointer  
>> array? I'd rather not add more functionality if we don't have to.  
>  
> It would decrease the need, but not eliminate it. One use that I can  
> remember now is to handle arrays to/from code that uses pointers,  
> which before 8.0 were needed in a lot more situations. I am already  
> adding those conversions to the class I am writing to provide the new  
> overloadbrackets methods. I will post it here when it gets ready.

There is also the independent need of a `no_copy` keyword for `hash::tostruct()`, `list::toarray()`, and `hash::init()`. For `hash::init()` one can get around the lack of `no_copy` with `temporary()`. But for `toarray` and `tostruct`, there is no way to use them without making a copy.

---