

## Re: [OT] Re: memcpy() vs. for() performance

**Source:** [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.c/2004-07/0119.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2004-07/0119.html)

---

**From:** Dan Pop ([Dan.Pop\\_at\\_cern.ch](mailto:Dan.Pop_at_cern.ch))

**Date:** 07/01/04

Date: 1 Jul 2004 16:32:01 GMT

In <40e40d8c\$0\$93324\$e4fe514c@news.xs4all.nl> Case <no@no.no> writes:

>Dan Pop wrote:

>>

>> *When the size is unknown at compile time (or too large), the compiler cannot inline the memcpy call, it will call the library version.*

>

>*When I had to make a choice between the two, I would call it optimization. I'm surprized that you seem to prefer the term inlining. Why?*

Because this is the specific name of that particular optimisation.

What is so difficult to understand?

As I said, inlining is NOT the only way an implementation can optimise a memcpy call. There are plenty of optimisations that can be applied to the library version of memcpy (especially if it's not written in C).

>> *If you want ultimate answers, benchmark the two versions yourself.*

>> *Keep in mind that they cannot be extrapolated to other implementations.*

>

>*Yep, one other good reason to always use memcpy(). However, how was the saying again .... "Never say always!" :-)*

Another failed attempt at humour...

Dan

--

Dan Pop  
DESY Zeuthen, RZ group  
Email: [Dan.Pop@ifh.de](mailto:Dan.Pop@ifh.de)