

# Proposal for C2X

## WG14 N 3145

<b>Title:</b>	\$ in Identifiers v2
<b>Author, affiliation:</b>	Robert C. Seacord, Woven Planet <a href="mailto:rcseacord@gmail.com">rcseacord@gmail.com</a>
	Corentin Jabot <a href="mailto:corentin.jabot@gmail.com">corentin.jabot@gmail.com</a>
	Steve Downey, Bloomberg, USA < <a href="mailto:sdowney@gmail.com">sdowney@gmail.com</a> , <a href="mailto:sdowney2@bloomberg.net">sdowney2@bloomberg.net</a> >
	Peter Bindels, TomTom, Netherlands, <a href="mailto:dascandy@gmail.com">dascandy@gmail.com</a>
<b>Date:</b>	2023-6-22
<b>Proposal category:</b>	Defect
<b>Target audience:</b>	Implementers
<b>Abstract:</b>	Allow \$ as an implementation extension in identifiers v2
<b>Prior art:</b>	C23

# \$ in Identifiers v2

Reply-to: Robert C. Seacord (rcseacord@gmail.com)

Document No: **N 3145**

Reference Document: [N 3046](#), [N2939](#), [N2836](#), P1949R7 (<http://wg21.link/p1949>)

Date: 2022-3-02

This paper is to repair a potential defect introduced by accepting Alternative 1 of [Proposal for C2X WG14 N 3046](#) which itself repaired a defect introduced by voting in [N2836 Identifier Syntax using Unicode Standard Annex 31](#) into C23.

## Change Log

2023-6-22

- Rebase on top of N3096 and remove options 2 and 3

2022-7-26:

- Initial version

## 1.0 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

A question was raised at the July 2022 WG14 meeting concerning going back to the original identifier rules. The following straw poll was taken:

Straw poll: Does WG14 want to bring back the original identifier rules (e.g., allow \$ in identifiers as an extension, but not required to allow it)?

The results had clear consensus:

Results: 10 yes 2 no 8 abstain

Further discussion showed that the actual direction was less clear with the following opinions being noted:

- Each programming language can define its identifier syntax as relative to the Unicode identifier syntax, such as saying that identifiers are defined by the Unicode properties, with the addition of \$.
- The original text allowed any implementation-defined characters, not just \$

- I am strongly against what I'm suggesting but the “best” solution is to revert the “other implementation-defined characters” that got removed
- I would be much strongly opposed to something that would mention \$ or any other specific character explicitly
- Allowing \$ in identifiers would be a massive and unjustifiable land grab for both C and C++
- Would the following change suffice?

6.4.2.1#1 add to identifier-nondigit:

other implementation-defined characters

- Probably adding that sentence to both identifier-start and identifier-continue

As can be seen, opinions ranged from reverting to implementation-defined characters to keeping the current wording.

A quick survey of existing practice shows that current versions of gcc, clang, and icc all allow the \$ character anywhere in an identifier by default:

<https://godbolt.org/z/frGzcTWoK>

Only clang will diagnose the use of a \$ in an identifier, but only in -pedantic mode.

In both GCC and Clang, this is controlled by the -f[no-]dollars-in-identifiers flag which defaults to allow.

This paper proposes allowing \$ anywhere in identifiers as an implementation extension.

## 2.0 PROPOSED WORDING

Wording

Add the text in green in the N3096 working draft:

### Subclause 6.4.2.1 paragraph 1

nondigit: one of

\_ a b c d e f g h i j k l m

  n o p q r s t u v w x y z

  A B C D E F G H I J K L M

N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

#### **Subclause 6.4.2.1 paragraph 2**

An XID\_Start character is an implementation-defined character whose corresponding code point ISO/IEC 10646 has the XID\_Start property. An XID\_Continue character is an implementation-defined character whose corresponding code point in ISO/IEC 10646 has the XID\_Continue property. An identifier is a sequence of one identifier start character followed by 0 or more identifier continue characters, which designates one or more entities as described in 6.2.1. It is implementation-defined if a dollar sign \$ may be used as a nondigit character. Lowercase and uppercase letters are distinct. There is no specific limit on the maximum length of an identifier

## **4.0 Acknowledgements**

We would like to recognize the following people for their help with this work: Jens Maurer, Zach Laine, Tom Honermann, Corentin Jabot, and Aaron Ballman.

## 5.0 References

---

[AltId] Unicode Standard Annex.

[http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/tr31-11.html#Alternative\\_Identifier\\_Syntax](http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/tr31-11.html#Alternative_Identifier_Syntax)

[DefId] Unicode Standard Annex.

[http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/tr31-11.html#Default\\_Identifier\\_Syntax](http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31/tr31-11.html#Default_Identifier_Syntax)

[N3146] Clark Nelson. 2010. Recommendations for extended identifier characters for C and C++.

<https://wg21.link/n3146>

[UAX15] Ken Whistler. Unicode Normalization Forms.

<http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr15>

[UAX31] Mark Davis. Unicode Identifier and Pattern Syntax.

<http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr31>

[UAX36] Mark Davis and Michel Suignard. Unicode Security Considerations.

<http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr36>

[UAX44] Ken Whistler and Laurențiu Iancu. Unicode Character Database.

<http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr44>

[UTS51] Mark Davis and Peter Edberg. Unicode Emoji.

<http://www.unicode.org/reports/tr51>