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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
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.
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