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Abstract

string-literals can appear in a context where they are not used to initialize a character array, but are used at compile time for diagnostic messages, preprocessing, and other implementation-defined behaviors. This paper clarifies how compilers should handle these strings.

Motivation

A string-literal can appear in _Pragma, asm, extern, static_assert, [[deprecated]] and [[nodiscard]] attributes...

In all of these cases, the strings are exclusively used at compile time by the compiler, and are as such not evaluated in phase 6. This means they should not be converted to the narrow encoding or any literal encoding specified by an encoding prefix (L, u, U, u8).

Their encoding should therefore not be constrained or otherwise specified, except that these strings can contain any Unicode characters.

This proposal aims to identify contexts in which strings are not evaluated so that they can be handled consistently by compilers.

Revisions

R6

Apply core feedback:

• Reword [over.literal]
• Revert the changes to [cpp]
• Rebase the wording in [dcl.pre]
R5

- Re-specify \texttt{asm} declarations to accept any \textit{balanced-token-seq} rather than trying to put constraints on the \textit{string-literal} they are currently specified to accept. This simplifies the specification and more closely matches existing practices. Following EWG review, additional wording has been added to make it clear that an implementation does not have to support \texttt{asm} statements or any grammar therein. The intent of the proposal is to allow implementer to either allow any kind of grammar they want in \texttt{asm} statements, or allow no grammar whatsoever; No implementation would have to change its handling of \texttt{asm} statements with this proposal. Further work to remove [decl.asm] entirely while leaving the \texttt{asm} keyword reserved for vendor extensions could be the object of a separate paper.
- Fix a number of typos.

R4

- Rebase the wording and wording tweaks.

R3

- Improve wording by not making \textit{unevaluated-string} preprocessing token as preprocessing tokens should not be context dependent. Fix the wording of \texttt{#line} and \texttt{_Pragma} accordingly.
- Append null-terminator during evaluation of string-literals to make it clear that \textit{unevaluated-string} are not null-terminated.
- Adapt the grammar of \texttt{literal-operator-id}
- Adapt the wording of \texttt{extern} to clarify that the linkage specification denotes unicode characters.
- Allow numeric escape sequences in \texttt{asm} statements.

R2

- \textit{unevaluated-string-literal} to \textit{unevaluated-string}.
- Add a note about not disallowing non-printable characters
- Add a note about \textit{unevaluated-string} not being expressions.
- Fix typos.
- Improve wording.
Proposal

Unevaluated string literals can appear in

- _Pragma
- #line directives
- [[nodiscard]] and [[deprecated]] attributes
- extern linkage specifications
- asm statements
- static_assert
- literal operator

We propose that in all of these cases:

- No prefix is allowed
- The string is not converted to the execution encoding.
- universal-character-name and simple-escape-sequence (except \0) are replaced by the corresponding Unicode codepoints, and other escape sequences are ill-formed.

This last point is important. Because the encoding the compiler will convert these strings to is not known, and because UCNs can represent any Unicode characters, numeric-escape-sequences have no use beyond forcing the compiler to contend with invalid code units in diagnostic messages.

All of these changes are breaking changes. However, a survey of open source projects tends to show that none of the restrictions added impact existing code.

This proposal does not specify how unevaluated strings are presented in diagnostic messages.

Non-printable characters and escape sequences

This proposal does not attempt to restrict further the characters allowed in unevaluated strings. In particular, they may contain all manner of space, control characters, invisible characters, and alert. The handling of these characters in diagnostic messages is left as quality of implementation, mostly for simplicity. The alternative would be to only allow graphic characters (General_Category L, M, N, P, S + spaces).

Alternative considered

Allowing and ignoring any prefix

This is arguably the status quo. The issue is that it is hard to teach. Users should be able to expect for example that L"X" is always in the wide execution encoding. It could be argued that
"foo" not being in the narrow-encoding is also confusing, however, there is precedence for that in headers names (which are already not string-literals).

**Allowing prefixes and encode all strings using that prefix**

This is both implementer- and user-hostile. It would force users to use any of u, u8, U on all of their `static assert` which contain non-ASCII characters as it is the only way to obtain a portable encoding. It has the advantage of being mostly consistent (all strings except those in headers names would be encoded using the encoding associated with their prefix) but would break existing code using non-ASCII characters in `static assert` and attributes and litter C++ code with these prefixes, which seems to be a net negative.

**asm declarations**

Several people in SG22, as well as an implementer, raised concerns about banning numeric escape sequences in asm statement as supposedly an implementation could do "something" here. Given the implementation-defined, conditionally supported nature of asm declarations, and existing practice, we decided to modify the grammar to accept any balanced token sequence (which includes string literals). This is consistent with GCC's "extended asm" syntax, notably. Implementations that support a single string literal in asm declarations can, of course, continue to do so with no change required to their implementation and are free to put whichever requirements they need on them. This does not requires an implementation to be able to parse arbitrary balanced-token-seq either. The intent is that any balanced-token-seq not recognized by an implementation that would otherwise support asm statements can be ill-formed.

**Compilers survey**

_Pragma

In _Pragma directives, the standard specifies that the L prefix is ignored. In C, all encoding prefixes are ignored. This divergence is highlighted in CWG897 [2]. MSVC does not support _Pragma(L""). Only Clang supports other prefixes in _Pragma.

Out of the 90 million lines of code of the 1300+ open source projects available on vcpkg, a single use of that feature was found within clang's lexer test suite, for a total of 2000 uses of _Pragma. Similarly, the only uses of _Pragma (u8""), _Pragma (u""), _Pragma (U""), etc were found in Clang's test suite (both because these are valid C and because neither GCC nor Clang are conforming, only L"") is described as valid by the C++ standard).

**Attributes**

Clang does not support strings with an encoding prefix in attributes, other compilers accept them.
**static_assert**

All compilers support strings with an encoding prefix in static assert. MSVC appears to convert the string to the encoding associated with that prefix before displaying it, producing mojibake if a string cannot be represented in the literal encoding. The following diagnostics are emmited by MSVC with `/execution-charset:ascii`:

```cpp
code
static_assert(false, "Your code is on \u00A5");
<source>(1): warning C4566: character represented by universal-character-name \u00F0' cannot be represented in the current code page (20127)
<source>(1): warning C4566: character represented by universal-character-name \u0178' cannot be represented in the current code page (20127)
<source>(1): warning C4566: character represented by universal-character-name \u201D' cannot be represented in the current code page (20127)
<source>(1): warning C4566: character represented by universal-character-name \u00A5' cannot be represented in the current code page (20127)
<source>(1): error C2338: ????

static_assert(false, u8"Your code is on \u00A5");
<source>(1): error C2002: invalid wide-character constant
```

**extern & asm**

No compiler support strings with an encoding prefix in extern and asm statements.

**#line**

GCC and Clang do not support encoding prefix in #line directives.

**Future direction**

This proposal does not prevent supporting constant expression in static_assert or attributes in the future; we can imagine the following grammar:

```cpp
code
static_assert-declaration:
  static_assert ( constant-expression ) ;
  static_assert ( constant-expression , unevaluated-string ) ;
  static_assert ( constant-expression , constant-expression ) ;
```

Those may make `static_assert(true, u8"foo")`; valid again as u8"foo" would be a valid constant expression.
Implementability

This proposal requires implementations to keep around a non-encoded string for diagnostic purposes. This has recently come up in a clang patch to support EBCDIC as the literal encoding. To support diagnostics in this context, especially on a non-EBCDIC platform the original sequence of characters must be retained. This proposal offers a well-specified, portable mechanism to solve this problem.

Wording Challenges

Strings are handled in phases 5 and 6 before the program is parsed, which might force us to have a “reversal” of these phases. `string-literal` and `unevaluated-string-literal` only differ by the context in which they may appear.

It is important to note that `unevaluated-string`, by virtue of not being evaluated, are not C++ expressions. They are purposefully left out of the `literal` grammar. Not being literal, and not being expressions, `unevaluated-string` do not have a value category.

Previous works

P2246R1 [1] removes wording specific to attributes mandating that diagnostic with characters from the basic characters are displayed in diagnostic messages, which was not implementable.

Wording

[Editor's note: Add after "[[lex.string]/p10"]]

- Unevaluated strings

  `unevaluated-string`:
  `string-literal`

  An `unevaluated-string` shall have no encoding-prefix.

  Each `universal-character-name` and each `simple-escape-sequence` in an `unevaluated-string` is replaced by the member of the translation character set it denotes. An `unevaluated-string` that contains a `numeric-escape-sequence` or a `conditional-escape-sequence` is ill-formed.

  An `unevaluated-string` is never evaluated and its interpretation depends on the context in which it appears.

  [Editor's note: “translation set” is defined in P2314R2 [3] in [lex.phases]]
Declarations

Preamble

simple-declaration:
  decl-specifier-seq init-declarator-list_opt ;
  attribute-specifier-seq decl-specifier-seq init-declarator-list ;
  attribute-specifier-seq_opt decl-specifier-seq ref-qualifier_opt [ identifier-list ] initializer ;

static_assert-declaration:
  static_assert ( constant-expression ) ;
  static_assert ( constant-expression, unqualified-string-literal ) ;

[...]

In a static_assert-declaration, the is contextually converted to bool and the converted expression shall be a constant expression ([expr.const]). If the value of the expression when so converted is true, the declaration has no effect. Otherwise, the program is ill-formed, and the resulting diagnostic message[intro.compliance] should include the text of the unqualified-string-literal, if one is supplied.

[Example:

static_assert(sizeof(int) == sizeof(void*), "wrong pointer size");

— end example]

The asm declaration

An asm declaration has the form

asm-declaration:
  attribute-specifier-seq_opt asm ( string-literal balanced-token-seq ) ;

The asm declaration is conditionally-supported; any restrictions on the balanced-token-seq and its meaning is are implementation-defined. The optional attribute-specifier-seq in an asm-declaration appertains to the asm declaration. [Note: Typically it is used to pass information through the implementation to an assembler. — end note]

Linkage specifications

All functions and variables whose names have external linkage and all function types have a language linkage. [Note: Some of the properties associated with an entity with language linkage are specific to each implementation and are not described here. For example, a particular language linkage might be associated with a particular form of representing names of objects and functions with external linkage, or with a particular calling convention, etc. — end note] The default language linkage of all function types, functions, and variables is C++
language linkage. Two function types with different language linkages are distinct types even if they are otherwise identical.

Linkage between C++ and non-C++ code fragments can be achieved using a linkage-specification:

```
linkage-specification:
  extern unevaluated-string-literal { declaration-seq_opt }
  extern unevaluated-string-literal declaration
```

The unevaluated-string-literal indicates the required language linkage [Note: Escape sequences and universal-character-names have been replaced in [lex.string.unevaluated] — end note].

This document specifies the semantics for the unevaluated-string-literal "C" and "C++". Use of a unevaluated-string-literal other than "C" or "C++" is conditionally-supported, with implementation-defined semantics. [Note: Therefore, a linkage-specification with a string-literal-language linkage that is unknown to the implementation requires a diagnostic. — end note] [Note: It is recommended that the spelling of the string-literal-language linkage be taken from the document defining that language. For example, Ada (not ADA) and Fortran or FORTRAN, depending on the vintage. — end note]

Every implementation shall provide for linkage to the C programming language, "C", and C++, "C++". [Example:

```c
complex sqrt(complex); // C++ language linkage by default
extern "C" {
  double sqrt(double); // C language linkage
}
```

— end example]

// [...]

Attributes [dcl.attr]

Deprecated attribute [dcl.attr.deprecated]

The attribute-token deprecated can be used to mark names and entities whose use is still allowed, but is discouraged for some reason. [Note: In particular, deprecated is appropriate for names and entities that are deemed obsolescent or unsafe. — end note] It shall appear at most once in each attribute-list. An attribute-argument-clause may be present and, if present, it shall have the form:

```
( unevaluated-string-literal )
```

[Note: The unevaluated-string-literal in the attribute-argument-clause can be used to explain the rationale for deprecation and/or to suggest a replacing entity. — end note]
Nodiscard attribute

The attribute-token nodiscard may be applied to the declarator-id in a function declaration or to the declaration of a class or enumeration. It shall appear at most once in each attribute-list. An attribute-argument-clause may be present and, if present, shall have the form:

\[(\text{unevaluated-string-clause})\]

A name or entity declared without the nodiscard attribute can later be redeclared with the attribute and vice-versa. [Note: Thus, an entity initially declared without the attribute can be marked as nodiscard by a subsequent redeclaration. However, after an entity is marked as nodiscard, later redeclarations do not remove the nodiscard from the entity. — end note] Redeclarations using different forms of the attribute (with or without the attribute-argument-clause or with different attribute-argument-clause s) are allowed.

A nodiscard type is a (possibly cv-qualified) class or enumeration type marked nodiscard in a reachable declaration. A nodiscard call is either

- a function call expression[expr.call] that calls a function declared nodiscard in a reachable declaration or whose return type is a nodiscard type, or
- an explicit type conversion (??, ??, ??) that constructs an object through a constructor declared nodiscard in a reachable declaration, or that initializes an object of a nodiscard type.

Recommended Practice: Appearance of a nodiscard call as a potentially-evaluated discarded-value expression[expr.prop] is discouraged unless explicitly cast to void. Implementations should issue a warning in such cases. [Note: This is typically because discarding the return value of a nodiscard call has surprising consequences. — end note] The unevaluated-string-clause in a nodiscard attribute-argument-clause should be used in the message of the warning as the rationale for why the result should not be discarded.

User-defined literals

The string-literal or user-defined-string-literal in a literal-operator-id shall have no encoding-prefix and . The unevaluated-string or user-defined-string-literal shall contain no characters other than the implicit terminating \"\" be empty. The ud-suffix of the user-defined-string-literal or the identifier in a literal-operator-id is called a literal suffix identifier. Some literal suffix identifiers are reserved for future standardization; see ?? . A declaration whose literal-operator-id uses such a literal suffix identifier is ill-formed, no diagnostic required.

[...]

9
Acknowledgments

Thank you to Masayoshi Kanke and Peter Brett who offered valuable feedback on this paper!

References


