

#line is not in line with existing implementation

Document #: P4136R2
Date: 2026-03-24
Programming Language C++
Audience: CWG
Reply-to: Corentin Jabot <corentin.jabot@gmail.com>

History

R2

Remove alternate wording, fix typos.

R1


Fix typos (including the wording of the).

Abstract

The restrictions on #line do not match existing practices. This addresses FR-009-108 15.8

Motivation

[P2843R3](#) [1] made the following change.

 **Line control** **[cpp.line]**

line-directive:
line *pp-tokens new-line*

The *string-literal* of a #line directive, if present, shall be a character string literal.

The *line number* of the current source line is the line number of the current physical source line, i.e., it is one greater than the number of new-line characters read or introduced in translation phase 1[lex.phases] while processing the source file to the current preprocessing token.

A preprocessing directive of the form # line *digit-sequence new-line* causes the implementation to behave as if the following sequence of source lines begins with a source line that has a line number as specified by the digit sequence (interpreted as a decimal integer). If the digit sequence specifies zero or a number greater than 2147483647, the **behavior is undefined**

`program is ill-formed.`

This is great because we want to avoid talking about UB during translation. And generally avoid unnecessary UBs. However, it forces an implementation to diagnose on the following directives:

```
#line 0
#line 2147483648
```

Yet, only EDG diagnoses the first directives, and all implementations accept the second. So the standard is overly restrictive.

In fact, testing Clang, EDG, GCC, and MSVC,

```
#line 0 // edg rejects
#line 2147483647
#line 2147483648 // all accept
#line 4294967295 // all accept
#line 4294967296 // GCC warns, edg and clang reject
#line 9223372036854775807 // GCC warns, edg, and clang reject
#line 9223372036854775808 // GCC warns, edg, and clang reject
```

So the UB that existed in the standard was used as an extension point by implementations, extension point that we accidentally took away, forcing implementations to emit a warning.

Solution

Given that all implementations use different strategies to represent source locations, which have a significant impact on compiler performance, we cannot reasonably mandate widening the requirements.

We should also observe that if a value is accepted by `#line`, the extent to which it is actually preserved in diagnostics varies.

We should also not force a diagnostic in these situation, as lots of existing code, often generated, use these extensions. For example, I've found a few thousands [instances of `#line 0`](#).

This leaves us with two solutions:

- Make the values outside of [1, 2147483647] conditionally supported.
- Make the whole thing implementation supported.

I prefer the second, as the number of physical lines supported is already a QoI. This diverges from C - where values outside of [1, 2147483647] are still UB. But we should realize that no implementation is going to change as a result of this paper, or of the status quo.

Note that in all cases, negative numbers are precluded by the grammar.

Wording approved by EWG

[Editor's note: Modify [cpp.line] as follows]

~~If the digit sequence specifies zero or a number greater than 2147483647, the program is ill-formed.~~ Digit sequences representing a number outside of the range [1,2147483647] are conditionally supported.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Alisdair Meredith for his work on P2843R3!

References

- [1] Alisdair Meredith. P2843R3: Preprocessing is never undefined. <https://wg21.link/p2843r3>, 7 2025.
- [N5008] Thomas Köppe *Working Draft, Standard for Programming Language C++* <https://wg21.link/N5008>