Doc no: N2235=07-0095
Date: 2007-04-17
Reply-To: Gabriel Dos Reis
`gdr@cs.tamu.edu`

Generalized Constant Expressions — Revision 5

Gabriel Dos Reis Bjarne Stroustrup Jens Maurer

Abstract

This paper generalizes the notion of *constant expressions* to include *constant-expression functions* and *user-defined literals*. In addition, some floating-point constant expressions are allowed. The goal is to improve support for generic programming, systems programming, and library building, and to increase C99 compatibility. The proposal allows us to remove long-standing embarassments from some Standard Library components (notably `<limits>`).

1 Introduction

This paper generalizes the notion of constant expressions to include calls to “sufficiently simple” functions (*constexpr functions*) and objects of user-defined types constructed from “sufficiently simple” constructors (*constexpr constructors*.) The proposal aims to

- improve type-safety and portability for code requiring compile time evaluation;
- improve support for systems programming, library building, generic programming; and
- simplify the language definition in the area of constant expression to match existing practice,
- remove embarassments from existing Standard Library components.

Any enhancement of the notion of constant expressions has to carefully consider the entanglement of many different notions, but strongly related. Indeed, the notion of constant expression appears in different contexts:

1. The general notion of compile-time evaluation of expressions, e.g. array bounds, expressions in case-statements, initialization of enumerators in enumeration definition.

2. Specification of values for non-type template-parameters.
3. Static initialization of objects with static storage.

The Standard is carefully written so that it does not require information about template arguments that are available only at link-time, too late to be useful. Similarly, we do not propose to change the already complex and subtle distinction between "static initialization" and "dynamic initialization". However we strieve for more uniform and consistency among related C++ language features and compatibility.

2 Acknowledgment

The suggestions in this proposal directly build on previous work — in particular *Generalized Constant Expressions* [DRS06, DR03] and *Literals for user-defined types* [Str03] — and discussions at committee meetings — in particular in Kona (October 2003), Redmond (October 2004), Mont Tremblant (October 2005), Berlin (April 2006), and Portland (October 2006).

3 Problems

Most of the problems addressed by this proposal have been discussed in previous papers, especially the initial proposal for *Generalized Constant Expressions* [DR03], the proposal for *Literals for user-defined types* [Str03], *Generalized initializer lists* [DRS03], *Initializer lists* [SDR05]. What follows is a brief summary.

3.1 Embarassments with numeric limit constants

The standard `numeric_limits` class template provides uniform syntax to access functionality of `<limits.h>`, but fails to deliver constant expressions. For example, the expression `numeric_limits<int>::max()` while functionally equivalent to the macro `INT_MAX`, is not an integral constant. That is due to an unnecessarily restrictive notion of constant expressions. The result is that macros are preferred in situations where values need to be known at compile time.

The main thrust of this proposal suggests to allow explicitly identified simple functions to be used as part of constant expressions.

3.2 Convoluted bitmask types

The Standard Library [ISO03, §17.3.2.1.2] uses the notion of *bitmask type* described as follows:

> 1 Several types defined in clause 27 are *bitmask types*. Each bitmask type can be implemented as an enumerated type that overloads certain operators, as an integer type, or as a bitset (23.3.5).

2 The bitmask type *bitmask* can be written:

```
enum bitmask {
  V0 = 1 << 0, V1 = 1 << 1, V2 = 1 << 2, V3 = 1 << 3, .....
};
static const bitmask C0(V0);
static const bitmask C1(V1);
static const bitmask C2(V2);
static const bitmask C3(V3);
.....
bitmask operator&(bitmask X, bitmask Y)
         // For exposition only.
         // int_type is an integral type capable of
         // representing all values of bitmask
{ return static_cast<bitmask>(
              static_cast<int_type>(X) &
              static_cast<int_type>(Y)); }
// ...
```

3 Here, the names `C0`, `C1`, etc. represent *bitmask elements* for this particular bitmask type. All such elements have distinct values such that, for any pair `Ci` and `Cj`, `Ci&Ci` is nonzero and `Ci&Cj` is zero.

None of the implementation techniques suggested in the C++ standard text is really satisfactory. We are forced to choose between type safety (“elegance”) and compile-time evaluation (“efficiency”). For example, if a bitmask type is implemented by an enumeration type with overloads of the appropriate operators, then the masking operators no longer deliver constant expressions when the inputs are constant expressions. That is a real efficiency problem for some system programs. On the other hand, if a bitmask is implemented by an integer type or we rely on the implicit conversion of enumerations to int, then the masking operators come for free and are efficient; but the operators do not provide any type guarantees.

This proposal allow efficient implementation of bitmask type, and without loss of type information.

3.3 Brittle enumerated types

The Standard Library [ISO03, §17.3.2.1.1] uses the notion of *enumerated type* defined as follows:

1 Several types defined in clause 27 are *enumerated types*. Each enumerated type may be implemented as an enumeration or as a synonym for an enumeration$^{150)}$.

[with footnote 150]

Such as an integer type, with constant integer values (3.9.1).

2 The enumerated type *enumerated* can be written:

```
enum enumerated { V0, V1, V2, V3, ... };

static const enumerated C0(V0);
static const enumerated C1(V1);
static const enumerated C2(V2);
static const enumerated C3(V3);
....
```

3 Here, the names `C0`, `C1`, etc. represent *enumerated elements* for this particular enumerated type. All such elements have distinct values.

This definition does not prevent user errors, such as accidental use of implicit conversions and operations on the underlying integer type (`operator|`, `operator&`, etc.) Our proposal for literals of user-defined types, combined with constant-expression functions, provide an alternative.

3.4 Unexpected dynamic initialization

In current C++, a variable or static data member declared `const` can be used in an integral constant expression, provided it is of integral type and initialized with constant expression. Similarly, global variables can be statically initialized with constant expressions. However, it is possible to be surprised by expressions that (to someone) "look `const`" but are not. For example in

```
struct S {
    static const int size;
};

const int limit = 2 * S::size;   // dynamic initialization
const int S::size = 256;
const int z = numeric_limits<int>::max(); // dynamic initialization
```

Here, `S::size` is indeed initialized with a constant expression, but that initialization comes "too late" to make `S::size` a constant expression; consequently `limit` may be dynamically initialized. The issue here is that there is no simple, systematic, and reliable way of requesting that a datum be initialized before its use and the initializer must be a constant expression. That problem is addressed using constant-expression values (§4.2).

3.5 Complex rules for simple things

The focus of this proposal is to address the issues mentioned in preceding sections. However, discussions in the Core Working Group at the Berlin meeting (April 2006) concluded that the current rules for integral constant expressions are too complicated, and source of several Defect Reports. Consequently, a "cleanup", *i.e.* adoption of simpler, more general rules is suggested.

4 Suggestions for C++0x

The generalization we propose are articulated in three steps: First, we introduce *constant-expression functions* and use those to generalize constant expressions. Second, we introduce “literals for user-defined type” based on the notion of *constant-expression constructors*. Finally, we describe floating-point constant expressions.

4.1 Constant-expression functions

A function is a *constant-expression function* if

- it returns a value (*i.e.*, has non-`void` return type);
- its body consists of a single statement of the form

  `return` *expr*`;`

  where after substitution of constant expression for the function parameters in *expr*, the resulting expression is a constant expression (possibly involving calls of previously defined constant expression functions); and
- it is declared with the keyword `constexpr`.

This is an elaborate way of saying that a constant-expression function is a named constant expression with parameters, and has been explicitly identified as such. Expressions having the same properties as *expr* above are called *potential constant expressions*. A constant-expression function cannot be called before it is defined.

A constant-expression function may be called with non-constant expressions, in that case there is no requirement that the resulting value be evaluated at compile-time. Here are some examples

```
constexpr int square(int x)
{ return x * x; }               // fine

constexpr long long_max()
{ return 2147483647; }          // fine

constexpr int abs(int x)
{ return x < 0 ? -x : x; }      // fine

constexpr void f(int x)         // error: return type is void
{ /* ... */ }

constexpr int next(int x)
{ return ++x; }                 // error: use of increment

constexpr int g(int n)          // error: body not just ''return expr''
{
   int r = n;
   while (--n > 1) r *= n;
```

```
    return r;
}

constexpr int twice(int x);
enum { bufsz = twice(256) };    // error: twice() isn't (yet) defined

constexpr int fac(int x)
{ return x > 2 ? x * fac(x - 1) : 1; } // error: fac() not defined
                                       // before use

template<typename T>
  constexpr int bytesize(T t)
  { return sizeof (t); }        // fine


float array[square(9)];         // OK -- not C99 VLA
enum { Max = long_max() };      // OK
bitset<abs(-87)> s;              // OK
extern const int medium;
const int high = square(medium); // OK -- dynamic initialization
char buf[bytesize(0)];          // OK -- not C99 VLA
```

Here “fine” indicates that the function body is simple enough to be evaluated as a constant expression given constant expression arguments.

Note that constant-expression functions provide what we usually expect from functional macros combined with usual pass-by-value evaluation (e.g. the argument to `square` is used twice, but evaluated only once) and type safety. The requirement that a constant-expression function can only call previously defined constant-expression functions ensures that we don’t get into any problems related to recursion. Experimental implementations of calls to functions in constant expressions in C++ have long history going back to early versions of CFront.

We (still) prohibit recursion in all its form in constant expressions. That is not strictly necessary because an implementation limit on recursion depth in constant expression evaluation would save us from the possibility of the compiler recursing forever. However, until we see a convincing use case for recursion, we don’t propose to allow it.

A constant expression function must be defined before its first use. For example:

```
struct S {
    constexpr int twice();
    constexpr int t();
private:
    static constexpr int val;  // constexpr variable
};

constexpr int S::val = 7;
constexpr int S::twice() { return val + val; }

constexpr S s = { };
int x1 = s.twice();     // ok
int x2 =  s.t();        // error: S::t() not defined
```

```
constexpr int ff();     // ok
constexpr int gg();     // ok

int x3 = ff();          // error: ff() not defined

constexpr int ff() { return 1; }        // too late
constexpr int gg() { return 2; }

int x4 = gg();  // ok
```

4.2 Constant-expression data

A *constant-expression value* is a variable or data member declared with the `constexpr` specifier. A *constant-expression value* must be initialized with a constant expression or an rvalue constructed by a constant expression constructor with constant expression arguments. For example:

```
const double mass = 9.8;
constexpr double energy = mass * square(56.6); // OK
extern const int side;
constexpr int area = square(side);  // error: square(side) is not a
                                    //   constant expression
```

A variable or data member declared with `constexpr` behaves as if it was declared with `const`, except that it requires initialization before use and its initializer must be a constant-expression. Therefore a `constexpr` variable can always be used as part of a constant expression.

As for other `const` variables, storage need not be allocated for a constant-expression datum, unless its address is taken. For example:

```
constexpr double x = 9484.748;
const double* p = &x;          // the &x forces x into memory
```

4.3 Constant-expression constructors

The notion of constant-expression data generalizes from data with built-in types to data with user-defined types. To construct constant-expression values of user-defined type, one needs the notion of *constant-expression constructor*: a constructor

- declared with the `constexpr` specifier;
- with member-initializer part involving only potential constant-expressions; and
- and the body of which is empty.

A constant-expression constructor is just like a constant-expression function, except that since constructors do not return values their body must be empty and the constant expression evaluation happens in member initializations which must deliver constants if the inputs are constants. An object of user-defined type constructed with a constant-expression constructor and constant expression arguments is called a *user-defined literal*. For example:

```
struct complex {
   constexpr complex(double r, double i) : re(r), im(i) { }

   constexpr double real() { return re; }
   constexpr double imag() { return im; }

private:
   double re;
   double im;
};

constexpr complex I(0, 1);  // OK -- literal complex
```

For a constant-expression constructor:

- the definition is checked for consistency with potential constant expression assumptions. It is an error if the definition does not meet those constraints. A constant-expression constructor is `inline`;
- the use with constant expression arguments is guaranteed to yield a user-defined literal, e.g. an expression with user-defined type that is evaluated at compile time.

A constant-expression constructor may be invoked with non-constant expression arguments — the resulting initialization may then be dynamic. This implies that there is no need to have two versions for constructors that would do the same thing, e.g. one constructor that accepts only constant expression arguments and one that may accept non-constant expression arguments. For example:

```
double x = 1.0;
constexpr complex unit(x, 0); // error: x non-constant
const complex one(x, 0);   // OK, ``ordinary const'' -- dynamic
                           //   initialization

constexpr double xx = I.real();  // OK
complex z(2, 4);           // OK -- ordinary variable
```

When the initializer for an ordinary variable (*i.e.* not a `constexpr`) happens to be a constant, the compiler can choose to do dynamic or static initialization (as ever).

Declaring a constructor `constexpr` will help compilers to identify static initialization and perform appropriate optimizations (like putting literals in read-only memory.) Note that since “ROM” isn’t a concept of the C++ Standard and what to put into ROM is often a quite subtle design decision, this proposal simply allows the programmer to indicate what might be put into ROM (constant-expression data) rather than trying to specify what actually goes into ROM in a particular implementation.

Using the value of an object declared `constexpr` requires the compiler to "remember" its value for use in constant expressions (later in the same translation unit), like is the case for enumerators. For example:

```
constexpr complex v[] = {
     complex(0, 0), complex(1, 1), complex(2, 2)
};
constexpr double x = v[2].real();  // OK
```

Clearly, a compiler might have to "remember" a lot of values, but then memories on systems running compilers tend to be correspondingly large these days. Also, this kind of "compile-time data bloat" can occur only as the result of explicit use of `constexpr` for large arrays.

Note also that `constexpr` values are those that the compiler can evaluate at translation time. In particular, given

```
constexpr int i = 98;
```

the following declaration is ill-formed

```
const int p = (int) &i;   // ERROR
```

because the initializer is not an integral constant expression.

4.3.1 Destructor

Can an user-defined literal be destroyed? Yes. The destructor needs to be trivial. The reason is that a constant-expression is intended to be evaluated by the compiler at translation time just like any other literal of built-in type; in particular no observable side-effect is permitted. Since destructors do not yield values, the only effect they may have is to modify the state of the (executing) environment. Consequently, to preserve behaviour, we require that the destructor for a user-defined literal be trivial.

4.3.2 Copy-constructor

When a user-defined literal is copied, e.g. arguments passing in function call, using a copy constructor and the copy constructor is trivial, then the copy is also a user-defined literal. For example:

```
constexpr complex operator+(complex z, complex w)
{
  return complex(z.real() + w.real(), z.imag() + w.imag());  // fine
}
constexpr complex I2 = I + I;                 // OK

struct resource {
  int id;
```

```
    constexpr resource(int i) : id(i) { }       // fine
    resource(const resource& r) : id(r.id)
    {
      cout << id << " copied" << endl;
    }
  };

  constexpr resource f(resource d)
  { return d; }                 // error: copy-constructor not trivial

  constexpr resource d = f(9);   // error: f(9) not constant expression
```

4.4 Floating-point constant expressions

Traditionally, evaluation of floating-point constant expression at compile-time is a thorny issue. For uniformity and generality, we suggest to allow constant-expression data of floating point types, initialized with any floating-point constant expressions. That will also increase compatibility with C99 [ISO99, §6.6] which allows

> [#5] An expression that evaluates to a constant is required in several contexts. If a floating expression is evaluated in the translation environment, the arithmetic precision and range shall be at least as great as if the expression were being evaluated in the execution environment.

For example, in

```
  constexpr complex w = I + complex(3.5, 8.7);           // OK
```

the variable `w` is as if initialized with `complex(3.5, 9.7)`.

4.5 Changes to the C++ standard

The original proposal [DR03] for generalizing constant expressions did not introduce a new keyword to distinguish constant-expression functions from others. That proposal relied on the compiler recognizing such functions being simple enough for use in constant expression. However, during discussions in the Evolution Group at the Kona meeting (October 2003), the consensus was that we needed syntactic marker. Given that (our proposed **`constexpr`**), a programmer can state that a function is intended to be used in a constant expression and the compiler can diagnose mistakes. We considered this in conjunction with the user-defined literal and initializer-list proposals [Str03, SDR05]. At the Mont Tremblant meeting (October 2005), the Evolution Group agreed on the new declaration specifier `constexpr`, for defining constant-expression functions and constants of user-defined types.

The remaining subsections provide necessary wordings to implement the design outlined in the previous sections.

4.5.1 Syntax

New keyword Add the new keyword `constexpr` to “Table 3” [ISO03, §2.11].

New specifier The keyword `constexpr` is a declaration specifier; modify the grammar in [ISO03, §7.1] as follows:

1 The specifiers that can be used in a declaration are

decl-specifier:
  storage-class-specifier
  type-specifier
  function-specifier
  `friend`
  `typedef`
  `constexpr`

We do not propose to make `constexpr` a *storage-class-specifier* because it can be combined with either `static` or `extern` or `register`, much like `const`. We do not propose to make `constexpr` part of *type-specifier* as a *cv-qualifier* because it is not a new distinct type qualifier, and we don't see a need to distinguish between, say, a type for literal `int`, and a separate type for non-literal `int`. That helps keep the type rules as simple as possible. Finally, we do not propose to make `constexpr` a *function-specifier* because it can be used to define both functions and variables. We don't propose to make `constexpr` applicable to function arguments because it would be meaningless for non-inline functions (the argument would be a constant, but the function wouldn't know which) and because it would lead to complications of the overloading rules (can I overload on `constexpr`-ness? — no).

4.5.2 Semantics

New section Add the following section for the description of `constexpr` semantics:

7.1.6 The `constexpr` specifier [decl.constexpr]

1 The `constexpr` specifier can be applied only to the definition of an object, function, or function template, or the declaration of a static data member of literal type (3.9). [*Note:* Function parameters cannot be declared `constexpr`.] [*Example:*

```
constexpr int square(int x) // OK
{
   return x * x;
}

constexpr int bufsz = 1024; // OK

constexpr struct pixel {   // error: pixel is a type
    int x;
    int y;
};

int next(constexpr int x) // error
{ return x + 1; }
```

```
extern constexpr int memsz;   // error: not a definition
```

—*end example*]

2 A `constexpr` specifier used in a function declaration declares that function to be a *constexpr function*. Similarly, a `constexpr` specifier used in a constructor declaration declares that constructor to be a *constexpr constructor*. Constexpr functions and constexpr constructors are implicitly `inline` (7.1.2). A constexpr function shall not be virtual (10.3).

3 The definition of a constexpr function shall satisfy the following constraints:

- its return type shall be a literal type; and
- its parameter types shall be literal types; and
- its *function-body* shall be a *compound-statement* of the form

  `{ return` *expression*`; }`

  where *expression* is a potential constant expression (5.19); and
- every implicit conversion used in converting *expression* to the function return type (8.5) shall be one of those allowed in a constant expression (5.19).

[*Example:*

```
constexpr int square(int x)
{ return x * x; }             // OK

constexpr long long_max()
{ return 2147483647; }        // OK

constexpr int abs(int x)
{ return x < 0 ? -x : x; }    // OK

constexpr void f(int x)       // error: return type is void
{ /* ... */ }

constexpr int prev(int x)
{ return --x; }               // error: use of decrement

constexpr int g(int x, int n) // error: body not just ``return expr''
{
   int r = 1;
   while (--n > 0) r *= x;
   return r;
}
```

—*end example*]

4 The definition of a constexpr constructor shall satisfy the following constraints:

- its *function-body* is an empty *compound-statement*; and
- every non-static data member or base class sub-object is initialized (12.6.2); and

- every constructor involved in initializing non-static data member and base class sub-objects is a constexpr constructor invoked with potential constant expression arguments, if any.

A trivial copy constructor is also considered a constexpr constructor. [*Example:*

```
struct Length {
   explicit constexpr Length(int i = 0) : val(i) { }
private:
   int val;
};
```

—end example]

5 If the instantiated template specialization of a constexpr function template would fail to satisfy the requirements for a constexpr function, the `constexpr` specifier is ignored and the specialization is not a constexpr function.

6 A `constexpr` specifier used in a non-static member function definition declares that member function to be const (9.3.1). *[Note: The `constexpr` specifier has no other effect on the function type.]* The class of which that function is a member shall be a literal type (3.9). [*Example:*

```
class debug_flag {
public:
   explicit debug_flag(bool);
   constexpr bool is_on();  // error: debug_flag not
                            //         literal type
private:
   bool flag;
};

constexpr int bar(int x, int y) //  OK
{ return x + y + x*y; }
// ...
int bar(int x, int y)       // error: redefinition of bar
{ return x * 2 + 3 * y; }
```

—end example]

7 A `constexpr` specifier used in an object declaration declares it as `const`. The object shall be initialized, and every expression that appears in the *initializer* (8.5) shall be a constant expression. Every implicit conversion used in converting the initializer expressions shall be one of those allowed in a constant expression (5.19). [*Example:*

```
struct pixel {
  int x, y;
};
constexpr pixel ur = { 1294, 1024 }; // OK
constexpr prixel origin;      // error: initializer missing
```

—end example]

Paragraph modification. Modify paragraph §5.3.4/7:

> [*Example:* ~~if `n` is a variable of type `int`~~ **given the definition** `int n = 42`, then `new float[n][5]` is well-formed (because `n` is the *expression* of a *direct-new-declarator*), but `new float[5][n]` is ill-formed (because `n` is not a ~~*constant-expression*~~ **constant expression**). If `n` is negative, the effect of `new float[n][5]` is undefined. —*end example*]

Modify §6.4.2/1

> [...] Any statement within the switch statement can be labeled with one of more case lables as follows:
>
> `case` *constant-expression* :
>
> where the *constant-expression* shall be an integral ~~*constant-expression*~~ **constant expression** (expr.const) is implicitly converted to the promoted type of the switch condition.

Modify §7.2/2:

> An *enumerator-definition* with `=` gives the associated *enumerator* the value indicated by the *constant-expression*. The *constant-expression* shall be ~~of integral or enumeration type~~ **an integral constant expression**. [...]

Modify §9.4.2/2:

> If a `static` data member is of ~~const integral or const enumeration~~ **literal** type, its declaration in the class definition can specify a *constant-initializer* which shall be ~~an integral~~ **a** constant expression (5.19). In that case, the member can appear in ~~integral~~ constant expressions. The member shall still be define

Modify §9.6/1

> [...] The *constant-expression* shall be an integral ~~*constant-expression*~~ **constant expression** with a value greater than or equal to zero. The ~~*constant-expression*~~ **value of the integral constant expression** may be larger than the number of bits in the object representation (basic.types) of the bit-field's type; in such cases the extra bits are used as padding bits and do not participate in the value representation (expr.types) of the bit-field. [...]

Modify §9.6/2

> [...] Only when declaring an unnamed bit-field may the **value of the** *constant-expression* be a ~~value~~ equal to zero.

Modify §12.1

> 7 [...] The implicitly-defined default constructor performs the set of initializations of the class that would be performed by a user-written default constructor for that class with an empty *mem-initializer-list* (12.6.2) and an empty function body. If that user-written default constructor would be ill-formed, the program is ill-formed. **If that user-written default constructor would satisfy the requirements of a constexpr constructor (7.1.6), the implicitly-defined default constructor is constexpr.** Before the implicitly-declared default constructor for a class is implicitly defined, all the implicitly-declared default constructors for its base classes and its non-static data members shall have been implicitly defined. [...]

Modify §14.3.2/1

> [...] an integral ~~*constant-expression*~~ **constant expression** of ~~integral or enumeration type~~.

New paragraph Insert after §3.9/10:

11 A type is a *literal type* if

- it is a scalar type; or
- it is a class type (9) with
  - trivial copy constructor,
  - trivial destructor,
  - at least one constexpr constructor other than the copy constructor,
  - no virtual base classes, and
  - all non-static data members and base classes of literal types; or
- it is an array of literal type.

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §3.6.2/1 as follows:

1 Objects with static storage duration (3.7.1) shall be zero-initialized (8.5) before any other initialization takes place. Zero-initialization and initialization with a constant expression are collectively called *static initialization*; all other initialization is *dynamic initialization*. Objects of POD **or literal** types (3.9) with static storage duration initialized with constant expressions (5.19) shall be initialized before dynamic initialization takes place. Objects with static storage duration defined in namespace scope in the same translation unit and dynamically initialized shall be initialized in the order in which their definition appears in the translation unit. [*Note:* 8.5.1 describes the order in which aggregate members are initialized. The initialization of local static objects is described in 6.7.]

Notice that this proposal does not directly change what is "static initialization" versus "dynamic initialization". We consider the topic to be alrewady subtle and complex. We have extended the set of types for which the notion of static initialization applies by including literal types in that set. In particular given

```
struct B {
   constexpr B(int i) : val(i) { }
   int val;
};
```

the definition of the namespace-scope object

```
B b(3);
```

is subject to static initialization, and *not* dynamic initialization.

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §9.2/4 as follows:

4 A *member-declarator* can contain a *constant-initializer* only if it declares a `static` member (9.4) of `const` ~~integral or `const` enumeration~~ **literal** type~~s~~, see 9.4.2.

4.5.3 Constant expressions revised

Paragraph modification. Replace section 5.19 with

1 Certain contexts require expressions that satisfy additional requirements as detailed in this sub-clause. Such expressions are called constant expressions. [Note: Those expressions can be evaluated during translation.]

> *constant-expression:*
>
> *conditional-expression*

2 A *conditional-expression* is a *constant expression* unless it involves one of the following as a potentially evaluated subexpression (3.2), but subexpressions of logical AND (5.14), logical OR (5.15), and conditional (5.16) operations that are not evaluated are not considered [Note: an overloaded operator invokes a function]:

- `this` (5.1) unless it appears as the *postfix-expression* in a class member access expression, including the result of the implicit transformation in the body of a non-static member function (9.3.1);
- an invocation of a function other than a constexpr function or a constexpr constructor [Note: overload resolution (13.3) is applied as usual];
- an lvalue-to-rvalue conversion (4.1) unless it is applied
  - to an lvalue of integral type that refers to a non-volatile const variable or static data member initialized with constant expressions, or
  - to an lvalue of literal type that refers to a non-volatile object defined with constexpr, or that refers to a sub-object thereof;
- an *id-expression* that refers to a variable or data member of reference type;
- a type conversion from a floating-point type to an integral type (4.9) unless the conversion is directly applied to a floating-point literal;
- a dynamic cast (5.2.7);
- a type conversion from a pointer or pointer-to-member type to a literal type [Note: a user-defined conversion invokes a function];
- a pseudo-destructor call (5.2.4);
- a class member access (5.2.5) unless its *postfix-expression* is of POD or literal type or of pointer to POD or literal type;
- increment (5.2.6) or decrement operations (5.3.2);
- a typeid expression (5.2.8) whose operand is of polymorphic class type;
- a *new-expression* (5.3.4);

- a *delete-expression* (5.3.5);
- a subtraction (5.7) where both operands are pointers;
- a relational (5.9) or equality operator (5.10) where at least one of the operands is a pointer;
- an assignment or a compound assignment (5.17); or
- a *throw-expression* (15.1).

3 A constant expression is an *integral constant expression* if it is of integral or enumeration type. [Note: Such expressions may be used as array bounds (8.3.4, 5.3.4), as case expressions (6.4.2), as bit-field lengths (9.6), as enumerator initializers (7.2), as static member initializers (9.4.2), and as integral or enumeration non-type template arguments (14.3).]

4 If an expression of literal class type is used in a context where an integral constant expression is required, then that class type shall have a single conversion function to an integral or enumeration type and that conversion function shall be constexpr. [*Example:*

```
struct A {
  constexpr A(int i) : val(i) { }
  constexpr operator int() { return val; }
  constexpr operator long() { return 43; }
private:
  int val;
};

template<int> struct X { };

constexpr A a = 42;
X<a> x;            // OK: unique conversion to int
int ary[a];        // error: ambiguous conversion
```

—end example]

5 An expression is a *potential constant expression* if it is a constant expression when all occurrences of function parameters are replaced by arbitrary constant expressions of the appropriate type.

Expressions of user-defined literal types are allowed in contexts where an expression of integral type is required, provided there is a conversion function, uniquement identified by overload resolution. This is coherent with the current practice:

```
struct Z {
  operator int() const { return 42; }
  operator unsigned char() const { return 43; }
};
const Z z = { };
const int n = z;  // OK: n is initialized with 42
const long m = z;  // error: ambiguous conversion

enum E { v1 = 2, v2 = 10 };
E operator+(E, E);

float array[v1 + v2];   // error: v1+v2 not constant
```

We feel that there is an inconsistency in the language design with respect to the way copy-initialization and direct-initialization are handled for built-in types. That is, a class type `T`, the objects `t1` and `t2`

```
T t1 = 2;
T t2(2);
```

are potentially initialized differently, whereas the meanings are the same if `T` is a built-in type. This is just a note; we don't propose any change in that area.

4.5.4 Other changes

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §3.2/2 as follows:

> 2 An expression is *unevaluated* if it is the operand of the `sizeof` operator (5.3.3), or if it is the operand of the `typeid` operator and it is not an lvalue of a polymorphic class type (5.2.8). All other expressions are *potentially evaluated*. An object or non-overloaded function whose name appears as a potentially-evaluated expression is *used* unless it is an object that satisfies the requirements for appearing in ~~an integral~~ **a** constant expression (see 5.19), and the lvalue-to-rvalue conversion (4.1) is immediately applied.

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §3.2/2 as follows:

> 5 ... except that a name to a `const` object with internal or no linkage if the object has the same ~~integral or enumeration~~ **literal** type in all definitions of `D`, and the object is initialized with a constant expression (5.19), ...

Paragraph modification. Change §3.6.2/1 as follows

> [...] A reference with static storage duration and an object of POD **or literal type** with static storage duration can be initialized with a constant expression (5.19); this is called constant initialization.

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §6.7/4 as follows:

> 4 .... A local object of POD **or literal** type (3.9) with static storage duration initialized with a *constant expression* is initialized before its block is first entered. ....

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §9/4 as follows:

> 4 If a `static` data member is of ~~`const` integral or `const` enumeration~~ **literal** type, its declaration in the class definition can specify `constexpr` and its initializer ~~which~~ shall ~~be an integral~~ involve only constant expression**s** (5.19). In that case the member can appear in ~~integral~~ constant expressions. The member shall still be defined in a namespace scope if it is used in the program and the namespace scope definition shall not contain an *initializer*.

Paragraph modification Modify paragraph §14.6.2.3/1 as follows:

> 2 An *identifier* is value-dependent if it is:
>
> — a name declared with a dependent type,
>
> — the name of a non-type template parameter,
>
> — a constant with ~~integral or enumeration~~ **literal** type and is initialized with an expression that is value-dependent.
>
> ....

Extend paragraph §14.7.2/1:

> [...] **An explicit instantiation of a function template shall not use the `inline` or `constexpr` specifiers.**

5 Related proposals

5.1 Standard Library changes

We plan to propose changes to the standard library to take advantage of `constexpr`. Obvious candidates are `numeric_limits`, `bitmask`, and `enumerated` as described in §3 and `initializer_list`.

5.2 Non-type template parameter

The suggestion of extending non-type template parameter type to literal types will be subject of an independent proposal.

5.3 Generalizing PODs

There is a suggestion to extend the notion of POD. That suggestion is independent, in scope, of this constant expression proposal. The definition of "literal type" as suggested in this paper may be a starting point for that proposal.

6 Acknowledgments

Thanks to the committee members who provided feedback, suggestions for improvement, as expressed in face-to-face meetings or on the standard reflectors.

References

[DR03] Gabriel Dos Reis. Generalized Constant Expressions. Technical Report N1521=03-0104, ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21, `http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2003/n1521.pdf`, September 2003.

[DRS03] Gabriel Dos Reis and Bjarne Stroustrup. Generalized initializer list. Technical Report N1509=03-0092, ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21, `http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2003/n1509.pdf`, September 2003.

[DRS06] Gabriel Dos Reis and Bjarne Stroustrup. Generalized Constant Expressions – Revision 2. Technical Report N1972=06-0042, ISO/IEC SC22/JTC1/WG21, February 2006. Supersedes [DR03].

[ISO99] International Organization for Standards. *International Standard ISO/IEC 9899. Programming Languages — C*, 1999.

[ISO03] International Organization for Standards. *International Standard ISO/IEC 14882. Programming Languages — C++*, 2nd edition, 2003.

[SDR05] Bjarne Stroustrup and Gabriel Dos Reis. Initializer lists. Technical Report N1919=05-0179, ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21, `http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2005/n1919.pdf`, December 2005.

[Str03] Bjarne Stroustrup. Literals for user-defined types. Technical Report N1511=03-0094, ISO/IEC JTC1/SC22/WG21, `http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2003/n1511.pdf`, September 2003.