



Properly define blocks as part of the grammar

Jens Gustedt, Martin Uecker

► To cite this version:

Jens Gustedt, Martin Uecker. Properly define blocks as part of the grammar: proposal for C23. [Research Report] 2818, ISO JCT1/SC22/WG14. 2021, pp.3. hal-03363674v1

HAL Id: hal-03363674

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03363674v1>

Submitted on 4 Oct 2021 (v1), last revised 6 Oct 2022 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

2021-9-27

Properly define blocks as part of the grammar proposal for C23

Jens Gustedt¹ and Martin Uecker²¹ INRIA and ICube, Université de Strasbourg, France² University Medical Center Göttingen, Germany

History: Version 1 of this paper was voted 12-1-8 in favor by WG14. It also asked for the clarification about the status of some rarely occurring compound literals; that material has been moved to [N2819](#).

Changes in v2:

- Remove references to `lambdas`.
- Expand changed syntax sections for readability.
- Clarify the lexical range of the block to consist of three parts, the parameter type list, a possible following attribute specifier sequence and then the function body.

1. INTRODUCTION

Blocks are a fundamental concept in C for the definition of visibility scopes of identifiers and for the lifetime of objects. Currently, there is no closed definition what a block is and the different definitions that compose the term have to be collected in different places that spread over several clauses. In particular, the fact that dependent statements of iteration or selection statements form blocks of their own is easily overlooked and leads to misunderstandings for example concerning the lifetime of compound literals.

We propose to change that situation by introducing terms *primary block* and *secondary block* in the syntax and by referring to the other definitions of blocks, namely functions definitions and lambda expressions (if added to C23), in a summary definition.

2. AMBIGUITIES

The current text is not completely clear about the scope of function parameters in function definitions. Whereas it seems clear from examples that previous parameters can already be used as size expression in a VLA parameter, it is less clear whether it is visible in the attribute specifier list that follows the parameter type list.

Current practice and expectation seems to be to make the scope of visibility a lexical scope, that is have it stretch from the parameter declaration to the end of the function body. We propose to make this explicit. This is also consistent with the reach of *function prototype scope* where the scope also stretches to the end of the whole declarator, thus including possible attributes that follow the parameter type list.

3. IMPACT

The proposed changes are meant for clarification and should have no impact on the validity of user code and no implementation would have to change.

4. PROPOSED CHANGES

The following two are the principal changes proposed to the grammar.

CHANGE 1. Replace the content of clause 6.8 p1 by

```

statement:
~~~~~
labeled-statement
expression-statement
attribute-specifier-sequenceopt primary-block
attribute-specifier-sequenceopt jump-statement

primary-block:
~~~~~
compound-statement
selection-statement
iteration-statement

secondary-block:
~~~~~
statement

```

CHANGE 2. Change the start of 6.8 p3 as follows

A block is either a primary block, a secondary block, or the block associated with a function definition; it allows a set of declarations and statements to be grouped into one syntactic unit. Whenever a block *B* appears in the syntax production as part of the definition of an enclosing block *A*, scopes of identifiers and lifetimes of objects that are associated with *B* do not extend to the parts of *A* that are outside of *B*. The initializers of objects that have automatic storage duration, ...

Then, we also need to change the grammar of the three different forms of primary blocks.

CHANGE 3. In 6.8.2 (Compound statement) change p2 as follows:

A compound statement that is a function body together with the parameter type list and the optional attribute specifier sequence between them forms the block associated with the function definition in which it appears. Otherwise, it is a block that is different from any other block.

CHANGE 4. In 6.8.4 p1 and p2 (Selection statements) replace the syntax term ~~statement~~ by secondary-block.

Syntax

1 selection-statement:

```

if ( expression ) statementsecondary-block
if ( expression ) statementsecondary-block else statementsecondary-block
switch ( expression ) statementsecondary-block

```

CHANGE 5. In 6.8.4 p2 replace:

2 A selection statement selects among a set of ~~statements~~secondary blocks depending on the value of a controlling expression.

CHANGE 6. Remove 6.8.4 p3.

~~A selection statement is a block whose scope is a strict subset of the scope of its enclosing block. Each associated substatement is also a block whose scope is a strict subset of the scope of the selection statement.~~

CHANGE 7. In 6.8.5 p1 (*Iteration statements*) replace the syntax term ~~statement~~ by secondary-block:

Syntax

1 iteration-statement:

```

while ( expression ) statementsecondary-block
do statementsecondary-block while ( expression ) ;
for ( expressionopt ; expressionopt ; expressionopt )
statementsecondary-block
for ( declaration expressionopt ; expressionopt ) statementsecondary-block

```

CHANGE 8. Modify 6.8.4 p4.

An iteration statement causes a ~~statement~~secondary block called the loop body to be executed repeatedly until the controlling expression compares equal to 0. The repetition occurs regardless of whether the loop body is entered from the iteration statement or by a jump.¹⁷⁰⁾

CHANGE 9. Remove 6.8.4 p5.

~~An iteration statement is a block whose scope is a strict subset of the scope of its enclosing block. The loop body is also a block whose scope is a strict subset of the scope of the iteration statement.~~

And finally, we make the association of the parameter type list and the function body into a single block explicit.

CHANGE 10. Change 6.9.1 p9 (*Function definitions*) as follows

The parameter type list, the attribute specifier sequence of the declarator that follows the parameter type list, and the compound statement of the function body form a single block.^{FNT1)} Each parameter has automatic storage duration; its identifier, if any¹⁷⁷⁾, is an lvalue.¹⁷⁸⁾ The layout of the storage for parameters is unspecified.

and add the footnote

^{FNT1)} The visibility scope of a parameter in a function definition starts when its declaration is completed, extends to following parameter declarations, to possible attributes that follow the parameter type list, and then to the entire function body. The lifetime of each instance of a parameter starts when the declaration is evaluated starting a call and ends when that call terminates.

CHANGE 11. Apply the analogous changes to the language syntax summary in Annex A.2.3 and A.2.4.

5. QUESTION FOR WG14

QUESTION 1. Shall the indicated changes of N2818 be integrated into C23?