

Doc No: **X3J16/95-0095**  
**WG21/N0695**  
Date: Thu, May 18, 1995  
Project: Programming Language C++  
Reply to: John Micco  
(johnm@bedford.symantec.com)

## Proposed Changes to C++ <stdarg>

### Introduction

This document describes some small changes to the `va_start()` macro from <stdarg> that are required in order to make the C language standard argument support work properly for C++. The current definition of `va_start()` has some small wording problems when used in the context of C++.

### ANSI C standard `va_start`

In Austin, the core working group considered whether to allow references as the last parameter prior to the ellipsis in a variable argument list function. In doing so we discussed what limitations C had placed on variable argument list functions in order to be somewhat consistent. The C standard does not restrict (in the language) the use of any argument type prior to the ellipsis of a variable argument list function. For example:

```
void f(char c, ...);    // Legal in ANSI C
void f(int i, ...);    // Legal in ANSI C
```

At issue is the handling of the `va_start()` macro in many implementations of ANSI C. The `va_start()` macro is typically implemented as:

```
#define va_start(p, arg)      p = (va_list) (&arg+1)
```

The argument `arg` to the `va_start()` macro is the argument prior to the ellipsis in the function parameter list. Many implementations of ANSI C promote this argument using the default integral promotions. This led to the ANSI restriction that the second argument to `va_start()` be a type that would result after applying the default integral promotions.

The exact wording of the restriction from the ANSI C standard (X3.159-1989) section 4.8.1.1 p. 123 is:

“The parameter *parmN* is the identifier of the rightmost parameter in the variable parameter list of the function definition (the one just before the ...). If the parameter *parmN* is declared with the register storage class, with a function or array type, or with a type that is not compatible with the type that results after application of the default argument promotions, the behavior is undefined.”

The rationale for ANSI C does not explain the prohibitions on this parameter, but I believe these restrictions are made in support of the common implementation of the `va_start` macro given above. The restrictions are:

- The parameter cannot be declared with the `register` storage class. In ANSI C, the address of variables declared with the register storage class cannot be taken, hence this restriction.
- The size of the parameter must match the size of its declared type. This leads to the prohibition on arrays, functions, and non-promoted arguments. For example consider:

```
void f(char x, ... )
{
    va_list ap;
    va_start(ap,x); // Expands to:
                    // ap = (va_list) (&x+1)
}
```

Given this definition of the `va_start()` macro, implementations which promoted `x` before calling the function `f()` would not calculate the address of the first variable argument properly<sup>1</sup>.

## C++ problems with `va_start`

The ANSI C definition for `va_start()` presented above is clearly not sufficient for C++. There are several problems with it:

- The address of register variables can be taken in C++. This means that the prohibition on the

---

<sup>1</sup>Keep in mind that this is not merely a concession to existing implementations of K & R style C, many hardware implementations (including the MC68000) have data alignment requirements that require the stack be aligned and would not be able to pass a char type parameter in a single byte.

register storage class for C++ is superfluous.

- C++ does not define the “default argument promotions”, and therefore the concept must be extrapolated from the ANSI C definition.
- Reference types in C++ violate the unstated rule of the ANSI C standard that the size of the parameter must match its declared type. For example:

```
void f(double &dr, ...)
{
    va_list ap;
    va_start(ap, dr);          // Expands to:
                                // ap = (va_list) (&dr+1)
}
```

This would fail to yield the address of the variable arguments on most existing implementations of C++.

## Proposed wording for `va_start` in C++

In order to resolve these small problems and enable the existing implementation of `va_start()` to continue to work for C++, I would like to propose the following addition to [lib.support.runtime] section 18.7 in the current draft:

The restrictions placed upon the second parameter to the `va_start()` macro in `<stdarg.h>` should be replaced by:

The parameter `parmN` is the identifier of the rightmost parameter in the variable parameter list of the function definition (the one just before the `...`). If the parameter `parmN` is declared with a function, array or reference type, or with a type that is not compatible with the type that results when passing an argument for which there is no parameter, the behavior is undefined.

See Also: [expr.call], ISO C subclause xxx.

One problem that I noticed with the existing standard is that the concept of passing an argument for which there is no parameter (an ellipsis argument) is not given a name in the C++ standard. I believe this process (called default argument promotion in ANSI C) is the correct restriction for the

### Proposed Changes to C++ `<stdarg.h>`

John Micco X3J16/95-0095 WG21/N0695

`va_start()` macro in C++, and the editor may wish to provide a name for this concept so that the wording in clause 18.7 can be more concise.

This wording allows existing implementations of `va_start` to continue to work properly without adding any severe additional restrictions.

## Summary

The ANSI C restrictions on the second argument to `va_start()` were not quite appropriate for C++, the problem areas identified were:

- Use of “default argument promotions” from the ANSI C standard that does not exist as a term in C++.
- Superfluous prohibition on the register storage class.
- Reference types cause problems for most implementations of variable arguments and do not agree with the underlying intent of the ANSI C standard

These problems were addressed by rewording the restriction on this argument and adding a new prohibition on reference types.