Doc Number:	X3J16/94-0110 WG21/N0497
Date:	March 30, 1994
Project:	Programming Language C++

Summary of Revised Clause 4 [conv]: Standard Conversions

Samuel C. Kendall

Sun Microsystems Laboratories, Inc.

sam.kendall@east.sun.com

This document is part of the work of Tom Plum's subgroup of the Core WG. Mike Cote and I had hoped to have a revised clause [conv] ready for the mailing. Unfortunately that document is not complete. Instead, this document summarizes the conversions without the semantics or the standardese.

Table 1 lists the conversions in their revised categories. Note that the conversions are not just from type to type, but

From	То	Notes		
Lvalue Conversions				
lvalue "T"	rvalue "T"			
lvalue "array of T"	rvalue "pointer to T"			
rvalue "array of T"	rvalue "pointer to T"	a		
lvalue "F"	rvalue "pointer to F"	F is a function type. ^b		
Rvalue Conversions				
rvalue "T"	lvalue "T"	Except in the context of intializing an implied object parameter, T must be const.		
Qualification Conversions				
lvalue "T1"	lvalue "T2"	T2 is T1 with cv-qualifiers added according to those complicated rules (not written down here).		
rvalue "T1"	rvalue "T2"			
Promotions				
<i>cv</i> char ^c <i>cv</i> signed char <i>cv</i> unsigned char <i>cv</i> short <i>cv</i> unsigned short	<i>Implementation-defined, one of:</i> <i>cv</i> int <i>cv</i> unsigned int			
<i>cv</i> wchar_t <i>cv</i> enum E (<i>any enumera-</i> <i>tion type</i>)	Implementation-defined, one of: cv int cv unsigned int cv long cv unsigned long			

Table 1: Conversions

Table 1:	Conversions	(Continued)
----------	-------------	-------------

From	То	Notes			
cv bool	<i>cv</i> int				
cv float	<i>cv</i> double				
Standard ^d Conversions	Standard ^d Conversions				
<i>cv</i> int <i>cv</i> unsigned int <i>cv</i> long <i>cv</i> unsigned long <i>cv</i> double <i>cv</i> long double	cv A	A is any arithmetic type (including bool). Exclude conversions from a type to itself.			
<i>"cv</i> pointer to T" <i>"cv</i> pointer to member of class C of type T"	cv bool				
Constant 0 of type: cv int cv unsigned int cv long cv unsigned long	<i>cv</i> pointer to T <i>"cv</i> pointer to member of class C of type T"				
<i>cv</i> pointer to F	Implementation-defined, one of: "cv pointer to void" no conversion	F is a function type.			
lvalue "cv D"	lvalue "cv B"	B is an unambiguous, accessible base class of D			
rvalue " <i>cv</i> D"	rvalue "cv B"	B is an unambiguous, accessible base class of D			
<i>cv1</i> pointer to <i>cv2</i> D	<i>cv1</i> pointer to <i>cv2</i> B	B is an unambiguous, accessible base class of D.			
<i>cv1</i> pointer to <i>cv2</i> T	cv1 pointer to cv2 void				
<i>cv</i> pointer to member of class B of type T	<i>cv</i> pointer to member of class D of type T	B is an unambiguous, accessible base class of D.			
Ellipsis Conversions					
rvalue "T"		T cannot be a function or array type.			

a. It is odd and perhaps unfortunate that an rvalue array implicitly converts to a pointer, but that's the way the language is now. For example:

// ary-rv1.C, fnc-rv1.C
struct A { int a[10]; };
A f();
int* ip = f().a;
int (*ap)[10] = &f().a;

// ok, rvalue int [10] --> rvalue int* // ill-formed, explicit address of rvalue

The ARM, cfront 3.0, and Microsoft C++ agree.

b. Only lvalue functions (that is, only non-member functions) can convert to pointer type.

```
const char SPACE = ' ';
int i = SPACE;
```

then the second initialization below would be ill-formed:

For most of these conversions, I have put a matching "*cv*" onto the To item; I don't know whether it should be there. Does a "const char" promote to a "const int" or an "int"? It doesn't matter much, but it seemed simpler to put it there, for two reasons: first, to prevent weird loopholes from appearing that allow cv-qualifiers to be dropped; and second, because Tom WIIcox's revised [over.ics.scs] says "standard conversions do not change the ... cv-qualification of the type." d. In the absence of a better name I have called this category "standard conversions". However, the whole clause is titled "Standard Conversions", so either this subset of standard conversions, or the clause itself, should get a different name. I recommend the clause be renamed "Implicit Conversions".

also involve lvalue-ness and constant-ness. This has always been the case; I am just making it more explicit.

Each table entry is an rvalue unless otherwise noted (sometimes, for clarity, we redundantly note that an entry is an rvalue).

Unless noted, each From item can be a constant or a nonconstant (it doesn't matter). All conversions preserve constant-ness; that is, if the From item is a constant, so is the To item.

We need a better word than "item" to refer to the endpoints of a conversion.

This revised clause omits two items of information in the present version of [conv]. First, [conv.arith], Arithmetic conversions. Second, under [conv.ptr] paragraph 1, the conversion of a constant 0 to a pointer when used with various operators. Both of these items belong in clause 5 [expr]. The new [conv] is about implicit conversions in the context of initialization only