Fun with C11 generic selection expression

Zhihao Yuan <zhihao.yuan@rackspace.com>

Part I

Original use

To implement the C99 <tgmath.h>.

```
#define log2(a) _Generic((a),
    long double: log2l,
    default: log2,
    float: log2f)(a)
```

The syntax

```
_Generic(controlling-expr,
	type-name: candidate-expr,
	default: candidate-expr,
	type-name: candidate-expr)
```

The semantics

```
_Generic(controlling-expr,
type-name: candidate-expr,
type-name: candidate-expr,
default: candidate-expr)
```

- 1. All expressions but the selected expression are in unevaluated context.
- 2. Each *type-name* should be a complete object type (no reference types).
- 3. The controlling-expr is decayed.
- 4. No two type-name have the same type; at most one default.
- 5. The result expression preserves the selected expression's value category.

The implementation

Only Clang allows generic selection expression in C++ mode.

What works:

dependent types as candidate types expression SFINAE (e.g., no matched type Is Not An Error)

What doesn't:

in the return type of a function template

Bug (or feature?):

the controlling expression is not decayed

Implications

```
GCC:
                                  Clang:
_Generic("moew", char *: 1);
                                  _Generic("moew", char[5]: 1);
int const i = 1;
_Generic(a, int: 1);
                                  _Generic(a, const int: 1);
                                  auto& lr = i;
                                  _Generic(lr, const int: 1);
```

Implications

```
GCC:
                                  Clang:
_Generic("moew", char *: 1);
                                  _Generic("moew", char[5]: 1);
int const i = 1;
_Generic(a, int: 1);
                                  _Generic(a, const int: 1);
                                  auto& lr = i;
                                  _Generic(lr, const int: 1);
```

In the rest of the talk, Clang's semantics is used.

Part II

Given a type T, examine the type.

Given a type T, examine the type.

First try:

```
_Generic(T{}, ...)
```

Given a type T, examine the type.

```
First try:
   _Generic(T{}, ...)

Second try:
   _Generic(std::declval<T>(), ...)
```

Let's define a macro to simplify the use:

```
#define _Type_generic(T, ...)
   _Generic(std::declval<T>(), __VA_ARGS__)
```

Usage:

```
_Type_generic(type, char: expr, ...)
```

Type generic literals

Given a character type charT, how to produce

```
L"ms" from millisecond_suffix<wchar_t>,
u"ms" from millisecond_suffix<char16_t>, etc.?
```

Type generic literals

Given a character type charT, produces a string literal of charT[N]:

Example:

```
_G(char16_t, "ms") \Rightarrow u"ms"
```

Type generic literals

To answer the original question:

```
template <typename charT>
charT millisecond_suffix[] = _G(charT, "ms");
```

Also works with other standard literal prefixes, suffixes, and UDLs.

Produce a type

Given a generic selection expression, produce the type.

Produce a type

Given a generic selection expression, produce the type.

```
decltype(_Type_generic(...))
```

 $f :: type \rightarrow type$, we got a type function, anonymous.

Type function

Implement the std::is_floating_point trait, the traditional way:

```
template <class T> struct _is_floating_point : false_type {};
template <> struct _is_floating_point<float> : true_type {};
template <> struct _is_floating_point<double> : true_type {};
template <> struct _is_floating_point<long double> : true_type {};
template <class T> struct is_floating_point
    : _is_floating_point<std::remove_cv_t<T>> {};
```

Type function

With generic selection expression:

Given some expressions, select a type to declare a variable.

First try:

```
template <typename T>
void f(T t)
{
   decltype(_Generic(..., default: t)) i;
```

Given some expressions, select a type to declare a variable.

First try:

```
template <typename T>
void f(T t)
{
    decltype(_Generic(..., default: t)) i;
    // this produces T&
```

A generic selection expression is an expression, so

```
\begin{array}{ll} \texttt{decltype(} & \textit{lvalue } \texttt{)} & \Rightarrow \texttt{T\&} \\ \texttt{decltype(} & \textit{xvalue } \texttt{)} & \Rightarrow \texttt{T\&\&} \\ \texttt{decltype(} & \textit{prvalue } \texttt{)} & \Rightarrow \texttt{T} \end{array}
```

Don't forget that the generic selection expression preserves the value category of the selected association expression.

```
int i;
decltype(_Generic(T, void*: i, default: 'a'))
// int& if T is void*, otherwise char
```

Examine a value

Given a constant expression of integral, examine its value.

Examine a value

When producing values of the same type, no better than the ternary operator, nor the constexpr functions.

Examine a value

But producing the heterogeneous answer is a killer app.

Enum dispatching

Given an enum definition, use it in tag dispatching.

Pros of enum: numeric values → computable

Pros of tags: hierarchical relationship → refinable

Enum dispatching

A helper to produce a complete type from an enum:

Enum dispatching

Translate the enum to tags:

```
template <std::float_round_style i>
constexpr auto tag_of = _Generic(enum_ct<i>(),
        enum_ct<std::round_indeterminate>: round_indeterminate_tag(),
        enum_ct<std::round_toward_zero>: round_toward_zero_tag(),
        ... // warning: bad example - no refinement
```

Example:

```
f(..., tag_of<std::round_toward_zero>)
```

Examine a boolean

Given a boolean, examine the value.

```
_Generic(std::bool_constant<v>{},
    std::true_type: ...,
    std::false_type: ...)
```

Examine a boolean

Looks like...

```
switch (v)
{
case true: ...; break;
case false: ...; break;
}
```

Examine a boolean

```
Or even...

if (v)

...

else
```

Given the if statement and compiler optimization, why we still want

```
static if (v)
    true branch
else
    false branch
```

?

```
unevaluated context
else
    potentially evaluated
context
```

```
potentially evaluated context
else
   potentially evaluated context
```

Only the true branch is required to be well-formed.

```
static if (false)
    r = it[i];    // as if SFINAE-out in-place
else
    r = *next(it, i);
```

Both branches are required to be well-formed, but only the true branch is (potentially) evaluated.

But you can generate a function object, delay the instantiation of the operator() — with generic lambda.

```
static_if((s), (std::is_same<T, std::string>{}),
{
    std::cout << s.size() << std::endl;
}, {
    std::cout << std::char_traits<char>::length(s) << std::endl;
});</pre>
```

— for fun only: https://gist.github.com/lichray/ab525cc9e970c0dfb04c

Part III

Inspect...with

- A pattern matching syntax for C++ designed by Bjarne
- Presented at the Urbana meeting, Nov. 2014
- Powered by, probably, Mach7

```
inspect ( expr )
{
    with pattern: ...;
    with pattern: ...; // disclarmer: I forgot the details
    ...
}
```

Inspect...with

Also claims to be able to inspect types instead of expressions (!!)

```
inspect (T)
{
    with Forward_iterator: ...;
    with Random_access_iterator: it[n];
    ...
}
```

Inspect...with

Which means, this works...

```
inspect (std::bool_constant<v>)
{
    with some-identity-concept: true-branch;
    default: false-branch;
}
```

Summary

- Generic selection expressions work like specializations inside the expressions in C++
 - useful, sometimes addictive,
 - o and fun; thank you WG14.
- We want static-if so hard, where
 - the false branch is an unevaluated context, allowed to be illformed, and is discarded,
 - the true branch is a potentially evaluated context,
 - and both provide scopes.

Questions?