

# Re: casting

---

*Source:* [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-06/msg01247.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-06/msg01247.html)

---

- *From:* Keith Thompson <kst-u@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 10 Jun 2006 13:44:10 GMT
- 

Richard Heathfield <invalid@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

jaysome said:

<snip>

So what you're saying is that the consequences of "implementation defined behaviour" could be the same as the consequences of "undefined behaviour"?

If that were the case, and I'm not saying that it is or isn't, shouldn't we expect some hard-core pedantics to start telling us that use of "implementation defined behaviour" could lead to formatting of our hard drives?

It *can*\*. And in some cases it does.

The difference is that, for implementation-defined behaviour, the implementation is required to *document*\* this effect. If you want to format your drive, such a feature can be extremely useful, n'est-ce-pas?

The other difference is that, in the case of implementation-defined behavior, the standard provides two or more possibilities and the implementation has to pick one of them. (Unspecified behavior is the same, except that the implementation needn't document its choice.)

These terms are all defined in section 3 of the standard.

—  
Keith Thompson (The\_Other\_Keith) [kst-u@xxxxxxx](mailto:kst-u@xxxxxxx) <<http://www.ghoti.net/~kst>>  
San Diego Supercomputer Center <\*> <<http://users.sdsc.edu/~kst>>  
We must do something. This is something. Therefore, we must do this.