

Re: Return value of malloc(0)

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2006-06/msg00299.html>

- *From:* Pat Lashley <patl+freebsd@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 29 Jun 2006 15:33:08 -0400
-

On Thu, Jun 29, 2006 at 11:44:23AM -0400, Pat Lashley wrote:

> No, our implementation is NOT legal. We always return the SAME value. To
> be legal, we should not return that value again unless it has been
> free()-ed.

It is legal due to brain damaged definition of implementation defined
behaviour, but it violates the spirit of the standard :-)

Perhaps I'm misunderstanding the 'implementation defined behavior' choices in the standard. I thought that it could either 1) Return NULL; or 2) Behave as though it returned a 'minimum allocation' (which cannot be legally de-referenced). But if it did actually perform a 'minimum allocation'; wouldn't it have to return a different value every time to maintain the free() semantics?

-Pat _____
freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list
<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>
To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"