## When the normal window destruction messages are thrown for a loop



devblogs.microsoft.com/oldnewthing/20050727-16

July 27, 2005



Raymond Chen

Last time, I alluded to weirdness that can result in the normal cycle of destruction messages being thrown out of kilter.

Commenter Adrian noted that the WM\_GETMINMAXINFO message arrives before WM\_NCCREATE for top-level windows. This is indeed unfortunate but (mistake or not) it's been that way for over a decade and changing it now would introduce serious compatibility risk.

But that's not the weirdness I had in mind.

Some time ago I was helping to debug a problem with a program that was using the ListView control, and the problem was traced to the program subclassing the ListView control and, through a complicated chain of C++ objects, ending up attempting to destroy the ListView control while it was already in the process of being destroyed.

Let's take <u>our new scratch program</u> and illustrate what happens in a more obvious manner.

```
class RootWindow : public Window
public:
RootWindow() : m_cRecurse(0) { }
private:
void CheckWindow(LPCTSTR pszMessage) {
 OutputDebugString(pszMessage);
  if (IsWindow(m_hwnd)) {
  OutputDebugString(TEXT(" - window still exists\r\n"));
  OutputDebugString(TEXT(" - window no longer exists\r\n"));
 }
 }
private:
HWND m_hwndChild;
UINT m_cRecurse;
};
LRESULT RootWindow::HandleMessage(
                          UINT uMsg, WPARAM wParam, LPARAM lParam)
{
  case WM_NCDESTROY:
  CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_NCDESTROY received"));
  if (m_cRecurse < 2) {</pre>
    m_cRecurse++;
    CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_NCDESTROY recursing"));
    DestroyWindow(m_hwnd);
    CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_NCDESTROY recursion returned"));
  PostQuitMessage(0);
  break;
  case WM_DESTROY:
  CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_DESTROY received"));
  if (m_cRecurse < 1) {</pre>
   m_cRecurse++;
    CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_DESTROY recursing"));
    DestroyWindow(m_hwnd);
    CheckWindow(TEXT("WM_DESTROY recursion returned"));
  }
  break;
}
```

We add some debug traces to make it easier to see what is going on. Run the program, then close it, and watch what happens.

```
WM_DESTROY received - window still exists
WM_DESTROY recursing - window still exists
WM_DESTROY received - window still exists
WM_NCDESTROY received - window still exists
WM_NCDESTROY recursing - window still exists
WM_DESTROY received - window still exists
WM_NCDESTROY received - window still exists
WM_NCDESTROY recursion returned - window no longer exists
Access violation - code c0000005
eax=00267160 ebx=00000000 ecx=00263f40 edx=7c90eb94 esi=00263f40 edi=00000000
eip=0003008f esp=0006f72c ebp=0006f73c iopl=0
                                                nv up ei ng nz na pe cy
cs=001b ss=0023 ds=0023 es=0023 fs=003b gs=0000
                                                                ef1=00000283
0003008f ??
                         ???
```

## Yikes! What happened?

When you clicked the "X" button, this started the window destruction process. As is to be expected, the window received a wm\_destroy message, but the program responds to this by attempting to destroy the window again. Notice that Iswindow reported that the window still exists at this point. This is true: The window does still exist, although it happens to be in the process of being destroyed. In the original scenario, the code that destroyed the window went something like

```
if (IsWindow(hwndToDestroy)) {
  DestroyWindow(hwndToDestroy);
}
```

At any rate, the recursive call to <code>DestroyWindow</code> caused a <code>new</code> window destruction cycle to begin, nested inside the first one. This generates a new <code>WM\_DESTROY</code> message, followed by a <code>WM\_NCDESTROY</code> message. (Notice that this window has now received <code>two WM\_DESTROY</code> messages!) Our bizarro code then makes yet another recursive call to <code>DestroyWindow</code>, which starts a <code>third</code> window destruction cycle. The window gets its third <code>WM\_DESTROY</code> message, then its second <code>WM\_NCDESTROY</code> message, at which point the second recursive call to <code>DestroyWindow</code> returns. At this point, the window no longer exists: <code>DestroyWindow</code> has destroyed the window.

And that's why we crash. The base <code>Window</code> class handles the <code>WM\_NCDESTROY</code> message by destroying the instance variables associated with the window. Therefore, when the innermost <code>DestroyWindow</code> returns, the instance variables have been thrown away. Execution then resumes with the base class's <code>WM\_NCDESTROY</code> handler, which tries to access the instance variables and gets heap garbage, and then makes the even worse no-no of freeing memory that is already freed, thereby corrupting the heap. It is here that we crash, attempting to call the virtual destructor on an already-destructed object.

I intentionally chose to use the new scratch program (which uses C++ objects) instead of the classic scratch program (which uses global variables) to highlight the fact that after the recursive <code>DestroyWindow</code> call, all the instance variables are gone and you are operating on

freed memory.

Moral of the story: Understand your window lifetimes and don't destroy a window that you know already to be in the process of destruction.

## Raymond Chen

## **Follow**

