

CSE 3302 Notes 9: Subprograms

(Last updated 4/2/14 7:23 PM)

9.1. INTRODUCTION

Process and Data Abstraction . . . reusability, modularity . . . “software ICs”

<http://www.cs.dartmouth.edu/~Edoug/components.txt>

Data - Cardelli & Wegner *ACM Computing Surveys* (1985) article,

<http://dl.acm.org.ezproxy.uta.edu/citation.cfm?doid=6041.6042>

Process - W.P. Stevens, G.J. Myers, and L.L. Constantine, “Structured Design”, *IBM Systems Journal*, Vol 13 (2), 1974, 115-139,

<http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.ezproxy.uta.edu/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=5388187>

Cohesiveness - coincidental, logical, temporal, communicational, sequential, functional

Lambda calculus / function application as a model of computation:

<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES09/lambdaLand.rkt>

9.2. FUNDAMENTALS OF SUBPROGRAMS

Interfacing -

Input - Parameters (passed by value)

Output - return value or parameters (passed by reference)

State Changes - input/output parameters, encapsulated data structure/object, globals, database/files . . .

Relationship with caller - if any, or existence as a process/thread

Identity (“key”) - parameter profile/signature/prototype/protocol . . . *overloading*

Given a number of similar definitions (including inheritance), what are the possibilities for matching a call under the presence of coercions (C++)?

Parameters -

Positional

Keyword

Flexible arity -

<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES05/poly.c> (varargs, notes 05)

JavaScript - every function has a local variable `arguments` that accesses (and aliases) the argument list

9.3. DESIGN ISSUES

List of questions regarding subprogram support in a PL (Sebesta, p. 397):

Are the types of the actual parameters checked against the types of formal parameters?

<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES09/separate1.c>

<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES09/separate2.c>

9.4. LOCAL VARIABLES

Nothing new . . .

9.5. PARAMETER PASSING METHODS

Call-by-value - a copy of the object is created

Call-by-reference - a pointer to the object is passed, so the object may be modified
(Java situation for objects, C for arrays, is occasionally referred to as call-by-sharing)

Pascal - both -by-value and -by-reference are available for all objects

By-value - even arrays, structures, and sets will be copied
(aside: compiler “avoidance” or “persistent” data structures?)

To pass by reference - `var` keyword before parameter

Not difficult to mix these together

```
procedure c(var x:integer)
begin
end;
```

```
procedure d(x:integer)
begin
end;
```

```
procedure b(var x:integer)
begin
  c(x);
  d(x);
end;
```

```
procedure a;
var x:integer;
begin
  b(x);
end;
```

C

By-value - scalars, structures

By-reference - arrays

Mixing these is messy (but C++ uses & in parameter list to simulate var)

<pre>c(int *x) { }</pre>	<pre>void c(int &x) { }</pre>
<pre>d(int x) { }</pre>	<pre>void d(int x) { }</pre>
<pre>b(int *x) { c(x); d(*x); }</pre>	<pre>void b(int &x) { c(x); d(x); }</pre>
<pre>a() { int x; b(&x); }</pre>	<pre>void a() { int x; b(x); }</pre>

Call-by-name - behaves as though the argument *expression* is substituted into function

No concern for scope (involved variables are by-reference in original scope)

Simple examples look like call-by-reference

Like macros (but “dynamic” . . . “textual substitution”) - don’t take the call to the function, *take the function to the call*

Each argument expression may have associated code (“think”) to support the use of the expression as an r-value and an l-value

Relationship between arguments

<pre>swap(x, y) t=x; x=y; y=t;</pre>	<pre>swap(i, a[i]) t=i; i=a[i]; a[i]=t</pre>	<pre>swap(a[i], i) t=a[i]; a[i]=i; i=t;</pre>
--	--	---

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Man_or_boy_test (1964) brings recursion to the party ...

Passing arrays:

```
int a[10][20][30],***c;

void printMat1(int m,int n,int p,int ***c)
{
int i,j,k;

for (i=0;i<m;i++)
  for (j=0;j<n;j++)
    for (k=0;k<p;k++)
      printf("[%d][%d][%d]=%d\n",i,j,k,c[i][j][k]);
}

void printMat2(int m,int n,int p,int c[][20][30])
{
int i,j,k;

for (i=0;i<m;i++)
  for (j=0;j<n;j++)
    for (k=0;k<p;k++)
      printf("[%d][%d][%d]=%d\n",i,j,k,c[i][j][k]);
}

printMat1(10,20,30,c);
printMat2(10,20,30,a);
#error "1"
printMat2(10,20,30,c);
#error "2"
printMat1(10,20,30,a);
```

9.6. PARAMETERS THAT ARE SUBPROGRAMS

Binding time of referencing environment for a subprogram

Shallow Binding - ignore (goes along with dynamic scoping, e.g. Perl . . . stack-like)

Deep Binding

Static/lexical binding

Static chain pointer created *at same time as* reference to function (*closure*)

Problem when reference to function persists longer than stack frame

Solution - anything needed for closure gets heap allocation (and garbage collection)

Like object systems

Like functional languages

JavaScript (<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/closure.html>)

9.7. CALLING SUBPROGRAMS INDIRECTLY

Classic UNIX/C data structure examples:

```
void qsort(void *base, size_t nmemb, size_t size,
           int(*compar)(const void *, const void *));

void *bsearch(const void *key, const void *base, size_t nmemb,
              size_t size, int (*compar)(const void *, const void *));
```

Pascal - avoids issues by requiring passed procedures to have only by-value parameters

9.8. OVERLOADED SUBPROGRAMS (<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES05/poly.c>)

9.9. GENERIC SUBPROGRAMS

Options:

Macros - C (<http://ranger.uta.edu/~weems/NOTES3302/NEWNOTES/NOTES09/Qmacro.c>)

- stringify token

- concatenate tokens

<pre>// Macro definition #define Q(name,n,typ) \ typ Q##name[(n)+1]; \ int Q##name##Tail=0,Q##name##Head=0; \ int Qempty##name() \ { return Q##name##Tail==Q##name##Head; } \ \ int Qenqueue##name(typ x) \ { \ Q##name[Q##name##Tail++]=x; \ if (Q##name##Tail==(n)+1) \ { \ printf("Qenqueue%s error\n",#name); \ Q##name##Tail=0; \ } \ if (Qempty##name()) \ exit(0); \ } \ \ typ Qdequeue##name() \ { \ typ temp; \ if (Qempty##name()) \ { \ printf("Qdequeue%s error\n",#name); \ exit(0); \ } \ temp=Q##name[Q##name##Head++]; \ if (Q##name##Head==(n)+1) \ Q##name##Head=0; \ return temp; \ }</pre>	<pre>// Macro application Q(TenInts,10,int) ... for (i=0;i<10;i++) QenqueueTenInts(i); for (i=0;i<10;i++) if (i!=QdequeueTenInts()) exit(0); if (QemptyTenInts()) printf("TenInts works\n");</pre>
--	--

Dynamic Binding

Concept

Write general code in terms of a base class

New situations are handled by subclassing/method overriding

Runtime penalty for homogeneous situations?

Type errors are left to run-time

Generics

Concept

Similar to ML lists - all items have same type (oversimplified)

Still necessary to have methods/functions for new types

Can be defined with several involved type variables

Type variables could still involve dynamic binding

Type issues detected at compile time

Java - still only one bytecode block of code, regardless of number of instantiations

C++ (templates) - version of code for each instantiation

9.10. DESIGN ISSUES FOR FUNCTIONS

Side effects and nature of returned values

9.11. USER-DEFINED OVERLOADED OPERATORS

Ada, C++, ML

Issues: Arity, types, associativity, infix/functional notation, precedence

Fixed set of symbols to be overloaded? Or can new “original” operators be created?

9.12. CLOSURES

9.13. COROUTINES

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Named_pipe