Subject: Issues 300-303 (All related to FINAL)
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 00-007r3. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by immediately following text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that immediately following text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks for the editor are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

1.1 Issue 300

Issue 300 objects to the word "may," the plurality of "subroutines," and the term "object." There are many other places where the word "may" may be spurious, but we will focus only on the one at hand here.

[Editor: Replace "These subroutines may" by "A final subroutine might".]	51:23
[Editor: Replace "an object" by "a data entity".]	51:24
[Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 300.]	51:25-34
[Editor: "object" ⇒ "entity". There are numerous other nearby places that the editor did not remark where "object" ought to be "entity": [51:39], [59:2], [59:3], [59:4], [59:5], [59:6], [59:7], [59:9], [59:11], [59:13], [59:17], [59:25]. The term "object" is correct at [59:14], [59:18], [59:20], [59:21], [59:42], and [60:4]:]	51:36
[Editor: "objects" ⇒ "entities".]	59:13
[Editor: "objects" ⇒ "entities".]	60:9

1.2 Issue 301

Issue 301 asks if finalizable data entities in specification expressions in nonexecutable scoping units would not be finalized. The answer is that there are no such entities: Specification functions can only be used in array dimensions of dummy arguments, function results, and automatic arrays, which occur only in procedures.

[Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 301.]	59:30-34

1.3 Issue 302

Issue 302 asks if a requirement pertains to a program or a processor, and whether finalizing nonfinalizable objects is defined.

[Editor: "shall be" ⇒ "is".]	110:14
[Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 302. The question about finalization of nonfinalizable objects is nonsense; the sentence is talking about finalizing the finalizable object, *not* the allocatable component of which it is a subobject. The premise of the sentence is that the object is finalizable.]	110:16-21

1.4 Issue 303

Issue 303 asks whether the final subroutine for a function result in a specification expression should be pure.

[Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 303.]	59:35-41
[Editor: Delete "and".]	121:36
[Editor: Before "." insert "and where any final subroutine that is invoked is pure and is not defined with the RECURSIVE keyword". I'm not sure there's a technical reason for the prohibition against recursion. If 00-302 removes the direct restriction against recursive specification functions, there would be no "consistency" justification, either, so in that event the restriction should be removed here, too.]	121:37