Subject: Comments on Section 16
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 02-007. 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 associated text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

[The editor was right to re-insert the cross reference for scoping unit. But now this cross reference looks lonesome. Editor: Add "(2.2.1)" after "scope of a program", "(7.5.3, 7.5.4, 8.1)" after "scope of a construct" and "(3.3)" after "scope of a statement".] 381:4-5,7

[A name isn't necessarily global everywhere just because it's global in one scoping unit. Editor: "A" ⇒ "Within the scoping unit, a".] 387:15

[Concerning lines 5-6 of Note 16.13, the editor complains (in 02-101) that the note discusses pointers, then their association status, then uses "they" to refer to one or the other, but to which it's not clear. It's the pointers. Editor: To make this clearer: "the association status ... undefined" ⇒ "such pointers to have an undefined association status".] 390:5+

[The editor wondered whether the *Note to J3* in 01-354r1, after the edit for [379:27-31] in section 2 of that paper, was intended to be a note, an unresolved issue note, or a question for J3 to ponder during meeting 159. It was intended as the last of these, but no discussion ensued, so maybe it ought to be an unresolved issue note:] 393:7+

J3 internal note

Unresolved issue xxx 5.5.2.3 mentions "common blocks with the same name" and "blank common blocks". The above paragraph assumes a blank common block is the same entity no matter how many times it is declared. Which way do we want it?