Date:26 June 1998To:J3From:Van SnyderSubject:Discussion paper - Explicitly typed expressions and dummy argumentsReferences:98-124, 98-146, 98-160, 98-171, 98-172

Paper 98-124 advocated explicitly typed array constructors. Papers 98-146, 98-160 and 98-172 advocated explicitly typed allocations. Paper 98-171 indirectly advocated allowing function result types to participate in generic resolution.

All of these facilities could be brought together in a consistent way by allowing an explicit type declaration to precede a primary in an expression. This facility has utility even when using function result types for generic resolution. For example if one has the two enumeration types used in paper 98-171:

TYPE :: COLOR => UNORDERED(RED, GREEN, BLUE)
TYPE :: NAMES => UNORDERED(WHITE, BROWN, BLACK, GREEN, BLUE)

and some functions with the generic name FUN that take arguments of types COLOR and NAMES, the reference FUN (GREEN) is ambiguous, but FUN (TYPE(COLOR) :: GREEN) is not.

The reasoning in the standard about type conversions in expressions could be spelled out in terms of facilities within the language. E.g.

0.5d0 + 3 becomes 0.5d0 + REAL(KIND(0.5d0)) :: 3 becomes 0.5d0 + REAL(KIND(0.5d0)) :: REAL(3) becomes 0.5d0 + REAL(KIND(0.5d0))(3)

Some people prefer to define everything about a name in one place. This is almost possible, except in the case of dummy argument declarations. Allowing an entire type declaration, including attributes, followed by "::", to precede dummy argument names in procedure headers, would allow this style. (It would not become required.) If any argument includes such a declaration, they all must (so as to avoid ambiguity between type and attribute names, and argument names).

For example, the following two interface body declarations would be equivalent: