

Subject: Generalization of FORALL
 From: Van Snyder

1 **Number**

2 TBD

3 **Title**

4 Generalization of FORALL.

5 **Submitted By**

6 J3

7 **Status**

8 For consideration.

9 **Basic Functionality**

10 Generalize FORALL to allow CALL statements that refer to pure subroutines.

11 **Rationale**

12 It would be useful to me; I can't see a reason that this wasn't included in the first place.

13 **Estimated Impact**

14 Trivial for the standard, probably nearly trivial for implementors — since they have to be able to call
 15 subroutines to do defined assignment.

16 **Detailed Specification**

17	R756	<i>forall-body-construct</i>	is	<i>forall-action-stmt</i>	148:26
18	R757	<i>forall-action-stmt</i>	is	<i>assignment-stmt</i>	148:31
19			or	<i>call-stmt</i>	148:32+
20	[Replace “ <i>forall-assignment-stmt</i> ” by “ <i>forall-action-statement</i> ” thrice.]				151:14,18,24
21	R759	<i>forall-stmt</i>	is	<i>forall-header forall-action-stmt</i>	153:8
22	[Replace “ <i>forall-assignment-stmt</i> ” by “ <i>forall-action-statement</i> ”.]				153:10
23	[In the second line of Note 12.45, replace “ <i>forall-assignment-stmt</i> ” by “ <i>forall-action-statement</i> ”.]				287:7+21
24	No additional constraints are needed, because C738 would require the subroutine referenced in the				
25	<i>call-stmt</i> to be pure.				

26 **History**