



Zürich, January 25, 1960

Dear friends,

Last week I received a phone call from A. v. Wijn-
gaarden, who made some comments about my document 1001.
As a consequence, I feel obliged to clarify my standpoint.

First, I must point out, that I am very decided about
point a) of my proposal, which is not just a
matter of taste. In fact, saying that parameter p is an
array, is not a declaration in the usual sense, also the
compiler treats this information different from other de-
clarations. This alone would be no sufficient reason for
my proposal a). However the proposal to write these in-
formations about parameters in form of declarations and
place it inside the procedure compound, besides requiring
artificial exception rules, breaks completely down in case
the parameter p is a switch or procedure, because it
would require to write a declaration for an unknown switch
or procedure. Thus it should be clear that the information
about a parameter must be different from a declaration
(I called it 'reduced declaration', but "specification"
would be a better word). Besides that also from the
standpoint of readability these "specifications" should be
placed into the heading, our syntactical rules do not
allow to place them inside procedure compound.

Second, I do not feel equally strong on point b), (which
gives information on the call side) and I can understand
the rather strong objections of A.V. Wijngaarden. With
regards to part b) of my proposal I would therefore yield
in favor of any reasonable compromise, for instance
P. Haur's proposal.

I feel however, that his additional rules could be
boiled down to

"procedures without parameters
are not allowed"

simply because the only really interesting case of proce-
dure without parameters would be the "function like" proce-
dures and if this has to go I see no reason to make the
distinction in order to save the possibility of procedures
(in the proper sense) without parameters.

With kind regards

H. Reutishauser