Q: Why is `*a` the same as `a []` in a parameter declaration? [p. 266]

A: Both indicate that the argument is expected to be a pointer. The same operations on `a` are possible in both cases (pointer arithmetic and array subscripting, in particular). And, in both cases, `a` itself can be assigned a new value within the function. (Although C allows us to use the name of an array *variable* only as a "constant pointer," there's no such restriction on the name of an array *parameter*.)

Q: Is it better style to declare an array parameter as `*a` or `a []`?

A: That's a tough one. From one standpoint, `a []` is the obvious choice, since `*a` is ambiguous (does the function want an array of objects or a pointer to a single object?). On the other hand, many programmers argue that declaring the parameter as `*a` is more accurate, since it reminds us that only a pointer is passed, not a copy of the array. Others switch between `*a` and `a []`, depending on whether the function uses pointer arithmetic or subscripting to access the elements of the array. (That's the approach I'll use.) In practice, `*a` is more common than `a []`, so you'd better get used to it. For what it's worth, Dennis Ritchie now refers to the `a []` notation as "a living fossil" that "serves as much to confuse the learner as to alert the reader."

Q: We've seen that arrays and pointers are closely related in C. Would it be accurate to say that they're interchangeable?

A: No. It's true that array *parameters* are interchangeable with pointer parameters, but array *variables* aren't the same as pointer variables. Technically, the name of an array isn't a pointer; rather, the C compiler *converts* it to a pointer when necessary. To see this difference more clearly, consider what happens when we apply the `sizeof` operator to an array `a`. The value of `sizeof(a)` is the total number of bytes in the array—the size of each element multiplied by the number of elements. But if `p` is a pointer variable, `sizeof(p)` is the number of bytes required to store a pointer value.

Q: You said that treating a two-dimensional array as one-dimensional works with "most" C compilers. Doesn't it work with all compilers? [p. 268]

A: No. Some modern "bounds-checking" compilers track not only the type of a pointer, but—when it points to an array—also the length of the array. For example, suppose that `p` is assigned a pointer to `a[0][0]`. Technically, `p` points to the first element of `a[0]`, a one-dimensional array. If we increment `p` repeatedly in an effort to visit all the elements of `a`, we'll go out of bounds once `p` goes past the last element of `a[0]`. A compiler that performs bounds-checking may insert code to check that `p` is used only to access elements in the array pointed to by `a[0]`; an attempt to increment `p` past the end of this array would be detected as an error.

Q: If `a` is a two-dimensional array, why can we pass `a[0]`—but not `a` itself—to `find_largest`? Don't both `a` and `a[0]` point to the same place (the beginning of the array)? [p. 270]

A: They do, as a matter of fact—both point to element `a[0][0]`. The problem is that