Subject: Enumerations that are new types, and their enumerators

From: Van Snyder Reference: 98-194r1

1 Number

2 TBD

3 2 Title

4 Enumerations that are new types, and their enumerators

5 3 Submitted By

6 J3

7 4 Status

8 For consideration.

9 5 Basic Functionality

10 Provide enumerations that are new types, not a shorthand for named constants of integer type.

11 6 Rationale

- 12 Enumerations that are aliases for integer kinds provide none of the benefits of strong typing. Enumera-
- tions have far broader uses than C interoperoperability. For example, using them as array dimensions,
- 14 do inductors and subscripts allows compilers to provide subscript checking at low run-time cost —
- 15 frequently zero cost.

7 Estimated Impact

- 17 This is a moderate project, requiring changes (but not extensive ones) in Sections 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13
- and maybe 15.

19 8 Detailed Specification

- 20 Provide for ordered and unordered enumerations. For ordered enumerations, an explicit value cannot
- 21 be specified for any enumerator other than the first one of the type, and all relational operations are
- 22 defined between enumerators of the type. For unordered enumerations, an explicit value can be specified
- 23 for any enumerator of the type, and the only relational operations defined are equality and inequality.
- 24 The following is based on 98-194r1, which proposed also to provide C interoperable enumerations. C
- 25 interoperability is not an essential part of this proposal; it could be removed without significant com-
- 26 promise to the facility.
- 27 One way to declare enumerations and their enumerators is to extend the TYPE statement. This is used
- 28 as a vehicle to illustrate some of the advocated features.

```
29
    R1
            type-definition-stmt
                                              TYPE [,enum-spec-list] :: enum-definition-list
    R2
            enum-definition
                                              type-name => enumerators
30
    R3
            enum-spec
                                              access-spec
31
                                          is
                                             BIND(C)
32
                                              ORDERED [ ( kind-selector ) ] ( first-ordered-enum ■
    R4
            enumerators
33
                                              \blacksquare [, ordered-enum-list])
34
                                              UNORDERED [ ( kind-selector ) ] ( unordered-enum-list )
35
```

31 January 2004 Page 1 of 4

```
R5
            first-ordered-enum
                                             named\text{-}constant \ [\ (\ explicit\text{-}shape\text{-}spec\ )\ ]\ \blacksquare
 1
                                              \blacksquare [ = enum-initializer
 2
    R6
            ordered-enum
                                              named-constant [ ( explicit-shape-spec ) ]
                                         is
 3
                                             named\text{-}constant [= enum\text{-}initializer]
    R7
            unordered-enum
                                         is
 4
    R.8
            enum-initializer
                                              scalar-int-initialization-expr
                                         is
 5
                                             boz-literal-constant
 6
 7
    If BIND(C) is specified, C representational rules apply, and kind-selector is not allowed.
    If kind-selector is not specified, the kind of integer used to represent the enumeration is selected by the
 8
 9
    processor. The processor is not required to select the same kind for different enumerations. If kind-
    selector is specified it shall be a valid integer kind type parameter. The only reason to allow to specify
10
    a kind-selector is to allow storage association with objects of integer type. If this is not desired, the
11
    ability to specify a kind-selector should not be included.
12
    The "::" is not optional, because of the presence of the => symbol, just as it is not optional in the case
13
    of initializing a pointer object by using "=> NULL()" in a type-declaration-stmt.
    Enumeration types cannot be parameterized. Enumerators of enumeration types can be renamed during
15
    USE association.
16
    What is the effect of USE, ONLY on an enumeration? Does it make just the type available, or the type
17
18
    and the enumerators? Either way is probably wrong for some circumstances. It would be useful to have
    two syntaxes, one to say "use only the type," say, USE, ONLY: T, and another to say "use only the type
19
    and its enumerators," say, USE, ONLY: T()."
20
    Objects of enumeration types can be declared by using
21
    TYPE(type-name) :: enumeration-variable or
22
    TYPE(type-name), PARAMETER :: enumeration-constant-name = initialization-expr or
23
    TYPE(type-name) \dots FUNCTION \dots
24
    BIND(C) objects of enumeration types cannot appear in COMMON, in EQUIVALENCE, or as compo-
25
    nents of SEQUENCE derived types. Maybe it's ok for non-BIND(C) objects.
26
    The intrinsic function INT may be used to retrieve the numeric representation of an enumerator or object
27
    of enumeration type. If no enum-initializer is specified for the first enumerator, it is represented by zero.
28
    If it is an array enumerator its first value is represented by zero. If no enum-initializer is specified for
29
    the k'th enumerator, it is represented by SIZE(k-1)th enumerator) + INT(k-1)th enumerator). If an
30
    enum-initializer is specified the enumerator is represented by the value of the enum-initializer. If the
31
32
    enumerator is an array enumerator, its first value is enum-initializer.
    The size of scalar enumerators is one. The size of an array enumerator is the number of values. The
33
    SIZE intrinsic function may be used to retrieve the size of an enumerator.
34
    If explicit-shape-spec is specified for an enumerator, the size shall be positive. If E is an enumerator with
35
    bounds e_1:e_2, E(e_1) denotes the first value, etc., E and E(k:l) are sequences of values of the type
36
    of E, and INT(E) and INT(E(k:l)) are sequences of integers. INT(E(k)) = INT(E(e_1)) + k - e_1 + 1.
37
    LBOUND(E) returns e_1 and UBOUND(E) returns e_2.
38
39
    It is useful to allow enumerators of ordered enumerations to have a size other than one so that one can
    declare a type with enumerators having representations, say, 0, 1 and 10, while still guaranteeing that
40
41
    there are no gaps or duplications in the set of values of the type. Another application is to define an
    enumeration with one enumerator of a specified size, which is used as an array bound. If a variable of
42
    the type is then used as a subscript, array bounds checking has no cost (at least at the point of use as
43
    a subscript — but maybe it does where the variable gets a value). Here's an example:
      TYPE :: E => ORDERED ( EV (10) )
45
      REAL :: X(E)
46
      TYPE(E) :: V
47
      DO V = TINY(V), HUGE(V) ! No check needed for value of V here
48
49
         PRINT *, X(V)
                                   ! Bounds checking for X is FREE!
      END DO
50
```

31 January 2004 Page 2 of 4

- 1 You also can simulate unsigned integers there's no arithmetic (not directly, anyway), but you have a
- 2 better chance of getting the right representation than with SELECTED_INT_KIND. Here's an example:
- 3 TYPE :: B => BV(256).
- 4 It is possible for two enumerators of an unordered enumeration to have the same representation.
- 5 The intrinsic function KIND may be applied to a value of enumeration type to determine the kind of
- 6 integer used to represent values of the type. The kind value of a BIND(C) enumerator could be -1 if
- 7 the companion processor uses a representation for its type for which the Fortran processor has no kind.
- 8 The only intrinsic operations defined on values of unordered enumeration types are assignment (=),
- 9 equality (.EQ. or ==), and inequality (.NE. or /=).
- 10 If the proposal to add function result type, kind and rank to the criteria for generic resolution is adopted,
- 11 enumerators should be considered to be generic functions with no arguments and scalar result even
- 12 though they are referenced without an empty argument list. This would allow enumerators in different
- 13 enumerations to have the same name.

8.1 Additional features of ordered enumerations

- All numeric relational operators are defined on values of ordered enumeration types.
- Scalar values of ordered enumeration types may be used in SELECT CASE constructs and DO constructs. Array ones may be used in CASE statements.
- TINY and HUGE are defined for objects of ordered enumeration types, and return the first and last enumerator of the type, respectively (not an integer). Thus if one has a variable V of an ordered enumeration type, it is permitted to write DO V = TINY(V), HUGE(V), to use TINY(V) and HUGE(V) for array dimensions, etc.
- The name of an ordered enumeration type may be used as a specification for a dimension of an explicit-shape array. The bounds in that case are TINY and HUGE for the type. Scalar values of ordered enumeration types may be used as array bounds. If an array has a dimension bound given by a value of an object of an ordered enumeration type, the other bound of that dimension shall be of the same type, or omitted (in which case it is taken to be TINY or HUGE for the type, as appropriate). If the bound for a dimension is specified by the name or a value of an enumeration type, a subscript for that dimension shall be of the same type as the bound. A subscript range shall consist of scalar values of an enumeration type. An omitted lower or upper bound of a subscript range is taken to be TINY or HUGE for the type, respectively. An increment of a subscript triplet is an integer. This also applies to declarations of and references to array enumerators.
- Should increments for subscript ranges of enumeration types be prohibited?

Straw vote

• For each ordered enumeration, an elemental constructor having the same name as the type is defined. It takes a single integer argument and returns a value of the enumeration type. One can guard against an out-of-range argument by writing, e.g.

```
IF ( I >= INT(TINY(V)) .AND. I <= INT(HUGE(V)) ) V = \langle type-of-V \rangle (I)
```

36 37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

A constructor is not provided for unordered enumerations because different enumerators of the type may have the same representation, and there may be integers between the smallest one that represents a value of the type and the largest one that represents a value of the type that do not represent values of the type.

- Two elemental intrinsic functions are defined, say SUCC and PRED (spelling negotiable) that return the successor and predecessor of a value of an ordered enumeration type. The result is the same type as the argument, not an integer.
- Should SUCC and PRED be provided?

Straw Vote

31 January 2004 Page 3 of 4

- Should SUCC(HUGE(V)) be an error, or TINY(V)? The obvious anti-symmetric question applies Straw Vote
- to PRED. Whatever choice is made for the behavior of SUCC and PRED, one can guard against
- the error, or detect wrap-around, similarly to guarding against the error in the constructor.

4 8.2 Formatted input/output

- 5 Formatted input and output of values of enumeration types uses the text of the enumerator, without
- 6 regard to case. For objects of unordered enumeration types other than enumerators, several enumerators
- 7 may have the same representation. In this case, the output is processor dependent. For elements of array
- 8 enumerators or objects having values that correspond to elements of array enumerators, the subscript
- 9 shall be included. This could cause an arbitrarily large amount of output, or require an arbitrarily large
- 10 amount of input, in the case that the bounds of an array enumerator are given by another enumerator,
- 11 etc.

12 8.3 Alternatives for descoping of ambition

- 13 The facility could be simplified by removing array enumerators, and prohibiting enumerators of an
- 14 unordered enumeration from having the same representation. Descoping the proposal in either or both
- 15 of these ways should not result in abandoning it altogether.

16 9 History

31 January 2004 Page 4 of 4