A function is a parameterized portion of code within a larger program which performs a specific task.

A function in a programming language is in many ways similar to a mathematical function, but can have side-effects outside of the simple "function return value" .

What exactly happens at function calls? Consider this simple example in a C like language:

Observations:

```
fun f (x) {
    var t = x + 1;
    return t;
}
...
var i = f(3);
print(i);
```

. . .

- In many programming languages communication to a function is via formal and actual parameters by value.
- Communication from a function is via return values.
- Functions have local scope locally defined variables.
- The formal parameter are declared as local variables.

How do we interpret function definitions and calls?

```
fun f (x) {
    var t = x + 1;
    return t;
}

...

var f = fun (x) {
    var t = x + 1;
    return t;
}

...

var i = f(3);
print(i);

var i = f (x = 3);
print(i);
...
```

Observations:

- Function names act like variables that have been initialized with a function value!
- During a function call we simply look up the function stored in the variable, activate it, and pass it the actual parameters.
- The actual parameters act like initial values for the formal parameters during a function call.

Function Parameters

There are two different ways to associate actual with formal parameters:

Positional Correspondence – Here the actual parameters are associated with the formal parameters via their position in the actual and formal parameter lists.

```
fun foo(a,b) ...
... call foo(1,2)...
```

Here actual parameter 1 will be associated with the formal parameter a and actual parameter 2 will be associated with formal parameter b.

Keyword Correspondence – Here the actual arguments are associated with the formal parameters by an explicit assignment.

```
fun foo(a,b) ...
... call foo(a=1,b=2)...
```

Function Parameters

Our implementation:

- We implement function parameters by call-by-value using keyword correspondence.
- The biggest problem we will be facing are side effects; function calls can modify global variables and functions can appear in both arithmetic and boolean expressions! We need to be able to model both of these aspects of functions in imperative languages.

In our language we introduce new syntactic structures to deal with functions. The first one is the *function call*:

```
A ::= call(f, [PL]) \mid call(f, [])
```

here f represents function names and PL is the non-terminal for actual parameter lists,

The second structure is the function definition:

```
C ::= fun(f,[ FL ],C,A) | fun(f,[ ],C,A)
FL ::= x , FL | x
```

Here FL is the formal argument list. This is a highly stylized version of a function definition, think of it as

```
fun f(x) is C returns A
```

```
This will enable us to write programs such as
     fun inc(x) is skip returns add(x,1) seq
     var(q) seq
     assign(q,call(inc,[assign(x,q)]))
Or consider the factorial program
     fun fact(i) is
             var(result) seq
             if(eq(i,1),
                  assign(result,1),
                  assign(result,mult(i,call(fact,[assign(i,sub(i,1))]))
         returns result seq
     var(x) seq
     assign(x,call(fact,[assign(i,3)]))
```

The semantics of a function declaration is binding a funval to a function variable,

The semantics of a function call is returning a value from the execution of the function,

```
(call(F, [ ]).State) -->> Val :-
                                      % function call
   lookup(F,State,funval([],C,A)),
   pushenv(State.LocalState).
    (C.LocalState) -->> S1.
    (A,S1) -->> Val,
   popenv(S1,_),!. % TROUBLE!!!
(call(F,PList),State) -->> Val :-
                                        % function call
    lookup(F,State,funval(FList,C,A)),
    pushenv(State.LocalState).
    declareparams (FList, LocalState, S1),
   initparams(PList,S1,S2),
   (C,S2) -->> S3.
    (A.S3) -->> Val.
   popenv(S3,_),!. % TROUBLE!!!
```

Note: We are only dealing with side effect free functions. Why?

In order to include side effects we need to create a new semantic function that interprets arithmetic expressions, including function calls, and carries side effect information with it.

```
(call(F,[]),State) -->> (Val,OState) :-
                                                    % function call
    lookup(F,State,funval([],C,A)),
    pushenv(State, LocalState),
    (C.LocalState) -->> S1.
   (A.S1) \longrightarrow (Val.S2).
    popenv(S2, OState),!.
(call(F.PList),State) -->> (Val,OState) :-
                                                      % function call
    lookup(F,State,funval(FList,C,A)),
    pushenv(State,LocalState),
    declareparams (FList, LocalState, S1),
    initparams(PList,S1,S2),
    (C,S2) -->> S3,
    (A.S3) \longrightarrow (Val.S4).
    popenv(S4, OState),!.
```

Side effects impose an ordering on the evaluation of operands in an expression:

```
(add(A,B),State) -->> (Val,OState) :- % addition
  (A,State) -->> (ValA,S),
  (B,S) -->> (ValB,OState),
  Val xis ValA + ValB,!
```

compare this to our side effect free semantics:

In optimizing programming languages function calls with side effects together with boolean expressions are a notorious source of bugs. Consider this C program:

```
#include <stdio.h>
int cnt = 0;
int x = 0;
int f(void) {
   cnt++;
   return x;
}

void main(void) {
   if (f() && f())
      printf("condition is true\n");
   else
      printf("condition is false\n");

printf("function f was called %d time(s)\n",cnt);
}
```

What kind of output would you expect with x == 0? What kind of output would you expect with x == 1?

Side effects ripple through the whole language definition. Consider the boolean expressions:

Consider the statements: