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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Evolution of Software
During the first generation of the computer industry, the late $1940^{\prime}$ s through the middle 1950 's, the emphasis on the development of computer software was negligible (2, p. 470). At the time technology was focused on the development of functional hardware. The vacuum tube proved so unreliable that extensive maintenance was required; consequently, only a minimum amount of programming could be done. The few computers available were typically one-of-a-kind and short-lived, so the need for standard software packages was not felt. Since the early machines were slow in execution and contained small memories, the programmer was severely restricted by the capabilities of his computer (3, p. 360).

The lack of software development then was a direct result of the primitive and unreliable hardware in existence; moreover, many programmers believed that with the improvement of computer machinery the burden of the programmer would be lifted (3, p. 860). The programmer would no longer have to contend with the limitations of the
hardware but would enjoy a new freedom, and programming would no longer be a problem.

As a result of the early experiences with computers, the important role that software and programming would assume in future machines was grossly underestimated (2, p. 469). The second generation of computers, extending from the late-1950's to the mid-1960's, gave the programmer his larger and faster machine, and in so doing, completely altered the role of software in the computer industry.

The programmers of the second generation faced the task of developing software to match the advances in electronic technology. The transistorized machines of the second generation introduced an unforeseen complexity to programming. Programmers had to deal with such problems as I/O interrupts, multilevel stores and multiprogramming. The limitations of computing were shifting from the hardware to the software.

Another problem confronted the programmers of the second generation. With these new and more powerful machines the widespread use of computers in industry became feasible (2, p. 472). There was a tremendous demand for programmers and software by business and industry. Not only was the computer industry lacking in software development, but there was also an inadequate number of experienced programmers available to produce the needed software.

The problems of the software industry continued to grow with time. During the mid-1960's, the beginning of the third generation computers, integrated circuit technology came into use. Again computer hardware increased in speed and complexity. There now existed what has been termed the "software crisis" (2, p. 474). In short this crisis represented the disparity between the sophistication and capabilities of computer machinery and the inadequate and functionally underdeveloped software used by these machines.

In summary, as the technology of computer hardware improved, providing smaller, faster, and more complex machines, programmers were faced with the increasingly difficult task of designing software for these machines and programming the many problems of business and industry which these machines were capable of solving. To quote Dijkstra,

> . . as long as there were no machines, programming was no problem at all; when we had a few weak computers, programming became a mild problem, and now that we have gigantic computers, programming has an equally gigantic problem (3, p. 861 ).

A crisis has developed as a result of the inabilities of the programmers and their software to meet this problem.

Today this problem is best reflected in the software produced in industry. Industrial programs are usually very expensive since they typically require many man-hours to code, and quite often they are error-prone because their complexity prevents adequate debugging. Industrial software
is usually difficult to understand, hard to modify, requires constant maintenance and cannot be adequately tested for correctness. This is not surprising since many industrial programmers have had no formal training in organized program production.

The typical industrial programmer produces on the order of five to ten lines of code per day over the average life of a project because most of his time is spent debugging (1, p. 58). Programming techniques in present use are not producing either the quantity or quality of software that is in demand.

The computer industry has realized the inadequacies of software and programming techniques for quite some time. Accordingly, within the last seven years a growing number of programmers have expounded various concepts and methodologies which they believe will improve software design and will increase the productivity, reliability, maintainability, and extendability of programs. These various concepts and techniques have been referred to as "structured programming." At this time there is disagreement as to what does or does not constitute structured programming. Some programmers feel that it encompasses a wide variety of techniques while others view it as a single or perhaps limited aspect of programming. It remains to be seen exactly what will eventually be included in a definition of structured
programming, but its development has been a direct result of the software crisis.

Chapter II presents a survey of the major concepts associated with structured programming. The work of E.W. Dijkstra is first presented. It includes the concepts of "GOTO-less" programming, hierarchy of software modules, abstract resources and the principle of non-interference. Dijkstra's work is followed by a discussion of the contributions of H. D. Mills, which includes such concepts as the "top-down" approach to programming, the chief programmer team method, the one-entry and one-exit rule for program module design, and the development support library. A number of other important structured programming concepts which are not associated with a particular contributor are also discussed. These concepts include modular programming, program clarity, and open programming.

Of the various concepts involved in the structured programming controversy one of the most commonly implicated is the issue of control structures. A control structure is a program instruction or set of instructions which determines the order in which other program instructions will be executed or the number of times a particular set of instructions are to be executed. Simple control structures include the unconditional branch statement, the branch-on-high and the branch-on-low instructions. More
sophisticated control structures include the FORTRAN DO statement, $\mathrm{PL} / \mathrm{I}$ IF-THEN-ELSE statement, and program interrupts caused by external events.

The controversy centers around the correct use of control structures. What set of control structures should the programmer be allowed to use? Should he have a large set of structures at his disposal or should he be limited to a small but sufficient set? Should the GOTO statement be allowed or should it be removed completely? What discipline should be imposed on interrupt programming methods? These are some of the questions to which programmers are addressing themselves in an effort to determine the proper set and use of control structures in programming.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to describe the development of a small but sufficient set of control structures to facilitate structured programming in ALC, the macro assembly language of the IBM 360 computer.

An ALC macro call consists of a single programmerdefined macro instruction which may be inserted into an ALC program. At assembly time the macro instruction is replaced by a predetermined set of ALC instructions associated with it. With a set of ALC macro definitions for various higher-level language control structures an assembly
language programmer is able to code programs using the concepts of structured programming which require these more sophisticated structures. The programmer uses the macro instructions to implement the logic defined by higherlevel language control structures.

Before describing the macros developed in this thesis, a survey of the major concepts of structured programming is presented both to familiarize the reader with structured programming and to set in proper perspective the important role that control structures play in structured programming. The concepts of control structures are more fully expanded in a separate chapter which precedes the discussion of the macros.

Justification
The numerous articles which discuss structured programming and the control structures of structured programming limit themselves almost without exception to a discussion of concepts which apply to higher-level languages. Kessler (4) has published a noteworthy report which did attempt to apply the concepts of structured programming directly to assembly language. Given the present state of software and the prevalent use of assembly languages in industrial programming, it should be evident that there exists a need for a thorough investigation into
the application of structured programming techniques to the control structures of assembly language programming.

Assembly language programs by the nature of their instruction sets are difficult to code and debug; thus the need for improving assembly language programming techniques is obviously present. Since assembly language programs usually require many more lines of code than equivalent higher-level language programs, the necessity of improving assembly language programs would seem to be greater than that of higher-level languages. One of the major intentions of structured programming is to make programs more readable; the assembly language program is in most instances more difficult to read than a comparable higher-level language program.

The use of structured programming control structures in higher-level languages facilitates a block-structured or modular program design. If these control structures are applied to assembly languages, then block-structured programming could be more easily implemented in assembly language programs. The control structures or branching mechanisms which are presently available in most assembly languages do not readily lend themselves to modular or block-structured programming.

Higher-level languages usually contain a variety of control structures, some of which may be very powerful.

In contrast, the typical assembly language contains an unconditional branch, unconditional subroutine linkage, and a small set of very simple conditional branches such as a branch-on-equal, branch-on-high, branch-on-negative, etc. With the implementation of a more powerful and problemoriented set of control structures in assembly languages the methods of structured programming could be applied more directly to assembly language programming.

This research was undertaken in light of the fact that there exists a need to improve the techniques of assembly language programming. If the concepts of control structures of higher-level languages within the scope of structured programming are applied at the assembly language level, perhaps significant improvements in assembly language programming will be achieved.

Before entering a discussion of control structures and their proper use, an overview of the development of structured programming, its major concepts, and its major contributors will be given in Chapter II in order to establish the significance and relationship of control structures to structured programming.
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## CHAPTER II

## STRUCTURED PROGRAMMING

The origin of structured programming is usually traced to a letter by E. W. Dijkstra (7), which appeared in the March, 1968, issue of the Communications of the ACM. The letter entitled "GOTO Statement Considered Harmful" warned programmers of the potential problems which the GOTO statement may introduce into programs.

## Dijkstra's Work

In his letter Dijkstra pointed out that the unrestricted use of the GOTO statement may unnecessarily complicate the flow of control within a program. Because of the complexity of such a program difficulties may be encountered if debugging or modification is required.

If a program contains many GOTO statements, it is likely that the program will have a nonlinear flow of control. This means that its instructions will not be executed in the same order as they are written. In contrast, when a program contains no GOTO's or other branching constructs, its instructions are executed in a purely sequential manner. The first instruction is executed first, the second next, and so forth until termination
occurs. Such a program is said to have a linear flow of control. While few programs can be written in a purely linear fashion, the free use of GOTO's may completely destroy any semblance of linearity and produce unnecessarily complicated program logic.

Figure 1 illustrates the type of program which may result from the blatant use of the GOTO statement. Notice that the program has a very complicated execution sequence. There is no correspondence between the order in which the statements appear and their order of execution. Although the program of Figure 1 is rather small, it would be difficult to debug or prove correct because of its nonlinear flow of control.

Since the time of Dijkstra's letter so much literature has been published on the use of GOTO statements that structured programming and "GOTO-less" programming are sometimes used synonymously. This, however, is an oversimplification. A program which contains GOTO's may be very well structured in the sense that it maintains an almost linear or sequential flow of control. On the other hand the flow of control of a program coded without GOTO's is not inherently linear or necessarily well structured. Dijkstra cautioned the programmer that the GOTO statement lends itself to misuse, i.e., it may disrupt the sequential execution of the program. He was not suggesting that programming without


Fig. 1--The excessive use of GOTO statements in a program.
the GOTO statement would in itself produce well-structured programs.

It has been shown in a paper by Bohm and Jacopini (4) that the following three control structures are a sufficient set to define any program logic: a sequence control structure, a repetitive control structure, and a selective control structure. Using these three structures only, the GOTO statement is not needed nor for that matter are any other control structures required.

At this time there is a controversy among programmers as to whether or not the GOTO statement should be completely eliminated since it is not strictly required. Those in favor of its removal argue that it is merely a temptation toward poor programming practices. Those not in favor of its removal argue that circumstances occur when the judicious use of an occasional GOTO statement will not interfere with the program's structure and will, in fact, provide a solution to a logic problem which may otherwise require excessive code.

The concept of programming without the GOTO statement is by no means the only contribution of Dijkstra to structured programming. Concerned with the development of software systems, he published his experience with the "THE" Multiprogramming System which made use of what he calls abstract resources in the design of software systems (6).

Dijkstra views a software system as a hierarchy of software modules or machines. Each level of the hierarchy produces an abstract resource which is supported by the level below it. Each of the resources is available to the level directly above it. Any module then consists of a set of programs which manipulate the abstract resource of the next lower level and produce an abstract resource which can be manipulated by the next higher level.

An example will illustrate Dijkstra's concepts of abstract resources, hierarchy layers, and levels of abstraction.

A software package which will read a file is to be written. The file is considered the highest level of abstraction and will consequently, be the highest layer in the hierarchy. The next level is a record since a file can be considered a collection of records. A record is a collection of words, a word is a collection of bytes and a byte is a collection of bits so that the hierarchy of resources needed to read a single bit is as follows: Highest Level: FILE

There are five abstract resources and hence, five levels of abstraction. Each level is a layer in the hierarchy and
represents a functional part or machine in the system. A set of programs would be written to implement each level. For instance, at the lowest level a set of programs would be written which operate on bits and thus alter bytes. At the highest level a set of programs would operate on records to manipulate files.

Dijkstra emphasizes that each level has a specific relation to the level immediately above and below it, and that special care should be taken to insure that each level is consistent in that the operations executed at one level will be supported by those below and will, in turn, support those in the level immediately above.

In developing his software system Dijkstra attempted to use a design which would lend itself to thorough testing and which could be proven logically correct. Using his method of hierarchy of levels, Dijkstra was applying what he refers to as the "principle of non-interference" (3, p. 143). This principle suggests that the correctness of the software system can be more readily determined if the system is divided into a set of smaller problems which are logically independent and which can be united into the software package at the functional level. These small problems must be proven correct at every level of integration.

To test the example above using this principle it would be necessary to test each layer. For example, the
middle layer would be independently tested to insure that it correctly manipulates bytes to produce words. Likewise, when each layer had been thoroughly and independently tested, the system would be considered correct.

It should be noted at this time that Dijkstra's hierarchy of levels or layered approach to software design appears to be equivalent to a modular approach to programming. In fact, Dijkstra's approach is modular, but he has imposed other restrictions such as the hierarchy concept on the modules formed by the design. The sample given above is modular in that the byte programs are independent of the bit and word programs, however, there is the added restriction that the word programs may manipulate only bytes and have no direct effect or connection to record, file or bit programs. Modular programming, which will be discussed later, does not necessarily place such restrictions on the relationships among various modules. There is no hierarchy or layering of modules in the conventional approach to modular programming.

Dijkstra seems to be most concerned with developing techniques for designing and encoding programs which will lend themselves to testing and proof of correctness. He advocates the avoidance of GOTO statements because they tend to add complexity to programs and hence, increase the difficulty of proving their correctness (7). Dijkstra approaches software design with his hierarchy technique
since to verify the software system, it is necessary to prove correct only the independent layers rather than the system as an entity. In designing his multiprogramming system Dijkstra was assisted by a group of programmers who were mostly mathematicians; thus, an indication of the emphasis he places on the necessity of proving program correctness (6).

## Mills' Work

Harlen Mills, F. T. Baker, and others at the IBM Corporation have developed some operational procedures for the design and encoding of large reliable programs. The techniques they have developed represent a major contribution to structured programming.

Mills (14) describes what he calls a "top-down" approach to program design and coding. He also elaborates on a number of programming techniques, which he collectively refers to as structured programming. These techniques include the use of a standard set of control structures or branching conventions, a modular or segmenting method of programming, and a restriction on any module that it have only one entry and one exit point.

The top-down approach to programming is a technique whereby the initial problem is repeatedly broken down into a hierarchy of program modules or segments. The highest module might represent a control or supervisory function.

The various routines called by the control module would represent the next lower-level of the hierarchy. Likewise, the second-level routines reference various lower-level routines. In effect, a tree structure containing program modules is formed. Coding begins at the highest level and proceeds downward with "program stubs," dummy names to represent uncoded segments being inserted into the code where references to lower-level segments are made. The program modules or segments are carefully limited in size so that they may be coded on a single page. A segment defines a function having one entry and one exit point. The function merely transforms data which may or may not represent another segment.

The branching conventions or control structures which may be used in coding a segment include a simple sequencing of code, a selective branching structure such as an IF THEN ELSE statement and a repetitive control structure such as a DO WHILE statement. The GOTO statement is not permitted. By requiring that each program segment be designed and coded according to these particular structured programming techniques, a certain amount of program uniformity is insured (12, pp. 22-23). Each segment will be reasonably small and will not possess any complicated control structures to interfere with module testing or readability (13, p. 156). Module interfacing is simplified when the one
entry and one exit rule is used since there can be only one path of connection between program segments.

A top-down design method permits program testing concurrently with program coding (13, pp. 9-10). Once a particular segment on the hierarchy structure has been coded, it may be tested by having the programmer provide the necessary input to evaluate the correctness of the segment. This input, of course, will eventually be supplied by the lower-level segments which are called by the segment being tested. In this manner the program can be verified as each module is coded; thus the reliability of the entire system is proven without having to rely on exhaustive testing once the system is complete.

Mills' top-down programming technique is similar to Dijkstra's layered approach to program design; however, the two methods seem to depend on slightly different concepts and each emphasizes somewhat different aspects of design. While Dijkstra is chiefly concerned with the separation of abstract resources during his hierarchy development (13, p. 57), Mills is mostly interested in achieving a hierarchy tree structure of one entry and one exit modules. Dijkstra emphasizes a design approach which is intended to be highly testable and provable while Mills, though he is concerned with the ability to test programs seems to emphasize simplicity and clarity in program design (12, p. 57).

Another concept of structured programming developed at IBM and described by Mills (13) is the "chief programmer team," which is an organizational and managerial technique for large program production.

The chief programmer team consists of a chief programmer, a backup programmer, a programming librarian, and other junior programmers required by the particular production. These team members utilize a development support library and apply the principles of top-down design and structured programming described by Mills in the development of large programs.

The chief programmer is a technical manager responsible for designing and coding the most important segments of the program. All other team members receive their responsibilities and coding assignments from the chief programmer. He coordinates all program interfaces and supervises all coding to insure the proper use of top-down structured programming techniques. Quite naturally the chief programmer must be a highly experienced and competent programmer since the success of the team and the project are largely dependent upon his decisions.

The backup programmer is a research assistant to the chief programmer and helps significantly in the design and coding of the major portion of the project. He must be completely familiar with the entire project and be ready to assume the position of chief programmer should the need
arise. The backup programmer shares the burden of responsibility, allowing the chief programmer to concentrate on the major problems encountered in the project. The backup programmer may, for example, develop all testing procedures without the assistance of the chief programmer. The programming librarian is responsible for maintaining all listings and records of the project. This information is kept in both an internal, machine-readable, and an external, human-readable, form. The librarian maintains this information in a development support library. The development support library contains a set of organized listings which detail the current status and previous development of the project. These listings represent the external project records. Among these records are notebooks which are headed by a directory and contain an alphabetized list of the program modules. A journal is kept to record all changes in updating the directory. All results of testing procedures are also recorded in a journal.

By maintaining a detailed record of the project's development the programmers have an accurate account of all program bugs encountered and tests made at any given time. Since these records are maintained by a programming librarian, the programmers are not burdened with timeconsuming clerical work.

Besides maintaining and updating the various records which are kept in the library, the librarian has a significant amount of paperwork to do concerning the documentation of the design and coding phases of the program. Mills (2) emphasizes that the librarian is a key member of the team rather than a part-time assistant to programmers.

The development support library consists of a number of office and machine procedures for maintaining programmer-generated material such as coded program segments, for maintaining files and records of the project in the external records, for processing data in the internal library which is on disk, and for performing all runs during each stage of program development including testing procedures.

During the course of the project programmers make corrections in status notebooks, introduce new or altered coding sheets, and request various runs. It is the responsibility of the programming librarian to invoke the necessary office or machine procedures to accomplish these tasks. He is responsible for preparing and executing all program runs and posting the results in the external and internal files.

Figure 2 shows the relationship of the librarian and programmers within the development support library (2). It is evident in the diagram that the librarian plays a key role in the success of the library.


Fig. 2--Development support Iibrary

By using the development support library within the chief programmer team method, the team members are working on a common product rather than merely coding independently, separate segments of a large program. Since the members are working together, there is less chance of duplicating code or coding errors. The library provides an in-depth documentation of the development of the project. This documentation reflects the progress of the team.

The chief programmer team concept was developed in order to improve the organization, communication, and productivity of programmers involved in large-scale programming. The top-down method is applied to program design under the chief programmer team method, and the structured programming techniques are applied in code segments within the top-down method.
F. T. Baker (1) described an industrial project which was developed using a chief programmer team. The project required twenty-two man-months to design and code, involving the production of over 83,000 lines of code. Only twenty-one errors were found during formal testing of the completed system.

Baker concluded that the use of the chief programmer team, top-down programming, and the application of structured programming techniques contributed to the success of the project. He suggested that the top-down method may not always be applicable to some types of projects, and that
other methods may be more feasible in the design of some programs. For instance, when a program organization, viewed as a tree structure, is narrow and tall, then a strictly top-down approach may require too much time to be practical (1, p. 343). Baker also suggested that the chief programmer should do more code reviewing and allow the other members to do the major portion of coding. In the project described by Baker the chief and backup programmers did most of the functional coding; consequently, there was little time to review code, especially that written by junior programmers.

As a result of the development of top-down programming and the chief programmer team at IBM, the concept of structured walk-through evolved at that corporation (16, p. 31). A structured walk-through is a series of progress meetings which are held at various times in the design and development of a programming project.

A committee of approximately five members discuss the completeness, accuracy, and general quality of a project's development (10, p. 30). Each member of the committee, or reviewer as he is called, presents a brief introduction to his portion of the project and then "walks" the other committee members through the specific function of his area of responsibility. In this way each member becomes familiar with the purpose and progress of all aspects of the project.

One committee member, the recording secretary, records errors and inconsistencies which are discovered during each reviewer's walk-through. When the meeting is completed, each reviewer is given a copy of the secretary's notes. It is the responsibility of each member to insure that any problems within his area are resolved and that he notifies other committee members of any corrective action he takes. The purpose of a structured walk-through is not to evaluate the ability or effectiveness of its committee members, but rather, through the exchange of information and ideas, determine the progress of the project, and detect the errors existing in the production at its current level of development (16, p. 30). Committee members are encouraged to exchange ideas, offer constructive criticism, and view the meetings as educational experiences.

The use of structured walk-through provides a method for not only measuring a project's development, but also for discovering production errors at the earliest possible time when they are easiest to correct and have the smallest impact on the production (10, p. 35).

Modular Programming
Modularizing a program refers to the technique of isolating sections or functions in the program so they may be designed and coded independently; hence the original problem is reduced to a set of smaller ones. Program
modules might be coroutines, subroutines, programmer-defined functions, loops, or merely sequences of instructions which are logically grouped and coded together. The concept of modularity is not new to programming, but it has recently been given new emphasis as a structured programming technique.

The advantages of modular programming include: simplification of program design and coding by reducing a large problem into a set of smaller ones, extendability of coded modules since a functional program module can be inserted into other programs, ease of program modification where only effected modules need to be altered, and clarity of program design since the function of the entire program can be viewed as the interaction of the individual program modules.

Within the realm of structured programming programmers are well aware of the benefits of modular programming. They do not agree, however, on the principles which should govern program modularizing. Two methods which form a basis for program modularization have already been discussed, namely Dijkstra's levels of abstraction which modularizes according to what he calls abstract resources, i.e., the various elements or data types on which a program operates, and Mills' top-down design approach which modularizes according to a stepwise refinement of program segments. Besides these methods there exist two other important techniques which
involve program modularity. They are compartmentalization and information hiding.

Compartmentalization is an approach to program coding whereby program modules are formed on the basis of their relationship to a particular design decision. Examples of design decisions include such things as I/O formats, arithmetic precision, and variable declarations. The advantage of this approach to program modularity is its ease of modification when new design specifications must be incorporated. For example, in a compartmentalized program if a new input format were required, only the module which generated formats would need to be changed. There would be no need to search through various program segments to alter each format statement.

To implement compartmentalized modules the most appropriate technique is by means of macros. One macro may expand to produce various format statements while another may, for instance, generate declaration statements. Such macros may provide the basis for program modules rather than other program features such as functions or subroutines.

Parnas (15) has suggested a method of modular programming which attempts to reduce the interface requirements and relationships between modules and thus reduce module connectivity. His method, information hiding, stresses the need to code some modules without utilizing characteristics or features of other interfacing modules. The
programuer is supplied with the information needed to code his module, and information relating to the connecting modules is deliberately withheld or "hidden" from him. This technique may require additional coding to facilitate the proper interfacing of modules, but information hiding produces program modules which are inherently nonrestrictive and independent in nature.

It appears that no single modularizing technique is sufficient to always produce the most efficient and wellstructured program; rather the technique to use seems to be dictated by the nature of the problem. The current interest in modular programming should yield valuable methods for the decomposition of programs and contribute significantly to structured programming.

## Program Clarity

It was once considered sufficient to produce a program which would satisfy the problem at hand. It did not really matter if the program could be interpreted by anyone other than its author. As programs increased in size, however, and as the need for program modification became greater, program managers began to insist on code which could be understood and readily interpreted.

One of the basic goals of structured programming is to establish methods which will increase the readability of programs. This means writing a program in such a way that
programmers unfamiliar with it will be able to understand what it is attempting to do.

The use of documentation is very important in providing program clarity. If there are explanatory comments at the beginning of each program module, the purpose of the code will be more apparent. Besides explaining code documentation should specify any restrictions or exceptions to code function such as input format requirements, arithmetic precision of output, or "special cases" not handled properly by the program.

The use of spacing and indentation will also improve the clarity of program documentation. Spacing to separate program modules and indentation to represent loop nesting and extent of control within a loop will help produce more legible code.

Figure 3 illustrates the use of spacing and indentation. Modules $A$ and $B$ in the figure are separated by spacing to show their logical independence. Module $B$ has two levels of indentation to indicate both the range of the IF statement within the outer DO, and the range of the THEN DO and ELSE DO statements within the IF. Notice that spacing within the IF statement clarifies the effect of the THEN DO and the ELSE DO routines.

The use of meaningful labels and variable names will also improve program readability. Acronyms and word abbreviations may be necessary if the language being used


Module $B \longrightarrow$
ELSE DO:


Fig. 3--Spacing and indentation
places restrictions on the lengths of labels and variable names.

Open Programming
Programming was once considered an art which only a few people knew how to do, but today it is more and more becoming a professional skill which can be taught and improved upon with proper guidance. Indeed, the basis of structured programming is a set of methods and techniques which assumes that programming can be taught and improved upon with the application of these techniques.

Open programming is a method for teaching and improving programming skills. It involves a group approach to learning. Programmers compare and discuss each other's work making evaluations and suggestions for improvement. An open panel discussion may be used to critique programs. There is frequent exchange of experiences and problems with fellow programmers.

The basic goal of open programming is self-improvement of programming techniques by studying the programming methods of others and having others evaluate one's own work. Weinberg (16) speaks of this practice as "egoless" programming. Each programmer must be willing to accept the constructive criticism of others while, at the same time, share his programming abilities with his critics.

## Summary

This chapter has presented the major concepts associated with the term "structured programming." A variety of methods and techniques have been discussed, and it remains to be seen just which of them will be included in a formal definition of structured programming.

Intuitively it appears that any definition of structured programming will have to be of a general nature encompassing many concepts and techniques since the solution of the multitude of problems presented to programmers today require a variety of approaches and methods, especially with regard to program design.

Chapter III will discuss more fully the role of control structures in structured programming. So far it has been suggested that the proper use of control structures is to adapt a small but sufficient set of branching conventions and that the use of the unconditional GOTO branching statement should be avoided. Chapter III will present some of the theory and application of control structures with a more thorough analysis of the GOTO controversy.
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## CHAPTER III

CONTROL STRUCTURES

Almost every paper on structured programming alludes to the proper use of control structures. This is not surprising since the structures used can affect many aspects of a program. The degree of linearity in program execution is a direct result of the structures used. Program modularity can be maximized with effective control structures. Testing a program and proving its correctness may be feasible only if the program's structures allow the isolation of program segments. The clarity and readability of a program may be significantly hampered if it contains complicated control mechanisms.

Bohn and Jacopini's Work
The importance of control structures has not been overlooked by those interested in improving programming techniques. A paper by Bohm and Jacopini (2) is frequently referenced in structured programming articles. The paper shows mathematically that the control of any flowchartable program can be logically defined using only three control structures. These structures include l) a sequencing procedure, 2) a selective structure, and 3) a repetitive
structure. Each structure is characterized by a single entry and single exit point.

The sequencing structure, shown in Figure 4 , represents the normal execution of instructions, i.e., in the order the instructions were written. Figure 4 represents a linear flow of control. A program containing no branching structures would be completely sequential or linear in the strictest sense.

A selective structure, illustrated in Figure 5, causes the execution of a particular block of code or set of instructions depending on the truth of the selective condition. In the diagram the diamond represents the selective mechanism. The IF THEN ELSE structure of $\mathrm{PL} / \mathrm{I}$ is a selective structure. When the IF statement is true, all instructions within the THEN block are executed. When the IF statement is false, all instructions within the ELSE block are executed.

The IF THEN ELSE structure may be considered linear since each instruction is executed or not executed in the same order as it is coded. The program flow of control does not change directions but continues forward either bypassing instructions or executing them as they are encountered.

The third structure, a repetitive block, is shown in Figures 6 and 7. This structure represents the repeated execution of a block of code. The diamonds in the diagrams


Fig. 4--A sequencing structure


Fig. 5--A selective structure


Fig. 6--A DO WHILE structure


Fig. 7--A DO UNTIL structure
represent the selective mechanisms which determine the number of repetitions. There are two forms of this structure. The first one, Figure 6, tests the looping condition before loop execution. This is implemented in PL/I with the DO WHILE statement. The second form, Figure 7, implemented in ALGOL with the DO UNTIL statement and in FORTRAN with the DO statement, tests the looping condition after each execution of the loop. When the looping condition is satisfied, the repetitive structure passes program control to the instruction immediately following the loop.

Any program logic can be performed by some combination of these structures. They may be sequenced one after another or nested in any combination. As an example, Figure 8 shows the nesting of several structures. A repetitive block is contained within a selective block which is itself nested within another selective block. Notice that the one entry and one exit feature is maintained within the logic structure.

A simple program which uses only the structures suggested by Bohm and Jacopini is diagrammed in Figure 9. The program includes combinations of all three structures and can be decomposed into the various structures used. Each structure maintains a single entry and single exit point; this insures a certain degree of consistency in program design.


Fig. 8--Nested control structures


Fig. 9--Decomposition of program structures

Figure 10 represents a program containing control structures other than the three just described. In the figure blocks one through four appear to form a DO UNTIL structure; however, the loop condition may possibly be overridden by decision block two which provides a branch from within the loop. In blocks nine, eleven, and twelve a similar loop situation exists in that there are two decision blocks and two exits from the loop. In the second situation, however, the logic is further complicated by the fact that different paths are taken depending upon the point of departure from the loop.

Figure 10 is a reasonably short program, yet its unusual control structures may prove difficult to debug. Also problems may arise in understanding the purpose of the code because of the rather complicated logic structure. It appears that the programmer has developed control structures to accomplish the program logic, but he has made no attempt to develop a relatively uncomplicated or readable program design. By adhering to the use of the three simple and sufficient control structures, the programmer can define the logic of any program in a manner that will require only simple control structures which may be combined in larger decomposable structures.

Donaldson (4, p. 53), however, describes two occasions where the strict use of only the three mentioned structures will result in inefficiency.


Fig. 10--Improper use of control structures

The first situation occurs when a multivalued selective structure, as shown in Figure 11 , is required. Such a situation arises when only one of the three operations is to be performed, depending on whether a variable is less than, equal to, or greater than zero. A control structure implemented for this use is the FORTRAN computed GOTO statement.

To implement a multivalued selective structure using only the three structures of Bohm and Jacopini, a selective structure must be nested within another selective structure, as in Figure 12. Compared to the computed GOTO, this nested form of the selective structure may be grossly inefficient and less readable since it requires an unnecessary ordering of decision statements.

The second instance of inefficiency occurs when the abnormal termination of a repetitive structure is required. This situation is illustrated in Figure 13. Although this structure violates the single entry and single exit rule, Donaldson (4, p. 53) suggests that such a structure may save considerable time and space. Since this structure contains two possible loop-terminating conditions, its use should be properly flagged.

The three basic control structures can usually be approximated in most, higher languages. They are directly implemented in $P L / I$ with the IF THEN ELSE and DO constructs, in ALGOL with the IF THEN ELSE and the FOR constructs and


Fig. ll--Multivalued selective structure


Fig. 12--Multivalued selective structure implemented by nesting simple selective structures.


Fig. 13--Abnormal termination of a repetitive structure.
in COBOL with the IF THEN ELSE and the PERFORM constructs. FORTRAN has an IF statement which can approximate a selective structure and a DO construct for repetition (13, p. 111).

Assembly languages do not possess IF statements or DO constructs, but these structures can be approximated if macro processing is available. The use of macros to implement these constructs will make the structure of an assembly language program more visible since macro instructions tend to stand out among other assembly language instructions. Without macros, however, assembly language programming is limited to a few conditional and unconditional branching mechanisms which can only simulate selective and repetitive structures with a great deal of awkwardness, and which tend to obscure program structure. Significance of Simple Control Structures

The major advantage of limiting the programmer to the three sufficient control structures is that it forces him to design more carefully (1, p. 146). With simplified logic he must take care in deciding how to code iterative and selective procedures and make sure that termination conditions are correct. Forcing the programmer to be careful will increase the likelihood of a correct program. The programmer need not be concerned with a vast repertoire of program structures if he is limited to three.

He need only decide how to combine these three to satisfy his problem. With such simple logic his programs will more likely be understood. Diagrams, such as Figure 7, can be used to illustrate program logic and program decomposition. Since each of the three structures maintains a single entry and exit point, the program lends itself to segmentation and modularity. Such programs are more readily verified since testing can be done on program segments rather than on the program as an entity.

If only the three structures are used, program notation can be greatly simplified and easily understood. A notation such as the following:

and

THEN

-
END THEN
ELSE
-

END ELSE
will suffice to define most program logic. Programs will not contain complicated or vague structuring mechanisms which tend to obstruct readability and clarity. If the single
entry and exit rule is maintained while using this notation, the program can be read in a linear fashion making program logic easier to follow.

While these three structures are sufficient to code any programmable logic, it has been pointed out (4) that they may be inefficient in some cases. Limitations on code size or execution time may force the programmer to use other structures to improve code efficiency. When there are not, however, strict limitations on code size and execution time, the use of this simple set of structures should provide overall efficiency, with respect to program readability, accuracy, and maintenance. Although a program may require more time to design and may be less efficient in terms of code usage and execution time, the debugging time will be considerably less and program maintenance considerably easier. A certain amount of assurance in the quality of the program can be implied if the constructs used are simple (1). The use of a simple but sufficient set of control structures can improve almost every aspect of program design and coding. Program features most likely to be negatively affected by these structures include: time required for program design since the designer is limited by the logic structures available to him, and program length and execution time since the set of structures are sometimes inefficient.

The benefits of using the simple structures seem to outweigh their disadvantages. The author believes that the use of a simple set of structures will improve most programs especially in terms of functional correctness and program readability. The use of additional constructs should be avoided whenever possible, but when they are utilized, care should be taken to insure that their presence has been properly documented. It is much too easy for a program to become unnecessarily complex when a variety of constructs are used indiscriminately by a careless programmer.

## The GOTO Controversy

In regard to the use of other control structures in programming besides the three discussed above, much attention has been directed to the use of GOTO statements. Dijkstra (3) and Mills (9) are just two of the many authors who have directly attacked the use of GOTO constructs in programming. Hopkins (6), on the other hand, suggests that while the GOTO is commonly abused in programming today, it is not necessary or even desirable to discontinue its use in computer languages.

In an effort to define a structured programming technique, the elimination of GOTO constructs is sometimes presented as the only issue (8, p. 51). Indeed, Hopkins ( 6, p. 55) suggests that the GOTO issue has been greatly
over-emphasized. Programmers looking for a simple solution to the problems of programming today have used the GOTO as a scapegoat. While Hopkins (6) agrees that the removal of GOTO's will improve the code of most programmers, he does not consider this sufficient grounds for eliminating the structure from programming.

Removal of the GOTO statement is suggested mostly on the arguments of programming clarity and simplicity of logic. Most studies expound methods of improving GOTO programs by the substitution of other control structures; few, however, discuss the cases where these other structures will themselves produce inefficient code or perhaps some other undesirable side effect. Attention has been focused on the elimination of the GOTO statement and, for the most part, has ignored the problems which programming without the GOTO may introduce.

One of the major criticisms of the GOTO structure is its use in multiple exits to different program locations from within a loop. Consider the following FORTRAN code whose structure is diagrammed in Figure 14.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D O 1 I=1,50 \\
& X=X+1 \\
& Y=Y+1
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I F(M . E Q \cdot 10) \text { GO TO } 3 \\
& M=Y * 2 \\
& I F(M . E Q \cdot 200) \text { GO TO } 4 \\
& T=T+1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
1 \text { CONTINUE }
$$

$$
3 \quad \ldots \ldots
$$

$$
4
$$

The loop contains three possible exit points, each of which branches to a different location in the program, and consequently, produces a somewhat complicated execution sequence. When the loop has terminated, program control will be at one of three possible locations, and the problem of determining which location may be significant. If the programmer is accustomed to unrestricted use of the GOTO, loops similar to the one just described may be common in his programs.

While it is desirable to avoid this type of logic, eliminating the GOTO will not necessarily prevent multiple exits to locations outside the control of the looping structure. The following $P L / I$ code produces a multiple-exit loop, yet it contains no GOTO structures. Here the programmer has used the RETURN statement just like a GOTO, i.e., to escape the control of the loop and branch to a location outside the range of the loop. Thus, merely


Fig. 14--A DO loop with multiple exits
eliminating GOTO statements will not prevent awkward control paths or complex logic structures.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DO } \mathrm{I}=1 \mathrm{TO} 10 ; \\
& \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{X}+1 ; \\
& \mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{Y}+10 ; \\
& \text { IF } \mathrm{X}=100 \text { THEN RETURN; } \\
& \mathrm{M}=\mathrm{Y} * 2 ; \\
& \text { IF } \mathrm{M}=200 \text { THEN RETURN; } \\
& \mathrm{T}=\mathrm{T}+1 ; \\
& \text { END; }
\end{aligned}
$$

Multiple loop exits will not necessarily complicate the logic structure. If the exits all branch to the end of the loop, then the block structure which the loop represents is maintained. In effect, the loop has executed or partially executed some number of times and control passes to the location just past the loop.

On occasion a programmer will discover that a large code segment is not functionally correct, and with the addition of a GOTO statement the program can be made to execute correctly. In this case the insertion of a GOTO may save a considerable amount of time, especially if major code alteration is required to correct the mistake without using the GOTO; moreover, if a functional program were required in a short time, the programmer may be forced to use the GOTO since major code revision is usually timeconsuming.

If used with discretion then, the GOTO may be an appropriate means of solving an awkward logic problem. Also since some programs are used only once or are used only by the programmer himself, the need for simplicity or clarity in a program may not be felt; the programmer may see no justification for coding without the GOTO. Although every program can be written without the use of GOTO statements, not every program need be so written.

The program which must maintain strict limits with regard to code efficiency or length may be possible only with the use of GOTO statements. While this situation should be avoided whenever possible, the fact that it does occur suggests that, from a practical point of view, the GOTO construct may be quite useful.

Some of the reasons for eliminating the GOTO have already been mentioned. They include: destruction of program linearity when GOTO constructs are freely used; increase in program complexity due to GOTO branches; and the decrease of program modularity, clarity, and readability due to the presents of GOTO constructs.

The strongest argument against the GOTO statement is the fact that there are so many ways to use it incorrectly. The presence of a GOTO is more likely to be the result of poor programming techniques than it is a sound logic structure. Since the GOTO is not needed and since it is
so apt to be misused, there is good reason to desire its removal.

It is suggested by Wulf (14, p. 68) that efficiency should not be used as an excuse for GOTO programming. Efficiency of program code should be achieved through a highly optimizing compiler; the programmer should not have to resort to introducing GOTO constructs for the sake of improving run time. Code optimization during compilation is more effective if the programmer has used a blockstructured program design and has avoided the use of GOTO structures which unnecessarily disrupt program modularity.

Programming with GOTO's necessitates the use of labels, a factor which adds to program complexity since a label referenced in a program instruction requires a search through the source code to locate the label and interpret the referencing instruction. One of the basic reasons for developing a structured programming style is to achieve a certain degree of program simplicity. Removing the GOTO's will reduce the need for labels, and hopefully, simplify program logic by reducing the number of label references.

The author is of the opinion that programming without the GOTO in most cases will improve the quality of a program; however, to completely eliminate the GOTO seems to be unjustified at this time. It should be remembered
that there are circumstances where the GOTO is useful even though it may produce awkward code or undesirable program logic. Although it lends itself to misuse, the GOTO is not unique in this respect. Many features of a language may be subject to improper or inefficient use, yet it would be impractical to remove all of them.

## Subroutines

Another control structure which deserves special attention is the subroutine call. Like the GOTO statement the subroutine call causes an unconditional branch. The branch passes control from the main program to an external set of instructions, referred to as the subroutine or subprogram, which are then executed. Once the subroutine has been executed, program control returns to some location in the main program.

The use of the subroutine call does not disrupt the structure of a repetitive, selective, or sequential construct within the main program when the subroutine satisfies two conditions. First, if the subroutine returns control to the statement immediately following the subroutine call, then linearity has been preserved. Three sequential statements will have been executed: these statements are the one preceding the call, the subroutine call, and the statement following the subroutine call. The second
condition requires that the subroutine itself consist of some combination of the three simple control structures. Some subroutines allow multiple entry and exit points in addition to multiple return locations. The legality of their use in terms of structured programming control structures seems to be unclear at this time since most authors, when discussing control structures of structured programming, do not mention subroutines specifically. Program modules is a frequently-used term which may or may not include subroutines. Mills (10), when discussing control structures, uses the term segments. He suggests (10) that program segments should have only one entry and one exit point, but it is unclear whether or not he is applying this rule to subroutines as well.

It seems reasonable to assume that the concepts of control structures discussed in this chapter would apply directly to subroutines. The subroutine is a block of code that is represented in a program by a single instruction, the subroutine call. The subroutine, when inserted in place of the call, should produce a logic structure conforming to the principles of structured programming.

Conclusions
The theory of control structures plays a key role in the development of a structured programming technique;
however, control structures alone will not provide the solution to the present software dilemma. All aspects of programming, including data structures, must be investigated to develop the most effective approaches to program design and constructions.
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## CHAPTER IV

## CONTROL STRUCTURES IMPLEMENTED WITH MACROS FOR ASSEMBLY LANGUAGE PROGRAMMING

In IBM 360 assembly language programming (7) there are no instructions which will provide for the documentation and execution of selective and repetitive control structures described in the previous chapters. Like most assembly languages the IBM 360 language contains only a set of conditional and unconditional branching instructions of which the most sophisticated include the BXLE, BSH, and BCT instructions (6, pp. 66-67). With the use of labels and these branching instructions available to him, the programmer may simulate in ALC the selective and repetitive structures he needs. The additional instructions required for implementing these structures, however, may significantly increase the complexity of the code and reduce the clarity of the program. Because there are no adequate control structures available in ALC, the programmer is forced to improvise looping and selective structures each time they are required in a program.

A set of IBM 360 assembly language macros to be used as selective and repetitive control structures were developed in this study. These macros should provide at
least two important benefits to the ALC programmer. First, the burden of formulating such control structures when they are required is removed from the programmer; he needs only supply the necessary symbolic parameters for the macro which will generate the desired control structure.

The second important benefit which the macros provide is an increase in program clarity. It is readily apparent to anyone reading the code that the macro prototype statements represent looping and selective structures. The mere presence of the macro names within the code indicates the extent of control of each structure. If the NOGEN print option is used, the program source listing is significantly simplified since macro-generated code is not shown. The NOGEN option causes the suppression of print-out of all macro-expanded code. The source listing includes only ALC instructions and macro instructions as they were coded by the programmer. When the NOGEN print option is omitted and the source listing contains the expanded macro code, the program, of course, looks much like a typical assembly language program, since all of the branching instructions and labels necessary to implement the macros are shown. The Appendices contain examples of programs with unexpanded code and programs with expanded code. The differences will be readily apparent to the reader.

Repetitive Control Structure Macros
To implement a looping or repetitive control structure in ALC two macros, DO and ENDDO, have been developed. The DO macro generates the code for testing the looping condition and the code which either continues the execution of the loop or branches to terminate the loop. The ENDDO macro besides providing a label to which a branch will occur when the loop is terminated, signifies the extent of control of the DO macro.

The DO macro is similar to the DO statement in PL/I. It may be specified with just an increment and range such as DO $I=1$ TO 10 BY 3, with just a WHILE condition such as DO WHILE (X LE 2) or with both a looping range and WHILE condition such as DO I = 1 TO 100 BY 3 WHILE (Y GT 30). These options are specified by means of keyword parameters attached to the macro prototype statement.

The looping conditions may be specified by literals when parameters are equated to numeric values, in registers when parameters are equated to register numbers, or by locations when parameters are equated to labels. Numeric values may not be used to specify locations. Once the DO loop parameters are determined, they are maintained in a stack generated by the macro; the programmer need not be concerned with destroying looping variables initially specified in registers or locations. He is free to use registers and locations originally containing looping
parameters as he wishes without affecting the state of the DO loop parameters. Table I contains an explanation of each DO macro parameter.

TABLE I
KEYWORD PARAMETERS FOR THE DO MACRO

| Keyword Parameter | Meaning | Characteristics of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LABEL | Label to identify corresponding ENDDO macro. | Any valid ALC label. |
| LOWNUM | Value of the lower range of a DO loop. | Integer. |
| BYNUM | Value of increment of a DO loop range. | Integer. |
| HGHNUM | Value of the upper range of a DO loop. | Integer. |
| LOWREG | Register containing the lower range of a DO loop. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| BYREG | Register containing the increment of a DO loop range. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| HGHREG | Register containing the upper range of a DO loop. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| LOWLOC | Location containing the lower range of a DO loop. | Any valid ALC label. |
| BYLOC | Location containing the incremenet of a DO loop range. | Any valid ALC label. |
| HGHLOC | Location containing the upper range of a DO loop. | Any valid ALC label. |
| DOLOOP | Indicates the presence of a DO loop. | Any non-null value |
| WHILE | Indicates the presence of a DO WHILE condition. | Any non-null value. |

## TABLE I--Continued

| Keyword Parameter | Meaning | Characteristics of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WOP | Logical operator for a DO WHILE condition. | LT, LE, EQ, GE, GT, or NE. |
| WREGA | Register containing the left operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| WREGB | Register containing the right operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| WLOCA | Location containing the left operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| WLOCB | Location containing the right operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| WLITA | Numerical value representing the left operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Integer. |
| WLITB | Numerical value representing the right operand of a DO WHILE condition. | Integer. |

The ENDDO macro utilizes only one keyword parameter LABEL. This parameter should be equated to the value of the LABEL parameter of the DO macro associated with the ENDDO macro.

Examples of the DO macro are shown in Figure 15. Macro A represents a simple DO loop. The lower range is specified in register three (LOWREG=3), the upper range is a numerical


Fig. 15--Examples of DO macro parameters
eighty-five (HGHNUM=85), and the increment for the loop is contained in location INCRMT (BYLOC=INCRMT). Note that the DOLOOP parameter has been made non-null. This is required when a DO loop is specified. Macro B represents a simple DO WHILE loop. The loop will be executed as long as the contents of register five (WREGA=5), is less than or equal to (WOP=LE), the contents of location SPACE (SLOCB=SPACE). The WHILE parameter must be made non-null when a DO WHILE loop is specified. Macro $C$ represents a combination of a DO loop and DO WHILE condition. In this macro both the DOLOOP and WHILE parameters must be made non-null. The lower limit of the DO loop is contained in location NUM, (LOWLOC=NUM), the upper limit is in register three (HGHREG=3), and the increment is in register fourteen (BYREG=14). The WHILE condition is satisfied when the contents of location TIME (WLOCA-TIME), is greater than or equal to $(W O P=G E)$, a numerical one hundred (WLITB=100). When both a DO loop and DO WHILE condition are specified, each is tested before the loop is executed. The basic logic of a DO and ENDDO construct is shown in Figure 16. Since a stack is used to maintain DO loop parameters, the DO macro permits nesting. A DO macro and its ENDDO macro may be entirely contained within the bounds of a second DO and ENDDO macro. Figure 17 illustrates nesting of DO macros to the second level. Notice that the LABEL parameters of the DO and ENDDO macros must be properly


Fig. 16--Flowchart of $a$ DO and ENDDO construct


Fig. 17--DO macros nested to the second level
matched, i.e., at any given level of nesting, the LABEL parameters of the DO and ENDDO macros are equated to identical values. (A unique LABEL parameter value should be specified for each DO construct.)

Figure 18 illustrates the use of the stack in executing the nested macros of Figure 17. As each DO macro is encountered its parameters are stacked in a last-in first-out stack. Before executing a particular DO loop, its parameters are unstacked and tested. If the loop is to be executed, then the parameters are restacked; otherwise, the parameters are not restacked, and the loop is bypassed. Thus, each


Fig. 18--Flowchart of stack logic for code in Figure 17
time LOOP A is executed the DO macro of LOOP $B$ will be encountered, its parameters stacked, unstacked, and tested. In a similar manner, with each execution of LOOP $B$, the DO macro of LOOP C will be encountered, and its parameters will be stacked, unstacked, and tested.

Program instructions falling between a DO macro and its corresponding ENDDO macro represent the body of the code affected by the looping construct. This code may include any acceptable ALC instruction including macro instructions; however, the loop should not include branching instructions which transfer program control to a point outside the range of the DO macro. If the programmer wishes to terminate the looping construct abnormally, he should use the LEAVE macro, which is discussed in this chapter.

The DO macro extensively tests parameter specifications at assembly time. When an incorrectly specified parameter is detected, an appropriate error message is printed if the expanded macro code is shown, and the macro is terminated. Before termination of the macro, however, the "work" registers will be restored with their original contents so that program execution may continue. The macro, however, will have essentially been ignored by the program.

In addition to the complete source listings of the DO and ENDDO macros, Appendix A contains an expanded version of each of these macros and sample listings of macrogenerated error messages.

This particular form of the repetitive control structure was selected for implementation because it offers the greatest flexibility in defining looping conditions. A loop may be defined with a simple range condition similar to the FORTRAN DO statement, with a simple comparison condition similar to a PL/I DO WHILE or with a combination of both a range condition and comparison condition similar to the PL/I statement, DO $I=\ldots$...TO...WHILE(......). . Since conditional tests are always executed prior to loop execution, a DO UNTIL structure as illustrated in Figure 7 cannot be generated with the DO and ENDDO macros. The DO UNTIL statement tests looping conditions after the loop is executed; consequently, the loop is always executed at least once even when a condition fails on initial testing. In order to avoid any ambiguity with regard to initial loop execution, a DO UNTIL construct was not implemented. All repetitive loops will be executed only after their looping conditions are tested. If the conditional test fails initially, the loop will not be executed at all.

## The LEAVE Macro

It was pointed out in Chapter III that occasionally it may be expedient to abnormally terminate a looping construct, i.e. branch to the end of the loop from a point within the loop control. Figure 13 is a construct representing an abnormal loop termination.

The DO and ENDDO macros generate instructions that will terminate a loop only when the inclusive code has been completely executed. The programmer might insert a branch instruction within the inclusive code to escape the DO macro, but such a practice is not advised, since the effects of the branch instruction may not be readily understood or perhaps may be overlooked by a programmer unfamiliar with the code.

To provide a loop escape mechanism the LEAVE macro has been developed. It permits a conditional or unconditional branch to the end of the ENDDO macro, and thus, the looping control structure will be abnormally terminated.

Figure 19 illustrates the use of the various LEAVE macro parameters. In the first LEAVE macro LABEL is equated to AAAA in order to associate it with the external DO and ENDDO macros. This LEAVE macro contains a conditional branch since the COND parameter has been made non-null, $C O N D=F$. If the number nine ( $L I T A=9$ ) is equal to (OPRATOR=EQ) location $Y$ (LOCB=Y) then the LEAVE condition will be true and a branch to location AAAA, (LABEL=AAAA) will occur. The second LEAVE macro does not specify a condition and will, consequently, produce an unconditional branch to AAAA (LABEL=AAAA) when executed. The third LEAVE macro contains a conditional branch (COND=;), and the branch is executed if the contents of register ten

DO LABEL=AAAA, . . . .

```
•
                        •
                    LEAVE LABEL=AAAA,COND=F,LITA=0,
                        OPRATOR=EQ,LOCB=Y
        LEAVE LABEL=AAAA
        •
        .
        •
        •
```

            ENDDO LABEL=AAAA
                DO LABEL=XYZ, . . . .
            .
            -
            LEAVE \(\quad\) REGA \(=10\),LITB \(=22\), OPRATOR=NE,
                    LABEL \(=X Y Z, C O N D=;\)
                    ENDDO LABEL=XYZ
    Fig. 19--Examples of LEAVE macro parameters
( $\mathrm{REGA}=10$ ) are not equal (OPRATOR=NE) to a numeric twenty-two (LITB=22). The LABEL parameter (LABEL=XYZ) specifies the destination of the LEAVE branch. Table II contains a summary of LEAVE parameters, and Figure 20 describes the basic logic of the LEAVE macro at execution time.

TABLE II
KEYWORD PARAMETERS FOR THE LEAVE MACRO

| Keyword Parameter | Meaning | Characteristics of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LABEL | Destination of a LEAVE macro producing a branch. | Any valid ALC label. |
| COND | Indicates the LEAVE branch is conditional. | Any non-null value. |
| OPRATOR | Logical operator for a conditional branch. | $\mathrm{LT}, \mathrm{LE}, \mathrm{EQ}, \mathrm{GE},$ GR, or NE. |
| REGA | Register containing the left operand of LEAVE condition. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| REGB | Register containing the right operand of LEAVE condition. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| LOCA | Location containing the left operand of LEAVE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| LOCB | Location containing the right operand of LEAVE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| LITA | Numerical value of the left LEAVE condition operand. | Integer. |
| LITB | Numerical value of the right operand of LEAVE condition. | Integer. |



Fig. 20--Flowchart of execution of a LEAVE macro

If the LEAVE macro is used in lieu of a branching instruction, there can be no doubt as to the intentions of the code. The LEAVE statement appearing in the code will readily indicate the presence of a possible abnormal loop exit. Since the LEAVE macro may be specified with condition parameters, the programmer need not include the additional instructions to test his branching condition. He need merely specify the branching conditions by means of the keyword parameters; thus, the development of the LEAVE macro provides the programmer with a convenient and simple method for abnormal loop termination.

While it is possible to specify a LEAVE macro which will branch to a point other than just beyond the control of the looping macro, this practice should be avoided as explained in Chapter III since it may significantly complicate the program's structure.

Figures 21 and 22 illustrate the proper and improper use of the LEAVE macro. Notice that when coded properly the DO and ENDDO LABEL parameters are identical to each other and to any inclusive LEAVE macro LABEL parameters.

The LEAVE macro also tests parameter values at assembly time, and when improperly specified, the LEAVE macro will be ignored at execution time. Like the DO macro not all parameters of the LEAVE macro can be verified at assembly time; macro specification errors may, consequently, cause system-generated errors at execution time.


Fig. 2l--Properly coded LEAVE macros

```
HERE
DO
                                    LABEL=LOOP, . . .
                                    •
\[
\checkmark
\]
.
LEAVE LABEI=HERE, . . .
-
LEAVE LABEL=THERE, . . .
-
\[
\text { ENDDO } \quad \mathrm{LABEL}=\mathrm{LOOP}
\]
THERE
```

Fig. 22--Improperly coded LEAVE macros

Appendix $B$ contains a source listing of the LEAVE macro, an example of the expanded macro code, and samples of macro-generated error messages.

Selective Control Structure Macros
A selective control structure, the CASE macro, for ALC has been developed in this study. The CASE macro provides a multiple-selective structure for the programmer so that alternative sets of program instructions may be executed depending on the truth of the conditional parameters specified with each CASE macro.

Each CASE macro must be followed by an ENDCASE macro. All program instructions placed between the CASE and ENDCASE macros represent the code which will be executed if the CASE condition is true.

The CASE macro generates code to test the macro condition which is specified with keyword parameters similar to those which are used with the LEAVE macro. If the condition is true, instructions immediately following the CASE macro are then executed. If the condition is false, a forward branch to the paired ENDCASE macro will occur. The basic logic of a CASE macro is flowcharted in Figure 23.

The ENDCASE macro may be specified in one of two ways. The first way, OPTION=1, will cause a branch around any successive CASE macros if the preceding CASE condition were


Fig. 23--Flowchart of the execution of a CASE and ENDCASE construct.
true. In other words, when several successive CASE and ENDCASE macros are coded with OPTION=1, the first encountered CASE construct whose condition is true will be executed. All subsequent CASE macros will be bypassed. If OPTION=2 is specified with successive CASE macros, each of the macro constructs with true conditions will be executed.

In order to provide an alternative set of instructions to be executed when all of the immediately preceding CASE conditions are false, the ELSE and ENDELSE macros have been developed.

The ELSE macro is merely a prototype statement to signify the beginning of the alternative code. The ENDELSE macro provides a label for branching purposes when the instructions included between the ELSE and ENDELSE macros are not to be executed. The ENDELSE prototype statement indicates the termination of both the selective CASE macros and the ELSE macro.

An example of several CASE and ENDCASE macros using OPTION=1 is shown in Figure 24. The conditional parameters for a CASE macro are identical to those of the LEAVE macro with the exception of the COND parameter. The CASE macro is always conditional so a COND parameter is not required. The ENDCASE macros contain three parameters. One of the parameters is the OPTION keyword which in all cases has been equated to one. This indicates that as soon as one of the


Fig 24.--Example of CASE macros using OPTION=1

CASE conditions is true and its inclusive code is executed, the remaining CASE constructs along with the ELSE construct will be bypassed. In other words at most only one of the four constructs will be executed, namely the first one encountered whose condition is true. If all of the CASE conditions are untrue, the ELSE construct will be executed. The LABEL parameters associate each ENDCASE macro with its corresponding CASE macro. The LAB parameters specify the location of the ENDELSE macro associated with the CASE macros. Notice that each ENDCASE macro has its LAB parameter equated to TAG. This is necessary since a branch to the same ENDELSE macro will occur if any one of the CASE constructs is executed.

Figure 25 is a set of CASE and ENDCASE macros similar to those in Figure 24 except for the specification of the OPTION parameters. In Figure 25 each CASE construct has OPTION=2 specified. Since the second option has been specified, each CASE construct will be tested and executed if its condition is true. There is no ELSE construct included since forward branching does not occur when the second option is used.

The programmer is at liberty to use any combination of OPTION=1 and OPTION=2 CASE constructs that he wishes. Since the CASE and ENDCASE macros never produce backward branching, program linearity is not destroyed when the two options are used in successive CASE constructs. It is

Fig. 25--Example of CASE macros using OPTION=2
important to remember that when OPTION=1 is specified, an ELSE construct must also be included. Tables III and IV summarize the various parameters which may be specified with the CASE and ENDCASE macros.

Both the CASE and ENDCASE macros contain a number of error detection instructions. For the most part, macro keyword parameters are checked to insure that they have been coded correctly. If a CASE macro has been incorrectly specified, its condition is set to false. When ENDCASE macros have been incorrectly specified, the OPTION parameter is set to one and the macro is accordingly expanded.

The source listings for the CASE, ENDCASE, ELSE, and ENDELSE macros are in Appendix C, which also contains an expanded version of each of the macros and samples of macro-generated error messages.

The CASE macro as a selective control structure was implemented because of its versatility with respect to path selection. Any number of CASE constructs may be successively defined; thus, there is no limit to the number of possible paths from which the programmer may choose. To the contrary the PL/I IF THEN ELSE statement, which is a form of the selective control structure, limits the programmer to one of two possible paths unless nesting is used. The CASE macro also allows the programmer to execute more than one of the tested paths if he so desires. This is possible when OPTION=2 is specified. The CASE macro is

TABLE III
KEYWORD PARAMETERS FOR THE CASE MACRO

| Keyword Parameter | Meaning | Characteristics of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IABEL | Label to identify corresponding ENDCASE macro. | Any valid ALC label. |
| OPRATOR | Logical operator for the CASE condition | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LT, LE, EQ, GE, } \\ & \text { GT,or NE. } \end{aligned}$ |
| REGA | Register containing the left operand of the CASE condition. | Integer from 0 to 15. |
| LOCA | Location containing the left operand of the CASE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| LOCB | Location containing the right operand of the CASE condition. | Any valid ALC label. |
| LITA | Numerical value of the left operand of the CASE condition. | Integer. |
| LITB | Numerical value of the right operand of the CASE condition. | Integer. |

TABLE IV
KEYWORD PARAMETERS FOR THE ENDCASE MACRO

| Keyword <br> Parameter | Meaning | Characteristics <br> of Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OPTION | Numerical value specifying type <br> of CASE construct. <br> Label linking ENDCASE macro <br> with corresponding CASE macro | Integer value <br> of 1 or 2. <br> Any valid ALC <br> label. <br> with corresponding ENDELSE <br> macro. |
| Any valid ALC <br> label. |  |  |

especially appropriate for structured programming since it produces no backward branches. Each CASE construct is tested sequentially as it is encountered within the code producing a linear flow of control.

Appendix $D$ contains a simple program which illustrates the combined use of the CASE and nested DO macros. A flowchart of the program is also included to illustrate the control structure of the program.

The DO, LEAVE, CASE, and ENDCASE macros contain a number of assembly-time error messages. All pertain to the specifications of macro parameters. Some of these messages indicate illegal parameter values while others identify missing parameters or duplicate parameters. It is possible to detect these error conditions at assembly-time since macro parameter values must be specified before program assembly begins. Other error conditions, relating to particular ALC instructions which are included within a macro definition, will produce system-generated messages at assembly time. The macros described in this chapter do not contain any execution-time error tests since any error condition occurring during execution will produce a system-generated error message. At execution time each macro has already been expanded into a set of ALC instructions, and these instructions with other program instructions are subject to all of the error-detecting capabilities of the particular system being used.
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## CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CRITIQUE, AND CONCLUSIONS

## Summary

Within the last seven years a growing number of programmers have expounded various concepts and methodologies which they believe will improve software design and will increase the productivity, reliability, maintainability, and extendability of programs. These various concepts and techniques have been collectively, and in part, referred to as "structured programming."

The purpose of this study was to present a survey of the major concepts, contributors and techniques of structured programming, and to develop a set of IBM 360 assembly language macros which would facilitate the application of structured programming control structures to assembly language programming.

The first significant contribution to structured programming was made by E. W. Dijkstra when he suggested (3) that the GOTO statement may prove harmful to a program's structure if the construct is used indiscriminately by the programmer. Dijkstra suggested that avoiding the use of the GOTO structure may significantly improve the logic of most programs.
since the time of Dijkstra's paper (3) a controversy has developed concerning the use of the GOTO construct. The question today is whether or not the GOTO statement should be eliminated from programming (7). "GOTO-less" programming is sometimes used synonymously with structured programming, although the GOTO issue is by no means the only concept involved in the development of a structured programming method. Other concepts being discussed include such issues as the proper methods for subroutine entry and exit (7), and the conditions permitting abnormal program termination (interrupts).

A second significant contribution to structured programming made by Dijkstra is his development of the "THE' Multiprogramming System (2) which illustrates a technique for system software design. This technique includes the use of what Dijkstra termed "abstract resources" in system design. These resources divided the system into layers or levels of abstraction (both control and data structures) which then were applicable to the definition of various programmable modules.

Dijkstra's work has had a profound impact on the development of structured programming, and most of the literature on structured programming, at least in part, reflects his philosophies.

Another important contributor to structured programming is Harlan Mills of the IBM Corporation. Mills (5) and his associates at IBM have developed the Chief Programmer Team method for the production of large programs. This method incorporates both a managerial and organizational approach to program design.

The Chief Programmer Team defines in a very specific manner the role of a chief programmer, a backup programmer, and a programming librarian in a programming team. The method also employs a well-defined system of program documentation during program development.

Mills (5) describes his "top-down" approach to program design. This approach includes the use of modular programming, specific programming control structures, and strict rules governing the entry and exit points of program modules. Data structures in the top-down approach are important only to the extent that they affect module interfacing.

The concepts of the Chief Programmer Team and top-down programming have contributed a possible solution to the problem of defining a structured programming method for the development of large programs.

An article by Bohm and Jacopini (1) is the basis for structured programming control structure theory. They showed that the logic of any program can be defined with the use of only three types of control structures. These
structures include a sequential, a repetitive, and a selective construct. The use of only these three control structures eliminates not only the necessity of GOTO statements, but also any other control structures which may complicate program logic.

Other programming techniques which are associated with structured programming include: modular programming, open programming, compartmentalization, information hiding, extensive program documentation, the use of indentation and spacing in program code, and the use of meaningful labels and variable names in program coding.

At this time there is no generally accepted definition of structured programming. The literature suggests various approaches to improving programming techniques, and it remains to be seen just which concepts and techniques will be included in a formal definition of structured programming.

In order to apply some of the structured programming principles expounded in the literature, the author developed a set of IBM 360 assembly language macros, described in this thesis, to provide the assembly language programmer the necessary and sufficient control structures defined by Bohm and Jacopini (1).

The IBM 360 assembly language macros implemented include a DO macro for repetitive constructs and a CASE macro for selective control structures. A LEAVE macro was also developed to provide an escape mechanism for abnormal
termination of a repetitive control structure. No macro was developed for sequential program control since IBM 360 assembly language instructions are executed sequentially when there are no instructions to the contrary.

These macros may be used to approximate structured programming constructs in assembly language. It should be remembered, however, that assembly language programs are inherently more tedious to code and interpret than are higher languages; consequently, structured programming techniques may not be as easily applied to assembly languages as they are to higher languages.

The presence of these macros within a program does not imply that the program is well structured. Only when the programmer takes care to apply the principles of structured programming throughout his code and uses the macros in the prescribed fashion will the control structures of his program reflect the type of structuring which is characteristic of structured programming.

In addition, a completely well-structured program would presumably observe certain principles of structuring restricting the access of program modules to data. It is not clear that the data hierarchy concepts of Dijkstra (2) will survive the test of time; in any case, the macros developed in this thesis have not considered the problems of data structures.

Critique
This investigation uncovered only one other attempt (4) to implement similar control structures using programmer-defined ALC macros. Kessler's (4) macros included a DO and CASE macro but no LEAVE statement.

The most significant difference in the author's DO macro and Kessler's is the specification of looping conditions through keyword parameters. Kessler's (4) DO macro is somewhat more flexible in that an UNTIL option is available, but it is also more restrictive since some conditional parameters must be specified in prescribed registers. The parameters Kessler (4) uses are fewer in number but substantially more complicated than those of this author.

Kessler's (4) CASE macro has a completely different implementation than the CASE macro of the author. Referring to Figure 26, an example of Kessler's CASE macro, if register $R_{x}$ conatins a 5,6 , or 7 , then code $A$ is executed. If register $R_{x}$ contains a 3 , then code $B$ is executed. If $R_{x}$ does not contain a $3,5,6$, or 7 , then neither code $A$ or Code B will be executed. Kessler's (4) CASE macro is significantly simplier than that in this thesis, but because it lacks conditional execution parameters, the programmer will be required to include necessary conditional testing procedures in his program. For instance, using the example

CASENTRY $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{X}}$
CASE 5,6,7
Code A
CASE 3
Code B

## ENDCASE

Fig. 26--An example of Kessler's CASE macro
of Figure 26 , the programmer would test a condition within his program code. Depending upon the truth of the test, he would load a certain value into register $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{x}}$ which would cause the appropriate CASE to be executed. Since the programmer is required to encode the testing procedure, Kessler's (4) CASE macro is not limited to the simple testing conditions of the CASE macro implemented in this thesis. It appears then that the CASE macro of Kessler is more flexible in terms of defining test conditions, but Kessler's macro will require more programmer-generated code than the CASE macro described in this thesis.

Conclusions
Besides developing an adequate set of structured program control structures at the assembly language level, there appears to be a need to impose some new discipline of data structuring and access, especially at the assembly language level of programming. These are only weakly
enforced by most input-output system calls. Multics (6) is the outstanding exception with regard to file security, but Multics per se does not enforce a modularity of user program structure.

It is hoped that after further investigation a set of principles will eventually be developed which will form the basis of a structured programming method. Not only would such a method improve the design and production of computer software and programs, but it would also initiate some semblance of uniformity in programming techniques and program structure. If all programs were written using the same basic set of programming principles, perhaps the interpretation of program logic would become standardized.

At the present time it appears that any structured programming method, if it is to be totally accepted, will have to be of a very general nature, encompassing only a few flexible principles, since the software and programs of today involve such a wide variety of programming problems and applications.
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## APPENDIX A

## THE DO AND ENDDO MACROS

The Source Listing for the DO Macro


| 48 | * |  | PqINTED AND THE MACRO TERMINATES。 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49 | * |  |  |
| 50 | * |  |  |
| 51 | - SKIP2 | AIF | ('ELOWNUM' EQ '1].A |
| 52 |  | AIF | ('EHGHNUM'EQ : ') Al $^{\text {a }}$ |
| 53 |  | AIf | ("EbYNuM EQ : ). Al |
| 54 |  | AIF |  |
| 55 |  | A: F | ('ELOWNUM EQ 'GHGHVUM'): EPR16 |
| 56 |  | AG] | -VEG |
| 57 | -P3S | ATF |  |
| 58 |  | AG? | . 41 |
| 59 | - NEG | AIF | ('EBYNUM' GT ${ }^{\prime}$ O').ERR18 |
| 60 | - A1 | L. 4 | 10,0 |
| 61 |  | 4 | 10, =F'\&LOWMUM. |
| 62 |  | A30 | -C |
| 63 | - $A$ | AIF | ('ELOWPEG' EQ ''). 8 |
| 64 |  | AIF | (T'ELOWREG NF 'N').ER224 |
| 65 |  | Alf | ('ELOWREG' GT 'L5'). ERR19 |
| 66 |  | L2 | 10, \&IOWREG |
| 67 | - B | Ago | - Cl 1 |
| 68 |  | A! F | 1'ELOWLOC' EQ '1.ERRI |
| 69 |  | 1 | 10, 510 WLOC |
| 70 |  | AGT | - C 2 |
| 71 | - C | Alf | ('ELMAREG' NE ' '1.ERR9 |
| 72 | - Cl | AIF | ('\&LOWLOC' NE ' 'loEkR9 |
| 73 |  | A30 | .C2 |
| 74 | * |  |  |
| 75 | * |  |  |
| 76 | * |  | THE FOLLOWTNG SECTIDM OF CODF SELECTS THE YOPER LIM- |
| 77 | * |  | IT OF THE DO l.jop zange it may be specifici in the |
| 78 | * |  | SAME FASHIDN AS THE LOWER LIMIT; THE COORESPOYOINR, |
| 79 | * |  | PAOAMETERS AOE HGHXUM, HGHREG AND HGHEC. THE COOED |
| 80 | * |  | PARAMETER IS ALSO CHECKED FOR VALIDITY, AVD THE UP- |
| 81 | * |  | PER LI!IIT IS LJADES IVTY OEGISTER 110 AN APPR CPGI- |
| 82 | * |  | ATE ERFOR MESSAGE WILL SE GENERATED FDR ILLEGAI. PA- |
| 83 | * |  | rametep valuEs amd the macpo hill tedminate. |
| 84 | * |  |  |
| 85 | * |  |  |
| 86 | - C 2 | A!F | (\%HGHNUM: EQ *).D |
| 87 |  | LA | 11,0 |
| 88 |  | 4 | 11, =F'EMGHNUT |
| 89 | - 0 | AGO | - F |
| 90 |  | AiF | ('\&HGHREG' ER ").E |
| 91 |  | AIF | (T'EHGHREG NE 'N'I.ERR25 |
| 2 |  | AIF | ('EHGHREG GT '15').ERR2O |
| 93 |  | LR | 11, EHGHREG |
| 94 |  | As0 | -F1 |
| 95 | - E | AIF | ('EHGHKSC'EQ *) - ERR2 |
| 6 |  | L. | 11, GHGHLOC |
| 97 |  | 4 O 0 | -F2 |
| $8 . \mathrm{F}$ |  | AIF |  |
| $99 . F 1$ |  | AIF |  |
| 00 |  | AGO | .F2 |
| 01 |  |  |  |
| 102 | * |  |  |
| 103 | * |  | THIS NEXT SEGTIIN DF COOE SELECTS THE DT LOOD IN- |
| 104 | * |  | COEMENT FOR TME SOECIFIED PANGE. THE INCREMEVT MAY |
| 105 | * |  | BE SPECIFTED BY A LITERAL (BYNUM), BY EEGISTER |
| 106 | * |  | (BYPEG) OR BY LDCATIOV (BYLOCl. THE TVEREMENT IS |
| 107 | * |  | loaded into register 9. illegal parametef values |
| 108 | * |  | WTLL TERMINATE YHE MACR?. |
| 110 | * |  | - - |
| 111 | -F2 | A1F | ('EbYNUM' EQ "tag |
| 112 |  | AIF | ('GBYNUM EQ O'laERRI2 |
| 113 |  | LA | 9.0 O |
| 114 |  | A | 9, $\mathrm{FF}^{\prime}$ \&BYNUM |



| 181 | * |  | IS COMPARED TH REGISTER IL AMD IF IT IS GOEATED THAM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 182 | * |  | REGISTER 11 FQQ a PJSITIVE INCPEMEVT TR LESS THAN |
| 183 | * |  | -EGIStER 11 for a negative increment, the program |
| 184 | * |  | BRANCHES OUT OF THE DO LJOP. if The lojo is not |
| 185 | * |  | SATISFIED, CONTROL PASSES TO THE NEXT SECTION OF |
| 186 | * |  | CODE. |
| 187 | * |  |  |
| 188 | * |  |  |
| 189 | - SKTP4 | $c$ | 9,2580 |
| 190 |  | BL | $X \& L A B$ |
| 191 |  | CR | 10,11 |
| 192 |  | 8.4 | Yelat |
| 193 |  | B | ZELAB |
| 194 | XELAB | C2 | 10.11 |
| 195 |  | 81 | YELAB |
| 196 |  | AGO | - SKIP5 |
| 197 | * |  |  |
| 198 | * |  |  |
| 199 | * |  | WHEN THE DO LDJP IS NJT SATISF?ED, THE FOLIDWYN |
| 200 | * |  | SECTION OF CODE ADDS THE INCGEMENT TO REGISTEP 10 |
| 201 | * |  | (Whene the lower ravge limit was ivitially loaded) |
| 202 | * |  | ANO STMRES THE INCREMENT AND RANGE VALUES BACK Into |
| 203 | * |  | THE STACK. |
| 204 | * |  |  |
| 205 | * |  |  |
| 206 | - SKPP5 | AVOP |  |
| 207 | ZELAB | $A^{2}$ | 10,9 |
| 208 |  | 1 | 8,porvter |
| 209 |  | ST | 9, STACK(8) |
| 210 |  | LA | 8,418) |
| 211 |  | ST | 10, STACK(8) |
| 212 |  | LA | 8.4(8) |
| 213 |  | ST | 11,STACK(8) |
| 214 |  | LA | 8,4(8) . |
| 215 |  | St | 8,PDINTER |
| 216 |  | AGO | -SKIPG |
| 217 | * |  |  |
| 218 | * |  |  |
| 219 | * |  | THE ORIGINAL CJNTENTS OF THE WOOKING REGISTERS ARE |
| 220 | * | * | PESTOPED AND THE PROGRAM BRANCHES TO THE BEGINNING |
| 221 | * |  | OF THE DO WHILE CODE。 |
| 222 | * |  |  |
| 223 | * |  |  |
| 22.4 | - SXIP6 | 1 | 8, SAVE 8 |
| 225 |  | 1 | 9, SAVEG |
| 226 |  | $\llcorner$ | 10, SAVE10 |
| 22.7 |  | L | 11.SAVE11 |
| 228 |  | 6 | WGL.AB |
| 229 |  | 490 | - SK!P7 |
| 230 | * |  |  |
| 231 | * |  |  |
| 232 | * | - | WHEN THF DO LOJP IS SATISFIED, A BRANCH FRDM EITHES |
| 233 | * |  | STATEYENT 204 DR 207 TS THE FOLLOWTNG CODE W:LL THEN |
| 234 | * |  | BE MADE, THE WORKING REGISTERS WILL BE ICADEO WITH |
| 235 | * |  | their jetginal values gthe do loop paramerens will |
| 236 | * | . | NJT be stackeot and the banch to 'aglagel' will |
| 237 | * |  | TERMENATE THE LOOP. |
| 238 | * |  |  |
| 239 | * |  |  |
| 240 | - Skrp7 | ANOP |  |
| 241 | YELAB | L | 8,SAVE8 |
| 242 |  | L | 9, SAVE9 |
| 243 |  | $L$ | 10, SAVE10 |
| 244 |  | 1 | 11.sAVEII |
| 245 |  | 8 | aflabel |
| 246 | WELAB | EQU | * |


| 247 |  | AGO | －SKT－8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 248 | ＊ |  |  |
| 249 | ＊ |  |  |
| 250 | ＊ |  | －the following code tests for the presenice tf a oo |
| 251 | ＊ |  | WHILE COUDITINV．IF A DO LOMD WAS SPECTFYED，BUT A |
| 252 | ＊ |  | DI WHILE CONDTTIJN WAS VAT，A BRANCH TO THE EVD OE |
| 253 | ＊ |  | THE YACE？OCCURS IF A DO WHTLE GTMOYTTM HAS BEEN |
| 254 | ＊ |  | SDECIFYED，THEN THE YACOO PRICEEDS TI SENEQATE CDDE |
| 255 | ＊ |  | TJ IMPLEMENT IT。 IF VEITHER A DJ INRP MOR DO Wivile |
| 256 | ＊ |  | CONOITIOH HAS BEEN SPECIFIED，AV EZRER MESSAGE IS |
| 257 | ＊ |  |  |
| 258 | ＊ |  | PRINTED ANO THE MACRS TERMEVATESO |
| 259 | ＊ |  |  |
| 260 | －SKIP8 | 4！F | （＇EWHILE＇EQ＇＇IaEND |
| 261 |  | Aso | － 2 |
| 262 | －WHILE | AIF | （＇EWHILE＇EQ＇＇）．ERR4 |
| 263 | \＆LABEL | EQU | ＊${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 26.4 |  | ASO | － 2 |
| 265 | ＊ |  |  |
| 266 | ＊ |  |  |
| 267 | ＊ |  | T9 IMPLEMENT THE OO WHILE CONDITION REGYSTERS 10 AVO |
| 268 | ＊ |  | $11.4 D E$ USED AS WORK REGISTERS：THEOEFRZE，THETE |
| 269 | ＊ |  |  |
| 270 | ＊ |  | Contents are initially saved． |
| 271 | ＊ |  |  |
| 272 | －R | ST | 10，SAVEIO |
| 273 |  | ST |  |
| 274 |  | AGO | －Skipg |
| 275 | ＊ |  |  |
| 276 | ＊ |  |  |
| 277 | ＊ |  | THE FRLLINING INSTRJCTIJNS LMAD THE LEFT CPEPANJ GF |
| 278 | ＊ |  | THE OO WHILE CSNDITIDY INTD DEGYSTER 100 THIS JOFR－ |
| 279 | ＊ |  |  |
| 280 | ＊ |  |  |
| 281 | ＊ |  | SOECIFIED OPERAND IS vOT A VAL：D VALUE isELF－ |
| 282 | ＊ |  | DEFTNJNG NUMEDICI WHEV A LITERAL TS CMDED，THEN AN： |
| 283 | \％ |  | EROOO GESSAGE WILL be printeo and the macro will TEOMINATE． |
| 285 | ＊ |  |  |
| 286 | ＊ |  |  |
| 287 | －SKPP9 | A！F | （＇EWREGA＇EQ M）．K |
| 288 |  | A！F | （T＇EWPEGA NE－V＇）．ERR27 |
| 289 |  | AIF | ＇＇EWREGA＇GT＇L5＇loERR2I |
| 290 |  | Lマ | 10，EWREGA |
| 291 |  | AGO | － 1 M |
| 29 ？ | －K | At ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | （＇ENLICAS EQ＇H．L |
| 293 |  | L． | 10，8ulgca |
| 294 |  | A30 | － 41 |
| 295 | －L | $A^{\prime} \mathrm{F}$ | （＇EWLITA EQ＊）${ }^{\text {（GERZR }}$ |
| 296 |  | A！F | （＇EWLITS＇NE＇1／EERR15 |
| 297 |  | L．A | 10．0 |
| 298 |  | A | 10，＝F＇E新ITA＇ |
| 299 |  | AGO | ． 12 2 |
| 300 | －${ }^{4}$ | AIF | （＇EULOCA＇NE＇1／ERRRI3 |
| 301 | －41 | AIF |  |
| 302 |  | AGO | －M2 2 |
| 303 | ＊ |  |  |
| 304 | ＊ |  |  |
| 305 | ＊ |  | THE FCLLJWING STATEYENTS LOAD THE OIGHT OPEPANO OF |
| 306 | ＊ |  | THE On WHILE COVOITIOY IVTM REGISTEF 11 AND COWPAPE |
| 308 | ＊ |  | IT TV REGISTER 10．THTS TPERANO MAY ALSO BE SPEC＇－ <br>  |
| 309 | ＊ |  |  |
| 310 | ＊ |  |  |
| 311 | ＊ |  | ERROT MESSAGE WILL BE PRINTED AND THE MACRD EXPAN－ |
| 312 | ＊ |  | SION WILL EE TERMIVATED＊ |


| 313 | * |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 314 | * |  |  |
| 315 | . 12 | A: F |  |
| 316 |  | AIF |  |
| 317 |  | ATF | ('EWRFGA GT '15').ER222 |
| 318 |  | L? | 11, EMGEGB |
| 319 |  | AG7 | - 9 |
| 320 | - N | AIf | ('\&WLncel EQ " ${ }^{\text {Pon }}$ |
| 321 |  | L | 11. EULOCA |
| 322 |  | AG 3 | ${ }^{2} 1$ |
| 323 | . 0 | AIf | ('EWLITR' EQ "'1.ERPG |
| 32.4 |  | LA | 11,0 |
| 325 |  | A | 11, =F'EWLITB' |
| 326 |  | As9 | - P2 |
| 327 | - ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | A 1 F | ('EWLOCB' NE '9).ERR14 |
| 328 | -P1 | AIF | (*'VLITB' NE 'r) |
| 329 | - P2 | CR | 10,11 |
| 330 |  | As | - SKIPIO |
| 331 * |  |  |  |
| 332 |  |  |  |
| 333 | * |  | WHEN BOTH DPEFANDS JF the do wht le condt ton have |
| 334 | * |  | 8EEN LITADED, this vext code segwent selects the |
| 335 | * |  | LOG'CAL gPERATJR USED IV THE COYPARSIOV。 IF AM IL- |
| 336 | * |  | LEEAL DPERATOR HAS SEEN SPECYFTED OR TF NT DPEOATRQ |
| 337 | * |  | HAS BEEN SPECIFIED, THE MACRO. WILL. TERMTAATE WITH AN |
| 338 | * |  | ERROP MESSAGE: OTHERWTSE, THE APPPJPRTATE COMPARISTN |
| 339 | * |  | WILL BE MADE, AVD If the on while condit onn is sat- |
| 340 | * |  | ISFIED, A BRANCH TJ TEPMINATE THE LOQP WILL GCCUR. |
| 341 * |  |  |  |
| 342 * |  |  |  |
| 343 | - SKIP10 | A 1 F | ('Ennp EO 'MaEPR? |
| 344 |  | A) F | ('EWIDS EQ 'EQ') |
| 345 |  | A. ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | ('gunp EQ 'ly'lotess |
| 346 |  | AIF | ('EXJo' FQ 'LE'taLESSEQ |
| 347 |  | AIF | ('EMDP EQ 'GE'IOGRTEQ |
| 348 |  | A'F | ('EnMO EQ 'Gr'lagrt |
| 349 |  | $A^{\prime} \mathrm{F}$ | ('sWnP: EQ NE'). NJTEQ |
| 350 |  | $43]$ | - End 8 |
| 351 | - EQUAL | BYE | TELAB |
| 352 |  | ASO | - 2 |
| 353 | -LESS | BYL | T\&LAB |
| 354 |  | AGO | - 2 |
| 355 | - LESSEQ | B4 | telab |
| 356 |  | A50 | - 2 |
| 357 | - GRTEQ | 8 L | TELAB |
| 358 |  | ASD | - 2 |
| 359 | - G8Y | B4y | telab |
| 360 |  | 167 | - 2 |
| 361 | - Norea | BE | TGLAB |
| 362 |  | AsO | - 7 |
| 363 | * |  |  |
| 364* |  |  |  |
| 365 | * |  | OVCe the do while CJnditrna has been testene the |
| 366 | * |  |  |
| 367 | * |  |  |
| 368 | * |  | SATISFIES, BRAVCHES TJ THE ENO OF YHE WACRO WHEqE |
| 369 | * |  | THE LIOP WILL BE EXECUTES AGATN. TF THE CONDITION |
| 370 | * |  | HAS GEEV SATISFIEO, A BRANCH TO THE 'ENDDT MACRO |
| 372 * WTLL |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 373 | 00 L 13.SAVElo |  |  |
| 374 |  |  |  |
| 375 |  | 1 | - hi, savell |
| 376 |  | B | VELAB |
| 377 | relab | t. | 1), SAVELO |
| 378 |  | 1 | 11,SAVEII |


| 379 |  | B | AGLABEL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 380 | VELAB | EQU | * |
| 381 |  | 467 | - END |
| 382 | * |  |  |
| 383 | * |  |  |
| 384 | * |  | THIS FIMAL SECTION JF MACRC CTOE REPOESESTS THE EO- |
| 385 | * |  | R 78 MFSSAGES GENEPATED OURIVG MAC23 EXPANSIZソ EF- |
| 386 | * |  | RORS THOICATE That the vacoo cav nat be expanoso to |
| 387 | * |  | Pr jouce executeable cmoe; Cjasequentty, whey gne |
| 388 | * |  | IS DETECTED, A MESSAGE IS POTNTED OUT AVO A SZANCH |
| 389 | * |  | TJ The 'EvDOD' Máczj 2 CGURSo The WORKIVG REGTSTEPS |
| 390 | * |  | WILL BE RESTOREO ANO THE 'DO. MACRO WILL vor be fup- |
| 391 | * |  | THER EXPANOED. |
| 392 | * |  |  |
| 393 | * |  |  |
| 394 | - ERR1 | MVITE | *, 'lower do lojp range vor specified: |
| 395 |  | $B$ | CElAbEl |
| 396 |  | 400 | - ENO |
| 397 | -ERR2 | YVOTE | *, upper do lojp ravge vot specified |
| 398 |  | B | CELABEL |
| 399 |  | AG? | - ENO |
| 400 | -ERR3 | muote | *, 'on logp incremevt vor spectayed. |
| 401 |  | 3. | CELABEL S |
| 402 |  | Aso | - ENO |
| 403 | - ERP 4 | Mvote | * :No oo or on while covoition seti |
| 404 |  | B | AELABEL |
| 405 |  | AGO | - EnO |
| 406 | -ERR5 | MNOTE | * "in left dperano specified on do while sondition. |
| 407 |  | 8 | BELABEL |
| 408 |  | AS? | - ENO |
| 409 | - ERR 6 | mvjte |  |
| 410 |  | B | BELABEL |
| 411 |  | AG? | - ENO |
| 412 | - ERR 7 | Mvote | * 'om yhile operatjr vot specyayed |
| 413 |  | 8 | Belarel. |
| 414 |  | AJO | - EnO |
| 415 | - ERR 8 | myote | *, "HVALTD On while gperator specifyed |
| 416 |  | 8 | BELABEL |
| 417 |  | 450 | - ENO |
| 418 | - ERRG | myote | *; minfe than one lower do lomp ravge specifiedi |
| 419 |  | 8 | CELABEL |
| 420 |  | AST | - EvD |
| 421 | - ERR10 | myate | *, 'umae than tne upper jo lomd range specifyed' |
| 422 |  | B | CSLABEI. |
| 423 |  | As0 | - Fin |
| 424 | - FRRLI | 4vate |  |
| 425 |  | 8 | CELABEL |
| 426 |  | 460 | - Evir |
| 427 | - ERRL2 | mvore | *.zSro is invalio do logo increment: |
| 428 |  | 9 | C\&lagel in |
| 439 |  | 453 | - 5Mo |
| 430 | -EQR13 | nvote | *, MMRE THAN ONE LEFT D7 WHILE JPEzAND SPECTEYEJ' |
| 431 |  | 3 | BGLABEL |
| 432 |  | 4 G 0 | - Ent. |
| 433 | -ERQ14 | svore | *, Mrate than ove right oj while doerand speiffied' |
| 434 |  | 8 | BGLABEL |
| 435 |  | 490 | - ENO |
| 436 | -ERR15 | ynote | * '0\% While covoitisn contains tho literal operanos. |
| 437 |  | 8 | BELAREL. |
| 438 |  | AGO | - End |
| 439 | - ERRLG | mvote | *, '00 toop has specified range of zeror |
| 440 |  | A\% 0 | - al |
| 441 | - ERR17 | HNJTE | *, 'vegative increment invalid for specrfeg do loopt |
| 442 |  | 日 | C\&LABEL |
| 443 |  | AG9 | - ENO |
| 444 | - ERR18 | Mvote | *, DOSITIVE incremevt invaly $m$ for specifien dj londo |



The Source Listing for the ENDDO Macro


| 504 |  | MACRD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 505 |  | Evodo | \&LABEL $=$ |
| 506 |  | B. | - LABEL |
| 507 | CELABEL | 1 | 8,SAVE8 |
| 508 |  | 1 | 9, Saves |
| 509 | BELABEL | $L$ | 10, SAVEIO |
| 510 |  | L | 11,SAVEIL |
| 511 | AGLABEL | EQU | * |
| 512 |  | MEND |  |

## Sample Program A Illustrating the DO and ENDDO Macros

```
STMT SOURCE STATEMENT
    962 OQTNT NTGEN
    963 FRISEEE ENTEQ 12,SAVEAPEA
    979 STAFT TPEN LA (OUMPAPEA,OUTPUTH
    986
    987
    988
    989
    9 9 0
    991
    992
93
974
995
996
    997
    9:8
    999
1011
1012
1013
1029 ( A A 3,WFFGG
1030
1031
1032
1 0 3 3
1034
1035
1036
1 0 3 7
1037
1045
1046
1058
1059
1060
1061
1 0 6 2
1063
1064
1065
1006
1067 *
    lll
1130
1131
1132
1133
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
SVAP & \(I D=2\), \\
LA & 3,0 \\
LA & 4,0 \\
LA & 5,0 \\
LA & 6,0 \\
LA & 7,0 \\
LA & 8,0 \\
LA & 9,0 \\
LA & 10,0
\end{tabular}
    CNAP 
*
    LSAP M, ID=2,DCB=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
* SVAP. ID=1,DCB=OUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
```



```
07 WHILE=Q,W2FGA=4,WOP=LT,NLITB=10,LABEL=ONE
1131
    SYAP M IO=2,DCB=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS 
                    A 4,=E:20
A 3,=F:1'
```



```
            A 5,=F'1'
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    LA 2,0
    LA 3,0
    LA 5,0
    LA 
    LA 
MA % %
92
*
**
*
0. W4IL
LA 
    LA 11,0
    LA 14,0
LA 15,0
*
    * A A 6,=F:I' 
    -A 5,=E12.
    A 6,9=F420
```



| REGS 8-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 C 00$ | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| END OF SVAP |  |  |  |  |



| REGS AT EVTRY TO SNAD. |  | ID $=003$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| REGS $0-7$ | $000002 A O$ | $A 001 B A 5 B$ | 00000000 | 00000010 |
|  | 00000010 | 00000010 | 00000010 | 00000010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REGS $8-15$ | 00000010 | 00000010 | 00000010 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 C 00$ | 00000000 | 00000000 |

END OF SNEP
REGS AT ENTRY TO SNAP
$10=004$

| REGS 0-7 | $000002 A O$ | 00018804 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| RESS 日-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | 00018600 | 00000000 | 00000000 |

## Program A with Expanded Macros



| $1023+$ | B | $V_{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1024+74 | L | 10, SAVE10 |
| 10254 | L | II, SAVEII |
| 1026 | 8 | AONE |
| 1027+V4 | EQU | * |
| 1028 |  | A 3, FF'1. |
| 1029 |  | A 4, =F'14 |
| 1030 | - | A. $5,=$ F'l $^{\prime}$ |
| 1031 |  | A $6,=F 1^{\prime}$ |
| 1032 |  | A 7, =Fi' |
| 1033 |  | A 8, =Fil' |
| 1034 | - | A 9, =F'l' |
| 1035 |  | A 10, $\mathrm{Fl}^{\prime} 1$ |
| 1036 | Evodo | LABEL=ONE |
| $1037+$ | 8 | ONE |
| $1038+$ CONE | $L$ | 8, SAVEA |
| 1039+ | L | 9 9, SAVE9 |
| 1040+BCNE | L | 10, SAVE 10 |
| 1041+ | $L$ | 11, SAVELI |
|  | Equ | * |
| 1043 * |  |  |
| 1044* |  |  |
| 1045 | SVAD | $I 0=2, O C B=$ OUMPAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |
| 10464+ | CNOP | 0,4 |
| 1047+ | 3AL | 1,1480006 BRANCH AROUND PARAM LIST |
| $1048+$ | OC | AL1(2) ID NUMBER |
| 1049 + | OC | ALI(0) |
| 1050+ | 06 | ALIP1301 DPTICN Flags |
| 1051+ | DC | ALl(32) MPYTON FLAGS |
| 1052* | DC | A(DIMDAQEA) DCB ADORESS |
| 10534 | OC | A(O) TCB ADDQESS |
| 1054* | DC | A(O) ADORESS IF SNAP-SHOT LTST |
| 1055+1480006 | DS | OH |
| 1056+ | SVC | 51 |
| 1057 | LA | 3,0 |
| 1058 | LA | 4,0 |
| 1.059 | - 4 | 5,0 |
| 1050 | LA | 6,0 |
| 1061 | L4 | 7,0 |
| 1062 | LA | 8,0 |
| 1063 | LA | 9.0 |
| 1064 | LA | 10.0 |
| 1065 * |  |  |
| 1066 * |  |  |
| 1067 | 0.7 | LTWNUM $=1$, HGANUM $=30, B$ YNUY $=4$, D 2 L $O D P=S, \angle A B E L=T W 0$ |
| 1068* | ST | \%, Saves |
| 1069. | Sr | 9, SAVE9 |
| 1070+ | ST | 10, SAVEIO |
| 1071. | ST | 11. SAVE11 |
| 1072+ | LA | 10.0 |
| 1073* | A | $10:=F+1$ ' |
| 1074* | \& 4 | 11.0 |
| 1075 | A | 11, FF'30' |
| 10764 | LA | 9.0 |
| 1077* | A | 9, -F.F4' |
| 1078* | 1 | B, DOTVTER |
| 1079+ | ST | 9,STACK(8) |
| $1080+$ | LA | 8.4 (8) |
| $1081+$ | ST | 10, STACK ${ }^{\text {(8) }}$ |
| $1082+$ | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 1083* | St | 11, STACK(8) |
| $1084+$ | LA | 8,4 (3) |
| 10854 | Sr | B, PJINTEQ |
| 1086+ | $L$ | 8,SAVES |
| 1087* | 1 | 9, SAVE9 |
| 1088 + | L | 10, SAVE10 |


| 1089+ | 1. |  | . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1090+$ W0 | ST | B. SAVE日 |  |  |
| $1091+$ | ST | 9, SAVEG |  |  |
| 1092+ | ST | 10, SAVE10 |  |  |
| 1093* | ST | 11. SAVEIL |  |  |
| 1094* | 1 | 8, ogTvTER |  |  |
| 10954 | S | $8,55^{4}$ |  |  |
| $1096+$ | 1 | 11, STACK(8) |  |  |
| 10974 | S | 8, =F'4' |  |  |
| $1093+$ | L | 10, STACK (8) |  |  |
| 10994 | 5 | $8,=$ F.4 |  |  |
| 1100+ | 1 | 9, STACK(8) |  |  |
| 1101+ | ST | 8,PJTJTER |  |  |
| 11024 | C | 9, ZERS |  |  |
| 1103* | BL | $\times 7$ |  |  |
| 1104+ | C2 | 10, 11 |  |  |
| 1105+ | 84 | Y7 |  |  |
| 11064 | B | 27 |  |  |
| $1107+\times 7$ | C2 | 10, 11 |  |  |
| $1108+$ | BL. | $Y 7$ |  |  |
| $1109+27$ | A | 10,9 |  |  |
| $1110+$ | L | 8,POIMTER |  |  |
| 1111. | ST | 9, STACK(8) |  |  |
| 1112* | LA | 8,4(8) |  |  |
| 1113+ | ST | 10, STACK(8) |  |  |
| 1114* | LA | 8,418) |  |  |
| 1115t | ST | 11. STACK(8) |  |  |
| 11164 | LA | 8,4(3) |  |  |
| 1117t | St | 8, Patnter |  |  |
| $1118+$ | L | 8,SAVE9 |  |  |
| 11198 | L | 9, SAVE9 |  |  |
| 1120* | L. | 10, SAVE10 |  |  |
| 11214 | 1 | 11.SAVEIL |  |  |
| $1122+$ | 8 | W7 |  |  |
| $1123+\mathrm{V} 7$ | 1 | 8, SAVES |  |  |
| $11.24 *$ | L | 9, SAVE9 |  |  |
| $1125 \%$ | 1 | 10, Savelo |  |  |
| $1126+$ | L | 11,SAVEL1 |  |  |
| 1127* | 8 | ATW? |  |  |
| 1128+W7. | EQU | * . |  |  |
| 1129 |  |  |  |  |
| 1130 |  | A $4,=\mathrm{FI}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| 1131 |  | A $51=\mathrm{F} 2^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| 1132 |  | A $6,=F^{\prime} 2^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| 1133 |  | A $7,=\mathrm{Fl}^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| 1134 |  | $48,=512^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| 11.35 |  | A 9, $\mathrm{F}^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| 1136 |  | A 10,=F'2' |  |  |
| 1137 | Evodo | $\angle A B E L=T W 0$ |  |  |
| 11384. | 8 | Twil |  |  |
| $1139+$ CTWO | $L$ | 8 8, SAVE8 |  |  |
| $1140+$ | 1 | 9, SAVEG |  |  |
| $1141+$ Brwo | L | 10. SAVE10 |  |  |
| 1142+ | 1 |  |  |  |
| 11.43+ATWO | E2U | 11,SAVE11 |  |  |
| 1144 * | . | . . . | . |  |
| 1145* |  |  |  |  |
| 1146 | SVAP | ID $=3$, OCB $=$ OUMPAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |  |  |
| 1147+ | CVOD | 0,4 |  |  |
| 11484 | 84 L | 1,1490009 ROANCH | ardund | PARAM LIST |
| 11494 | DE | ALI(3) YD NIJMAER |  | param last |
| 11504 | DC |  |  |  |
| $1.151+$ | DC | ALI(130) OPTION FLAGS |  |  |
| 1152* | OC | ALl1321 OPTInN flags |  |  |
| $1153+$ | DC | ACDUMDAREAI DCB ADORESS |  |  |
| 1154* | DC |  |  |  |


| 1155t | DC | A(O) ADDEESS OF SNAP-SHJT LIST |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1156+1480009$ | DS | OH |  |
| $1157+$ | SUC | 51 |  |
| 1158 | LA | 3,0 |  |
| 1159 | LA | 4,0 |  |
| 1160 | LA | 5,0 |  |
| 1161 | LA | 6:0 |  |
| 11.2 | L4 | 7.0 |  |
| 1163 | LA | 8,0 |  |
| 1164 | LA | 9,0 |  |
| 1165 | LA | 12.0 |  |
| 1166* |  |  |  |
| 116\%* |  |  |  |
| 1260 | 02 | $L$ WWNUM $=3, B Y L O C=Y, H G H R E G=4$, DOLOOP $=7$, WHILE $=N N$, $L \triangle B E L=T H R E E, W D P=G T, W L I T A=7$, WREGB $=15$ | X |
| $1169+$ | St | 8,SAVES |  |
| $1170+$ | ST | 9, SAVES |  |
| 1171* | ST | 10. SAVEIO |  |
| 1172+ | ST | 11: SAVEIL |  |
| $1173+$ | L4 | 10.0 |  |
| 1174* | A | $10:=F 3^{\prime}$ |  |
| 1175 | LR | 11.4 |  |
| $1176+$ | L | $9, Y$ |  |
| $1177+$ | 1 | 8,POIMTER |  |
| $1178+$ | ST | 9, STACK(8) |  |
| $1179+$ | LA | 8,4(8) |  |
| 1180* | ST | 10, STACK (8) |  |
| $1181+$ | LA | 8,418) |  |
| 1182* | ST | 11,STACK(8) |  |
| $1183+$ | LA | 8.4(8) |  |
| $1184+$ | ST | 8,POTVTER |  |
| 1185* | L | 8, SAVES |  |
| 1186* | $L$ | 9, saveg |  |
| $1187+$ | 1. | 10.SAVE10 |  |
| 1188 + | $t$ | 11, SAVFL1 |  |
| $1189+$ THREE | Sr | 8, Saves |  |
| $1190+$ | Sr | 9, Saveg |  |
| 11914 | Sr | 10, SAVE10 |  |
| 1192+ | ST | 11.SAVE11 |  |
| $1193+$ | t. | 8, PMIVTEQ |  |
| 1194+ | S |  |  |
| 1195+ | L | 11, STACK18: |  |
| 11964 | S | $8,=\mathrm{F}^{\prime} 4^{\text {\% }}$ |  |
| 1197+ | L | 10.5 SACK (8) |  |
| 1198* | S | 8, =F.4. |  |
| 1199+ | 1 | 9, STACK(8) |  |
| $1200+$ | ST | 8, DOTNTEP. |  |
| 12014 | C | 9, zera |  |
| 1202+ | BL | $\times 10$ |  |
| 1203* | Ca | 10.11 |  |
| 1204t | 84 | Y 10 |  |
| 12054 | B | 210 |  |
| $1206+810$ | C2 | 10,11 |  |
| 1207* | SL | Y10 |  |
| $1208+210$ | A\% | 10,9. |  |
| 1209+ | L | 8, PII VTER |  |
| 1210* | ST | 9, STACK(8) |  |
| 1211* | La | 8.4181 |  |
| 12124 | ST | 10. STACK(8) |  |
| $1213+$ | L. A | 8,4(8) |  |
| 1214* | ST | 11.STACK(8) |  |
| 1215\% | L. 4 | 8\%4(3) |  |
| 1216\% | ST | Qipgtarep |  |
| 1217 | 1. | $8.54 V=8$ |  |
| $1218+$ | 1 | 9. SAVE9 |  |
| $1219+$ | L. | 10, SAVEIO |  |


| $1.220+$ | L | 11,SAVC11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1221+$ | 5 | W10 |
| $1222+Y 10$ | L | 8,SAVE? |
| 1223* | 1 | 9, Saveg |
| 1224 + | L | 10, SAVE10 |
| 12254 | L. | 12, SAVELI |
| 1226* | 8 | athree |
| 1227+W10 | EQU | * |
| 1228* | ST | 10, Saveio |
| 1229+ | ST | 11, SAVEL. |
| $1230+$ | LA | 10,0 |
| 1231+ | A | 10, F\%'7' |
| 12324 | L? | 11,15 |
| 1233* | C ${ }^{2}$ | 10.11 |
| $1.234 *$ | BNH | 110 |
| $1235+$ | $L$ | 10, SAVEIo |
| 1236+ | $L$ | 11,SAVE11 |
| 1237+ | 8. | V10 |
| $1238+510$ | 1. | 10, Savelo |
| 1239+ | $L$ | 1\%. SAVEII |
| 1240+ | B | athree |
| $1241+\mathrm{V} 10$ | EQU | * |
| 1242 |  | A 3, Fi3. |
| 1243 |  | A $4, F^{\prime} 3^{\circ}$ |
| 1244 |  | A $5:=\mathrm{F}^{\prime} 3:$ |
| 1245 |  | A $61=F 131$ |
| 1246 |  | A 7, =F'3' |
| 1247 |  | A 8, $\mathrm{FFO}^{\prime}$ |
| 1248 |  | A 9, =F'3' |
| 1249 |  | A 10, =F'3: |
| 1250 | Evodo | $\angle A B E L=T H 2 E E$ |
| 1251* | B | THREE |
| 1252 +CTHREE | L | 8, SAVE8 |
| 12534 | L. | 9, SAVE9 |
| 1254+BTHREE | $L$ | 10. SAVE10 |
| 1255* | L | 11, SAVE11. |
| 1256+ATHREE | EQU | * |
| 1257* |  |  |
| 1258* |  |  |
| 1259 | SYAO | $10=4, D C 8=$ DUMPAREA, PDAYA $=$ REGS |
| 1260 * | CUOP | 0,4 |
| 1261+ | 8AL | 1,1HBOOL2 BRANCH AROUND PARAM LIST |
| 1262+ | OC | ALI(4) ID NUMBER. |
| $1263+$ | OC: | ALI(0) |
| 12644 | DC | ALI(130) OPTION FLASS |
| $1265+$ | DC | ALI(32) DPTIOV FLAGS |
| $1266+$ | DC | A (OUYPADEA) DCB ADURESS |
| 1267 + | DC | A (O) TCO ADOEESS |
| 1268 + | OC | A(O) ADDQESS OF SNAP-SHJT LIST |
| $1269+1+80012$ | DS | OH . |
| $1270+$ | SVC | 51. |
| 1271 * |  |  |
| $1272 *$ |  |  |
| 1273 | EXIT |  |
| 12744 | $L$ | 13,41,131 PCP UP SAVE AREA |
| 12754 | L.M | 14.12,12(13) RESTORE REGISTERS |
| $1276+$ | 4 VI |  |
| 1277* | B9 | 14 RETURN |
| 1278 | cl.jse | dumparea |
| 12794 | cvop | 0,4 ALYGN List To fulimjro |
| 12604 | BAL. | $1, *+6$ LTAO DEGI H/LIST ADDR |
| 1281****** | DC | ALI(128) OPTION BYTE |
| 12824 | DC | AL 3 (DJMPAREA) OCB ADLRESS |
| 1283* | SVC | 20 issue cense svc |
| 1284 SAVEAREA | D6 | 18A(0) |


| 1285 |  | DS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1286 | ZERD | 0 C |
| 1287 | SAVE8 | DS |
| 1288 | SAVE9 | OS |
| 1289 | SAVEIO | DS |
| 1290 | SAVEl: | 05 |
| 1291 | POINTER | DC |
| 1292 | STACK | DS |
| 1293 | $Y$ | DC |
| 1294 | dumparea | DCB |

OF
1Fior
1 F
1 F
$1 F$
$1 F$
1F10.
100F
1F:1'
DDNAME $=T E A M, D S D R G=P S, R E C F M=V B A$,
$x$

1296+*
1297**
1298 +DUMPAREA OG
1300**
drgect access device interface

| $1302+$ | 02 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1303+$ | $D C$ |

1305** . COMMON ACCESS METHOD INTERFACE

| $1307+$ | $D C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1308+$ | $D C$ |
| $1309+$ | $D C$ |
| $1310+$ | $D C$ |
| $1311+$ | $D C$ |

1.313** FOUNDATION EXTENSION

| $1315+$ | DC | BLI'00000000' 8FTEK, BFLN,HIARCHY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1316+$ | DC | AL3(1)EODAD |
| $1317+$ | DC | BLI131013100' RECFM |
| $1318+$ | $O C$ | $A L 3(0) E X L S T$ |

1320**
$1322+$ DC CL8'TEAM' DONAME
$1323+$ OC BLD:00300010' OFLGS
1324 t OC BLI.00000000 IFLG
1325* DC BL240000000000100000* MACR
1327+*
BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE
$1329+\quad O C \quad B L I \cdot 20000000$ RER. 1
$1330+$ DC AL3111 CHECK, GERR, PERK
$1331+$
$1332+$
DC
$1333+$
All SYMAD
H:O CYMDI, CTND2
AL21882) BLKSTZE
$1334+\quad 0$ O
1335+ DC
$1336+\quad D C$

FYO WCPM, WCPL, OFFSR, OFFSW
All Inga
ALL(0) NCP
AL3(1) EOBR, EOBAD
13394* BSAM-BPAN INTERFACE


| 1349 | =F'4: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1350 | =F'2' |
| 1351 | =F'3' |
| 1352 | *F'7' |

## Sample Program B Illustrating a DO Macro Coded Incorrectly

| STMT SOURCE | STATEMENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 962 FRISBEE | Evter | 12,SAVEAREA |
| 963 +FR ISBEE | DS | OH |
| $964+$ | EVTRY | frisbee declare name entry |
| 9654 | USING | *,12 neciare base adoressibility. |
| 9664 | BALP | 15,0 (INITIAL ADDRESSIBILITY). |
| 967* | B | 121,15) BPANCH AROUND IO FIELD |
| $968+$ | OC | ALIITY, CL7'FRISBEE' IO LENGTH AND ID |
| $969+$ | BCra | 15,0 (RESET INTTTAL ADORESSIBILITY |
| $970+$ | BCTR | 15,0 ABSOLUTE ENTRY POINTI. |
| 971* | STM | 14,12,12(13) SAVE REGISTERS |
| $972+$ | LR | 12,15 SETUP BASE REGISTER. |
| $973+$ | St | 13, SAVEAREAT4 CHATN BACK |
| 974+ | 14 | o, savearea chain forward |
| $975+$ | ST | 0,810,13) |
| $976+$ | L? | 13,0 SET UP SAVE AREA PJinyer |
| $977+$ | USING | SAVEAPEA, 13 AMO ADDRESSABIIIITY |
| 978 START | goen | (DIMMPAREA, CUTPUT) |
| $979+$ | cvop | 0,4 A!IGN LTST TO FULLAJRO |
| $980+5$ TART | BAL | 1,*+8 LOAD REGI W/LIST ADDR. |
| $981+$ | DC | AL1(143) OPTION BYTE |
| 982+ | OC | AL3 (0UMPAREAS DCB ADDRESS |
| $983+$ | SVC | 19 ISSUE OPEN SVC |
| 984 | L.A | 2,0 |
| 985 | L4 | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | LA | 5,0 |
| 988 | LA | 6,0 |
| 989 | LA | 7,0 |
| 990 | LA | 8,0 |
| 991 | LA | 9,0 |
| 992 | LA | 10,0 |
| 993 | LA | 11.0 |
| 994 | la | 14,0 |
| 995 | LA | 15,0 |
| 996 * |  |  |
| 997 * |  |  |
| 998 | SVAP | IO $=1$, DCS $=$ DUMPAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |
| $999+$ | cvop | 0,4 |
| $1000 *$ | BAL | IIIH80003 BRANCH AROUNO PARA:A LIST |
| $1001+$ | DC | ALI(I) ID NUMBER |
| 1002* | 0 C | All 10 ) |
| 1003* | DC | ALI(130) OPTION FLAGS |
| 1004* | OC | ALI(3) $)_{\text {derron flags }}$ |
| 1005 | DC | AIDYMPAREAI DCB ADDRESS |
| 1006* | 00 | AlO) YCB ADORESS |
| 1007+ | de | A(0) ADORESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST |
| 10084 1480003 | DS | OH |
| 1009* | SVC | 51 |
| 1020 * |  |  |
| 1011 * |  |  |
| 1012 | 07 | WHILEmR, WREGA $=4$ WOP |
| 1013+ONE | Equ | * |

```
10144 Sr IO,SAVE10
lol5t ST 12,SAVEIL
1017 LR 10.4
1018+ B *,NO QIGHT OPERAND SPEGIFIED ON OO WHILE GONOITION
1019 A 3,=F1'
1020 A A =#F'1'
1021 A 5,=F'1'
1022 A 6,=F'1.
1023 A 7,=F1'
1024 A 8,=Frl'
1025 A 9,=F'1.
1026 A 10,=F'1.
1027 ENDDO L.ABEL=ONE
1028+ 8 ONE
1029+CONE L B,SAVEB
l030+ L g.SAVEg
IO31+BONE L IJ,SAVELO
10324 L ll,SAVELI
1033+AONE
1034**
1035 *
1036 SNAP ID=2,DCB=DUYPAREA,PDATA=REGS
1037+ . CVJP. 0.4
1033+ BAL I,IHBOOOG BNANCH AROUND PARAM LIST
1030+ DC ALI(2) ID HMMBER
10404 DC ALI(J)
1041+ DC ALL(130) DPYION FLAGS
1042+ DC ALI(32) OPTION FLASS
1043+ DC A(DUMPAPEAI DCB ADURESS
L044+ DC A(0) TCA ADORESS
10454 DC ANO) ADDEESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST
1046+1HBOOO6 DS 04
1047t SVC 51.
1048 *
1049 *
1050 EXIT
1051+ L [3,41,1.3) PNP UP SAVE AREA
1052+ LM . 14,12,12(13) RESTOREREGISTERS
1053+ MVI ' 12(13),X'FF' FLAG EXIT
10544 BR 14 RETUQAM
1055 CLJSE DUMPAREA
1056+ CNJP 0,4 ALIGNE LIST TO FULLWJRD
1057* BAL L,*+8 LIPD FEGI W/LIST ADDR
1058+ DC ALL(128) DPTION BYTE
1059+ DC AL3(OUMPAREA) DCB AUDRESS
1060+ SVC 20 ISSUE CLOSE SVC
1061 SAVEAREA DC
1062 DS
1063 ZETO DC
1064 SAVE8 DS
1045 SAVEO DS
1066 SAVEIO DS
1067 SAVEL1 OS
1068 POINTER OC
1069 STACK DS
1070 DUMPAREA DCB
18A(0)
OF
LF
lF
lF
1F
IF
LFOM
100F
DONAME=TFAM,DSORG=PS,RECFM=VBA, X
    MACRF=W,BLKSYZE=882,LRECL=125
1072+*
1073+*
1074+DUMPAREA DC OF'OV ORIGIV ON WORD BJUNDARY
1076+*
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1078+ & 06 & BL1613' FOAD, OVISL \\
\hline \(1079+\) & 0 C & A(O) KEYLE, OEVT, TRBAL \\
\hline 1081 +* & & CTMMON ACCESS METHJO INTERFACE \\
\hline \(1083+\) & DC & ALI(O) BUFV \\
\hline 10844 & DC & AL3(1) EJFFCB \\
\hline 1085* & DC & AL2(0) BUFL \\
\hline \(1086+\) & DC & BL2:010000000000000.' DSTRG \\
\hline \(1087+\) & OC & A(1) \9BAD \\
\hline 1089+* & & FIIJNDATIOV EXTENSION \\
\hline \(1091+\) & DC & BL 1 100000020' BFTEK, BFLN, HIARCHY \\
\hline 1092+ & DC & AL3(1) E!tox \\
\hline \(1093+\) & OC & BLI'ULOLO100' RECFY \\
\hline \(1094 *\) & DC & AL3(0) EXLST \\
\hline 1096 +* & & FJUNDATION BLUEK \\
\hline 1098* & DC & Clbiteam' doname \\
\hline 1099* & DC & BLI'00000010' OFLGS \\
\hline \(1100+\) & DC & BL, 1-00000003' IFLG \\
\hline \(1101+\) & DC & BL2'0000000000100030' : AACR \\
\hline 11034* & & BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE \\
\hline 1105* & DC & BL 1. \(00000000 \cdot\) REF 1 \\
\hline 1106t & 06 & AL 3(1) CHECK, GEFR, PERR \\
\hline 1107 + & 00 & A(1) SYYAD \\
\hline \(1108+\) & OC & H'O: CINDR, CIND2 \\
\hline \(1109+\) & DC & AL2(882) BLKSIZE \\
\hline 11104 & DC & F'J: WCDE, WCPL, CFFS碞, OFFSW \\
\hline 11114 & DC & A(1) Trba \\
\hline 1112+ & OC & ALI(0) NCP \\
\hline 1113 z & DC & AL3(1) EOBR, EOBAD \\
\hline 1115** & & BSAM-bpaM Interface \\
\hline 1117* & DC & All Enbw \\
\hline 1118 + & 0 C & H'O. DIRCT \\
\hline \(1119+\) & DC & AL 21259 LRECL \\
\hline 11204 & DC & A(I) GNTQL, NOTE, POINT \\
\hline 1121 & END & \\
\hline 1122 & & FF'1 \\
\hline & & mple Program C Illustrating a DO Macro Coded Incorrectly \\
\hline STMt SOURCE & STATEM & Evt \\
\hline 962 FR1SBEE & . ENTER & 12. Savearea \\
\hline \(9634 F R 15 B E E\) & OS & OH \\
\hline 964 + & Evtay & FOISEEE DEClARE NaME EVIRY \\
\hline 9654 & USING & *.12 declare base ajonessibilitya \\
\hline \(966+\) & BALR & 15,0 (Ial! TiAl AUDPESSI3ILTMYI。 \\
\hline \(967+\) & B & 121.15) Braitch arolivo ID FIELD \\
\hline 9684 & DC &  \\
\hline 968* & BCTR & 15,0 (DESET INITIAL AD) \({ }^{\text {SeSSIBILITY }}\) \\
\hline \(970+\) & BCTR & 15,0 A3STlute entry poivti. \\
\hline 9714 & Sr.m & 14.12,12113) SAVE XEGISTERS \\
\hline \(972+\) & LQ & 12, 15 SETUD BASE PEGISTER. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

1037*
.1038
1039+
1040+ CNOP 0,4
10414 OC ALI(2) IO NUMSER
1042+ DC ALL(O)
1043+ OC ALI(130) OOTION FLAGS
1044+ DC ALL(32) OPTION FLAOSS
1045+ DC A(DJMPAMFA) DCB AOJRESS
1046+ DC A(O) TC3 ADDRESS
1047* DC A(O) ADSRESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST
10484!HBOOOS OS O4
1049+ SVC 51
1050*
1051 *
1052 EXIT
1053+ L 13,41,131 PTP UP SAVE AREA
1054+ LM 14,12,12013) RESTORE REGISTEQS
1055+ MVI 12(13).XVFFI FLAG EXIT
l0504 BR 14 RETUNA
1057 CLTSE DYMDAEEA
1058+ CVOP 0.4 ALPG! EIST TO FJLLWORD
1059+ SAL 1,**3 LAOFEGI W/L:ST ADOR
1060* DC ALI(L23) IPTIONBYTE
10S1* OC AL.3(DUMPAREA) DCB ADORESS
1062: SVC 20ISSUE CLOSE SVC
1063 SAVEAREA DC 19A(0)
1064 DS OF
1065 ZESO DC IFIOD
1066 SAVEB DS IF
1067 SAVEg DS LF
1068 SAVEIO DS IF
1069 SAVFII DS IF
1070 POINTER OC IFIO.
1071 STACK DS LOOF
1072 DUMPAREA DCB DONAME=TEAM,DSUKG=PS, RECFM=VBA,
MACRF=W:BLKSIZE=882,LRECL=125
1074+*
1075+*
1076FDUMPAREA DC. OF'DV ORIGIN ON WORD BJUNDARY
1078** DIRECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERFACE
1080+ OC BL16.OP FDAO,DVTBL
1081+ DC A(O) KEYLE,DEVT,TPBAL
1083+* COMMON ACCESS NETHOD INTERFACE
1085+ DC ALI(0) BUF.1O
10864 DC AL3(L) BUFCB
1087+ OC A!2(0) BUFL
10884 OC BL2:0100000000000000' DSORG
1089+ OC A(L) IOBAD
1091+*
1093+ DC BL.1.00000000' BFTEK,BFLN,HIAGCHY
10244 DC AL31I1 EOMAD
1095+ OC BLI.J1010100' RECFY
1096+ DC ALS(0) EXIST

| $1100+$ | DC | CL. ${ }^{\text {PTEAM' doname }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1101+$ | OC | BLI'00000010' OFLGS |
| 1102+ | OC | 8L-1/0000003) IFLG |
| $1103+$ | DC | 8L2.0000000000100000' 1ACR |
| 1105** |  | BSAM-BPAM-USAT INTERFACE |
| 11074 | DC | BLI'00009000' RER2 |
| $1108+$ | DC | AL3(1) CIAFCK, GEPR, PERR |
| $1109+$ | DC | All) SYNAD |
| $1110+$ | DC | HIJ CIMDI, CINO2 |
| 1111* | DC | AL2(882) BLKSIZE |
| 1112+ | 0 C | FOO' WCPO, WCPL, OFFSR DFFSW |
| 11134 | DC | A(1) IOBA ... |
| 1114* | DC | ALLIO) NCP |
| 1115 + | DC | AL3(1) ERBR, EOBAD |
| 1117** |  | BSAM-BPAM INTERFACE |
| $1119+$ | DC | A(1) EOSW |
| 11204 | OC | H'O' DIRCT |
| $1121+$ | OC | AL2(125) LPECL |
| 11224 | DC | A(l) CNTRL, NOTE, PUENT |
| 1123 | ENO |  |
| 1124 |  | =F'1' |
| 1125 |  | =F'2' |

## Sample Program D Illustrating a DO Macro Coded Incorrectly

```
STMT SOURCE STATEMENT
    9G2 FPISBEE ENTER l2,SAVEAREA
    GG3+FRISBEE ES OH O
    964+ ENTRY FRISBEE DECLARE NAME ENTRY
    965+ USING *.l2 dECLARE BASE ANORESSIBILITY.
    9664 GALR 15,J (RNTYIAL ADDRESSIBILIMY).
    967+ B 121.15 BFANCH AROUND IO FIELD
    968+ DC ALI(7),CLTPFRTSBEEE IO LENGTH ANO ID
    9694 BCTR 15,3 (AESET INITIAL ADJRESSIBILITY
    970+ BCTR 15,0 ABSTLJTE EMTPY PIINTI.
    971+ STM 1+,12.12(13) SAVE REGISTERS
    972+ LR 12.15 SETUP BASE REGISTER.
    G73+ ST L3,SAVEAOEA+4 CHAIN BACK
    974+ LA O.SAVEANEA CHAIN FURWARD
    975+ ST 0,3(0.1.3)
    976+ LR 13.0 SET UP SAVE AREA PJTNTER
    977+ USING SAVEA?EA,13 ANO ADJRESSABHLITY
    978 START DPEN (OUMPAGEA,OUTPUT)
    979* .
    CNDP 0,4 AlIGN-LIST TO FULLWDRO
980+5TART BAL L,*+8 LTMD REGE W/LIST ADDR.
981+
982
983+
984
985
986 3,
LA 4,0
988 LA 5,0
989 LA 7.0
990 LA 8,0
991 LA 9,0
992 LA 10.0
```

```
\begin{tabular}{lll}
993 & LA & 11,0 \\
994 & LA & 14.0 \\
995 & LA & 15.0
\end{tabular}
    496*
    937 *
    998 *
    999 *
1000
10014
1002+
1003+
1004+
1005t
1036t
1007+
1008+
1009+
1010+IH80003
1011+
1012 *
1013%
1014 O0 WHILE=NN,WOP=GY,WLOM, LOMGMREG=24,DOLOOP=2,LABEL=THREE, X
1015+ . ST 8.SAVE&
lol6+ ST 9,SAVEg
1017t ST lo,SAVElo
1018* ST I1.SAVE1I
1019+ LA 10,0
10204 A 10,=F'3.
1021 *,IVVALI
1022 *,LDOP
1023t B CTHREE
1024 A
1025
102
102
1028 A A O,=F!3'
1029 . A.. 8, =F:3'
1030 A 9,=F'3'
1031 A 10:=F'3'
1032 ENODO LABEL=THREE
1033+ . B THREE
1034+CTHREE
1035+
1036+8YHREE
10.7t
10384ATHREE
Equ
1039 *
1040 *
1041 CMTDNAP SD=2,OC8=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
1042+
1043+
1044+
1045+
1046+
1047
10484 DC A(DUYPAREA) DCB ADURESS
1.5494 DC A(J) TCB ADORESS
1050+ DC A(O) ADORESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST
105itIH8OOO6 DS OH
1052+ SVC 51
1053 *
1054 *
1055
EXIY
1057+ Lm 13,41,13} OOP up SAVE AREA
1057+ LM 14.12.120134 RESTORE REGISTERS
```

```
1058+ YVT L2O13I,XPFF'FLAG EXIT
1050+ BR 14 SETUPN
l060 CLOSE DJMPAFEA
1061+ CNOP 0,4 AL\GV L.IST TO FULLAORO
1C62+ BAL L,*+8 LOAD REGI W/LIST AODR
1063+ DC ALI(128) OPTION BYTE
1064+ DC AL3(DMMPADEA) DCB ADDRESS
1065% SVC 20 ISSJE ClOSE SVC
```

```
1066 SAVEAREA DC
```

1066 SAVEAREA DC
1067 - DS OF
1067 - DS OF
106\& ZERO OC LF'O'
106\& ZERO OC LF'O'
1009 SAVEG DS IF
1009 SAVEG DS IF
1070 SAVEG DS . IF
1070 SAVEG DS . IF
10% SAVE10 OS LF
10% SAVE10 OS LF
1072 SAVELL OS LF
1072 SAVELL OS LF
1073 POINTER DC. LF*O'
1073 POINTER DC. LF*O'
1074 STACK DS LOOF
1074 STACK DS LOOF
1075 Y DC
1075 Y DC
1076 DUMPAREA DCB
1076 DUMPAREA DCB
1F"1"
1F"1"
DONAME=TEAM,OSORG=PS,RECFM=VBA,
DONAME=TEAM,OSORG=PS,RECFM=VBA,
1078+*
1079+*
1080+DUMPAREA DC
OF'O. ORIGI'I ON WORD BDUNDARY
1082**
dIRECT ACCESS DEvICE INTERFACE

```

```

1087+*
COMMON ACCESS METHOD INTERFACE

| $1089+$ | $D C$ | ALICO BUFVI |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1090+$ | $D C$ | AL3C1) BUFCB |

1071+ DC AL2(0) BUFL
1092+ DC
BL2:0100000000000000' USORG
A(1) 10BAO
1095+* FOUNDATION EXTENSION

| $1097+$ | DC | BL1.00000000 BFTEK, BFLN,HIARCHY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1098+$ | OC | AL3:11 EROAL |
| $1099+$ | DC | BL1.01010109 RECFM |
| $1100+$ | DC | AL3101EXLST |

1102+*
FOUNDATICN BLOCK

```

```

$1105+\quad 0$
$1106 t$ OC
BLI'J0000010' OFLGS
$1107+\quad D C$
Br.00000030 IFLG BL2•00000000001000J0: YACR
1109**
ASA4-BPAM-JSAM INGERFACE

| $1111+$ | DC | BLI'00000000' RER 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1112+ | 0 C | AL3(1) CHECK, GERP, PFRR |
| $1113+$ | DC | All SYilng |
| 1114+ | $\cdots$ | H'OC CIADL, CINOL |
| 1115 | DC | AL2terz) BLKSILE |
| $1116+$ | DC | FOO WCPN, WCPL, DFFSR, OFFSH |
| 1117* | OC | A(1) !03A |
| 1118* | OC | ALI(0) HCP |
| 11194 | DC | AL3(2) EDBR, EOBAO |


| $1123+$ | 0 C | Alll EgBW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1124+$ | DC | H.O' DIRCT |
| $1125+$ | OC | AL. $2(125)$ LRECL |
| 1126 t | DC | A(1) CNTPL, NOTE. |
| 1127 | END |  |
| 1128 |  | =F'3' |

## APPENDIX B

## THE LEAVE MACRO

The Source Listing for the LEAVE Macro




| 628 |  | AS 2 | - EMD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 629 | -LESS | BVL. | $A \& 1 . A B$ |
| 630 |  | AG7 | - ENO |
| 631 | - Lesseg | 81 | AELAB |
| 632 |  | 407 | - End |
| 633 | - GRTEQ | BL | AELAB |
| 634 |  | ASO | - ENO |
| 635 | - GQ Y | By | AELAB |
| 636 |  | AGO | - Emi |
| 637 | - NOYEQ | BE | AELAB |
| 638 |  | - AST | - END |
| 639 | * |  |  |
| 640 | * |  |  |
| 641 | * |  | THE NEXT SET OF instructions restores megtsters |
| 642 | * |  | 10 and il after the leave condition has been tested. |
| 643 | * |  | IF THE COMDIT:JV IS PRUE, A BRANCH TC 'label WILl |
| 644 | * |  | OCCUR: OTHERWISE, THE PROGRAM WILL CONTIMJE SE- |
| 645 | * |  | QJENTIAL EXECUTIDN. |
| 646 | * |  |  |
| 647 | * | . |  |
| 648 | - END | $L$ | 10, SAVE10 |
| 649 |  | 1 | 11, SAVE1. |
| 650 |  | 8 | AELABEL |
| 651 | AGLAB | t. | 10, SAVE10 |
| 652 |  |  | 11, SAVE11 |
| 653 |  | AGQ | - Stop |
| 654 | * |  |  |
| 655 | * |  | - . . . |
| 656 | * |  | THIS LAST SECTION OF CJDE IS THE SET DF ERROR MES- |
| 657 | * |  | SAGES \&NY ONE OF WHICH MAY bE GERERAYED if THE |
| 658 | * |  | MACFO'S SYMBYLIC PARAMETEPS HAVE BEEN INCORQECTLY |
| 659 | * |  | SDECIFIEO, WHEV AN EQRIR MESSAGE TS PDIMTED, THE |
| 660 | * |  | MACRO TERMINATES (EXCEPY TN THE CASE JF AM © ERPG |
| 661 | * |  | MESSAGEJ, NEVER GEVERATING A program branch. |
| 663 | * |  |  |
| 664 | - ERR 1 | mvote | *,'"rega.' of leave covoition is not a self-* |
| 665 |  | mvote | *, DEFINYNG NUMERIC: |
| 666 |  | B | AELAS |
| 667 |  | AGO | - END |
| 668 | -ERR2 | MVITE | **"'rega* of leave covoition does not spectfy: |
| 669 |  | MNJTE | * 'a valid register njmber' |
| 670 |  | $B$ | $A \& L A B$ |
| 671 |  | AG? | - Eno |
| 672 | - ERR3 | MVOTE | *,'left operand of leave conoiyion was not specim' |
| 673 |  | mvote | *, 'FIED* |
| 674 |  | B | Aslas |
| 675 |  | AG3 | - END |
| 676. | -ERR4 | Mvore | * "Two literals have been specifyed in a leave con-* |
| 677 |  | mujte | *, 'DITION. |
| 678 |  | AS3 | - RETUPN |
| 679 |  | AG9 | - EnO |
| 680 | - ERrs | MVOTE | *, imgze than one left jperavo spentfied for a leave, |
| 681 |  | mvore | *, 'conoition: |
| 682 |  | B | A\&LAB |
| 683 |  | AGJ | - END |
| 684 | - ERRG | Mvote | * 'iofegbis of leave covoirton ts vot a selfor |
| 685 |  | myote | *, DEFYNIMG NUMERTC' |
| 686 |  | $B$ | $A \& L A B$ |
| 687 |  | AS? | - ENO |
| 688 | - ERRT | MVJTE | *."MREGB" of leave covortion does not specify a. |
| 689 |  | mvote | * "valid register njmber" |
| 690 |  | $B$ | AELAB |
| $69 \%$ |  | AGO | - ENO |
| 692 | - ERRA | Mvote | * "No right operand has been specified for a leave: |
| 97 |  | mvore | **COVOITITN" |


| 694 |  | 8 | AGEAB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 695 |  | As? | - END |
| 696 | - ERR9 | MYOTE | **'MnPe than ove right jperand specified for a' |
| 697 |  | MVJTE | *, 'eave condition' |
| 698 |  | 8 | $A E L A B$ |
| 699 |  | AS? | - ENO |
| 700 | - ERR10 | yyote | *,''OPRATCR'* FOR Leave condition has ndj beEn' |
| 701 |  | MnJte | *, SPECTFIEO' |
| 702 |  | 8 | $A \& L A B$ |
| 703 |  | AGO | - END |
| 704 | - ERR11 | mvote | *,'ILLEGAL OPERATOR SPECIFIEO for a leave conoitions |
| 705 |  | B | AELAB |
| 706 |  | AGI | - ENO |
| 707 | - STOP | MENO | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$. |

## Sample Program E Illustrating the LEAVE Macro

| STMT | SOURCE | statement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 962 |  | PRINT | NOGEN |
| 963 | FRISBEE | ENTER | 12,SAVEAREA |
| 979 | START | TPEN | ( DUMPAREA, OUTPUT) |
| 985 |  | 1.4 | 2.0 |
| 986 |  | 1.4 | 3.0 |
| 987 |  | La | 4.0 |
| 938 |  | LA | 5.0 |
| 989 |  | La | 6,0 |
| 990 |  | LA | 7.0 |
| 991 |  | LA | 8,0 |
| 992 |  | LA | 9,0 |
| 993 |  | LA | 10,0 |
| 994 |  | LA | 11.0 |
| 995 |  | LA. | 14.0 |
| 996 |  | LA | 15,0 |
| 997 | * |  |  |
| 998 | * |  |  |
| 999 |  | SNAP | $10=1, O C B=$ OUMPAREA P PATA R REGS |
| 1011 | * |  |  |
| 1012 | * |  |  |
| 1013 |  | 00 |  |
| 1076 |  |  | A 4 ¢ F Fll |
| 1077 |  |  | A 5 , =F:14 |
| 1078 |  |  | LEAVE $\quad$ ABEL $=2, L I T A=7, O P R A T J R=E Q, R E G B=4, C O N O=F$ |
| 1091 |  |  | A 6, FF'1. |
| 1092 |  |  | A 7, $\mathrm{FFO}^{\text {2 }}$ |
| 1093 |  | EYODO | LABEL= 2 |
| 1100 | * |  |  |
| 1101 * |  |  |  |
| 1102 |  | SNAP | 10:2,DCB $=$ DUMPAREA, PDAYA $=$ QEGS |
| 1114 | * |  |  |
| 1115* |  |  |  |
| 1116 |  | 03 |  |
| 1179 |  |  | 4 14, =Fil |
| 1180 |  |  | Leave Labelax |
| 1182 |  |  | 4 15,FF11: |
| 1183 |  | Evods | $\angle A B E L=X$ |
| 1191 * |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1182 |  | SVAP | IO=3, DC $8=0$ OHPAREA, PGATA REGS |
| 1204 | * |  |  |
| 1205 | * |  |  |
| 1206 |  | EXIT |  |



KEGS AT ENTRY TO SNAP $\quad$ ID $=001$

| REGS 0-7 | 00000030 | 90018888 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| PEGS 8-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | 00018824 | 00000000 | 00000000 |

REGS AT ENTRY TO SNAP $\quad 10=002$

| REGS 0-7 | $000002 A 0$ | 80018908 | 00000000 | 00000000 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000007 | 00000007 | 00000006 | 00000006 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REGS 8-15 | $\cdots$ | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  |  | 50018820 | 00018624 | 00000000 | 00000000 |

REGS AT ENTRY TC SNAP

| REGS $0-7$ | 00000240 | A001BAF8 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000007 | 00000007 | 00000006 | 00000006 |
| REGS 8-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 B 24$ | 00000001 | 00000000 |
| ENO OF SNAP |  |  |  |  |

Program E with Expanded Macros

STMT SOURCE STATEMENT

| 962 FRISEEE | ENTER | 12.SAVFAREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 963 FRRISBEE | DS | OH |
| 964* | EvTRY | FRISBEE DECLARE MAME ENTRY |
| 965 + | USING | * 12 DECLARF BASE AUORESSIBILITY. |
| $966+$ | GALR | 15,0 TINITIAL ADORESSIBILITYI. |
| 9674 | B | 121.151 BFANCH AROJVD IO FIELD |
| 9684 | OS | ALI(7), CLT'FRISBEE ID LENGTH AND IO |
| 9694 | BCTR | 15,0 (RFSET INITIAL ADORESSIBILITY |
| $970+$ | BCTR | 15.0 ABSOLUTE ENTRY POINTJ. |
| $971+$ | STH | 14,12,12(13) SAVE REGTSTERS |
| $972+$ | LQ | 12,15 SETUP BASE REGISTER. |
| 9734 | ST | 13. SAVEAPEAT4 CHATV EACK |
| 974 | 14 | O, SAVFAREA CHAIN FJRWARD |
| 975 + | ST | $0.8(0,13)$ ( 0 ( |
| 9764 | 19 | 13,0 SET UP SAVE AREA POINTER |
| $977+$ | USING | SAVEAREA, 13 AND ADJRESSABILITY |
| 978 START | gPEN | (IUMPAOEA, DUTPJT) |
| $979+$ | CVOP | 0.4 ALTGH LTST TO EULLUJRD |
| $980+$ START | BAL | 1,**8 LOAD PEGI W/LIST ADOR。 |
| $981+$ | DC | ALI(143) OPTION BYTE |
| $982+$ | DC | AL 3(DUMPAREA) DCB AJOESSS |
| $983+$ | SVC | 19 ISSUE OPEN SVC |
| 984 | LA | 2.0 |
| 985 | LA | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4.0 |
| 987 | LA | 5.0 |
| 988 | LA | 6.0 |
| 989 | LA | 7.0 |
| 990 | LA | 8.0 |
| 991 | LA | 9.0 |
| 992 | LA | 10.0 |
| 993 | LA | , 11,0 |
| 994 | LA | 14,0 |
| 995 | LA | 15:0 |
| $996 *$ |  |  |
| 997 |  |  |
| 998 | SVAP | $1 D=1, D C B=$ OUMFAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |
| $999+$ | CNOP | 0.4 O. 0 , |
| $1000+$ | BAL | 1.IHBOOO3 GOANCH AROUNO PARAM LIST |
| 1001 t | DC | ALIC1\% TD NUMBER |
| 10024 | OC | A!1(0) |
| 1003+ | DC | A! 1 (130) OFTICN FLAGS |
| 1004+ | 0 C | AL 1.32) OPTION FLAGS |
| 1035t | DC | A (DUMPAREA) OCD ADORESS |
| $1006+$ | 0 O | A(O) TCB NODRESS |
| 1007t | $D C$ | A(O) AODRESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST |



| 1074*W4 | Equ | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1075 |  | A $4,=$ Fil: |
| 1076 |  | A 5, =F' ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| 1077 |  | LEAVE LABEL=L,LITA:7,OPRATJR=EQ,REGB $=4, C O N D=F$ |
| 1078* | ST | 13, SAVElo |
| 1079+ | ST | 11,SAVE11 |
| 1080* | LA | 10,0 |
| $1081+$ | A | $10,5 \mathrm{~F}^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ |
| 1082+ | LQ | 11,4 |
| 10834 | CR | 10,11 |
| 1084* | BVE | A5 |
| 1085* | L | 10, SAVE1O |
| 1085 4 | 1 | 1L, SAVEII |
| 1087* | 8 | AL |
| 1088tas | 1 | 10, SAVEIO |
| 1089+ | L . | 11,SAVE11. |
| 1090 |  | - A 6, FF'1 |
| 1091 |  | A 7, =F'1' |
| 1092 | EVDOO | $\angle A B E L=Z$ |
| 10934 | 3 | 2 |
| 1094tCZ | L | 8, SAVE3 |
| 10954 | 1 | 9, 5AVE9 |
| 10964.32 | L. | 10, SAVEIO |
| 1097* | L | il.SAVELI |
| $1098+42$ | EQU | * |
| 1099 * |  |  |
| 1100 * |  |  |
| 1101 | SVAP | $I D=2, D C B=$ DUMPAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |
| 1102* | cvoo | 0.4 |
| 11034 | BAL | I.IHBOOO7 BRANCH AROUNO PARAM LIST |
| $1104 \%$ | OC |  |
| 1105* | $D C$ | ALlios |
| $1106+$ | DC | ALI(130) MOTION FLAGS |
| 1107* | DC | ALI(32) OPTION FLAGS |
| 11084 | DC | A(DUYPARFA) DCB ADURESS |
| 1199+ | OC | AlO) TCB ADORESS |
| 1110* | nc | A(O) AODPESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST |
| $1111+1480007$ | OS | OH |
| 1112+ | SVC | 51 |
| 1113* |  |  |
| 1114* |  |  |
| 1115 | 00 | $L J W$ UUM $=1, B Y$ UUM $=1$, HSANUM $=100, D 0 L J O P=X, L A B E L=X$ |
| $1.116+$ | ST | 8, SAVE3 |
| 11174 | ST | 9, SAVES |
| 11.84 | St | 1. S. SAVE 10 |
| $1119+$ | ST | 11,SAVEII |
| $1120+$ | LA | 1).0 |
| 1121* | A | 10, =Fi' |
| $1122+$ | 1.4 | 11.0 |
| 11234 | A | 11, =F:100* |
| 11244 | L. 4 | 9,0 |
| 11254 | 4 | 9, FF+1\% |
| 1126 + | $L$ | B,PoIvrer |
| 1127+* |  |  |
| $1178+$ | ST | 9.STACK(8) |
| 1129 + | LA | 8,4(8) |
| $1130+$ | St | 10, STACK(8) |
| $11.31+$ | L. 4 | 8,4(8) |
| $1132+$ | Sr | 11,STACK(8) |
| $1133+$ | LA | 8,4, 81 |
| 1134 t | 51 | 8 ,onivter |
| $1135+$ | 1. | 8, Savea |
| 11364 | L. | 9, SAve9 |
| 11374 | $L$ | 10, SAVE 10 |
| 11304 | L | 11,SAVE: 1 |
| $11.29+x$ | ST | 8, SAVES |
| 11404 | Sr | 9 SAVE9 |


| 11414 | ST | 10, SAVE10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1142* | ST | 11. SAVELI |
| 11434 | L | 8, PITNTEP |
| 1144t | S. | $8,=514$. |
| 11454 | 1 | LI, STACK(8) |
| 11464 | \$ | $8,=\mathrm{F}^{1} 4^{4}$ |
| 11474 | L. | 10, STACK(8) |
| $1.168+$ | \$ | 8, =F\% $4^{\text {\% }}$ |
| 11.494 | L | 9, STACK(3) |
| 1150 | ST | 8,PJINTER |
| 1151+ | C | 9, 2 ERO |
| 11524 | 31 | $\times 8$ |
| 1153* | CQ | 10,11 |
| 1154* | Bt | $Y 8$ |
| 1155* | 8 | 18 |
| $1156+\times 8$ | C? | 10.11 |
| 1157+ | BL | Y8 |
| 1158428 | AR | 10.9 |
| 11594 | $t$ | 8,PITNTE |
| 1160* | ST | 9, Srack(8) |
| 1161* | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 11624 | Sr | 10, STACK(8) |
| $1163+$ | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 1164 | ST | 11.STACK(8) |
| 11654 | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 11.664 | ST | 8.POTNTER |
| 1167* | L | 8, SAVE8 |
| 11684 | L | 9, Saveg |
| $1169+$ | 1 | 10, savelo |
| 1170 | L | 11.SAVE11 |
| $1171+$ | 8 | $\mathrm{H}_{8}$ |
| $1172+98$ | L | 8,54VE8 |
| 1173* | $L$ | 9.SAVE9 |
| 11744 | 1 | 10. Savelo |
| 11.75+ | L | 11, SAVEII |
| $1176+$ | B | $A \mathrm{X}$ |
| 12774*8 | EQU | * |
| 1278 |  | A 14, $=\mathrm{F}: 1^{\circ}$ |
| 1179 |  | leave Label=x |
| 11804 | 8 | AX |
| 1.81 |  | A 15,FF'l' |
| 1182 | Endoo | LABEL=X |
| 1183* | B | x |
| $11.84+6 x$ | L | 8, SAVES |
| $1185+$ | L | 9, SAVE9 |
| $1186+B X$ | L | 10, SAVElo |
| 1187 | L | llasAVEll |
| 1198.4X | EQU | * |
| 1189 * |  |  |
| 1190* |  |  |
| 1191 | SVAP | $10=3, O C B=$ OUMPAREA, POATA $=$ REGS |
| 11924 | CVOD | 0.4 , 0 , |
| $1193+$ | GAL. | 1, TH39011 BRANCH AROUND PARAM LIST |
| $1194+$ | DC | ALL(3) 10 NUMBER |
| 1195+ | DC | ALI(0) |
| $1196+$ | 0 C | ALI11301 OPTION FLAGS |
| $1197+$ | 0 C | ALl 1321 DPT TONFEAGS |
| 11984 | 0 C | A(DUYPAREA) DCB ADORESS |
| $1199+$ | DC | AlO) TCB ADORESS |
| 12004 | 0 C | AlOS ADOPESS OF SNAP-Shit lise |
| 1201+1H80011 | OS | OH |
| 1203** | SVC | 51 |
| 1204 * |  |  |
| 1205 | EXIT |  |
| $1206+$ | $L$ | 13,41,13) POP UP SAVE AREA |


| 1207* | L.M | 14,12,12(13) RESTORE REGISTEQS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1208+$ | 4VI | 12(13), X'FF' FLAG EXIT |
| 12094 | BR | 14 RETURN |
| 1210 | ClITSE | Dijupapea |
| 12114 | CNJP | 0.4 ALTGN ISST TO FULLWJRD |
| 12124 | SAL | L, * +8 LOAO PEGI W/LIST ADDR |
| $1213+$ | OC | Al.1(128) OPYION BYTE |
| 121.4+ | DC | AL. 3 coumpareal dCe address |
| 1215t | SVC | 20 ISSUE CLOSE SVC |

## 1216 SAVEAREA DC <br> 18401

1217 DS
1218 2EPO DC
1219 SAVE8 DS
1220 SAVE9 DS
1221 SAVE10 DS
1222 SAVEII DS
1223 POINTER OC
1224 STACK DS
1225 DUMPAREA DCB
OF
IF'O'
1 F
$1 F$
IF
1F
LF'O'
100 F
DDNAME $=T E A M, D S O R G=P S, R E C F M=V B A$,
$x$
MACRF:W, BLKSILE $=882$, LRECL $=125$

## 1227+*

1228+*
$1229+$ DUMPAREA DC
1231**
DATA CONTROL-BLOCK
OF'O' RRIGIN ON WORD BJUNDARY
direct access device interface

| $1233+$ | $D C$ | $B L 160^{\prime}$ FDAD.DVTBL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1234+$ | DC | ACOI KEYLEDDEVT, TRBAL |
| $1236+*$ |  | COMHON ACCESS METHOD INTERFACE |


| $1238+$ | $D C$ | $A L 1(0) B U F Q O$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1239+$ | $D C$ | $A L 3(1)$ |
| $1240+$ | $D C$ | $A L 2(0) B U F S$ |
| $1241+$ | $D C$ | $B L 2\left(0100000000000000^{\circ}\right.$ DSORG |
| $1242+$ | $D C$ | $A(1) 10 B A D$ |

1244+*

## FOUNDATION EXTENSION

| $1246+$ | DC | 8L1:00000000' | BFTEK, BFLV, HIARCHY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1247* | DC | AL3(1) EODAD |  |
| 12484 | DC | BLI'01010103' | RECFA |
| 1249+ | DC | AL3(0) EXLST |  |

1251+* FRUNDATICN BLICK


| 12604 | DC | BLI'90000000' RER1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1261* | OC | AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR |
| 126.24 | 06 | A(1) SYiNan |
| 12634 | D | H.J' CIND, CINOL |
| 1264+ | 00 | AL. 2 (832) BLKSILE |
| 1265 + | DC | FOO WCPO. WCPL, OFFSR, OFFSW |
| $1266+$ | 0 c | A(1) 1034 |
| 1267+ | DC | AL, 1 (0) NT.P |
| $1268+$ | DC | AL3(1) EDBF. EOBAD |



## Sample Program F Illustrating a LEAVE Macro Coded Incorrectly

STMT SOIRCE STATEMENT

| 962 FRISREE | Evter | 12, savearea |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 963 +FRISBEE | OS | OH |
| $964+$ | eytry | Fr!Sbee declare mame entoy |
| $965+$ | USING | * 12 declare base audressibilityo |
| 966 + | BALR | 15.0 IMNITSAL ADDRESSIBILITYI. |
| 9674 | B | 121,151 BFANCH AROUID ID FIELD |
| $968+$ | 02 |  |
| 969 | $B C T R$ | 15,0 feeser tnitral adjressibility. |
| $970+$ | BCTP | 15,0 ABSTLUTE ENTRY POENTI. |
| $971+$ | STM | 14,12,12113) SAVE KEGISTEQS |
| 9724 | 12 | 12,15 SETUP BASE FEGISTER. |
| $973+$ | ST | 13, SAVEAPEA+4 CHATN BACK |
| $974+$ | LA | o, savearea chain furvard |
| $975+$ | ST | 0,8(0,13) |
| $976+$ | LR | 13,0 SET UD SAVE AZEA PJINTER |
| $977+$ | USing | SAVEAREA, 13 AND ADORESSABILITY |
| 978 START | OPEN | (IUMDAREA, OUTPUT) |
| $979+$ | CVOP | 0,4 ALIGN LIST TO FULLAJR9 |
| 9804 START | BAL | 1,*+3 LOAD QEGI W/LIST ADOR. |
| $981+$ | DC | ALI(143) CPYION BYTE |
| $982+$ | DC | AL 3(DUPPAREA) DCB ADDRESS |
| $983+$ | SVC | 19 ISSUE OPEN SVC |
| 984 | L.A | 2,0 |
| 985 | L.A | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | La | 5:0 |
| 988. | LA | 6,0 |
| 989 | LA | 7,0 |
| 990 | 14 | 8,0 |
| 991 | L.A | 9,0 |
| 992 | LA | 10,0 |
| 993 | LA | 11.0 |
| 994 | LA | 14:0 |
| 995 | LA | 15,0 |
| 996 * |  |  |
| 997 * |  |  |
| 998 | SNAD | TO=1,OCB=DUSPAREA, PDATA $=$ REGS |
| 999. | cuIp | 0.4 |
| $1000+$ | 84L | ardund param list |
| 1001+ | 06 | Allll 10 NU4BER |
| 1002+ | DC | ALI(0) |
| 1003+ | OC | ALI(130) DPTION FLAGS |
| 10046 | D2 | ALI 1321 OPTION FLAOS |
| 1005+ | DC | Aldumpareal docb adoress |
| 1006+ | $0 \cdot$ | A (0) TCR ADDRESS |
| 1007 + | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | AlOI ADDPESS OF SHAP-ShOT LIST |
| $1008+1+80003$ | OS | 07 |


| 10094 | SVC | 51 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1010* |  |  |
| 1011* |  |  |
| 1012 | D) | $1.2 W^{\wedge} \cup \cup M=1, B Y N U M=1, H \hat{O}+N M M=100,02 L O D P=A, \angle A B E L=2$ |
| 1013t | ST | 8,SAVE 3 , |
| 1014+ | ST | 9, Saveg |
| 1015t | ST | 10, SAVEIo |
| 1016+ | SY | 11.SAVEll |
| $1017+$ | LA | 10,0 |
| 10184 | A | $10,=F^{\prime} 1^{\prime}$ |
| 1019+ | LA | 11,0 |
| 1020+ | A | $11,=F^{1} 1001$ |
| 1021+ | LA | 9,0 |
| 1022+ | A | 9, =F'I' |
| $1023+$ | L | 8,POINTER |
| 1024+ | ST | 9,STACK(8) |
| 1025t | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 10264 | ST | 10, STACK(8) |
| 1027+ | LA | 8,4(8) |
| $1028+$ | ST | 1i, STACK(8) |
| 1029+ | LA | 8,4(9) |
| $1030+$ | ST | 8, DG:VTER |
| 10314 | L | 8, SAVES |
| $1032+$ | L | 9, SAVE9 |
| $1033+$ | $L$ | 10, SAVF10 |
| 1034. | L. | 1., SAVEIL |
| $1035+2$ | ST | 8 , SAVE8 |
| 10364 | ST | 9, SAVES |
| $1037+$ | St | 10, SAVE10 |
| $1038+$ | ST | 12, SAVELI |
| 1039* | L | 8, POINTEQ |
| 1040* | S | $8, \pm F 141$ |
| 10414 | 1 | 11,STACK (8) |
| $1042+$ | S | $8,=514{ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| $1043+$ | 1 | $10,5 T A C K(8)$ |
| 1044+ | S | 8, =F'4 ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| 1045 | L | 9, STACK (8) |
| 10464 | ST |  |
| 10474 | $c$ | 9,LERJ |
| 1048 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | BL | $\mathrm{X}_{4}$ |
| 1049+ | CR | 10,11 |
| $1.050+$ | BH | Y4 |
| 1051* | B | 24 |
| 10524.44 | C2 | 10,11 |
| $1053+$ | 31. | Y4 |
| $1054+24$ | A2 | 10,9 |
| 1055 + | L | 8, DIINTEO |
| $1056+$ | Sr | 9, STACK(8) |
| 2057 | LA | 8,4(8) |
| 1058 4 | ST | 10.STACK(8) |
| 10594 | 14 | 8,4(8) |
| $1060+$ | ST | 11.STACK(8) |
| 1061+ | LA | 8,4(3) |
| $1062+$ | ST | 8.PQIMTE? |
| 10634 | L | 8, SAVER |
| 1064 + | l | 9, SAVE? |
| $1065+$ | L | 10, SAVEIO |
| 1066* | L | 11, SAVELI |
| $1067+$ | 8 | W4 |
| $1068+94$ | L | 8, SAVES |
| 10694 | L | 9, SAVE9 |
| $1070+$ | L | 10, SAVEIO |
| $1071+$ | L. | 11, SAVELI |
| 10724 | B | AL |
| 10736W4 | EQU | * |
| 1074 |  | A $4,=$ F'1. |



| $1140+$ | OC | BL16') FDAD, OVTBL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1141+$ | $0 C$ | AIOJ KEYLE, DEVT, TRBAL |
| 1143** |  | CJMmon access methoo interface |
| 1145* | OC | ALI(0) BUF:NO |
| $1146+$ | DC | AL3(1) BUFCB |
| 1147 * | DC | AL2(9) BUF! |
| $1148+$ | DC | BL2.0100000000000000' DSORG |
| $1149+$ | Di | A(1) 19840 |
| 1151** |  | FOUNDATION EXTENSION |
| $1153+$ | DC | BLI'00000000' BFTEK, BFLN, HIARCHY |
| 1154 + | OC | AL3(1) EDOAD |
| 1155* | DC | BLI'01010100' RECFM |
| $1156+$ | DC | AL3(0) EXLST |
| 1158** |  | FOIANDATION BLIOCK |
| $1160+$ | DC | Clg'team doname |
| 1161* | DC | BLI'00000010' OFLGS |
| 1162 * | DC | BLI' $00000000^{\prime}$ IFLG |
| 1163 * | $D C$ | BL2:0000000000100000' MAC? |
| 1165+* | - | BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE |
| 11674 | DC | BL1'00000000' RERI |
| $1168+$ | OC | AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR |
| 11694 | DC | A(1) SYNAD |
| 11704 | DC | H.O' CINDL, CTMD2 |
| 1171+ | DC | AL2(882) 3LKSIZE |
| 1172+ | OC | FOO WCPT, WCPL, OFFSP, DFFSW |
| 1173+ | DC | A(1) IDBA |
| 1174* | DC | ALI 101 NCP |
| 1175* | DC | AL3(1) EOBR, FIBAD |
| 1177** |  | BSAM-BPAM INTERFACE |
| 11794 | D | A(1) EnBw |
| $1180+$ | OC | H'O' DIRCT |
| 1181* | OC | AL2(125) LRECL |
| 1182+ | OC | A(1) CNTPL. NOYE, POINT |
| 1183 | END |  |
| 1184 |  | FF'1' |
| 1185 |  | =F'100' |
| 1186 |  | \#F94. |

## Sample Program G Illustrating a LEAVE Macro Coded Incorrectly

STMT SOUPCE Statement

| 962 FRYSEEE | ENTER | 12. SAVEAREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $963+F R X S B E E$ | OS | OH |
| 96\%* | EVTPY | FYiSbeE DECLAOE NAME EVTRY |
| 9654 | USTNG | *,12 DECLARE GASE ADDAESSibilityo |
| $966 \%$ | BAL? | 15.0 \{TNTTTAL ADDRESSI3ILTTY)。 |
| 967* | B | 121.151 RNANCH ARCJiNO ID FTELO |
| $968+$ | 0 C | ALIT7),CYYERISBEE YO LEVGTH ANO ID |
| 9694 | Qtot? | 15,0 \{RESET INITYAL AODRESSIBILITY |
| 970 - | BETQ | 15.0 ABSDLUTE ENTRY POIVT). |
| 9714 | STM | $14.12 .12(13)$ SAVE REGISTERS |


| $972+$ | Lq | 12,15 SETUP RASE REGISTER. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $973+$ | St | 13, SAVEATEAT4 CHAIV PACK |
| 974+ | LA | O, SAVEATEA GHAIN FJZWARO |
| 975* | ST | 0,8(0,13) |
| 976* | LP | 13.0 Set up save area pjivter |
| $977+$ | USING | Sivearchil 1 ANO ADDRESSABILITY |
| 978 START | OPEN | (nympao ea, nutputi |
| $979+$ | CNo | 0,4 ALICNLTST TO FILLNDPD |
| $980+$ START | BAL | I,*+8 LTAO QEGL W/LIST ADOR. |
| 981. | DC | AL1(143) SPTION BYTE |
| $982+$ | DC | AL 3(OJMPAPEA) DCB ADORESS |
| 9834 | SVC | 19 ISSUE MPEN SVC |
| 984 | LA | 2,0 |
| 985 | LA | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | LA | 5,0 |
| 988 | LA | 6,0 |
| 989 | LA | 7,0 |
| 990 | LA | 8.0 |
| 991 | LA | 9.0 |
| 992 | 1.4 | 10,0 |
| 993 | LA | 11,0 |
| 994 | LA | 14,0 |
| 995 | 1.4 | 15,0 |
| 996 * |  |  |
| 997 * | SNAP $\quad 10=1, D C 8=D U T P A R E A, P D A T A=P E G S ~$ |  |
| 998 |  |  |
| $999+$ | CHOP | 0,4 |
| 10094 | BAL | 1,IHBTDO3 BAANCH AROUND PARAM LIST |
| 1001* | DC | ALI(L) ID NUMBE? |
| 1002+ | DC | ALI 10 ) |
| $1003+$ | DC | ALI(130) OPYTOM FLAGS |
| 1004 + | OC | ALI(32) SPTION Flacs |
| 1005 + | DC | AlOUYDARCAI OCB ADORESS |
| $1006+$ | DC | A(0) TCS ADOPESS |
| 1007* | 0 C | A(O) AOORESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST |
| 1008+1H80003 | DS | OH |
| 1009+ | suc | 51 |
| 1010* |  |  |
| 1011 * |  |  |
| 1012 | 03 |  |
| 1013+ | ST | 8,SAVE8 |
| 1014* | ST | 9, SAVE9 |
| 1015+ | Sr | 10, SAVE10 |
| 1015* | ST | 11. SAVE11 |
| $1017+$ | L. A | 13,0 |
| 1018* | 4 | 10, =F'1' |
| 1019* | 1.4 | 11,0 |
| 1020 + | A | 11, =F'100' |
| 1021+ | LA | 9,0 |
| 1022+ | A | $9 .=511$ |
| 1023+ | L | 8, POTNTF* |
| 1024* | ST | O,STACK(3) |
| 1025+ | LA | 8,4 (8) |
| $1026+$ | ST | 10, STACK(8) |
| 102.7* | 1.4 | 8,4(9) |
| 1029* | ST | 11,5TACK(8) |
| 10294 | LA | 8,4(9) |
| 10204 | Sr | 8\%PJITEP? |
| 1031+ | 1. | 8, SAVE8 |
| 1.032 \% | L. | 9, SAVEO |
| 1033* | 1 | 10, SAVE12 |
| $1034 *$ | L | 1itstueli |
| $1035+2$ | St | 8, SAVE3 |
| $1036+$ | ST | 9, savca |
| 1037 | ST | 10, SAVELO |

```
10384 ST 11.SAVE1I
10394 L 8,POIMTER
10404
1041+
1042*
10434
10444
10454
1048*
1047+ C 9,2ERO
1048* BL X4
10494 CR 10,11
1050+
1051*
10524\times4
1053+
1054+24
10554
1056*
1057*
1058+
10594
10604
1061* L.A 8,4(8)
10624 ST 8,POINTER
1063* L. 8,SAVE8
1064* L 9,SAVEO
1065*
10664
1067t
1068+44
1069*
1070*
1071*
1.0724
1073*144
1074
1 0 7 5
1076
1077+
1078+
1079
1080
108!+
1082*
1083+
1084+
1085+A5
1086+
1087
1088
1089
1090+
1091+cz
1092+
1093+82
10744
1095+AZ
1096 *
1097 *
1098
1099+
1100+
1101+
1102+
1103.
EYODO
    8,=F'4*
    11,STACK(8)
    8.=F'4:
    10,STACK(8)
    8,=F!4'
    9, STACK(8)
    ST B,POYNTER
    10,11
CR 10,
B Z4
C2 10,11
RL. Y4
AQ. 10,9
L 8,POTNTER
ST g,STACK(8)
LA B,4(8)
ST 10,STACk(8)
LA 8,4(8)
ST 11,STACK(8)
    9,SAVEG
    11:SAVEIl
    H4
    8,SAVE8
    9,SAVE?
    10, SAVE10
    11,SAVEII
    AL
    EQU *
        A 4,=F'1:
        A 5,=F,'1,
            LEAVE LABEL=Z,OPRATOQ=EEQ,REGB=4,COND=K
    ST 10,SAVE1.0
    ST 11,SAVELl
    *, Left opeqand of leave conditton was not speci-
        *,FIEO
    B AS
    l 10,SAVF10
    11,SAVE11
    AZ
    10, SAVE }1
    11,SAVEII
        A 6,=F'1'
        A 6,=F'1'
            A L % %,
    g z
    l 8,Saves
    - 9,SAVE8
    L lo,SAVElo
    E2! *
        1,SAVEIl
        SNAP ID=2,DCB=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
    CNOP 0.4
    BAL 1,$HBOOO7 BOANCH AROUND PARAM LIST
    DC ALI(Z)ID NUMOER
    OC ALl(C)
    DC ALI(:30) OPTITIN FLAGS
```

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1104* & 0 & AL1(32) DPTTON FLAGS \\
\hline 1105* & DC & a(DJYDAREA) ocb aduress \\
\hline \(1106+\) & DC & A(0) TCB ADODESS \\
\hline \(1107+\) & DC & A(0) ADDEESS OF SNAP.-SHJT LIST \\
\hline \(1108+1480007\) & DS & OH \\
\hline 11094 & SVC & 51 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1110*
1111 *
1112 EXIT
1113+ 1 L 13,4(,131 POP UP SAVE AREA
1114+ LM 14,12,12(13) RESTMRE REGISTERS
1115+ MVI 12(13),X'FF. FLAG EXJT
11164 BR 14 RETUQN
1117
11184 CNIP 0,4 ALISN LIST TO FULLHJRO
1119* BAL 1,*+8 LOAD REGL W/LIST ADDR
l120+ DC ALI(I28) CPTION GYTE
1121* DC AL3IDMMPAREAI OCB ADOQESS
1122+ SVC 20 ISSUE ClOSE SVC
1123 SAVEAREA D: 194(0)
1124 OS OF
1125 LERO DC IF'O
1126 SAVEB DS
1127 SAVFg DS
l128 SAVE!O DS
1129 SAVEL1 DS
1130 POINTER DC
1131 STACK DS
1132 DUMPAREA DEB
IF
1F
lF
IF
150'
lOOF
ODNAME=TEAM,OSORG=PS,RECFM=VBA,
MACRF=W,BLKSIZE=382,LRECL =125
1.134+*
11354*
1136+DUMPAREA DC OFO' DRIGIN IN WCRO BJUNDARY
1138** DIRECT ACCESS QEVYCE INTERFACE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(1140+\) & D & BL.16.0' FOAD, DVIBL \\
\hline 11414 & DC & A OI KEYEE, DEVT, TRBAL \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1143+* COMMDN ACCESS METHJD INTERFACE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \(1145+\) & 0 & ALI (0) & BUFN3 & \\
\hline 11464 & 06 & AL3(1) & QJFCB & \\
\hline \(1147+\) & \(0 \cdot\) & AL \(2(0)\) & BUFL & \\
\hline \(11.48+\) & DC & BL2'01 & 0000000000000 & asozg \\
\hline 1149* & 02 & Alll ! & bad & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1151+% FOUNDATION EXTENSIDN
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \(1153+\) & DC & BL1.00000000' & bFtek,bFLN, HIARCHY \\
\hline 1154+ & DC & AL3(1) EODAD & \\
\hline 1155 * & DC & BLI'J1017100 & RECFM \\
\hline \(1156+\) & 00 & AL3(0) EXLST & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1158** FOUNDATYON BLOCK
1160+ OG ClBPTEAM' DDNAME
1161+ DC BLI'0,000010' OFLGS
11624 DC BLI.05000000' TFLC,
1163+ DC BL2.0000000000100000' MAC?
1165+* BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE
```

| 11574 | 05 | BL1:000000J0: RERL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1168+$ | OC | AL3(1) CHECK, GERQ, PEZR |
| $1169+$ | OC | A(1) SY*AO |
| 11704 | DC | H*O CIMOL, CIND2 |
| $1171+$ | 0 O | AL. 2 (882) BLKSIZE |
| 1172+ | DE | FOO SCDT, WCPL, CFFSR, OFFSW |
| $1173+$ | DC | A(1) IORA |
| 1174+ | DC | AL.1(0) NCP |
| 1175* | DC | AL3(1) ETAR, EOBAO |
| 1177** |  | BSAM-BPAK INTERFACE |
| 1179+ | DC | A(1) EOBW |
| $1180+$ | DC | $\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ - Dr8Cy |
| 1181 | $D C$ | AL 21125$)$ LRECL |
| 1182*. | DC | A(I) CMTPL, NOTE, POINT |
| 1183 | EVD |  |
| 1184 |  | =F'1' |
| 1185 |  | $=F .1001$ |
| 1186 |  | =F'4* |

## Sample Program H Illustrating a LEAVE Macro Coded Incorrectly

sfre source statement


```
999+ CvOP 0.4
1000+ B4L 1,THBOOO3 BRANCH ARDUND PARAM L.IST
1001% DC ALI(1) ID SHMMBER
1002+ DC All(0)
1003+ DC ALI(I3O: GPTION FLAGS
1004+ OC ALI(32) OPTICNFLAGS
1005+ OC A{DUMPADEAS DCE ADURESS
1006+
1007+
1008+1H80003
10094
1010 *
1011 *
1012
1013+
1014+
1015t
1016t ST 11.SAVELl
1017t LA 10,0
10184 A 10.=F11.
l0194 LA 11,0
1020+ A 11,=F'100.
1021+ LA 9,0
1022+ A 9,=F11'
1023+ L 8,POINTER
1024+ ST 9.STACK(8)
1025+ LA 8,4(8)
1026* ST 10,5TACK(8)
10274 LA 8,418)
1028+ ST 11,STACK(8)
1029+ LA 8,4(8)
1030+ ST 8,POTVTER
1031+ L B,54VE8
10324 L 9,SAVEO
1033+ L lo,SAVE10
1034+ L . Ll,SAVE11
1035+2 ST 8,SAVE8
1036+ ST g,SAVE9
1037* ST 10,SAVE10
1038+ ST 11.SAVE11
1039* L 8,POINTER
1040+ S 8,=F44'
1041+ L 11,STACK(8)
1042+ S 8,=F!4'
1043+ L 10,STACK(8)
1044* S B&=F'4.
1045+ & 9.STACK(8)
1046+ ST 8,POIMTER
1047* C 9,ZERO
10434 BL X4
1049+ C.R 10,11
10504 B4 Y4
1051+ B 24
1052+X4 C& 10,11
1052+ BL Y4
1054+24 &Q 10.9
1055* L 8.POINTER
1056+ ST 9.STACK(8)
1057* LA 8.4(B)
1050. ST 10.STACK(B)
1059+ LA 8.4(8)
1060+ ST ll.STACK(8)
1061% LA 8.4(8)
1062* s% 8.POYNYER
1063* L B,SAVEE
1054* L 9.SAVE9
```

```
l065+
l067+
lo67+
1069+
1070+
1071+
1072+
1073+W4
1074
1 0 7 5
1076
1077+
1078+
1079+
1080+
1081+
1082+
1083
1084t 8 A5
10854 L 10,SAVE10
1086+
1087+
```



```
lo88+A5 l L L lo,SAVELO
1090
1 0 9 1
1092 ENDDO LABEL=Z
1093+ B 2
1094+CZ
L 8,SAy=8
10954
1096+82
9,Save?
l lo,SAVElo
lo97*
l097*
EQU
    W4
    8,SAVE8
    9,SAVE9
    10. SAVEIO
    11,SAVELI
    AZ
        4 4,=F'1'
        A 5,=F:1.
10774 St
ST
        LEAVE LABEL=Z,LITA=T,OPRATJR=QQ,REGB=4,COND=T
    10,SAVE10
    11,SAVEII
    10,0
    10,=F'7'
    11,4
    10,11
    *,illegal operator specified for a leave conoition
    10,SAVE }1
    11,SAVEL1
    AZ
lo88+A5
    - A G.=F'1'
            A 0;=F'1'
    11.SAVEII
1099
1100
1100
1101 SNAD IO=2,DCB=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
1102+
1103+ BAL I.IHBOOOT BRANGH AKJUNO PARANLIST
1104+ DC ALI(2) ID NUMBER
1105+ DC ALI(O)
ll06+ 
llo6t 
1107* OC ALIS321 JPTION FLASS
11084*
    A(OHMPAOEA) DCB ADORESS
1109+ OC A(J) TCB ADOQESS
11104
    A(O) ADORESS OF SNAP-SHOT LIST
111L+1H80007 OS OH
OC
Il12*
    5 1
1113*
1114**
1115 EXIT
1116+ L 13,4(,13) DOP UP SAVE AQEA
1117+ LM 14,12,12(13) RESTORE REGISTERS
1118* 4VI 12(13),XIFF: FLAGEXIT
11194 BR 14 RETURN
$120 Close oumDAREA
1121* CVOP 0.4 ALIGN IIST TO FULLWJRD
1122* SAL 1,**8 GAD OEGI WMIST ADDR
1123+ DO ALI(129) TPTVON BYTE
1124* OC AL3(DYAPAREAIDCB AOORESS
1l25* SVC 20 ISSUE ClOSE SVC
1126 Savearea d
DC
                184(0)
ll27 OS . OF
1128 2EOO OC 1F.O'
l129 SAvE8 US IF
1130 SAVEQ US IF
1131 SAVEIO DS LF
```

| 1132 | SAVF11 | OS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1133 PDIMTER | OC |  |
| 1134 | STACK | OS |
| 1135 | DUMPAREA | OCB |

$1137+*$
$1138+*$
1139 ADUMPAREA OC
1141 +*

| $1143+$ | $O C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1144+$ | $D C$ |
| $1146+*$ |  |
| $1148+$ | $D C$ |
| $1149+$ | $D C$ |
| $1150+$ | $0 C$ |
| $1151+$ | $D C$ |
| $1152+$ | $D C$ |

1154**

| $1156+$ | $D C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1157+$ | $D C$ |
| $1158+$ | $D C$ |
| $1159+$ | $D C$ |

1161**

| 11634 | 0 C |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1164+$ | 0 C |
| 1165* | DC |
| 11864 | DC |
| 1168** |  |
| 1170t | DC |
| 11714 | DC |
| 1172* | DC |
| 1173 | DC |
| $1174+$ | DC |
| 1175 | DC |
| 11764 | DC |
| 1177 | OC |
| 1178+ | DC |

1180**

| $1182+$ | $O C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1183+$ | $D C$ |
| $1184+$ | $D C$ |
| $1185+$ | $D C$ |
| 1186 | END |

1 F
1F.0.
lonf
DONAME=TEAM, OSJRG=PS, PECFM=VBA,
X

DATA CONTROL BLOCK
OF'O' ORIGIN ON WORD BJUNDARY
DIRECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERfACE
BL16.0' FDAD, DVTBL
A(O) KEYLE, DEVT, TRBAL
COMmON ACGESS mEthod interfate
ALl(O) BUFNO
AL 3(1) BUFCB
AL2(0) BUFL
BL2:0100000000000000' DSORG
All) 108AD
FOUNDATIOL EXTENSION
BLI'00000000' 8FTEK,BFLV,HIARCHY
AL3(l) EODAO
BLI'01010100' RECFM
AL3(0) EXLST
FOUNDATION BLOCK
Cl8'TEAM: DDNAME
BL1'00000010' CFLGS
BLI $100000000^{\circ}$ IFLG
BL2'00000000001000002 MACR
BSAK-BPAM-QSAY INTERFACE
BLI'00000000' RERI
AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR
A(1) SYNAD
H'O' CINDI, CINDZ
AL2(882) BLKSIZE
FOO ACPO, WCPL, OFFSR: OFFSW
A(I) IOBA
AL.1(0) NCP
AL3(1) EOBR, EOBAD
BSAM-BPAM INTERFACE

- A(1) EOBW
$\mathrm{H}^{\circ} \mathrm{O}^{\prime}$ DIRCT
Al.2(1)5) LRECL
All) CNTRL, NOTE, POINT
$=5111$
$=F=100^{\circ}$
$=F 44^{\circ}$
=F'T'


## APPENDIX C

THE CASE, ENDCASE, ELSE, AND ENDELSE MACROS

## The Source Listing for the CASE Macro

## STMT SOURCE STATEMENT



| 757 | - 8 | AIF | ('Elnca eq ' ').errs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 758 |  | L | 10, \&LOCA |
| 759 |  | ASO | - 6 |
| 760 | * |  |  |
| 761* |  |  |  |
| 762 | * |  | the next section of code determynes the right oper- |
| 763 | * |  | AND, ANO LOADS IT IVTT REGISTEQ 11. It may be spec- |
| 764 | * |  | YFIED IN THE SAME YANYER AS THE LFFT IPERAND WITH |
| 765 | * |  | The pesdective parameters belng litb, dFgb ano locb. |
| 766 | * |  | A yisstng oz illegally specifyeo parameter will |
| 767 | * |  | CaUse the generation of an error message, and the |
| 768 | * |  | Case conotiton will be assumed false. |
| 769 * 76 |  |  |  |
| 770 * |  |  |  |
| 771 | . C | A! F | ('\&LITB' EQ M). D |
| 772 |  | A!F | ('\&REGB' NE ''). ERRS |
| 773 |  | AIF | ('ELICB' NE ' 'l. ERRG |
| 774 |  | 14 | 11,0 |
| 775 |  | A | 11, FF'ELITB' $^{\text {a }}$ |
| 776 |  | AG? | - $F$. |
| 777 | - 0 | AIF | ('EREGB' $20 \cdot 1$ ). $E$ |
| 778 |  | AIF | ('EL)CB' NE "').ERRS |
| 779 |  | A! F | (T'EREGB NE 'N'). ERR7 |
| 780 |  | A! F | ('\&REGB' GT 215').ERR8 |
| 791 |  | LR | 11.EPEGB |
| 732 |  | AG? | -F |
| 783 | - E | ATF | ('\&LACS' EQ ' ') ERRG |
| 784 |  | L | 11, \&LOCB |
| 785 |  | A5] | - F |
| 786 | * |  |  |
| 787* |  |  |  |
| 788 | * |  | THE NEXT SECTIOV OF CJDE COMPARES THE LEFT AND RIGHT |
| 789 | * |  | OPERANDS AND GEvERATES AN APPRCDRIATF BRANCH IN- |
| 790 | * |  | Struction based on the value of the spectfied log- |
| 791 | * |  | ICAL moerator. if the jperator is illegal oe miss- |
| 792 | * |  | IVG FRJM THE PARAMETER LIST, AN EDZOR MESSAGE WILI |
| 793 | * |  | BE DUTPUT, AND THE CASE CONDITION WILL BE ASSUMEO |
| 794 | * |  | FALSE. |
| 795 * |  |  |  |
| 796 * |  |  |  |
| 797 | ${ }_{4} \mathrm{~F}$ | $C^{2}$ | 10,11 |
| 798 |  | AIF | ('EาPRATOR: EQ 'loERR9 |
| 799 |  | ATF | ('\&uPRATOR' EQ 'LT'loless |
| 800 |  | A! F |  |
| 801 |  | AIF | ('EJPRATJR' EQ EQ').EQ'AAL |
| 802 |  | AYF |  |
| 803 |  | A]F | ('EDPQATOR' EQ 'GT').GRTEQ |
| 80\% |  | ATF | ('goprator' EQ ene'). NOTEQ |
| 805 |  | ASO | - ERR10 |
| 806 | - Equal. | 8 VE | BEL4B |
| 807 |  | B | celab |
| 808 |  | AGO | - Eno |
| 809 | -LESS | BVL | BELAB |
| 810 |  | 8 | Cstas |
| 811 |  | As0 | - END |
| 812 | -LESSEQ | B4 | BELAS |
| 813 |  | 8 | CELAb |
| 814 |  | AG? | - ENO |
| 815 | - Grtea | BL | BELAB |
| 816 |  | B | CEl $A B$ |
| 817 |  | 460 | - END |
| 818 | - grter | BVH | BELAB |
| 819 |  | B | CELAB |
| 820 |  | A30 | - END |
| 821 | - NOTEQ | BF | BELAB |
| 822 |  | 8 | CELAB |


| 873 |  | A30 | - END |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 824 |  |  |  |
| 825 |  |  |  |
| 826 | * |  | TME FOLLOMING SET OF INSTRUCTITNS RESTIRES THE DRIG- |
| 827 | * |  | IVAL CONTENTS JF THE WODKING PEGISTERS AND CAUSES |
| 828 | * |  | Either the executijy of program instruitions (if |
| 829 | * |  | THE CASE CONDITI?N IS TRUE) TR A BOANCH TD THE 'END- |
| 830 | * |  | CASE MACPO (if the case conoition is falsel. |
| 831 |  |  |  |
| 832 * |  |  |  |
| 833 | - ENO | AVDP |  |
| 834 | BULAB | L | 10, SAVEIO |
| 835 |  | L | 11,SAVEII |
| 836 |  | B | \&LABEL |
| 337 | C\&LAB | 1 | 10,SAVE10 |
| 838 |  | $L$ | 11. SAVE11 |
| 839 |  | 490 | - stop |
| 840 * |  |  |  |
| 841 * |  |  |  |
| 842 | * |  | BELOW ARE THE ERRTR CONDITIDNS WHICH THE MACRO MAY |
| 843 | * |  | OETECT. WHENEVEP AY ERROR CJUDITITN IS RAISED, A |
| 844 | * |  | MESSAGE IS PRINTED AND the case conditton is set to |
| 845 | * |  | FALSE。 |
| 846 * |  |  |  |
| 847 * |  |  |  |
| 848 | - ERat | myote | *, More than one left oderand specified for case: |
| 849 |  | MNOTE | *, CONDITInN. |
| 850 |  | AG? | - END |
| 851 | -EPR2 | YVOTE | *, MMCE than one literal specified in conottions |
| 852 |  | MVTTE | *, Statement. |
| 853 |  | A5? | - return |
| 854 | - ERP3 | YYITE | *, "Mrega* SPECIFIED is not a self-defingng |
| 855 |  | MYOTE | * 'Numeral ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 856 |  | 4G? | - End |
| 857 | -ERf4 | mvote | *, "PEGA" does nor specify a valio rfgister. |
| 858 |  | MVTTE | *, 'number' |
| 859 |  | AG: | - Evo |
| 860 | - ERRS | MVOTE | * 'HO left operand has been specified for case' |
| 861 |  | MVITE | *, CONDITION' |
| 862 |  | AG? | - END |
| 863 | - ER?6 | MVOTE | *, 'mofe than one right operand specified for case* |
| 864 |  | mudte | *, CONDITION' |
| 865 |  | AGO | - END |
| 866 | -EQRT | MVOTE | *,''REGB', SPECIFIEO IS Nat a SELF-DEF!NTNG: |
| 8.7 |  | MVTTE | *, 'Numertc' |
| 868 |  | 4G9 | - Evo |
| 369 | - E¢98 | y Mote | *, "eregb* does vot spectay a valto recisteri |
| 870 |  | MVOTE | *, 'NUMBER' |
| 871 |  | AGO | - ENO |
| 872 | - ERR9 | MVTTE | *, 'opgaator for case conditton has not been* |
| 873 |  | MNJTE | *,'SPECYFIED'. |
| 874 |  | AGO | - END |
| 875 | - ERR10 | MNJTE | *, illegal operator specifieg for a case czvoiticn: |
| 876 |  | ASO | -END. |
| 877 | - STOP | MEND |  |

## The Source Listing for the ENDCASE Macro

## STMT SOURCE STATEGENT



The Source Listing for the ELSE Macro

STMT SOURCE STATEMENT

```
940
941
942.*
943*
944 *
945 *
946 MACPO
948 MEND
STRUCTIONS TD BE EXECUTED WHEN ALL OF THE PROCEEDing Case stateyents have failed. an endelser macpo SHOULD ALWAYS BE SPECIFIED WHEN THE ELSE MACRJ IS USED.
```

The Source Listing for the ENDELSE Macro

| 950 * |  | the endels me macro genera | tes a label to hhich a set |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 951 * |  | df Case statenents will | BrANCH WHEN ANY OR ALL HAVE |
| 952 * |  | had trrue conoitions. | IT A!SO MARKS THE END OF |
| 953 * |  | THE SET OF INSTRUCTIONS | ENCDMPASSED BY THE ELSE |
| 954 * |  | MACRO. |  |
| 955 * |  |  |  |
| 956 * |  |  |  |
| 957 | MACRO | . |  |
| 958 | fydelse | $\varepsilon!A B=$ | . |
| 959 \&LAB | EQU | * |  |
| 960 | MEAD |  |  |

Sample Program I Illustrating the CASE, ENDCASE, ELSE, and ENDELSE Macros

| 962 |  | PRINT | NIGEN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 963 | frisege | Enter | 12, Savearea |
| 979 | START | DPEN | (DUMPAREA, OUTPUT) |
| 985 |  | L. ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | 2,0 |
| 986 |  | LA | 2,0 |
| 937 |  | LA | 3.0 |
| 938 |  | L.A | 4,0 |
| 989 |  | LA | 5,0 |
| 990 |  | LA | 6.0 |
| 991 |  | LA | 7,0 |
| 992 |  | LA | 8,0 |
| 993 |  | 1.4 | 9,0 |
| 994 |  | LA | 10,0 |
| 995 |  | LA | 11,0 |
| 996 |  | LA | 14,0 |
| 997 |  | LA | 15,0 |
| 998 | * |  |  |
| 997 | * |  | - |
| 1000 |  | SVAP | $10=1, D C B=O U M P A R E A, P O A T A=R E G S$ |
| 1012 | * |  |  |
| 1013 | * |  |  |
| 1014 |  | case | LABEL=A,LIMA $=0$, OPRATOR $=$ NE, REGB $=15$ |
| 1028 |  |  | A 4, =F'l. |
| 1029 |  |  | A 5,=F'14 |
| 1030 |  |  | A 6, FFil |
| 031 |  |  | A 7, \%f'is |
| 1.32 |  |  | A $B_{p}=F+1{ }^{\prime}$ |
| 1033 |  |  | A S, FF'l* |


| 1034 |  | Evdcase | OPTTOM = L, LABEL=A, LAB = HERE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1037 | * |  |  |
| 10.88 | * |  |  |
| 1039 |  | CASE | $\angle A B E L=3, R E G A=14, O P 2 A T O R=E Q, L I T B=0$ |
| 1053 |  |  | A $4,=F{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1054 |  |  | $4 \quad 5,=F 2^{\circ}$ |
| 1055 |  |  | A $6,=\mathrm{F}^{\prime} 2^{\circ}$ |
| 1055 |  |  | A $71=\mathrm{F}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1057 |  |  | A $8,=\mathrm{F}^{\circ} 2^{\circ}$ |
| 1058 |  |  | A $9,=\mathrm{F}^{\circ} 2^{\circ}$ |
| 1059 |  | EvOCASE | DPTION=L, $\angle A B E L=B, L A B=H E R E$ |
| 1062 | * |  |  |
| 1063 | * |  |  |
| 1064 |  | CASE | LOCA $=X, L O C B=Y, L A B E L=C, O P R A T O R=L T$ |
| 1077 |  |  | A 4, =F'3. |
| 1078 |  |  | A 5, FF'3' |
| 1079 |  |  | A $6,=F \cdot 31$ |
| 1080 |  |  | A 7\% F F $3^{\circ}$ |
| 1081 |  |  |  |
| 1082 |  |  | A 9, 9 F'3 |
| 1083 |  | ENDCASE | OPTICN: $1, C A B E L=C, L A B=H E R E$ |
| 1086 | * |  |  |
| 1097 | * |  |  |
| 1088 |  | ELSE |  |
| 1089 |  |  | A $4,=F^{1 / 49}$ |
| 1090 |  |  | A $5,=$ F $^{14}$ |
| 1091 |  |  | A $6,=5140$ |
| 1092 |  |  | A $7,=54^{\circ}$ |
| 1093 |  | - | A $8,=\mathrm{Fi}^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1094 |  |  | A 9, =F'4* |
| 1095 |  | ENDELSE | $\angle A B=H E P F$ |
| 1097 | * |  |  |
| 1098 | * | SNAP |  |
| 1098 |  |  | $10=2, D C B=$ DUMP $A R E A, P D A T A=R E G S$ |
| 1111 | * |  |  |
| 1112 | * |  | , |
| 1113 |  | EXIT |  |
| 1118 |  | CLOSE | DUMPAREA |
| 1124 | savearea | 0 C | 1940) |
| 1125 |  | OS | OF. |
| 1126 | 2ERO | DC | 1F90. |
| 1127 | SAVE8 | OS | $1 F$ |
| 1128 | SAVE9 | 05 | IF |
| 1129 | savelo | DS | $1 F$ |
| 1130 | SAVEIl | OS | IF |
| 11.12 | potnter | dc | 1F901 |
| 1132 | Stack | DS | 100F |
| 1133 | * | DC | 1F14 |
| 1134 | Y | DC | 1F:8* |
| 1135 | dumparea | DCB 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ODNAME }=T E A M, D S O R G=P S, R E C F M=V B A, \end{aligned}$ |
| 1186 |  | END |  |
| 1187 |  |  |  |
| 1188 |  |  |  |
| 1189 |  |  |  |
| 1190 |  |  |  |
| 1191 |  |  |  |


| REGS 0-7 | 00000030 | 9001888 C | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FEGS B-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 5001 B820 | 0001 B9C8 | 00000000 | 00000000 | END OF SNRP

REGS AT ENTRY TO SNAP

| REGS 0-7 | 000002 AO | A001899C | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000032 | 00000002 | 00000002 | 00000002 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REGS 8-15 | 00000002 | 00000002 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | 00018908 | 00003000 | 00000000 |

END CF SNAP

## Program I with Expanded Macros

```
STMT SQURCE STATEMENT
962 FRTSBEE EVTER 12,SAVEAREA
903+FRISBEE DS OH
964* EVTRY FRISBFE OECLARE NANE ENTRY
965+ USING *,12 DECLARE GASE AUDNESSIBILITYO
906* 3SLR 15,0 ITSTTYAL ADOESSSISILITYI.
96%+ B 126.151 BOAYCH AROJNO iD F:ELO
968* OE AL.1(7),CLTPFRISEEE: ID LENGTH AND 10
969+ BCTR 15,0 (CESET EVITIAL AOJQESSISILITY
970+ BCTR 15.0 ABSRLUTF ENTPY POINTI.
971+ STM 14,12,12(13) SAVE ;EGTSTERS
972* LR 12,15 SETUP RASE RE:ISTEQ.
973+ ST 13.S{VFACEA+4 CHAIN BACK
974+ LA O,SAVEAREA CHAIN FJRWAZO
9754 ST 0,810.131
9764 LQ 13,0 SET UP SAVE AREA PJINTER
977+ USING SAVEAREAF13 SND ADDRESSAQILITY
978 START JPEN (DUMPAREA,OUTPUT)
979+ CVOP 0,4 AL!G:L!ST TOFULLNJQD
980+START GAL I:*+B LMAD REGI W/LIST ADOR.
992% DC AL.IT143) OPTION BYTE
982+ DC AL3(DIMPAREA) DCE ADDRESS
983+ SVC 19 ISSUE GPEN SVC
984 LA 2,0
985 L.4 2,0
906 LA 3,0
```



```
1054
1055
105%
1057
1059
1052*
1060+B
1061%
1062 *
1063
1064+
1065+
10664
1067+
1068*
10694
1070%
10714.88
1072*
1073+
10744C8
1075+
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080 - A T,=F!3'
1.081
1082
1083+
1084+C
1085 *
1086**
1087 ELSE
1088
1099
1070
1091
1092
1 0 7 3
1094
1095+HERE
1095 *
1097*
1098 SUAF ID=2,DCB=OUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
1099+ CNOP 0.4
1100* BAL 1,IHBOO12 BOANGH AROUNO PARAM IIST
H01% OC ALL(2) IO NUMBER
1102+
1103+ OE ALI(130) JPTION FLAGS
1104% DC ALI(32) DPTIONFLASS
1105* DC ADDUMPAREAI DCB ADORESS
1106*
1107+
1108+1H80012
1109+
DC A(D) TCG AOORESS
1110*
1111
1112 FEXIT
11134 L 13.41.131 POP UP SAVEAREA
1114+ L4 14,12.12(13) OESTOREREGISTERS
1115+ MVI L2(13),XtFFP FLAG EXIT
1116+
1117
GR 14PETURN
CLOSE DUMPAREA
1118+ CVOP 0,4 Al!GNEIST TO FULL&JRO
ll194 BAL L,*+& LCAD REGI W/LIST AOOR
ll20+ DC ALH1L28 OPYION EYTE
```



| 1185 | End |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1186 |  | $=\mathrm{FPO}^{\circ}$ |
| 1187 |  | $=F^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 1188 |  | =F'2' |
| 1189 |  | =F\%3' |
| 1190 |  | = F\% ${ }^{\prime}$ |


| SOURGE STAYEMENT |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 962. FRISBEE | evter | 12, SAVEACEA |
| $963+F R \mathrm{CLSEE}$ | DS | OH |
| 964* | EvTRY | FQISBEE DECLARE NAAE ENTRY |
| 965 + | USING | *, l2 declare base audosssibility. |
| $966+$ | BALR | 15,0 (INITIAL ADDEESSIBILYTY). |
| $967+$ | 8 | 126.151 BPANCH AROIND IO FIELD |
| $968+$ | OC | ALIf7, CIT 7 FRISGEE ID LENGTH AND ID |
| $969+$ | BCTR | 15,0 (RESET INITIAL ADORESSIBILITY |
| $970+$ | $B C T R$ | 15,0 ABSILUTE ENTPY POIVTI. |
| $971+$ | STM | 14,12,12(13) SAVE REGISTERS |
| 972+ | LQ | 12,15 SETUP BASE REJISTER。 |
| 973* | ST | 13, SAVEAREA+4 CHAIN BACK |
| $974+$ | LA | o, Savearea chain forward |
| 975* | ST | 0,810,131 |
| 9764 | LR | 13, ) SFT UP SAVE ARER POINTER |
| 977 + | USING | savearea, 13 amio adozessability |
| 978 START | OPEN | (dumparea, outputi |
| $979+$ | cvop | 0,4 ALIGN LIST TO FULLWURD |
| 980 START | B4L | $1 . * * R$ LOAD REGI W/LIST ADDR. |
| $981+$ | DC | ALI(143) DOTIDN BYTE |
| 932+ | DC | AL 3 OUMAPAREA) DCB ADORESS |
| $983+$ | SVC | 19 ISSUE MPEN SVC |
| 984 | 14 | 2,0 |
| 985 | la | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | LA | 5.0 |
| 988 | LA | 6.0 |
| 989 | LA | 7,0 |
| 992 | LA | 8.0 |
| 991 | LA | 9,0 |
| $99 ?$ | LA | 10,0 |
| 993 | L4 | 11.0 |
| 994 | LA | 14,0 |
| 925 | La | 15,0 |
| 996 * |  |  |
| 997 * |  |  |
| 998 |  | VAP $\quad$ ID $=1$, OCB $=$ DUYPAREA, PDATA=REGS |
| 999. | CVOP | 0.4 |
| 1000\% | BAL | 1, TH30003 BRANCH ARJUNO PARAM LIST |
| 10014 | DC | ALLU) TO NUMBER |
| 1002+ | OC: | ALI(0) |
| 1003+ | DC | ALI(170) OPTION FLAGS |
| 10044 | OG | AL 1432) Morime flags |
| 1005* | 0 C | A (DUyPAEEA) DCB ADJRESS |
| 1006t | DC | A(0) TCB ADDEESS |
| 1007* | DC | A(O) ADORFSS DF SNAP-SHOT LIST |
| 1008+[1880003 | OS | OH |
| $1009+$ | suc | 51 |
| 1010* |  |  |
| 1011** |  |  |
| 1012 | CASE | $L . A B E L=A, L T A=0, ~ O P R A T O R=N E, R E G B=1$ |

```
1013*
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
lll
1026
2027
1028
1029
1 0 3 0
1031
EYDCASE A 9,=F'1'
1033
1034
10354
1036+A
1037*
1038*
1039
10404
1041+ ST 11,SAVEIL
1042% LR 10,14
10434 LA 11,0
1044+ A 11,=Fro*
1045+ CR 10,11
10464
1047*
10484.86
1049+
1050*
1051+C6
1052+
1053
1054
1055
1056
1.057
1058
1 0 5 9
10504
106148
1062 *
1063*
1064 CASE LOCA=X,LOCB=Y,LABEL=F,OPRATOR=LY
1065+
1066+
1067+
1068+
1069*
10704
1071*
10724.88
10734
1074*
1075+C8
1076*
1077
1078
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
ST & \(10, S A V E 10\) \\
\(S T\) & \(11, S A V E 11\) \\
\(L A\) & 10,0 \\
\(A\) & \(10,=F 10:\) \\
\(L R\) & 11,15 \\
\(C R\) & 10,11 \\
\(B E\) & \(B 4\) \\
\(B\) & \(C 4\) \\
\(L\) & \(10, S A V E 10\) \\
\(L\) & \(11, S A V E 11\) \\
\(B\) & \(A\) \\
\(L\) & \(10, S A V E 10\) \\
\(L\) & \(11, S A V E 11\)
\end{tabular}
1032 EVDCASE OPTION=4,LABEL=A,LAB=HERE
    **'DPTION' SPECIFIED IS AN ILLEGAL NUMERIC value
    *.(optigN set to one)
    CASE l
    B HERE
EQU
    *
        A 4,=F'1'
        A 5,=FO!'
        A 6:=F'1'
        A 7:=F'1.
        A. 8,=FI1'
    * SPECifIED IS aN Illegal numeric value
A
    *
    CASE LABEL=B,REGA=14,OPRATOR=EQ,LITB=0
    11,=F'0*
    CR 10.11
    BNE BG
    BNE B6
```

```
\begin{tabular}{lll}
1079 & \(A\) & \(6,=F: 31\) \\
1080 & \(A\) & \(7,=F: 3^{\prime}\) \\
1081 & \(A\) & \(8,=F: 3\) \\
1082 & \(A\) & \(9,=F .3^{\circ}\)
\end{tabular}
1033 EVOCASE TPTMON=1,LABEL=C,LAB=HERE
1084+ B HERE
1085+C
1086*
1087*
1088 ELSE
1089
1090
109
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096+HERE
1097*
1098 *
1099*
1100*
1101 CNOP ONAP % IO=2,DCE=DUMPAREA,PDATA=REGS
1102.
1103% AAL l,IHBOOL2 ROANCH AROUNO PARAM LIST
1104+ OC ALL(2) IO NUMBER
1105+ DC ALI(0)
1106+ DC ALI{130) OPTION FLAGS
1107t DC ALII32) OPTION FLAGS
1108+ DC A(OIMDAREA) DCB AOORESS
1109+ OC AlO) TCB ADORESS
1110+ OC A(O) ADOQESS OF SNAP-SHJT LIST
111L+IHBOOL2 DS OH
1112* SVC 51
1113*
1114%
1115 EXIT
11164 L 13,41,131 POP UP SAVE AREA
1117+ LM 14,12.12(13) RESTMRE REGISTERS
1118+ MVI 12(13),K+FF' FLAGEEXT
1119* BR 14 RETIRN
1120 CLSSE DUMOADEA
1121* CNOP 0,4 ALIGNLIST TOFULLWORD
1122+ BAL 1,*+8 LOAD REGL W/LIST AODR
1123+ DC ALI(123) OPTION 8YTE
1124 DC AL3(DIMMPAREA) DCF ADORESS
1125* SVC 20ISSUE CLISE SVC
1126 SAVEANEA DC 18A(O)
1127 DS OF
112.% &EOD OC LF.O'
1129 SAVEZ DS IF
1130 SAVES OS IF
1131 SAVELO DS IF
1132 SAVELI DS IF
1133 POINTER OC IFIOO
2134 STACK DS 1OOF
1135x DC IF.4'
1136 Y DC 1F%8%
1:37 DUMPAREA DCB DONAME=YEAM,OSONG=PS,REGFMOVBA.
MACQF=W,GLKSIZE=882,L.RECL=125
\(1139+\) *
\(1140+4\)
1141+DUMPAREA DC. OF'O DOYGTY DN WORJ BOUNOARY
```

```
1143+* OIOECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERFACE
```

```
1143+* OIOECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERFACE
```

| 11454 | DC | BL16'0' FDAD, DVTBL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11464 | DC | A(J) KEYLE, DEVT, TRBAL |
| 1148* ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | COMMON ACCESS YETHJD In TERFACE |
| 1150 + | DC | ALI(0) BUFNO |
| 11514 | DC | AL3(1) BUFCS |
| 11524 | DC | AL2(0) BUFL |
| $1153+$ | DC | 9L2.0100000000000020' DSORG |
| 11544 | DC | A(1) InBaD |
| 1156+* |  | FOUPDATION EXTENSIJN |
| 11584 | DC | BLL. 00000000 BFTEK, BFLN,HIARCHY |
| $1159+$ | OC | AL3(1) Endad |
| $1160+$ | DC | BLI'01010100' PECFM |
| 1161+ | DC | AL3(0) EXLST |
| 1163** |  | FDUNDATION BLDCK |
| 1165* | 06 | CLB'TEAM D DNAME |
| $1166+$ | OC | BL1'00000010' OFLGS |
| $1167+$ | 0 O | BLI'00000000' IFLG |
| $1168+$ | OC | BL2*0000000000100030' HACR |
| 1170+* |  | BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE |
| 1172* | 06 | BLI'00000000' REOL |
| $1173+$ | $0 C$ | AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR |
| $1174+$ | DC | A(1) SYNAO |
| 1175* | 0 C | HOO' CIMOL, CIND2 |
| $1176+$ | DC | AL2(882) BLKSIZE |
| 1177 * | DC | F.O1 WCPG, WCPL, OFFSR, OFFSW |
| 1178 * | DC | A(1) 108A |
| 1179+ | DC | ALITO) NCP |
| 11804 | OC | AL3(1) EOBR, EOBAD |
| 1182** |  | BSAM-BPAM INTERFACE |
| $1184+$ | DC | A(1) EOBW |
| 1185 | $D C$ | HEO DERCT |
| $1186+$ | DC | AL. $\% 1251 \mathrm{LRECL}$ |
| 1187* | DC | A(1) CNTRL, NOTE, PDINT |
| 1188 | Evo |  |
| 1189 |  | 二F゚0 |
| 1190 |  | =F'11 |
| 1191 |  | =F'2' |
| 1192 |  | =F3' |
| 1193 |  | = $\mathrm{F}^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\circ}$ |

## Sample Program K Illustrating a CASE Macro Coded Incorrectly

## STMT <br> SOURCE STATEMENT

| 962 FPISBEE | ENTER | 12.SAVEAREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $963+\mathrm{FtP}$ SEE | DS | OH |
| 964 + | ENTRY | FQisbee declare nave fyray |
| 9654 | USING | * l2 dectafe base adonessibility. |
| 9664 | 3AL? | 15.0 (INPTIAL ADOFESSISILTYY. |
| $967+$ | 8 | 12(.15) BPGNCH AROUND ID FIELD |
| 9684 | DC |  |
| $969+$ | BCTP | 15,0 IRESET INITIAL ADJRESSIBILITY |




| 1103 | 0 C | A(0) TCB AODRESS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1104+$ | 0 C | A(O) ALIODESS OF SNAP-SHOT L.IST |  |
| $1105+14 B O 012$ | DS | OH |  |
| 11064 | SVC | 51 |  |
| $1107 *$ |  |  |  |
| 1108 * |  |  |  |
| 1109 | EXIT |  |  |
| $1110+$ | L | 13,41,131 PIP UP SAVE AREA |  |
| 11114 | LM | 14,12,12(13) RESTRRE REGISTERS |  |
| 1112+ | MVI | 121131, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{FF}$ ( FLAG EXIT |  |
| $1113+$ | BR | 14 RETURN |  |
| 1114 | CLOSE | DIMSAPEA |  |
| 1115* | CNOP | 0,4 ALTGNLIST TO FULLNJRD |  |
| 11164 | BAL | $1, *+8$ LJAD REGI W/LIST ADOR |  |
| 1117 | DC | ALI(129) OPTION BYTE |  |
| 1118 | $0 C$ | AL 3 (DUPAPAREA) DCB ADDRESS |  |
| 1119* | SVC | 20 ISSUE CLOSE SVC |  |
| 1120 SAVEAREA | $0=$ | $184(0)$ |  |
| 1121 | OS | OF |  |
| $11222 E 90$ | $D C$ | 1F'O' |  |
| 1123 SAVE8 | 0 S | 1 1F |  |
| 1124 SAVES | OS | 1 F |  |
| 1125 SAVE1O | OS | $1 F$ |  |
| 1126 SAVEII | OS | $1 F$ |  |
| 1127 POTNTEP | OC | $1 \mathrm{FO}^{\circ}$ |  |
| 1128 STACK | OS | 100 F |  |
| 1129 X | DC | 1F:4: |  |
| 1130 Y | DC | 1F\%' |  |
| 1131 DUMPAREA | DC 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DONAME }=T E A M, \text { DSORG=PS, } Q E G F H=V B A ; \\ & M A C Q F=W, B L K S I Z E=882, L R E C L=125 \end{aligned}$ | $X$ |
| 1133+* |  | DATA CONTZ.2L BL |  |
| $1134+4$ |  | data conraj block |  |
| 1135+DUMPAREA | DC | OF'OP ORIGIN ON WQRD BJJNOAPY |  |
| $1137+{ }^{1}$ |  | DTDECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERFACE |  |
| 11394 | DC | BLIG'0 FDAD, DVTBL |  |
| 11404 | OC | A(O) KEYLE,DEVT, TRISAL |  |
| 11424* |  | COMMJN ACGESS METHOD INTERFACE |  |
| $1144+$ | 05 | ALI(O) BUFNO |  |
| $1145+$ | 05 | AL3(1) BUFCB |  |
| 1146* | 0 C | ALz(0) BuFL |  |
| 11474 | OC | BL 20100000000000000' OSORG |  |
| 11484 | OC | A(1) ICBAO |  |
| 1150** |  | FOUNDATITV EXTENSION |  |
| 1152+ | $D C$ | BLI'00000000' BFTEK, BFLV, HI ARCHY |  |
| 11534 | DC | AL311 FnOAD |  |
| $11.54{ }^{+}$ | DC | BL1'01010100' RECFM |  |
| $1155+$ | OC | AL3(0) EXLST | . |
| 1157** |  | FOUNDATION BLOCK |  |
| 11594 | DC | CL8*TEAM, DDNAME |  |
| $11.60+$ | 06 | 8L1.00000010' OFLGS |  |
| $1161+$ | OC | 8LI'00000200' TFLG |  |
| $1162 *$ | DC | BL2:0000000000100000' YACR |  |
| 1164+* |  | RSAM-BPAM-QSAA INTERFACE |  |
| $1166 \%$ | $D C$ | BL1.00000000' REQ1 |  |


| 1167 + | OC | AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1168 + | DC | Alll SYMAD |
| 1169+ | OC | H'OC CINDI, CINDZ |
| $1170+$ | DC | AL2(882) BLKSIZE |
| 1171* | 0 C | FOO MCOM, WCPL, OFFSR, OFFSW |
| 1172+ | DC | A(1) 1034 |
| 11734 | 0 C | AL1(0) NCP |
| 1174 + | OC | AL3(2) EORR, EOBAD |
| 1.176+* |  | BSAM-BPAX INTERFACE |
| 11784 | DC | A(1) E08W |
| 1179+ | DC | H.O' OIRCT |
| 11804 | DC | AL2(125) LRECL |
| 1181** | OC | A(1) CNTRL, NOTE, POINT |
| 1.182 | EVD |  |
| 1133 |  | =F'0, |
| 1184 |  | FF'1' |
| 1135 |  | $=F 2^{\circ}$ |
| $1: 36$ |  | 二F'3* |
| 1.87 |  | =F't ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |

## Sample Program L Illustrating a CASE Macro Coded Incorrectly

| STMt source | STATEMENT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -962 Ftisgee | ENTER | 12, Savearea |
| $963+$ FR158EE | DS | OH |
| $964+$ | EXTRY | frisbee declare name evtry |
| $965+$ | USING | *, 12 declate base adoressibility. |
| 9664 | BALQ | 15.0 (INTMAL ADOEESSIHILITY). |
| $967+$ | 8 | 121:15) BFANCH AROJND ID FIELO |
| $968+$ | $D C$ | ALI(7), CLT'FRISBEE' ID LENGTH ANO ID |
| 9694 | BCTR | 15,0 fRESET INITIAL ADORESSTBILITY |
| $970+$ | BGTR | 15,0 ABSOLUTE ENTRY POENTI. |
| $971+$ | STM | 14,12,12(13) SAVE REGTSTEPS |
| $972+$ | 12 | 12,15 SETUP BASE REGISTER. |
| $973+$ | ST | 13, SAVEAPEA+4 CHAIN BACK |
| $974+$ | La | 0, Savearea chain firward |
| 975* | ST | 0,8(0, 13) |
| $976+$ | LQ | 13,0 SET up save area pointer |
| $977+$ | USING | SAVEAREA, 13 AND AD:URESSABYLITY |
| 978 START | DPEN | (DU4PAFEA, DUYPUT) |
| $979+$ | covo | 0.4 ALISN LISt ro fullajob |
| $980+$ STARY | BAL | $1, *+3$ L.DAD REGL W/LIST ADOP. |
| 981+ | DC | ALl(143) DPTIOV BYTE |
| $982+$ | DC | AL3(DUMPAREA) DCB ADORESS |
| 983 t | SVC | 19 \%SSUE TPEN SVC |
| 984 | LA | 2,0 |
| 985 | LA | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | LA | 5.0 |
| 988 | LA | 6.0 |
| 989 | 1.4 | 7,0 |
| 990 | L.A | 8,0 |
| 991 | LA | 9,0 |
| 992 | LA | 10,0 |
| 993 | LA | 11,0 |
| 994 | 1.4 | 14,0 |
| 995 | LA | 15.0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 996 * \\ & 997 * \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |




| 1130 | POUHER | OC |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1131 | STACK | $O S$ |
| 1132 | $X$ | $O C$ |
| 1133 | $Y$ | $O C$ |
| 1134 | DUMPAREA OCB |  |

$1136+w$
$1137+\%$
$1138+$ DUMPAREA DC

DAYA CONTRJL BLOCK
1.1384 DUMPAREA DC

OF:O' ORIGIN ON WORD BOUNDAZY
$1140+*$
DIRECT ACCESS DEVICE INTERFACE
$1142+\quad D C \quad B L 16^{\prime} 0^{\prime}$ FDAD, OVTBL
11434 DC A(O) KEYLE,DEVT, TRBAL
$1145+*$

| $1147+$ | $O C$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1148+$ | $O C$ |
| $1149+$ | $O C$ |
| $1150+$ | $O C$ |
| $1151+$ | $O C$ |

ALICO) BUFND
AL3(1) BUFCB
AL2(0) BUFL
$\begin{array}{ll}1150+ \\ 1151+ & O C \\ & O C\end{array}$
8L2'0100000000000003' OSORG
A(1) IOBAO
1153** FCUNDATION EXTENSIDN

| 1155* | DC | BLI'00000000' BFTEK, BFLN, H ( ARCHY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.56+ | DC | AL3(1) ETOAD |
| 1157\% | DC | 8L1.01010100' RECFM |
| $1158+$ | DC | AL3(0) EXLST |
| 11604 |  | FOUNOATIOIV BLJCK |
| 1162* | DC | CLB'TEAM: DONAME |
| 11634 | 06 | BL:00000010: OFLGS |
| 1164 t | DC | ALI'00000000' IFLG |
| 11654 | DC | SL2:0000000000100000: 4ACR |
| $1167+4$ |  | BSAY-BPAM-QSAY INTERFACE |

$1169+\quad$ OC BL1.00000000: QER1
$1170+$ DC AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR
1171+ DC A(I) SYNAD
$1172+\quad \mathrm{DC}$
$1173+\quad O C$
11744
H'O. CINOL, CIND2
AL21892) BLKSI2E
$1175+\quad D C$
$1176 \%$ OC
1177* OC
F'O' WCPG, WCPL, OFFSA, OFFSW
A(1) 1مBA
ALLTO 1 NCP
Al.3(1) ECBR, EOBAD
$1179+4$
BSAM-BPAY INTERFACE
1131+ OC AIL EOBN
$118 ? \mathrm{t}$ OC HO OIRCT
$1183+\quad D C \quad A L 2(125)$ LRECL
$\begin{array}{lll}1184+ & \text { DC } & \text { A(1) CNTRL. NOTE, POINT } \\ 1185 & \text { ENO } & \end{array}$
18 ENO

1136
1187
1188
$1189 \quad=F 13^{\circ}$
$=\mathrm{FO}^{\circ} \mathrm{O}^{\circ}$
$=F * I$
$1190 \quad=F: 4^{\prime}$

## APPENDIX D

## THE USE OF NESTED DO MACROS

## Sample Program M Illustrating Nested DO and ENDDO Macros

```
STMT SOURCE STATEMENT
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 962 & & POINT & NOGEN \\
\hline 963 & FRISBEE & ENTER & 12，SAVEAREA \\
\hline 979 & START & OPEN & （DUMPAREA，OUTPUT） \\
\hline 985 & & LA & 2，0 \\
\hline 986 & & L．A & 3：0 \\
\hline 987 & & LA & 4，0 \\
\hline 988 & & LA & 5，0 \\
\hline 989 & & LA & 6，0 \\
\hline 990 & & LA & 7，0 \\
\hline 991 & & LA & 8，0 \\
\hline 992 & & LA & 9：0 \\
\hline 993 & & LA & 10，0 \\
\hline 994 & & LA & 1．1，0 \\
\hline －995 & & LA & 14，0 \\
\hline 996 & & L．A & 15，0 \\
\hline 997 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 998 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 999 & & SNAP & YO＝1．DC \(3=\) DUMPAREA，PDATA＝QEGS \\
\hline 1011 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1012 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1013 & & 03 & LOWNUM \(=1, B Y\) UUM \(=1, H G H N U M=5, D O L O O P=S, L A B E L=L O O P A\) \\
\hline 1075 & & & A \(4,=\mathrm{FA}^{\prime}\) ： \\
\hline 1076 & & & A \(5,=\mathrm{FE}\) I＇ \\
\hline 1077 & & & A \(6,=F^{\prime \prime} 1^{\prime}\) \\
\hline 1078 & & & SNAP \(\quad 1 D=2, D C B=D U Y P A R E A, P D A Y A=R E G S ~\) \\
\hline 1090 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1091 & & D0 & WHILE \(=A, W R E G A=8, W O P=L T, W L I T B=10, L A B E L=L D O P B\) \\
\hline 1107 & & & A 8，＝F＇I＇\({ }^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline 1108 & & & A 9，＝F＇1＇ \\
\hline 1109 & & ENOOO & LABEL二厶⺝刂pe \\
\hline 1116 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1117 & & & SNAP \(\quad 10=3,0 C 8=D J M P A P E A, P D A T A=R E G S ~\) \\
\hline 1129 & & & A 14，FF， \\
\hline 1130 & & & A 15， 5 Fl ， \\
\hline 1132 & & EVOOO & \(\angle A B E L=\angle O Q P A\) \\
\hline 1138 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1139 & ＊ & & \\
\hline 1140 & & CASE & \(L A B E L=T E S T A, R E G A=\uparrow, O P R A T O R=E Q, R E G B=15\) \\
\hline 1153 & & & L．A 4，0 \\
\hline 1154 & & & LA 5，0 \\
\hline 1155 & & & LA 6，0 \\
\hline 1156 & & & LA 8，0 \\
\hline 1157 & & & L1 9，0 \\
\hline 1158 & & & LA 14，0 \\
\hline 1159 & & & LA 15，0 \\
\hline 1160 & & & SNAP ID \(=4\) ，DCZ \(=\) OJMPAREA，PDATA＝REGS \\
\hline 1172 & & ENDCASE & OPTTON＝2，LASEL＝TESTA \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```



| REGS 0-7 | 00000030 | 90018888 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| EEGS 8-15 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 C 20$ | 000000000 | 00000000 |



KEGS AY ENTRY TO SNAP. ID $=003$

| FEEGS 0.7.7 | $000002 A 0$ | $800199 F 8$ | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000003 | 00000003 | 00000003 | 00000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FESS 8-15 | 00000004 | 0000000 A | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | $5001 B 820$ | $00018 C 20$ | 00000002 | 00000000 |

    ENO DF SNAP
    REGS AT ENTRY TO SNAB $\quad 10=002$

| REGS 0-7 | 000002 A0 | A0018924 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000004 | 00000004 | 00000004 | 00000000 |
| REGS 8-15 | 00000004 | 0000000 A | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 C 20$ | 00000003 | 00000001 |
| ENO OF SNAP |  |  |  |  |

REGS AT ENTRY TO SNAP $\quad$ ID $=003$

| REGS 0-7 | $000002 A 0$ | 3001 BOF8 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 00000004 | 00000004 | 00000004 | 00000000 |
|  | 00000004 | 00000004 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| REGS 8-15 | 50018820 | 0001 BC20 | 00000003 | 00000000 |

END OF SNAP



Fig. 27--Flowchart showing structured logic of Program M.

| FEGS 0-7 | $000002 A 0$ | $40018 B F 4$ | 00000000 | 00000000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 00000005 | 00000005 | 00000005 | 00000000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| REGS B-15 | 00000005 | 00000005 | 00000000 | 00000000 |
|  | 50018820 | $00018 C 20$ | 00000019 | 00000000 |

## Program M with Expanded Macros

STMT SOURCE STATEMENT

| 962 FRISBEE | EVTER | 12, SAVEAREA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 963-FRISBEE | OS | OH |
| 964* | EVTRY | frisbee declare naye entpy |
| $965+$ | USING | *, 12 declare base Adodesstbility. |
| 9664 | BALR | 15,0 (INITIAL ADDRESSIBILITYI. |
| 967 + | 8 | 12(,15) BRANCH AROUHD IO FIELD |
| $968+$ | $0 \sim$ | ALI(7),CLTFRIS8EE IO LENGTH ANO IO |
| $969+$ | BCMR | 15.0 (RESET INITIAL ADORESSIBILITY |
| $970+$ | 8 CrP | 15,0 ABSOLUTE ENTRY PJINT). |
| $971+$ | STM | 14,12,12(13) SAVE REGISTEPS |
| 97? + | 18 | 12.15 SETUP BASE REUSSTER. |
| $973+$ | ST | 13, SAVEAOEA+4 CHAI.V BACK |
| 9744 | LA | o. Savearea chatn forwaro |
| 9754 | Sr | 0,810,13) |
| $976+$ | 1 P. | 13,0 SET UD SAVE AREA PJIMTER |
| $977+$ | USING | SAVEAREA, 13 AND ADOKESSABILITY |
| 978 Start | DPEN | (dumparea, nutput) |
| $979+$ | cVop | 0,4 ALIGN LIST TO FUILNJRO |
| $980+$ START | BAL. | $1, *+8$ LOAD PEGI W/LIST ADOR. |
| $981+$ | OC | ALI(143) CPTLON BYTE |
| 982 | OC | AL3(DUMPAREA) DCB ADDRESS |
| $983+$ | suc | 19 I SSUE OPEN SVC |
| 984 | LA | 2,0 |
| 985 | LA | 3,0 |
| 986 | LA | 4,0 |
| 987 | LA | 5,0 |
| 988 | LA | 6,0 |
| 989 | LA | 7,0 |
| 990 | LA | 8,0 |
| 991 | LA | 9,0 |
| 992 | LA | 10,0 |
| 993 | LA | 11,0 |
| 994 | LA | 14,0 |
| 995 | LA | 15,0 |
| 996* |  |  |
| 997 * |  |  |
| 998 | SVAP | ID $=1, O C B=$ OUMPA EA, $P$ DATA $=$ REGS |
| 999 | cyop | 0,4 4 , |
| 10004 | BAL | 1, IHBOOO3 GRANCH ARJUND PARAM LIST |
| 1001t | OC | ALİ1) IO NUMBER |
| 1002+ | 06 | All(0) |
| 1003+ | $0 C$ | Al.11130) OPTION FEAGS |
| 1004t | 06 | ALL 1321 CPTTON Flats |
| $1.005+$ | DC | A DUMPAREA) DCB ADUESS |
| $1006+$ | D | A(O) TCB ADORESS |
| 1007+ | OC | A(O) AODSESS DF SNAP.-SHOT LIST |





| $1208+$ | ST | 8, SAV 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1209+ | ST | 9,SAVE9 |
| $1210+$ | ST | 10, SAVE10 |
| 1211+ | ST | 11,SAVE11 |
| 1212 + | LR | 10,4 |
| 1213* | LA | 11.0 |
| 1214+ | A | $11 .=F \cdot 100^{\prime}$ |
| $1215+$ | L2 | 9,4 |
| 12164. | L | 8, PTIVTER |
| 12174 | ST | 9,574CK(3) |
| $1218+$ | LA | 8.4 (3) |
| 1219+ | ST | 10, STACK(8) |
| $1220+$ | L. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8,4(3) |
| 12214 | ST | 12,stack 8 $^{\text {b }}$ |
| 1222* | LA | 8,4(3) |
| $1223+$ | St | 8, Pniver |
| 1224* | 1 | 8,Saveg |
| $1225+$ | L | 9, SAVEG |
| $1726+$ | L | 10, SAVE 10 |
| 1227 + | L | LL, SAVE1I |
| $1228+5 \mathrm{EE}$ | ST | 9,SAVE8 |
| 12 ?9+ | ST | 9,SAVE9 |
| 1230* | ST | 10, SAVE10 |
| 1231+ | ST | 11, SAVEIL |
| 1232* | L. | 8, POINTER |
| 1233* | S | $8,=514^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1234* | L | 11, STACK (8) |
| 1235 + | S | 8, =F'4' |
| 1236* | L | 10, STACK(8) |
| 1237 * | S | 8, =F'4' |
| 1238* | L | 9,STACK(8) |
| $1239+$ | ST | 8,POINTER |
| $1240+$ | 6 | 9,2ER |
| $1241+$ | BL | $\times 15$ |
| 12424 | CR | 10,11 |
| $1243+$ | BH | Y 15 |
| 12444 | B | 215 |
| $1245+\times 15$ | Co | 10,11 |
| $1246+$ | BL | Y 15 |
| $1247+215$ | AR | 10,9 |
| 12484 | L | 8, DITVIER |
| $1249+$ | ST | 9,StACK(8) |
| 1250 * | LA | 8,418) |
| 1251+ | ST | 10, STACK(8) |
| $1252+$ | LA | 8,4(8) |
| $1253+$ | St | 1., STACK(8) |
| $1254+$ | LA | 8.4 (3) |
| 1255* | ST | 8,PDIVTER |
| 12564 | L | 8, SAve8 |
| $1257+$ | L | 9,SAVE9 |
| 12584 | 1 | 10, SAVE1O |
| $1259+$ | 1. | 11.SAVEII |
| $1260+$ | B | $W 15$ |
| 1261+Y15 | L | 8, SAvea |
| 1262 * | L | 9, SAVE9 |
| 1263 ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ | L | 10. SAVELO |
| 1264 + | 1 | 11, SAVE11 |
| 1265 | B | AEEE |
| 12664.415 | c2u | * |
| 1267 |  | A 14.pF'I. |
| 1268 |  |  |
| 1269 |  | ENOOS LABEL=EEE |
| 1270 | B | EEE |
| 1271-CEEE | 1. | 8, SAVEg |
| $1272+$ | L. | 9, SAVE9 |
| 12736BEEE | L. | 10, SAVELO |
| 12744 | L | 11, SAVEIL |


| 1275-AEEE | E2U | * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1276 * |  |  |
| 12.77 |  | SNAP $10=6, D C B=0 J M P A R E A, P O A T A=R E G S ~$ |
| 12784 | cyop | 0,4 |
| 12794 | B4L | 1,IHBOOLT BRANCH AROUND PARAM LIST |
| 12824 | DC | ALI(G) IO INJMBER |
| 1281+ | DC | ALI(0) |
| 1287+ | DC | ALI(130) OPTYON FLAGS |
| $1283+$ | DC | ALI(32) OPTION FLAGS |
| 1284. | DC | A (DUMPAREAI DCB ADORESS |
| $1285+$ | DC | A(3) TCO ADORESS |
| 1286* | DC | A(O) ADDRESS OF SNAP-SHJT LISY |
| 128741480017 | OS | OH |
| $1288+$ | SVC | 51 |
| 1289 | EVOCAS | E LABEL=TESTR,OPTION=2 |
| 12904TESTB | EQU | * |
| 12.91 * |  |  |
| 1292 * |  |  |
| 1293 | SVAP | - $10=7, D C B=$ OUMPAREA, POATA $=$ REGS |
| 1294+ | CVOP | 0,4 |
| 1295+ | BAL | 1.1H90019 BrANCH ARJUNO PARAM LIST |
| 12964 | DC | ALI(7) In NUMBER |
| 1297* | DC | ALI(0) |
| 1298+ | DC | ALLI 1301 getton flags |
| 1299* | D2 | ALL(32) DPTION FLAGS |
| $1300+$ | DC | A(DUMPAREA) DCB ADURESS |
| 13014. | 00 | A(0) TCB ADODESS |
| 13024 | DC | A(O) ADDEESS OF SNAP-SHDT LIST |
| 13034.1480019 | DS | OH |
| 1304* | SVC | 51 |
| 1305 * |  |  |
| 1306* |  |  |
| 1307 | Exit |  |
| 13084 | 1 | 13,4(,13) POP UP SAVE AREA |
| 130\%* | L | 14,12,12(13) RESTORE SESISTERS |
| 13104 | MVI | 12(13), XPFF: FLAG EKIT |
| $1311+$ | B) | 14 PETURN |
| 1312 | close | DUMPAREA |
| $1313+$ | CVOP | 0,4 ALIGN LTST TO FULLWJPS |
| $1314+$ | BAL | 1,*+8 LOAD REGL W/LIST ADOR |
| 13154 | U6 | AL1(123) OPTION BYTE |
| 13164 | 0 C | AL3(DIMPAREA) DCB ADDRESS |
| 13174 | SVC | 20 ISSUE CLOSE SVC |
| 1318 SAVEAREA | 0 c | 18400 |
| 1319 | OS | OF |
| 1320 2E? | D: | 1F40* |
| 1321 SAVFa | DS | $1 F$ |
| 1322 S4V:9 | 05 | 1 F |
| 23.3 SAVEl0 | Os | $1 F$ |
| 1324 SAVEII | OS | IF |
| 2325 FIINTEQ | DC | $1 \mathrm{~F}^{+0}$ |
| 1326 STACK | OS | 100F |
| 1327 DUMPAREA | OCB | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DONAME }=T E A M, ~ D S U R G=2 S, ~ R E C F H=V B A, \\ & M A C R F=H, B L K S I L E=8 B 2 \times L A E C L=125 \end{aligned}$ |



| 1338** |  | COAMON ACCESS METHOD INTERFACE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13404 | DC | ALIL01 BUFNO |
| 1341. | OC | AL3(1) BUFCS |
| 1342* | DC | AL2(0) BUFL |
| 13434 | DC | BL? $210000000000000{ }^{\text {a }}$ DSORG |
| 1344** | DC | All lobab |
| 1346** |  | FOUNOATIDV EXTENSION |
| $1348+$ | DC | BLI'00000000' BFTEK, BFLV, HI ARCHY |
| $1349+$ | DC | AL3(1) EMDAD |
| 13504 | DC | BLIOL0L0100' RECFM |
| $1351+$ | DC | AL3(0) EXLST |
| 1353 +* |  | FOUNOATION BLJGK |
| $1355+$ | OC | CL8:TEAM D DNAME |
| 13564 | DC | BLI'00000010' JFLGS |
| 13574 | DC | BLI'09000000. IFLG |
| 1358 | DC | BL2'0000000000100000' 4ACR |
| 1360** |  | BSAM-BPAM-QSAM INTERFACE |
| 13624. | DC | BLI'00000000: RERL |
| 1363+ | DC | AL3(1) CHECK, GERR, PERR |
| $1364+$ | DC | All SYNAD |
| 13654 | OC | HoO' CINOL, CIND? |
| 13664 | DC | ALZ1882) BLKSIZE |
| 1367* | 0 C | F'O WCPM, WCPL, OFESR, OFFSW |
| 1368 | DC | A(1) IDBA |
| 1369* | OC | ALI(0) NCP |
| 13704 | 0 C | AL3(1) EOBR, EOBAO |
| 13724* |  | BSAM-BPAA SNTERFACE |
| 1374* | DC | All ${ }^{\text {a }}$ EOBW |
| 1375* | DC | H9OC UIRCT |
| $1376+$ | OC | AL2(125) LRECL |
| 1377+ | DC | All CNTCL, NOTE, PJINT |
| 1378 | END |  |
| 1379 |  | FF'1' |
| 1380 |  | =F'5' |
| 1381 |  | FF\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |
| 1382 |  | =F'10' |
| 1393 |  | $=F^{\circ} 0^{\prime}$ |
| 1384 |  | =F. $100^{\circ}$ |
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