CSE 303: Concepts and Tools for Software Development

Dan Grossman
Winter 2006
Lecture 4— Shell Variables, More Shell Scripts

Where are We

We understand must of the bash shell and its "programming language". Final pieces we'll consider:

- Shell variables
 - Defining your own
 - Built-in meanings
 - Exporting
- Arrays
- Arithmetic
- For loops

End with:

- A long list of gotchas (some bash-specific; some common to shells)
- Why long shell scripts are a bad idea, etc.

Shell variables

We already know a shell has state: current working directory, users, aliases, history.

Its state also includes *shell variables* which hold *strings*.

Features:

- 1. Change variables' values: foo=blah
- 2. Add new variables: foo=blah or foo=
- 3. Use variable: \$\{foo\}\ (braces sometimes optional)
- 4. Remove variables: unset foo
- 5. See what variables "are set": set

Omitted feature: Functions and local variables (see manual)

Roughly "all variables are global (visible everywhere)"

Only (1) is similar to "real" programming languages

Why Variables?

Variables are useful in scripts, just like in "normal" programming.

"Special" variables affect shell operation. 3 most (?) common:

- PATH
- PS1
- HOME

Export

Minor point...

If a shell runs another program (perhaps a bash script), does the other program "see the current variables that are set"?

It depends.

export foo - yes it will see value of foo

export -n foo - no it will not see value of foo

Default is no.

If the other program sets an exported variable, does the outer shell see the change?

No.

Arrays

More flexible than in Java, but much harder to use right

Make an array: $foo=(x \ y \ z)$

Set element: foo[2]=hi

Get element: \${foo[2]}

Get number of elements: \${#foo[*]}

Get all elements separated by spaces: \$\{foo[*]\}

Arrays do not have "fixed sizes"; example: code up an ever-growing list.

Arithmetic

Variables are strings, so k=\$i+\$j is not addition.

But ((k=\$i+\$j)) is (and in fact the \$ is optional).

The shell converts the strings to numbers, silently using 0 as necessary.

Example: code up a stack. (Enough to reimplement built-ins pushd and popd.)

For-loops

```
Syntax:

for v in w1 w2 ... wn

do

body

done
```

Execute body n times, with v set to wi on i^{th} one. (Afterwards, v=wn).

Why so convenient?

- Use a filename pattern after in
- Use \${blah[*]} after in

Quoting and Variables

Does x=* set x to string-holding-asterisk or string-holding-all-filenames?

If \$x is *, does Is \$x list all-files or file named asterisk?

Are variables expanded in double-quotes? single-quotes?

Could consult the manual, but honestly it's easier to start a shell and experiment.

Gotchas: A very partial list

- 1. Typo in variable name on left: create new variable oops=7
- 2. Typo in variable use: get empty string 1s \$00ps
- 3. Use same variable name again: clobber other use HISTFILE=uhoh
- 4. Omit subscript: get first element of array \${arr}
- 5. Omit [*] on length: get 1st element's string-length \${#arr}
- 6. Array-out-of-bounds on left: create larger array
- 7. Array-out-of-bounds on use: get empty string
- 8. Spaces in variables: use double-quotes if you mean "one word"
- 9. Non-number used as number: end up with 0
- 10. set f=blah: apparently does nothing (is assignment in csh)
- 11. Omitted braces: \$foo[0] and \$12 not what you think.

Shell Programming Revisited

How do Java programming and shell programming compare?

The shell:

- "shorter"
- convenient file-access, file-tests, program-execution, pipes
- crazy quoting rules and syntax
- also interactive

Java:

- none of the previous gotchas
- local variables, modularity, typechecking, array-checking, ...
- real data structures, libraries, regular syntax

Rough rule of thumb: Don't write shell scripts over 200 lines?

Treatment of Strings

Suppose foo is a variable that holds the string hello

	Java	Bash
Use variable (get hello)	foo	\$foo
Assign variable	foo = hi;	foo=hi
The string foo	"foo"	foo
Concatenation	foo + "oo"	\${foo}oo
Conversion to number	library-call	silent and implicit

Moral: In Java, variable-uses are easier than string-constants. Opposite in Bash.

Both biased toward common use.

More on Shell Programming

Metapoint: Computer scientists automate and end up accidentally inventing (bad) programming languages. It's like using a screwdriver as a pry bar.

HW2 in part, will be near the limits of what I recommend doing with a shell script (and we'll end up cutting corners as a result)

There are plenty of attempts to get "the best of both worlds" in a scripting language: Perl, Python, Ruby, ...

Personal opinion: it raises the limit to 1000 or 10000 lines? Get you hooked on short programs.

Picking the bash shell was a conscious decision to emphasize the interactive side and see "how bad programming can get".

Next: Regular expressions, grep, sed, find.

Bottom Line

Never do something manually if writing a script would save you time.

Never write a script if you need a large, robust piece of software.

Some programming languages try to give "best of both worlds" – you now have seen two extremes that don't (Java and bash).