Subject: Re: What does an optimal scientific programming language/environment need?

Posted by Duane Bozarth on Mon, 22 Sep 2003 18:16:08 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Richard Maine wrote:

Duane Bozarth <dp_bozarth@swko.dot.net> writes:

- >> Well, since F77 there is little that has actually been removed and a
- >> major consideration (as is evidenced in converstions in c.l.f) is
- >> maintaining compatability w/existing code. In practice, virtually
- >> nothing is ever removed from a commercial compiler although most have
- >> switches to allow specific standard level violations to be flagged...

- > Note that the "since f77" applies to the whole paragraph. Whether
- > you intended it to or not, I'm unsure; but it needs to.

Yes, I <did> intend that--hopefully it wasn't <too> unclear, but undoubtedly wise to comment/amplify...

I was, admittedly, making an implicit assumption that there really are few pre-F77 compilers around, which is, not <necessarily> globally true, but for a new language on what was specified to be for "Wintel/Lintel" only platforms figured that wouldn't be a stretch.

Subject: Re: What does an optimal scientific programming language/environment need?

Posted by Duane Bozarth on Mon, 22 Sep 2003 18:18:28 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Duane Bozarth wrote:

> Richard Maine wrote:

>> Duane Bozarth <dp_bozarth@swko.dot.net> writes:

- >>> Well, since F77 there is little that has actually been removed and a
- >>> major consideration (as is evidenced in converstions in c.l.f) is
- >>> maintaining compatability w/existing code. In practice, virtually
- >>> nothing is ever removed from a commercial compiler although most have
- >>> switches to allow specific standard level violations to be flagged...

- >> Note that the "since f77" applies to the whole paragraph. Whether
- >> you intended it to or not, I'm unsure; but it needs to.

> Yes, I < did> intend that--hopefully it wasn't < too> unclear, but

- > undoubtedly wise to comment/amplify...
- >
- > I was, admittedly, making an implicit assumption that there really are
- > few pre-F77 compilers around, which is, not <necessarily> globally true,
- > but for a new language on what was specified to be for "Wintel/Lintel"
- > only platforms figured that wouldn't be a stretch.

Although on re-reading Phil's posting, <maybe> the fairly substantial differences from pre- and post-F77 are specifically what he is referring to and my reading was perhaps(?) too narrow...

Subject: Re: What does an optimal scientific programming language/environment need?

Posted by phil chastney on Thu, 25 Sep 2003 12:42:28 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"Duane Bozarth" <dp_bozarth@swko.dot.net> wrote in message news:3F6F3CF4.8A52AE14@swko.dot.net...

- > Duane Bozarth wrote:
- >>
- >> Richard Maine wrote:
- >>>
- >> Yes, I <did> intend that--hopefully it wasn't <too> unclear, but
- >> undoubtedly wise to comment/amplify...
- >>
- >> I was, admittedly, making an implicit assumption that there really are
- >> few pre-F77 compilers around, which is, not <necessarily> globally true,
- >> but for a new language on what was specified to be for "Wintel/Lintel"
- >> only platforms figured that wouldn't be a stretch.

>

- > Although on re-reading Phil's posting, <maybe> the fairly substantial
- > differences from pre- and post-F77 are specifically what he is referring
- > to and my reading was perhaps(?) too narrow...

yup -- showing my age, I guess -- I started on Fortran IV

how about Perl as a better example of the value of occasionally making a break with the past? -- when I first encountered Perl 4, I swore I'd never write another shell script, but the language wasn't really what I'd call "industrial strength" -- then along came Perl 5, which had all the facilities I wanted -- so many facilities, in fact, that the syntax was context-sensitive (although Larry Wall claimed the compiler was pretty good at guessing what the programmer meant) -- an ambiguous syntax isn't a good basis for development, so he's taken the brave step of a redesign for Perl 6 -- good luck to him

one reason for the redesign is the desire (the need?) to base the thing on Unicode from the ground up, as opposed to having an 8-bit language with

character routines for UTF-8 or UCS-2 -- I didn't see Unicode mentioned in the OP at the head of this thread -- is it fair to take Unicode as a sine qua non of any modern language? especially now that they've incorporated the AMS extensions?

all the best ... /phil