
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 conversions 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/Intel" 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 conversions 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
