

Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Fortran/comp.lang.fortran/2005-06/msg00039.html>

- *From:* Walter Spector <w6ws_xthisoutx@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 02 Jun 2005 06:11:20 GMT
-

Brooks Moses wrote:

>
> Walter Spector wrote:
>> Downloaded the windows version and it actually works – sort of. It doesn't
>> know about the cygwin dlls, so a lot of my 'system call'ish code does not
>> easily link up.
>
> Is this something that means the Windows version is broken, or merely a
> result of the fact that non-cygwin programs in general don't know about
> cygwin dlls on the system?

The latter.

>> Gfortran did compile about 6k lines of that I threw at it. Most not particularly
>> challenging. However it did find a few non-Standard items in my code that needed
>> cleaning up, which had previously gone unnoticed. Not going to say what they are,
>> because otherwise someone associated with gfortran might 'fix' them...
>
> Well, as Steve Kargl mentioned, gfortran is intended to have various
> standard-compatibility options, such that if you prefer to have all of
> the non-standard items to be diagnosed, you should tell it to use
> "-std=f95".

Of course. But my real concern is that accepting 'every extension under the sun',
by DEFAULT, does nothing to discourage the use of the more problematic ones across
the Fortran community as a whole.

There are many Fortran developers who have no clue as to what is Standard-conforming
and what is not. And my observations are that many will never specify non-default
compilation options unless dragged kicking and screaming. So, IMHO, it is pretty important
to very carefully, thoughtfully, and conservatively sort out what sorts of extensions are
both useful and add to the quality the code base (e.g, adding F2003 capabilities should
be regarded as a Good Thing.) As opposed to blindly trying to make sense out of
"pretty much anything anyone tries to throw at the compiler".

> Though even There appears, from the mailing list, to be quite a bit of
> effort going into making the gfortran compiler very strict with regards
> to the standard when this is specified.

Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin

>From less than 1 day of use of gfortran, it seems that it is fairly clean right now.
So I'd hate to see the "by default" language to start getting cluttered up
like g77 and most commercial compiler are.

Walt

—...—

Walt Spector

(w6ws at earthlink dot net)

.

• **References:**

- ◆ **[A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 ◇ From: Dr Ivan D. Reid
 - ◆ **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 ◇ From: Tim Prince
 - ◆ **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 ◇ From: Walter Spector
 - ◆ **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 ◇ From: Brooks Moses
-
- Prev by Date: **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 - Next by Date: **[Re: implementation of DACOSD](#)**
 - Previous by thread: **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 - Next by thread: **[Re: A few quick questions about gfortran under cygwin](#)**
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**