

Re: J3's workings

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Fortran/comp.lang.fortran/2006-11/msg00316.html>

- *From:* nospam@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx (Richard Maine)
 - *Date:* Sun, 12 Nov 2006 08:25:55 -0800
-

Beliaevsky <beliaevsky@xxxxxxx> wrote:

Maybe after Fortran 2003, the language should evolve by having compiler writers, both commercial and volunteer, (gfortran and g95) add extensions that they think are important based on user requests. If those features are adopted by several compilers, they could later be standardized.

I think that approach is completely unacceptable.

1. As a user, I avoid using vendor extensions even when they are features that I highly desire. While I make exceptions, they are darned rare. And features supported by only a single vendor are even more rare (as in I can't think of a single one that I use). This wasn't always the case, but it is now. I'm not the only user like this. Thus you get a biased picture by looking only at things that users have pushed compilers developers into doing as extensions. You don't get the kind of features that people like me want; I tend to view that as a negative. :-)

2. When compiler vendors independently develop a feature independent of standardization, it is almost inevitable that the different versions of the feature won't be identical. This causes difficulty in the standardization. A common approach recently has been to deliberately do the feature in a way that is different from any of the existing implementations in a way that allows support of both the vendor-specific and the newly standardized versions to coexist. That approach works fine for things like intrinsic procedures, where using a different name is enough to avoid conflict. That approach wouldn't work so well for more basic things in the language.

—

Richard Maine | Good judgement comes from experience;
email: last name at domain . net | experience comes from bad judgement.
domain: summertriangle | — Mark Twain

.