

# Re: What computer languages are standardised?

---

*Source:* <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.programming/2005-11/msg00737.html>

---

- *From:* Scott Moore <[samiamsansspam@xxxxxxx](mailto:samiamsansspam@xxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 17 Nov 2005 16:31:29 -0800
- 

Oliver Wong wrote On 11/17/05 15:15,:

> "Ed Prochak" <[ed.prochak@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ed.prochak@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
> [news:1132266243.000510.326230@xx](mailto:news:1132266243.000510.326230@xx)

>

>>Scott Moore wrote:

>>

>>>Paul F. Dietz wrote On 11/17/05 05:31,:

>>>

>>>

>>>>IMO, a standard becomes especially useful when it's embodied in a set  
>>>>of conformance tests. Such tests keep the implementors on the same  
>>>>page, and also help debug the standard ('did you *\*really\** mean to  
>>>>require that behavior?')

>>>>

>>>>Paul

>>>>

>>>>Sure, thats a good one. Pascal had a huge suite of compliance tests  
>>>>appear at the same time as its standards (both of them). In fact,  
>>>>the Pascal compliance test may stand alone for a long time as  
>>>>being one of the best that has ever appeared. It checked not only  
>>>>what was in the standard, but checked for cases that should not  
>>>>compile as well, and many other quality tests.

>>

>>Doesn't ADA have a standard compliance test suite? I'd expect it to be  
>>more extensive than one for PASCAL, but I do not know this to be a  
>>fact.

>

>

> As does COBOL. The test is distributed by NIST, and it too contains both  
> tests programs which should compile and produce a certain result as well as  
> programs which are intentionally crafted so as to trigger specific compiler  
> error messages.

>

> - Oliver

>

>

## Re: What computer languages are standardised?

There was also a "standard model implementation" of Pascal produced, and the source for that released. So the "standard model" could be used to compile the standard tests, and each test corresponded to a dotted item number in the standard (like 5.3.5). The test, the model, and the standard left no chance for anyone to misinterpret the standard. The standard model compiler compiled to an internal code (like "bytecode") and interpreted that.

All for naught. The standard was almost completely ignored on the IBM-PC implementations.

---

### • **References:**

- ◆ **What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* casioculture
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* Scott Moore
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* MSCHAEF.COM
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* Paul F. Dietz
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* Scott Moore
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* Ed Prochak
  - ◆ **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
    - ◇ *From:* Oliver Wong
- 
- Prev by Date: **Re: License placement**
  - Next by Date: **Re: What cars do programming languages resemble?**
  - Previous by thread: **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
  - Next by thread: **Re: What computer languages are standardised?**
  - Index(es):
    - ◆ **Date**
    - ◆ **Thread**