Unresolved Issue 364

To: J3
From: Craig Dedo
Date: May 13, 2002
Subject: Unresolved issue 364

Introduction

Unresolved issue 364

Paper 02-129r2 emasculated this subclause (7.3), and reasonably so. We should probably finish the job. What remains is one short sentence of meat (the first one). The second sentence is all but identical to one in 7.2 (on intrinsic operations). The third also applies equally well to intrinsic and defined operations. One sentence doesn't seem enough for a top-level subclause in a clause about 36 pages long. None of the other top-level subclauses here are down to distinguishing between intrinsic and derived operations. I suggest we merge this material into 7.2. The two sentences that apply to all operations can be stated once in a way that applies to all. The one sentence of meat can either remain a sentence or can be a one-sentence subclause one level lower (7.2.5, presumably). Minor editing to 7.2.0 would be needed.

Edits

135:9 [Editor: Delete “intrinsic”.]

135:14-17 Replace the paragraph with the following:
The interpretation of a defined operation is provided by the function that defines the operation. The type, type parameters and interpretation of an expression that consists of an intrinsic or defined operation are independent of the type and type parameters of the context or any larger expression in which it appears.

135:18 – Add, immediately before section 7.2.1:
The operators <, <=, >, >=, ==, and /= always have the same interpretations as the operators .LT., .LE., .GT., .GE., .EQ., and .NE., respectively.

137:3-5 [Editor: Delete “The ... respectively.”]

138:10-15 [Editor: Delete subclause 7.3.]

139:0+ [Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 364.]

References

02-007r1, Fortran 2000 Draft

[End of J3 / 02-171r1]