Subject: Comments on Section 6
From: Van Snyder

1 Edits

Edits refer to 02-007r2. Page and line numbers are displayed in the margin. Absent other instructions, a page and line number or line number range implies all of the indicated text is to be replaced by associated text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that associated text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [and] in the text.

[The syntax term *scalar-int-expr* is used inappropriately here: A syntax term doesn't have a value. Editor: "starting and ending points" ⇒ "values of the starting and ending point expressions".] 104:17

2 Not sure what to do – Actually, do we have time to do anything?

The definition of *variable* could be construed to be circular: A *variable* is a *designator* is an *object-name* (see R601-603). C505 requires an object name to be the name of a data object. Subclause 2.4.3.1 specifies that a data object is a variable (among other things). Admittedly, the apparent circularity depends on the perceived equivalence of "variable" and "*variable*". There's nothing that says a variable is denoted by a *variable* (maybe there is but I couldn't find it), so the reader is left to infer it. Upon inferring it, the definition is circular.

Subclause 6.1.2 has gone overboard in its use of syntax terms. It says that syntax terms have properties, while it's really the entities they represent that have those properties.

At [105:7] we see that a *part-ref* and a *part-name* have a rank, and the rank of the *part-name* is the rank of the *part-name*. Hmmm, does this get us anywhere?

At [105:12-13] we see that a *data-ref* and a *part-ref* have a rank, and a *data-ref* has a base object.

At [105:14] we see that a *data-ref* has a type and type parameters.

At [105:15-17] we see that a *data-ref* is a subobject and that a *part-name* is a pointer.

We don't have ordinary terms for the entities for which we're presently using syntax terms. Putting in "the entity identified by" or some such equally verbose circumlocution will make the prose awkward. But it's wrong now.