

From: Gorelik  
To: WG5  
Subject: Reply on WG5-N983

On item 87 in Corrigendum 2

There was a proposition to make illegal to specify a PARAMETER attribute for an object with the SAVE attribute (constraint 16). My addition to this text was to make this edit symmetrical (constraint 18) as it is in constraints 11 and 12 for the POINTER attribute and the TARGET attribute in the same section (5.1). I think it is necessary to uniform describing of constraints.

Some propositions on improving the description  
in some sections of the Standard  
(for the 1995 revision)  
A.M.Gorelik, V.L.Ushkova (Russia)

1. Intrinsic procedures.

(Discussion on item 78 in Corrigendum 2).

The classification of intrinsic procedures in Fortran 90 is not clear and sometimes ambiguous. For example, is not clear if the term "array construction functions" is a technical term or simple English words. If it is a technical term it is necessary to list all functions of that class. Actually there is only one necessary classification: elemental functions, inquire functions, transformational functions and intrinsic subroutines. Another classification (numerical functions, array construction functions etc, see 13.5 - 13.9) is useful to explain meaning of intrinsic procedures, but it is not exact in Fortran 90. If the second classification remains in Fortran 95/96 it is necessary to list all intrinsic procedures for each class of this classification or to mark the appropriate class in the description of each intrinsic procedure.

2. Constraints in section 5.1

There is no uniformity in describing constraints on mutual using of specifications of attributes in type declaration statements. For example, prohibition to mix POINTER and TARGET in the same object is noted in constraints 11 (for POINTER) and 12 (for TARGET). For other combinations this symmetry is absent (SAVE and PARAMETER, see WG5-N983).

We think it is necessary to uniform describing of constraints. There are two ways. The first one is to make symmetry for all combinations and the second one is as in constraint number 19.

In both variants it would be very useful to give a table with all such combinations of constraints.

### 3. Constraints in section 5.2

There is phrase: "The combination of attributes that may be specified for a particular entity is subject to the same restrictions regardless of the method of specification." Nevertheless some constraints are repeated for attribute specification statements (for example, first constraints in 5.2.4, 5.2.6), but in other cases they are not repeated (5.2.10), in some cases they are repeated partially (5.2.7, 5.2.8).

We think it is necessary to uniform describing of constraints in section 5.2.

### 4. Section 13.13.62

It would be desirable to replace AB by  $A * B$ , XA by  $X * A$  and AY by  $A * Y$  in examples of section 13.13.62.

-----

## Russian activity report

The Fortran Working Group was organized in the former USSR in 1990. The members of this group are from different towns and now from different countries. Some articles and one book containing the description of new features of Fortran 90 have been published in our country; some lectures have been given. Now we have no possibility to arrange meetings, but we continue to keep personal contacts, interchange of opinions and discuss different problems.

As I said before we had translated Fortran 90 standard into Russian but we could not publish it. At the Berchtesgaden meeting Jerrold Wagener kindly agreed to help us and print our translation. we could not guess this work would take so much time and effort for J.Wagener.

The problem of printing this text is connected with the fact that it was prepared for other type of printer using other (older) software than J.Wagener uses. Now the text of the translation is almost ready for printing. On behalf of our specialists I thank J.Wagener very much for his great work.

A. M. Gorelik  
Russia