

Subject: Unresolved issue 329  
 From: Van Snyder

## 1 Review

Unresolved issue 329  
 I can't imagine that the above sentence in 4.5.3.2 actually is intended to mean what it says. Apparently if I inherit a generic binding to a pure procedure and then add a generic binding to a non-pure one, then that extends the generic? I don't believe it. I presume that there are 3 possibilities for a generic binding that has the same generic-spec as an inherited binding. 1) The new one may override 2) It may extend, or 3) It may be illegal. This sentence ignores the illegal cases and sounds like they extend the generic. It may be that we technically disallow the illegal cases elsewhere (I didn't search), but even if so, this sentence is misleading. It needs to at least qualify that it is talking only about bindings that are allowed by the rules of (wherever they might be). If there aren't such rules, then this sentence is just plain wrong.

## 2 Edits

Edits refer to 01-007r1. 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 immediately following text, while a page and line number followed by + (-) indicates that immediately following text is to be inserted after (before) the indicated line. Remarks are noted in the margin, or appear between [ and ] in the text.

---

[Editor: After "interface" insert ", and shall satisfy the requirements specified in 14.1.2.3".] 55:3

[One could deduce this from [48:24-25] but it's better to say it explicitly.]

---

[Editor: Delete unresolved issue note 329.] 55:4-14