

# Re: Universal grammar

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2006-11/msg00666.html>

---

- *From:* [haberg@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:haberg@xxxxxxxxxx) (Hans Aberg)
  - *Date:* Sat, 11 Nov 2006 13:00:59 GMT
- 

In article <1n55kt75qfd1s\$.184x0ip4w30jx.dlg@xxxxxxxxxx>, Joachim Pense <snob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Paul> Which is just one of the hardware interrupts that can be  
Paul> sent to a CPU.

That's a hardware `_signal_`, but usually not considered an interrupt:

- 1) RESET cannot be caught or masked.
- 2) INTERRUPT is caught, handled and then the system resumes from it. RESET abruptly brings to the whole system to a "start" state and never resumes from where it left off.
- 3) INTERRUPT is used by peripherals to catch the attention of the CPU, asking CPU to do something for them quickly. RESET is usually raised by operators (often human) to bring the system to a "start" state.

Paul> Hans is absolutely correct. It's an interrupt, it's one of  
Paul> the unmaskable hardware interrupts. Without it, the CPU  
Paul> would start executing instructions from an unpredictable  
Paul> address.

Reset or interrupt, it's for sure something that interrupts.

I think that in the low level technical language, that is, the one used when dealing with the CPU as a piece of hardware, all those signals are called interrupts. A software implementer computer manufacturer, working on a higher level, may use a different language.

--  
Hans Aberg