
Subject: Re: When you can't concatenate structures like you expect....
Posted by [Paul van Delst](#) on Mon, 24 May 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Kenneth P. Bowman wrote:

> In article <3745B3BB.815FDE87@ssec.wisc.edu>, Paul van Delst
> <paul.vandelst@ssec.wisc.edu> wrote:
>
> As Pavel pointed out in another post, anonymous structures have a "hidden"
> name that must match in order to be able to concatenate. The trick is to
> copy your original structure and update the fields, rather than creating a
> new structure.

Yep I know - I explained this and provided an example in my original post.

I guess what I really trying to say in my long-winded, circuitous way is that I do not understand why IDL treats structures differently from any other data type. I understand why one would have a restriction on changing the definition of the various "tags" within a structure but other than that, why should structures or arrays of structures be any different from other variable types or arrays? From my point of view, it appears to be an implementation issue within IDL - why should I care what the "hidden" structure name is? If I cared about structure names I'd used a named structure, right?

As Liam Gumley sagely pointed out to me this morning, I am really asking the wrong question. Instead of asking "why doesn't this work like I expect it should?" the question should be "what do I need to do to get the job done?"

cheers,

paulv

--

Paul van Delst
Space Science and Engineering Center | Ph/Fax: (608) 265-5357, 262-5974
University of Wisconsin-Madison | Email: paul.vandelst@ssec.wisc.edu
1225 W. Dayton St., Madison WI 53706 | Web: <http://airs2.ssec.wisc.edu/~paulv>
