

---

Subject: Re: Plea for IDL 2000 (was: a plea for more reliable mathematical routines)  
Posted by [davidf](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 1999 07:00:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Greg (ushomirs@my-deja.com) writes:

> see! that's yet another example of how poorly thought out IDL is!!  
> other directives (such as .RUN, .COMPILE) don't need a comma after  
> their names. Why not make it .COMPILE\_OPT, so that the lack of comma  
> would at least make sense? I guess that would be too reasonable and  
> well thought-out for RSI.. sigh..

Well, to be fair, other "compiler option" commands don't take commas either. For example, "Forward\_Function foobar". Such syntax is undoubtedly necessary to make the compiler aware of an option for it rather than to compile a procedure or function, which it would do otherwise. It makes sense to me and I would have probably realized it if I had taken 5 seconds to think about it, rather than typing away. Or, I could have just looked at the example in the book. It was pretty obvious there. :-)

Cheers,

David

P.S. Incidentally, another compiler option will make it necessary to use square bracket subscripting for all array subscripts. This will virtually eliminate the need for Forward\_Function, I think.

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.  
Fanning Software Consulting  
Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: [davidf@dfanning.com](mailto:davidf@dfanning.com)  
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>  
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

---