
Subject: Re: Plea for IDL 2000 (was: a plea for more reliable mathematical routines)
Posted by [Mirko Vukovic](#) on Fri, 17 Sep 1999 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In article <7rsidq\$5s\$1@nnrp1.deja.com>,
ushomirs@my-deja.com wrote:
> In article <MPG.124ad31447ec3ccd9898f7@news.frii.com>,
> davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) wrote:
>
>> New in IDL 5.3 (according to the on-line documentation in the beta
>> version is a "compile option" routine that can change the default
>> integer size from 16-bit to 32-bit:
>>
>> IDL> Compile_Opt DefInt32
>> IDL> a = 0
>> IDL> Help, a
>> A LONG = 0
>>
>> Cheers,
>>
>> David
>>
>> P.S. Note there is NO comma after the COMPILE_OPT
>> command! Took me about 10 minutes to realize that. :-(
>
> 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..
>
> greg
>
> Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>
> Share what you know. Learn what you don't.
>
Agreed

It seems to me that they should have a comp.lang.
specialist that would help them with routine names,
and parameter and keyword names and usages.
Sometimes a parameter is used to signal two different things.

Mirko

Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>

Share what you know. Learn what you don't.
