Subject: Re: idl2matlab translate-o-matic
Posted by Pavel Romashkin on Tue, 22 Feb 2000 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have already noticed that David McClain is rather critical about IDL. I am
sure he has his reasons for that and would not try to argue with a negatively
inclined user.

David McClain wrote:

> Perhaps "better than MatLab", but hardly what "professional programmers"
> want.

Professional programmers use assembly language. That's what a professional
programmer, who writes in C, told me. Also, the fact that Matlab's built-in
DLLs take up 950 Mb on a drive (compared to 70 Mb for IDL) tells me that I'd
have to put much more faith in Matlab's programmers than in RSI, for library
functions.

> What can you say of a language that is purely array oriented, but
> cannot comprehend the existence of an empty array?

Agreeing with D.F., I so far had no use for an empty array. I understand it is
not flexible, but I usually work on data other than nothing.

> What of a language that
> can itself reclaim memory from unused arrays, but forces the user to reclaim
> "pointers" and "objects"? Etc., etc., ...

Oh, but you have Heap_gc !..

Cheers,
Pavel