Subject: Re: translating an array name to a string
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Thu, 19 Oct 2000 07:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"J.D. Smith" <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> writes:
> This is definitely nicer looking, and it reminded me of a caveat. If
> you attempt to fetch a variable which doesn't yet exist, an undefined
> variable will be created on that level for you.

For versions of IDL 5.3 and greater. :-) I should document this.

> I think our methods offer equal protection against certain types of
> failure, but I also think call_function provides additional insurance
> against RSI deciding specifically to remove our capacity to use
> routine_names() (which they might do if we keep talking about it so much
> and people catch on!). It is simple to parse *compiler* statements like
> forward_function for disallowed names. It is impossible (OK, very, very
> awkward), to prohibit the use of classified *strings*. This is probably
> paranoid, but that's why I chose call_function.

Yikes! Paranoid indeed.

This is one argument in favor of an open version of IDL, so language
sabotage like this wouldn't be possible.

Craig

--
 --- --------------
Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D.   EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
 --- --------------