
Subject: Re: IDL Bug? (Re: include files in IDL programs)

Posted by [dsreyn](#) on Fri, 17 Nov 2000 08:00:00 GMT

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

In article <MPG.147f134c4803b032989c87@news.frii.com>,

davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:

> Doug Reynolds (dsreyn@ll.mit.edu) writes:

>

>> Agreed. However, since the Unix world allows file names to mix upper and
>> lower case, I believe this should be documented. The information on pp. 52-53
>> of the IDL 5.4 "Using IDL" manual makes no mention of case restrictions,
>> which implicitly suggests that anything goes.

>

> I looked up "automatic compilation" in the on-line help.

> Here is what I find:

>

> *****

> Automatic Execution

>

> IDL automatically compiles and executes a user-written function or procedure
> when it is first referenced if:

>

> 1. The source code of the function is in the current working directory or
> in a directory in the IDL search path defined by the system variable !PATH.
> 2. The name of the file containing the function is the same as the
> function name suffixed by .pro or .sav. Under UNIX, the suffix should be in
> lowercase letters.

>

> Note - IDL is case-insensitive. However, for some operating systems, IDL only
> checks for the lowercase filename based on the name of the procedure or
> function. We recommend that all filenames be named with lowercase.

> *****

Well, that's certainly clear enough. It seems odd that they don't bother
to mention this in the printed manuals.

>>> It does this *specifically* so these programs will run on UNIX machines.

>>

>> I'm not sure what you mean here. In the case I presented, the effect it
>> has is that the routine does *not* run.

>

> I mean that in a case-sensitive OS, IDL would have no hope
> of finding filenames unless some convention were used. The
> convention it uses (the most sensible, it seems to me) is
> that filenames are in lowercase characters.

OK, now I see what you meant.

Doug
