Subject: Re: User selectable lower array bound? Posted by Martin Schultz on Wed, 08 Aug 2001 11:47:53 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Craig Markwardt <craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu> writes: > JD Smith <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> writes: >> The most annoying thing about IDL arrays to me is the need always to >> test whether they exist or not when concatenating onto them. The idea >> of extending arrays in both directions would be neatly summed up by >> allowing: >> >> a= & a= even if a doesn't (yet) exist. >> >> Either that, or IDL needs a list type which allows such operations. >> Wasn't that just me ranting about special case functionality leading to >> inconsistency? > > Hmmm, agreed. I think WMC's and my proposal was for a "null" data > type which was essentially an empty list. > Craig as in var = nularr(100); -)what is N_Elements(nul_variable)? How do you test for a keyword etc.? Cheers, Martin [Dr. Martin Schultz Max-Planck-Institut fuer Meteorologie \prod Bundesstr. 55, 20146 Hamburg [[[[phone: +49 40 41173-308 [[[[fax: +49 40 41173-298 \prod [[[[martin.schultz@dkrz.de [[