
Subject: Re: User selectable lower array bound?

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Tue, 07 Aug 2001 17:21:03 GMT

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

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=[b,a] & a=[a,b] 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

--

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