
Subject: Re: User selectable lower array bound?

Posted by [Paul van Delst](#) on Mon, 06 Aug 2001 16:47:01 GMT

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

"Pavel A. Romashkin" wrote:

>

> Craig Markwardt wrote:

>>

>> Well, as grumpy as I have been in the past about IDL wishes, this is

>> one thing I do not want to have in IDL now!

>

> I am with you Craig. Besides, for the purists of array indexing, I think

> it is unfair to designate a *lower* array bounds. We don't designate the

> *upper* one.

In the context of initially declaring an array in IDL, sure you do:

```
x = fltarr(10)
```

declares the upper bound as 9. We also designate a lower bound: 0. The difference between the two is that I can change the former.

> To be exact, we need a zero point fixed

why?

> and the ability to

> extend an array in both directions. This way, I can add data in both

> positive and negative directions.

Why would this functionality be any different to what exists now? And, to me at least, allowing -ve indices would make this sort of data manipulation easier to understand, i.e. extend array in -ve direction => negative indices.

paulv

> P.S. I think David needs not worry about scientists learning new useful

> techniques :-(

I agree. :o\

--

Paul van Delst A little learning is a dangerous thing;
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7274 There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
Fax:(301)763-8545 And drinking largely sobers us again.
 Alexander Pope.
