Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000
Posted by tam on Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:55:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I note that my old version 4 IDL User's Guide explicitly describes 1D as
a double precision constant (p 3-3). Same is true in V5's
Building IDL Applications (p 15). In the context of describing doubles
whose values happen to be integral, I don't see why it's any sloppier
than the equivalent 1B or 1L used for other types.

 Regards,
 Tom McGlynn

William Thompson wrote:
>
> Joe Means <joe.means@orst.edu> writes:
>
>> Rick,
>> Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my
>> rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no
>> incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.
>> Joe
>
> Actually, I would argue that writing a number as simply "1d" is incorrect
> syntax, or at least sloppy syntax. IDL lets you get away with it in most cases
> (obviously not here), but the number really should be written as "1d0".
>
> Sorry, I don't mean to come off as harsh.
>
> William Thompson
>