
Subject: Re: Interesting WHERE function gotcha
Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Tue, 11 Feb 2003 04:24:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JD Smith <jdsmith@as.arizona.edu> writes:

>
> Notice I said "changes and improvements". You pick which is
> applicable ;). The truth is, I was once told by a top RSI developer,
> "If I were designing IDL over, there would be no scalars, just arrays
> of various dimensionality." Given that we can't go back there, I'm
> not sure which is better, lots of little workarounds, or just living
> with the pain. I for one tend to throw a lot of [0] indexing
> statements in for good measure.

I think of scalars and one element arrays quite differently. I'm glad IDL keeps them separate. Actually, in a parallel universe where scalars didn't exist, I'm sure we'd all be complaining about something else.

Alter-discussion:

JC Smith: "Research Cisterns Incorporated has just added something new called scalars!"

Stein Hagdorf: "Oh, no, that just adds another exception to all my array processing! SOHO will crash!"

Clyde Markwardt: "Gosh darnit! REFORM won't work on those new scalars. Can't they fix the old stuff before adding new stuff?"

David Franning: "Well, at least typing less of those []'s is going to make my tennis elbow better!"

Yours,
Clyde

[P.S. REFORM still doesn't work on scalars.]

--

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