

---

Subject: Re: IDL objects and names

Posted by [Randall Skelton](#) on Wed, 12 Feb 2003 16:42:13 GMT

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

---

- > No, I'm afraid it is true. One of the huge disadvantages of
- > IDL objects is that they are based on named structures, which
- > means the field names in the structure can't be duplicated.
- > In practice, this makes it hard to have deep inheritance
- > hierarchies. But what is even worse, is it makes it extremely
- > difficult to have multiple inheritance hierarchies.

IMHO, this isn't simply a huge disadvantage, but a colossal problem. If you look at some of tricks employed in Martin Shultz's scientific objects or the HESSI objects, you begin to realize much of the power of objects is squandered by RSI's limited implementation. This combined with the lack of public methods and operator overloading seriously reduces the usefulness of OOP in IDL for actual computing. I agree with David that you can write relatively simple objects with strict naming for an inherited level or two; alas, as soon as you start to work with complex objects with many levels, you end up chasing name clashes and conflicting containers.

I can only hope that this will be fixed once and for all in IDL 6.

---