Subject: Re: no backwards compatibility in IDL 5.6
Posted by David Fanning on Fri, 28 Feb 2003 17:47:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Pavel Romashkin (pavel_romashkin@hotmail.com) writes:

> Why is EXECUTE used in this program? Why can't the value just be
> returned from each CASE? Execute will slow it down and as far as I can
> tell, does nothing special. There is no code that follows the CASE to
> prevent you from returning at any point. Will it not compile in 5.4 with
> the extra keyword? I thought keyword mismatches are runtime errors. Am I
> missing something?

I don't know. I got so confused with the discussion
yesterday I finally just said the hell with it and
went back to bed. :-(

Let's just say I had no idea so many people used
the ATAN function.

I'm totally confused about when things will compile
and when they won't. The only thing I know for sure
is they won't compile if they have to. For example, they
would never compile if you were doing a demo in front
of the new Vice President of the company.

I think there must have been a change somewhere along
the way (while we are on this subject). Because I didn't
expect that file to compile in IDL 5.4, due to the REAL_PART
function in the IDL 5.5 part of the CASE statement. When it
did, that's when I realized I needed a nap.

Anyway, why don't you fix it up, Pavel, and I'll post
the darn thing. :-)

Cheers,

David

--
David W. Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155