
Subject: Re: no backwards compatibility in IDL 5.6
Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Fri, 28 Feb 2003 20:02:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 28 Feb 2003 12:42:42 -0700, David Fanning wrote:

> 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?
>
> Alright, here is why I am using EXECUTE. If I change the code to this:
>
> returnValue = 0.0
> version = Float(!VERSION.Release)
> IF (version LE 5.5) THEN returnValue = ATAN(imgpart, realpart) \$
> ELSE returnValue = ATAN(complexNum, /Phase)
>
> Then the code won't compile in IDL 5.4, complaining about the PHASE
> keyword not being defined. :-(
>
>
> P.S. The code *does* compile in IDL 5.5, by the way, even though the
> PHASE keyword is not defined there, either.

Which is when _STRICT_EXTRA was first introduced. Coincidence?

My conspiracy theory: RSI switched from checking built-in system routine keywords at compile to run-time with v5.5. This isn't the first time they've done this type of thing: around v5.3, they switched from checking the validity of system variables at compile time to run time (which was rather convenient, actually).

JD
