
Subject: Re: Who's up for breaking IDL?

Posted by [R.G. Stockwell](#) on Mon, 04 Aug 2003 17:06:04 GMT

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

"David Fanning" <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.19983a015914c4269896c7@news.frii.com...

> R.G. Stockwell writes:

>

>> However, I think the example shown by the original poster, which
>> used a literal string of the correct case, should have worked, and
>> the fact that it didn't is a bug.

>>

>> IDL> resolve_routine, 'Resolve_Me'

>> % Attempt to call undefined procedure/function: 'RESOLVE_ME'.

>> % Execution halted at: \$MAIN\$

>>

>> It seems like IDL took a string constant 'Resolve_Me' and changed
>> it to a different string constant 'RESOLVE_ME'.

>

> Bob, I think maybe you are missing the intention
> of the RESOLVE_ALL and its companion RESOLVE_ROUTINE

Yes, I am missing the intention.

> I think the designers figured that anybody who
> simply wanted to *compile* a routine would probably
> use the aptly named COMPILE command to do so. (Or,
> the completely misnamed RUN command, but that's
> another story.) I am 100% sure (although I have
> no case sensitive operating system here to check)
> that the .Compile command would work in the manner
> the user expected from the RESOLVE_ROUTINE command. :-)

Yes, you are right. The following fails

IDL> .comp resolve_me

while the following does indeed work

IDL> .comp Resolve_Me

I hereby withdraw to the comfortable confines of under my rock.

Cheers,
bob
