Subject: Re: Who's up for breaking IDL?
Posted by David Fanning on Mon, 04 Aug 2003 16:38:47 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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 it companion RESOLVE_ROUTINE
(which appears to do all the work. I'm reminded of
Don Quiote and his faithful servant Sancho). These
were designed so the user could *automatically* resolve
all the unresolved references in a piece of code
so you could create a save file.

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 RESOVE_ROUTINE command. :-)

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