

---

Subject: Re: What does an optimal scientific programming language/environment need?

Posted by [Jason Nielsen](#) on Fri, 19 Sep 2003 19:35:40 GMT

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

---

On Fri, 19 Sep 2003, grunes wrote:

- > 3. Very rapid developement and testing. Requires extreme conciseness,
- > support of arrays, complex number, linear algebra, finite element and
- > numerical integration of functions and differential equations, and
- > little need for type and shape declarations. Can easily switch on
- > automatic detection of subscript checking, memory reference checking,
- > argument mismatches, fixed and floating point errors. FORTRAN style
- > adjustable array bounds (e.g., a(-3:4, 5:7)).

Very efficient built-in univariate and multivariate random number generation would be a nice touch ;-)

- > 8. A compiled mode that really is as fast as FORTRAN or C, if you add
- > those declarations. Compiler would produce 2nd level code for
- > compilation by g77 and gcc.

If you could manage this you would definitely get peoples attention. Most modern array/matrix interpreted languages: Matlab, S-plus, R, Octave, Euler, IDL, Yorick, Ox, GAUSS etc., etc., etc. have most of your other points covered. However, all of them suffer from the fact that they are too slow for intensive simulation. I personally use a couple of these regularly and when the going gets tough re-code sections that are slowing things up in Fortran95 for dyn.loading. However writing some code in your favorite matrix language, adding some type declarations and compiling the sucker to a fast binary would be a nice touch. The only in-development project trying for something along these lines is LUSH:

<http://lush.sourceforge.net/>

Unfortunately they are using the dreaded lisp infix syntax.... urrrggh I can't stand that ;-)! I suppose I'll just stick with my Python, R, Matlab, and Fortran95 mix until you are finished your project ;-).

Cheers,  
Jason

---