
Subject: Re: Resolving Built-ins and FORWARD_FUNCTION
Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Tue, 09 Dec 2003 06:15:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JD Smith <jdsmith@as.arizona.edu> writes:

> Sent to RSI:
>
> =====
=====

> Using FORWARD_FUNCTION creates an unresolved stub in the routine list,
> even for built-in routines. E.g., in the NasaLib WRITEFITS you find :
...
> IDL could either check for built-in's being used in FORWARD_FUNCTION, or
> RESOLVE_ROUTINE could do the same, or FORWARD_FUNCTION functions could
> be removed from the list once they are encountered in the file. Since
> you can't override a built-in command (like FILE_SEARCH) with any amount
> of !PATH fiddling, it makes sense not to put built-ins on the unresolved
> list via FORWARD_FUNCTION.
> =====
=====

Yes, these seems like a totally legit complaint. I don't think this problem showed up before IDL 6.0, did it? Or else, why did nobody complain before now?

> Also, does anyone know what a SAV file run in the IDLVM does with a
> statement like:
>
> source=routine_info('MyPro',/SOURCE)
>
> I use these types of constructs to locate data bundled with my source
> distribution, and I want it to work with the IDLVM too. Since the VM
> technically doesn't do any compiling of files, I presume it might not
> do any path searching for file source either, in which case I'd have
> to come up with something different.

Why not try it yourself? I found that the "source" it reported was the path of the .sav file.

Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
