Subject: Re: Any interest in an IDL to Python interface? Posted by Anthony[1] on Mon, 03 Mar 2008 09:19:39 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Mar 2, 6:57 pm, Michael Aye <kmichael....@googlemail.com> wrote:
> On Mar 1, 3:49 am, metachronist <rkombi...@gmail.com> wrote:
>
>
>> On Feb 29, 9:42 am, Jason Ferrara < jason.ferr...@jacquette.com> wrote:
>
>>> On Feb 28, 12:13 pm, Reimar Bauer <R.Ba...@fz-juelich.de> wrote:
>>>> Hi
>>>> it could be nice if something like that is added for all supported OS
>>> versions not only for windows.
>>> Its our plan to support Windows, Linux, and Mac.
>>> python has lots of interesting libraries and is used as scripting
>>> language in many programs (OpenOffice.org, Blender, Maya, PyMOL, Gimp, etc.)
>>>> The problem will be the price or do you have considered to share it free
>>>> of charge?
>
>>> It would be a commercial product. The pricing hasn't been determined
>>> yet.
>
>>> And another question has to be discussed too. What of idl will be left
>>> over if such a powerful programming language will be added to idl.
>>> For example this will give us the possibility to use QT4 for widgets. Or
>>>> we never again do get "the sky is falling down miracle" because of the
>>> decimal data type. Or we can use pythons standalone webserver or lots of
>>> math libraries free of charge.
>>> One has to ask himself if an idl program is mostly based on python
>>> modules why he has to use idl and does not do the whole job in python
>>>> then? There are not much differences between both languages.
>>>> How would the development of idl been continued if we as user could
>>>> always use other libs?
>>> I don't see this as being an issue.
>>> Each language has its own strengths and weaknesses. Its not a one
>>> size
>>> fits all thing. Interoperability between languages means you can mix
```

>>> and

- >>> match as best solves your problem, rather than having to pick one and
- >>> then struggle with it for the things its not good with.

_

>>> And more libraries accessible from IDL makes IDL more useful, not >>> less.

>

- >> First of all this is an excellent idea.. But just curious.. what is
- >> the memory overhead in computationally intensive apps? Any bench
- >> marks? I personally am a big python advocate and learning more
- >> everyday! Thanks for any additional info that you can provide.
- >> Best wishes.
- >> /rk

>

- > Just adding:
- > Me too, plz. I love Python and would at least like to have some
- > interoperability.
- > I'm also eagerly waiting for a Python-SPICE interface, then SPICE
- > results could be fed directly into IDL's powerful plotting routines.
- > Or IDL's results could be fed via Python into this Python-supported 3D
- > rendering program Blender.
- > Go ahead with it!
- > Best regards,
- > Michael

Great idea - definitely worth having access to both Python and IDL functionality at the same time.

For myself, I think I'd generally want to use IDL within Python, rather than Python within IDL - though it would be good to be able to do both.

There are a couple of ways of running IDL from Python. E.g.,

pyIDL http://www.its.caltech.edu/~mmckerns/software.html - looks great, but I couldn't get it to compile on my machine.

pIDLy http://astronomy.sussex.ac.uk/~anthonys/pidly/ or http://pypi.python.org/pypi/pIDLy/ - a module I wrote as a wrapper on Pexpect. More likely to compile, but pretty slow for large arrays etc., not likely to get much faster, and at an early stage of development.

Cheers,

Anthony