

---

Subject: Re: On-the-fly compilation of routines

Posted by [Kenneth P. Bowman](#) on Fri, 07 Nov 2008 14:41:12 GMT

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

---

In article <MPG.237dd652953c0f9d98a510@news.giganews.com>,  
David Fanning <news@dfanning.com> wrote:

> This reminds me of a discussion we had several weeks ago that  
> I forgot to follow up on. Someone was trying to compile a large  
> program project with a script that did a .COMPILE on his files.  
> This worked fine in some earlier version of IDL, but had the  
> effect of opening hundreds of edit windows in later versions.  
>  
> I happened to ask about this when I was around some ITTVIS types  
> who were likely to know the answer. It turns out that .COMPILE  
> is now the equivalent to the command sequence .RUN/.EDIT. And  
> that what the person needed to do was replace all his .COMPILE  
> commands with .RUN.  
>  
> This sort of turns the .COMPILE command back on its head,  
> since I originally argued for it on the basis that no one  
> outside of RSI could figure out why .RUN only compiled and  
> didn't run anything, and that is why we needed a .COMPILE  
> command.  
>  
> Anyway, I suppose when your institutional memory leaves the  
> company, it's easy to forget why you did things originally. :-)  
>  
> Cheers,  
>  
> David

In true unix fashion, I always .r my programs to recompile them. Why type  
all of those extra characters. ;-) (.com will work, but .c is not unique).

Cheers, Ken

---