
Subject: Re: IDL & Win95 -- arrggh
Posted by [thompson](#) on Thu, 11 Jul 1996 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"A. Scott Denning" <scott@abyss.atmos.colostate.edu> writes:

> Mark Hadfield wrote:

>>

>> mallozzi@ssl.msfc.nasa.gov wrote:

>>>

>>> I just tried to port a large IDL package that runs fine on VMS, IRIX,
>>> Sun, and Linux to Win95. It appears that IDL does not recognize the
>>> long filenames that Win95 uses....

>>>

>>> I was using v3.6, but a colleague told me this also happens under 4.0.1

>>

>> Yes, it does occur under 4.0.1. Under NT (and presumably under Win95 also)

>> many routines seem to accept long file names if you append a space on the

>> end, eg,

>>

>> OPENR, 1, 'alongfilename.dat'+ ' '

>>

> How about long procedure names? I would think this would be even worse
> than the long data file names. I have a huge idl application I've been
> working on for almost 3 years under various flavors of unix and on the
> Mac (> 12,000 lines of code). Lots of procedure names like
> "define_colors.pro", "set_contours.pro", "widget_window.pro," etc that
> don't conform to DOS limits.

I haven't tried to use IDL under the newer flavors of Windows, but in Windows 3
one could reference a procedure by its name, and it would find it with the 8.3
filename. E.g., calling set_contours would look for a file called
"set_cont.pro". This causes problems when one has multiple routines which
start with the same eight characters.

I don't consider that IDL for Windows will be useful until long filenames are
supported. Otherwise, we have no sensible path for distributing our software
to those platforms the way we currently do with Unix and VMS users. Thus, I
discourage those who wish to use our software from buying IDL for Windows.

Bill Thompson
