Timm Weitkamp wrote:
> On Jun 7, 3:28 pm, David Fanning <n...@dfanning.com> wrote:
>> Timm Weitkamp writes:
>>> I would like to make a CONTOUR plot with self-defined tick names, like
>>> in this example (where the x tick names are user-defined):
>>> IDL> contour, dist(3), [-1,0,1], [-1,0,1], xticks=3, xtickv=[-1,0,1],
>>> xtickname=['a', 'b', 'c']
>>> That should work, I thought. But it doesn't. What happens is tha IDL
>>> overplots a zero ("0") over the "b". (See screenshot of the plot at
>>> <http://www.sendspace.com/file/0uhh4q>.)
>>> Does this happen on other IDL installations than mine? Is it a bug? A
>>> feature? And, above all: how can I get rid of this behavior? Any help
>>> appreciated.
>> You have a mismatch between the number of tick *intervals*
>> you specify (with TICKS) and the number of tick names
>> you provide. If you provide three tick names, then you
>> only want two tick intervals. If you put XTICKS=2 this
>> will work the way you expect it to work.
>
> Oops. Reading the manual more carefully would have helped. Sorry, and
> thank you!

While it's true that careful reading of the manual reveals the solution, I reckon the
fault lies with the keyword names themselves. I mean, what would one intuitively expect a
keyword called "XTICKS" to specify?? *Especially* when the other tick-related keywords are
tick related, not ticket-interval related.

It's one of those annoying special-case situations where you either have to remember the
rules, or continually RTFM.

cheers,

paulv

p.s. I'm only grousing about it because I made exactly the same error today.

p.p.s. While this aspect of IDL's plotting interface was undoubtedly settled very early
on, I think me reading Donald Norman's "The Design of Everyday Things" back in the '90s
has made me rather intolerant of poorly designed interfaces.