David Fanning wrote:
> Michael Galloy writes:
>
>> Yes, that's why I thought "function graphics" would be a good name.
>> Maybe some kind of numbered system? I think we would be up to new 4.0
>> graphics now? With "old" graphics being direct graphics, then object
>> graphics, Live Tools, iTools, and "new graphics"? Am I missing some
>> other graphics systems?
>
> Gosh, I never thought I would end up a taxonomist. I may be missing
> something, but aren't there five items on your list? Are we
> starting the count from zero, like in IDL?

I reckon just three: Direct, Object, and Function (to use Michael's term) graphics.

Let's simply not mention LiveTools (I'm sure RSI/ITTVIS would like that too :o) and, IMO, iTools just never had
sufficient mojo (with apologies to all the iToolistas out there....)

> What in the world would you call these new FSC_*** routines
> I've been working on? They aren't direct graphics, and they
> are a hell of a lot better than Live Tools. Probably better
> than iTools, too. Maybe we should number them by the year
> they were created. Then you could look back on them like
> you look back on failed marriages or bad relationships.
> You might even feel better about the new stuff. :-)

I reckon you've more than earned your own category. So let's expand the list to four:

Direct Graphics
Object Graphics
Function Graphics
Coyote Graphics (or would you prefer Fanning Graphics?)

Hmm?

cheers,

paulv