

---

Subject: Re: object argument passing behaviour changed in v8.2.2?  
Posted by [chris\\_torrence@NOSPAM](mailto:chris_torrence@NOSPAM) on Tue, 22 Oct 2013 15:57:16 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Tuesday, October 22, 2013 8:10:44 AM UTC-6, Paul van Delst wrote:

> Ha!  
>  
>  
>  
> It's probably my advancing age, but these special cases with regards to  
>  
> argument passing are really starting to annoy me... mostly because I  
>  
> \*still\* keep brain-fading about them, but also because these days I  
>  
> expect my code to do what I want, rather than what I tell it to do - a  
>  
> definite sign of old-codger-ism[\*] :o).  
>  
>  
>  
> Time to translate the code to Fortran2003 I guess. Urg. (Which we sorta  
>  
> have to do anyway, I was just hoping not to need to do it for a couple  
>  
> more years.)  
>  
>  
>  
> cheers,  
>  
>  
>  
> paulv  
>  
>  
>  
> [\*] Or, more likely, I think I'm in an "autonomous stage" but I'm really  
>  
> still in a "cognitive stage" with regards to programming skill.  
>  
> ( <http://www.brainpickings.org/index.php/2013/10/17/ok-plateau>)  
>  
>  
>  
> On 10/22/2013 09:39 AM, David Fanning wrote:  
>  
>> Paul van Delst writes:

```
>
>>
>
>>> That is, the creation of new object in the method doesn't do anything
>
>>> about the reference to the original object that was passed in, and
>
>>> eventually returned back to the caller?
>
>>
>
>> This appears to be the semi-passed-by-reference condition. ;-)
>
>>
>
>> Cheers,
>
>>
>
>> David
>
>>
>
>>
>
>>
```

Hi Paul,  
I don't think this is a special case. It's also not "semi-passed-by-reference." The code is simply passing an expression into a routine, so IDL cannot store into it.  
Cheers,  
Chris

---