

---

Subject: Re: God save me!

Posted by [Yngvar Larsen](#) on Fri, 17 Jan 2014 14:30:02 GMT

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

---

On Thursday, 16 January 2014 23:08:19 UTC+1, Heinz Stege wrote:

> On Thu, 16 Jan 2014 05:58:28 -0800 (PST), ??? wrote:

>

>> Thank a lot, Heinz. Adding `compile_opt idl2` works. But I wonder why sometimes the compilation passes even without the option. And later when I remove the line (`compile_opt idl2`) the compilation also passes.

>

> Zhibo, it is nothing wrong with not using the compile option. However,

> if you allow round brackets for array indexing (i.e. no compile

> option), the IDL compiler or interpreter has to find out if

> "colorbar(...)" is a variable or a function.

You can help the IDL interpreter figuring this out:

[http://www.exelisvis.com/docs/FORWARD\\_FUNCTION.html](http://www.exelisvis.com/docs/FORWARD_FUNCTION.html)

That being said, it is highly recommended that you use the `idl2 compile` option. Personally, I think it also more human readable with `[]` instead of `()` for the same reason as for the compiler: array indexing vs function call. And using round brackets for array indexing has been deprecated since IDL 5.0 (March 1997!). I'm not sure why this compile option is not default in 2014, almost two decades later. FUD regarding breaking of old code?

--

Yngvar

---