Subject: Re: cgimage not generating output with cgps\_open and cgps\_close (fine in X window).

Posted by JTMHD on Mon, 20 Oct 2014 19:56:54 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
On Monday, 20 October 2014 19:14:50 UTC+1, David Fanning wrote:
> David Fanning writes:
>
>
>
>>
>> David Fanning writes:
>
>>
>>> Well, leave the XSCALE and YSCALE keywords off your cglmage command.
>>> They aren't needed (cglmage does this automatically), and they are
>>> somehow (don't understand it yet) screwing things up.
>>
>> Alright, here is what is happening. This is a combination of the usual
>
>> keyword inheritance nonsense, with a little twist from IDL letting you
>> abbreviate keyword names.
>
>>
   The proper way to set axis properties in cglmage is via the AXKeywords
   keyword, which no one can figure out how to use. So I allow a *limited*
>> number of axis keywords to be used on the cglmage command line (e.g.,
>> xrange and yrange). I don't forbid you to use XSCALE and YSCALE keywords
>> (the ol' keyword inheritance problem), but there should be no reason to
>> use them, either. cglmage knows what it is doing and does axis things
>> correctly.
>>
>
```

```
>> Had you actually used XSCALE and YSCALE keywords, instead of their
>> shorted form XS and YS, you would have received an error message, since
   these keywords are passed along to the TV command. They don't mean
>>
   anything to the TV command, so the TV command complains. But, in their
>>
>> shortened form, XS and YS, they are interpreted by the TV command as the
   XSIZE and YSIZE keywords, and they will overwrite the XSIZE and YSIZE
>>
   values cglmage uses internally to size a PostScript image. (The XSIZE
>>
>> and YSIZE keywords are only used by the TV command when in the
   PostScript device.) As a result, and this is why you weren't getting an
>> error, your image was being sized to a one-by-one pixel, which was being
   displayed correctly in your output. :-)
>
>
  By the way, when you write code like this:
>
>
>
    cgimage, image, /xs, /ys
>
>
>
  You are doing two things wrong in my opinion. You are abbreviating
>
>
  keyword names, which makes your programs difficult to understand and
>
  debug (see current discussion today), and you are using a keyword
>
  shortcut that is inappropriate with non-boolean keywords that can have
>
>
  values *other* than 0 or 1. It works, but it strikes me as a lousy
  programming practice, since it, too, sends the wrong message to people
>
  looking for problems in your programs.
>
>
>
```

>

```
> Cheers,
>
>
> David
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
  David Fanning, Ph.D.
>
>
  Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
>
  Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.idlcoyote.com/
>
> Sepore ma de ni thue. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")
```

I see what you are saying and will bear it in mind. Its a hangover from using IDL interactively for a quick look at data, but I can totally see how this good practice would pay off if you where writing more sophisticated tools