

---

Subject: Cant find functions in lib

Posted by [Dominik\[1\]](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2001 09:01:09 GMT

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

---

Helle there,

I am using IDL for imaging in Nuklear Medicine. We wrote a big library (NukMed.pro) with some functions and dont want to compile it each time. So we thought to put it in the lib directory of IDL, where IDL itself puts all its \*.pro.

But when we try to use it, IDL doesnt find the functions we used the whole time. Do I have to precompile it or to sign up in a special list for all \*.pro files?

Thanks

Dominik

---

---

Subject: Re: Cant find functions in lib

Posted by [davidf](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2001 00:35:12 GMT

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

---

Kenneth P. Bowman (kbowman@null.net) writes:

> Why doesn't IDL simply compile everything in a file? What value  
> does the user get from stopping the compilation part of the way through  
> a file? (Aside from confusing newbies, of course, which has, at least,  
> mild entertainment value.)

You know, I don't ask why RSI does some of the things it does. But the last words I say before I go to bed every night are "Please, Lord, don't let those bullies from Kodak change the way RSI does things!".

Cheers,

David

P.S. Let's just say that for those of you who have been around the block a few times and know what you are doing, there is also `Resolve_Routine`, `/Compile_Full_File`. But I'd still put that main routine last. :-)

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: [davidf@dfanning.com](mailto:davidf@dfanning.com)

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

---

Subject: Re: Cant find functions in lib

Posted by [Paul van Delst](#) on Fri, 06 Apr 2001 13:45:24 GMT

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

---

"Kenneth P. Bowman" wrote:

>

> In article <MPG.1536350bbbff2315989dce@news.frii.com>, David Fanning

> <davidf@dfanning.com> wrote:

>

>> Yes, it has to be LAST, but really only if you want it

>> to work all of the time. :-)

>

> I have never understood the reason(s) for this, and find it somewhat

> inconvenient. If I have (say) a procedure and a few related functions

> that I would logically keep in the same file, it also seems logical to

> me to put the "main" procedure (the one whose name matches the

> filename) at the beginning of the file, rather than burying it at then

> end. Why doesn't IDL simply compile everything in a file? What value

> does the user get from stopping the compilation part of the way through

> a file? (Aside from confusing newbies, of course, which has, at least,

> mild entertainment value.)

The answer, if you can call it that, is that that is the way it's done. At some point someone had to make a decision about how to do this (probably the illustrious DS sitting in front of a PDP-11/70 terminal....). However, I don't see any problem with this method. It's a relatively simple way to, uh, encourage programmers to group what could be considered as "PRIVATE" functions/procedures with the "PUBLIC" namesake function/procedure, i.e. the last one. If there was to be a change to the way this worked I would prefer that, while IDL would still compile everything in the file, \*ONLY\* the namesake routine be available to the outside world. If you require the preceding routines outside the namesake procedure, stick it in its own file. Not very sophisticated I'll grant you (without introducing all manner of IDL "directives" indicating which routine is private or public?).

I don't know how this would be done, or even if it can. If it was, I'm sure it would break about 99% of IDL code out there.

paulv

--

Paul van Delst            A little learning is a dangerous thing;  
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP       Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;  
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7274   There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,  
Fax:(301)763-8545        And drinking largely sobers us again.  
paul.vandelst@noaa.gov            Alexander Pope.

---