# Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Rick Towler on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 19:02:39 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Bug? I don't know.

But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and 5.5(beta) on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on Solaris (sunos sparc).

FWIW, if you put spaces around your "+" you don't get the error:

-Rick

```
"Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu...
> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
> is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
> PRO Showbug
>
    numAll1Rets = 6
>
    segmentT = 2d
>
>
>
    distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>
    distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>
    ;This second statement generates a compile error:
>
    ;%Syntax error.
>
> Return
> End
```

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Dick Jackson on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 19:44:22 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
> "Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu...
>> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
>> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
>> is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
>>
>> PRO Showbug
>> numAll1Rets = 6
>> segmentT = 2d
```

```
>>
     distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>>
>>
     distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>>
     :This second statement generates a compile error:
>>
     ;%Syntax error.
>>
>>
>> Return
>> End
"Rick Towler" <rtowler@u.washington.edu> wrote in message
news:9r9nld$26e6$1@nntp6.u.washington.edu...
> Bug? I don't know.
>
> But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and
> 5.5(beta) on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on Solaris (sunos sparc).
> FWIW, if you put spaces around your "+" you don't get the error:
> -Rick
Right, and that would be because, for example, the constant 1d+3 means
1*10^3, double precision. 1d+D... is just not allowed. Rick's suggestion is
good, or if you prefer:
distancesT = segmentT*(1d0+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
distancesT = segmentT*((1d)+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
Cheers,
-Dick
Dick Jackson
                                dick@d-jackson.com
D-Jackson Software Consulting /
                                   http://www.d-jackson.com
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
                           / +1-403-242-7398 / Fax: 241-7392
```

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Joe Means on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 19:45:36 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Rick,

Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.

Joe

#### Rick Towler wrote:

```
> Bug? I don't know.
>
> But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and
> 5.5(beta) on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on Solaris (sunos sparc).
>
  FWIW, if you put spaces around your "+" you don't get the error:
>
> -Rick
>
  "Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu...
>
>> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
>> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
>> is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
>>
>> PRO Showbug
>>
     numAll1Rets = 6
>>
     segmentT = 2d
>>
>>
     distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>>
>>
     distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>>
     ;This second statement generates a compile error:
>>
     ;%Syntax error.
>>
>> Return
>> End
>>
Joseph E. Means
Assistant Professor, joe.means@orst.edu
Department of Forest Science
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331-5752
541-750-7351
```

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Rick Towler on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 21:45:35 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

- > Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my
- > rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no

> incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.

I agree! I thought you were on to something too but I personally don't use the word since I have eaten it so much and have lost the taste for it. Someone like Dick always comes along and points out your mistakes. If only I knew everything...

-Rick

"Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD86BE0.10908@orst.edu...

- > Rick.
- > Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my
- > rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no
- > incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.
- > Joe

>

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by David Fanning on Thu, 25 Oct 2001 22:05:57 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Rick Towler (rtowler@u.washington.edu) writes:

- > I agree! I thought you were on to something too but I personally don't use
- > the word since I have eaten it so much and have lost the taste for it.
- > Someone like Dick always comes along and points out your mistakes. If only
- > I knew everything...

This particular "bug" caused me about a 100 gray hairs and nearly a half a day in an IDL programming course I once taught. It's one of the reasons I because so anal about code "looking" right. :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D. Fanning Software Consulting

Phone: 970-221-0438, E-mail: david@dfanning.com

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

Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000

```
Joe Means wrote:
```

```
> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
 is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
>
> PRO Showbug
>
    numAll1Rets = 6
>
    segmentT = 2d
>
    distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>
    distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>
    ;This second statement generates a compile error:
    ;%Syntax error.
>
> Return
> End
Dear Joseph,
my linux Version gives a much more better error statement.
 distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
% Syntax error.
print,1e+dindgen(10)
gives the same syntax error.
I could not decide what is more wrong to set an exponent by a function
or to ignore exponents settings for double numbers by d.
I believe it is no bug but I agree that's the error statement you got
isn't very helpful.
regards
```

Reimar

> --

- > Joseph E. Means, joe.means@orst.edu
- > Department of Forest Science
- > Oregon State University
- > Corvallis, OR 97331-5752
- > 541-750-7351

--

#### Reimar Bauer

Institut fuer Stratosphaerische Chemie (ICG-1) Forschungszentrum Juelich email: R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/

\_\_\_\_\_\_

a IDL library at ForschungsZentrum Juelich http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/idl\_icglib/idl\_lib\_intro.h tml

http://www.fz-juelich.de/zb/text/publikation/juel3786.html

\_\_\_\_\_\_

read something about linux / windows http://www.suse.de/de/news/hotnews/MS.html

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Joe Means on Fri, 26 Oct 2001 19:16:14 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

<a href="https://www.chead-che

Joe<br>

<br>

Dick Jackson wrote:<br>

href="news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu">news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu</a>...<br/>
e><blockquote type="cite">pre wrap="">This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.<br/>
br>lf others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it<br/>
br>is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.<br/>
br>eproper value of the proper valu

href="mailto:rtowler@u.washington.edu"><rtowler@u.washington.edu&gt;</a> wrote in message<br><a class="moz-txt-link-freetext" href="news:9r9nld\$26e6\$1@nntp6.u.washington.edu">news:9r9nld\$26e6\$1@nntp6.u.washingto n.edu</a>...<br> <blockquote type="cite">Bug? I don't know.<br>>br>But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and <a href="https://doi.org/10.26/10.15">br>5.5(beta)</a> on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on error:<br><br><ri>Rick<br></blockquote> <!---><br>Right, and that would be because, for example, the constant 1d+3 means<br/>br>1\*10^3, double precision, 1d+D... is just not allowed. Rick's suggestion is<br/>br>good, or if you prefer:<br><br>distancesT = segmentT\*(1d0+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))<br><br>distancesT = segmentT\*((1d)+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))<br>>Cheers,<br>>--<br>>Dick<br>>Dick <a class="moz-txt-link-abbreviated" href="mailto:dick@d-jackson.com">dick@d-jackson.com</a><br/>br>D-Jackson Software Consulting <a class="moz-txt-link-freetext" href="http://www.d-jackson.com">http://www.d-jackson.com</a><br/>br>Calgary, Alberta, Canada +1-403-242-7398 / Fax: 241-7392<br><br> </blockquote> <br> --Joseph E. Means Assistant Professor, <a class="moz-txt-link-abbreviated" href="mailto:joe.means@orst.edu">joe.means@orst.edu</a> Department of Forest Science Oregon State University Corvallis, OR 97331-5752 541-750-7351 <br> </body></html>

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by thompson on Mon, 29 Oct 2001 15:48:16 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

<!---><br>"Rick Towler" <a class="moz-txt-link-rfc2396E"</pre>

Joe Means <joe.means@orst.edu> writes:

- > Rick,
- > Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my
- > rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no
- > incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.
- > Joe

Actually, I would argue that writing a number as simply "1d" is incorrect syntax, or at least sloppy syntax. IDL lets you get away with it in most cases (obviously not here), but the number really should be written as "1d0".

Sorry, I don't mean to come off as harsh.

#### William Thompson

```
> Rick Towler wrote:
>> Bug? I don't know.
>>
>> But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and
>> 5.5(beta) on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on Solaris (sunos sparc).
>>
>> FWIW, if you put spaces around your "+" you don't get the error:
>>
>> -Rick
>>
>>
   "Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu...
>>
>>> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
>>> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
>>> is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
>>>
>>> PRO Showbug
>>>
      numAll1Rets = 6
>>>
      segmentT = 2d
>>>
>>>
      distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>>>
>>>
      distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>>>
      ;This second statement generates a compile error:
>>>
      ;%Syntax error.
>>>
>>>
>>> Return
>>> End
>>>
> Joseph E. Means
> Assistant Professor, joe.means@orst.edu
> Department of Forest Science
> Oregon State University
> Corvallis, OR 97331-5752
> 541-750-7351
```

## Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by tam on Mon, 29 Oct 2001 16:55:24 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I note that my old version 4 IDL User's Guide explicitly describes 1D as a double precision constant (p 3-3). Same is true in V5's Building IDL Applications (p 15). In the context of describing doubles whose values happen to be integral, I don't see why it's any sloppier than the equivalent 1B or 1L used for other types.

Regards, Tom McGlynn

William Thompson wrote: > > Joe Means <joe.means@orst.edu> writes: >> Rick. >> Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my >> rationale for saying so is that it the offending statement contains no >> incorrect IDL syntax that I can see. >> Joe > Actually, I would argue that writing a number as simply "1d" is incorrect > syntax, or at least sloppy syntax. IDL lets you get away with it in most cases (obviously not here), but the number really should be written as "1d0". > Sorry, I don't mean to come off as harsh. > > William Thompson >

Subject: Re: Simple bug in IDL 5.4 compiler under Win2000 Posted by Foldy Lajos on Mon, 29 Oct 2001 17:43:55 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

IDL regards 1d+ as a double constant. Try 'help, 1d+' or 'a=1d+'. Both works. Try 'a=1d+x'. It gives a syntax error: a constant followed by a variable. So this '1d+ is a double constant in IDL' syntax is weird.

regards, Lajos Foldy

### On 29 Oct 2001, William Thompson wrote:

```
> Joe Means <joe.means@orst.edu> writes:
>
>> Rick,
>> Regarding your question about whether this behavior is a bug, my
>> rationale for saving so is that it the offending statement contains no
>> incorrect IDL syntax that I can see.
>> Joe
>
> Actually, I would argue that writing a number as simply "1d" is incorrect
> syntax, or at least sloppy syntax. IDL lets you get away with it in most cases
 (obviously not here), but the number really should be written as "1d0".
>
  Sorry, I don't mean to come off as harsh.
>
  William Thompson
>
>
>> Rick Towler wrote:
>>> Bug? I don't know.
>>> But I can confirm that as written, I get the same error in IDL 5.4 and
>>> 5.5(beta) on Win2k and in IDL 5.3 and 5.4.1 on Solaris (sunos sparc).
>>>
>>> FWIW, if you put spaces around your "+" you don't get the error:
>>> -Rick
>>>
>>>
>>> "Joe Means" wrote in message news:3BD85C6F.8040606@orst.edu...
>>>
>>>> This looks like a simple bug in the IDL 5.4 compiler under Windows2000.
>>>> If others confirm this, then RSI you may want to take note. Perhaps it
>>> is fixed in 5.5 which I cannot afford yet.
>>>>
>>>> PRO Showbug
>>>>
       numAll1Rets = 6
>>>>
       segmentT = 2d
>>>>
>>>>
       distancesT = segmentT*(Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2)+1d)
>>>>
>>>>
       distancesT = segmentT*(1d+Dindgen(numAll1Rets-2))
>>>>
        ;This second statement generates a compile error:
>>>>
        ;%Syntax error.
>>>>
>>>>
```

```
>>> Return
>>> End
>>>>
>
>
>
> --
>> Joseph E. Means
>> Assistant Professor, joe.means@orst.edu
>> Department of Forest Science
>> Oregon State University
>> Corvallis, OR 97331-5752
>> 541-750-7351
>
>
```