
Subject: Re: idl bytecode

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 06:03:29 GMT

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

"skymaxwell@gmail.com" <skymaxwell@gmail.com> writes:

- > seems IDL like Java interpreter language
- > all IDL programs run in IDL VM
- >
- > so where is bytecode files (in Java it's files with .class
- > extension) ? or how happened run process ?

One can save IDL byte code in SAVE files. However, this data is said to be encrypted now. Most commonly byte code is stored transiently within the memory of the current session, and is re-compiled from source for each session.

Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: idl bytecode

Posted by [Haje Korth](#) on Fri, 16 Feb 2007 13:13:37 GMT

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

In IDL you do not need a byte code file to run a program. When you run a program it is first compiled into memory and then executed. As Craig pointed out there is a possibility to create SAVE files which can among other things contain byte code. Unless you have code you don't want others to see, save files are in my opinion a rather impractical way for distributing code.

haje

<skymaxwell@gmail.com> wrote in message

news:1171602286.624414.51920@l53g2000cwa.googlegroups.com...

- > seems IDL like Java interpreter language
 - > all IDL programs run in IDL VM
 - >
 - > so where is bytecode files (in Java it's files with .class
 - > extension) ? or how happened run process ?
 - >
-
-

Subject: Re: idl bytecode
Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Sat, 17 Feb 2007 01:13:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Fri, 16 Feb 2007 08:13:37 -0500, Haje Korth wrote:

> In IDL you do not need a byte code file to run a program. When you run a
> program it is first compiled into memory and then executed. As Craig
> pointed out there is a possibility to create SAVE files which can among
> other things contain byte code. Unless you have code you don't want others
> to see, save files are in my opinion a rather impractical way for
> distributing code.

The other time when bytecode is convenient is to package all your dependencies into one file which is guaranteed not to conflict with various other tools broken inclusion of AstroLib/MPFit/etc. (I know people have 5 versions of MPFit from ~2000 via recent releases of tools which "bundle" it -- ouch). If everything is in a single sav, and they load it, they'll be in fine shape.

JD

Subject: Re: idl bytecode
Posted by [Haje Korth](#) on Mon, 19 Feb 2007 15:19:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

JD,
Good point, haven't thought of that.

Haje

"JD Smith" <jdsmith@as.arizona.edu> wrote in message
news:pan.2007.02.17.01.13.04.913158@as.arizona.edu...

> On Fri, 16 Feb 2007 08:13:37 -0500, Haje Korth wrote:

>

>> In IDL you do not need a byte code file to run a program. When you run a
>> program it is first compiled into memory and then executed. As Craig
>> pointed out there is a possibility to create SAVE files which can among
>> other things contain byte code. Unless you have code you don't want
>> others
>> to see, save files are in my opinion a rather impractical way for
>> distributing code.

>

> The other time when bytecode is convenient is to package all your
> dependencies into one file which is guaranteed not to conflict with
> various other tools broken inclusion of AstroLib/MPFit/etc. (I know
> people have 5 versions of MPFit from ~2000 via recent releases of

> tools which "bundle" it -- ouch). If everything is in a single sav,
> and they load it, they'll be in fine shape.
>
> JD
>
