
Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL

Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Tue, 25 Aug 2009 15:03:17 GMT

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

David Higgins writes:

> Does it work well? (Apart from not-yet-implemented routines, of
> course.)

It probably depends on how many of those not-yet-implemented routines you think you have to use in the course of a normal day.

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming (www.dfanning.com)

Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL

Posted by [penteado](#) on Tue, 25 Aug 2009 18:13:10 GMT

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

I use it only occasionally, when I want to give to someone a program I wrote in IDL. But I frequently find that I used some library routine not in GDL, so it does not help. I think GDL is a very good idea in principle, but it seems to me that the project is not very active, so the missing features will remain missing for a long time. It seems to have the significant advantage, compared to IDL, of talking to Python without the added cost of Slither, but I have never tried to use it with Python.

In a related issue, does anybody use PV-WAVE? If so, how does its current version compare to a current IDL? I did not find any PV-WAVE topics in recent years in this group.

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL

Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Tue, 25 Aug 2009 18:19:33 GMT

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

David Higgins wrote:

> Has anyone with extensive IDL experience used GDL (GNU Data Language),
> a free IDL-compatible incremental compiler (ie. runs IDL programs).

>
> Does it work well? (Apart from not-yet-implemented routines, of
> course.)
>
> Many thanks
> Dave

My experience is that it works well. The language features are fully implemented, but the library is obviously not complete.

Also, you must compile GDL before using it, which is not trivial since it has several prerequisites.

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com
Associate Research Scientist
Tech-X Corporation

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL
Posted by [penteado](#) on Tue, 25 Aug 2009 18:26:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Aug 25, 3:19 pm, mgalloy <mgal...@gmail.com> wrote:
> Also, you must compile GDL before using it, which is not trivial since
> it has several prerequisites.

Not necessarily. It has existed as an rpm in the Fedora repository, since around Fedora 5 or 6. Which makes it a lot easier to install (and to work after installed) than IDL, which frequently breaks when a new version of Fedora comes out.

The package I have installed is gdl-0.9-0.5.rc2.20090312.fc11.x86_64

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL
Posted by [russell.grew](#) on Wed, 26 Aug 2009 03:06:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

See also 'Fawlty Language' for another free alternative;

<http://fl.net23.net/>

Cheers.

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL

Posted by [penteado](#) on Wed, 26 Aug 2009 03:27:41 GMT

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

On Aug 26, 12:06 am, RussellGrew <russell.g...@gmail.com> wrote:

> See also 'Fawlty Language' for another free alternative;

>

> <http://fl.net23.net/>

Thanks! Somebody had told me about it, but I had completely forgotten to check it out.

Subject: Re: IDL vs GDL

Posted by [Florian Buerzle](#) on Thu, 27 Aug 2009 10:08:56 GMT

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

RussellGrew schrieb:

> See also 'Fawlty Language' for another free alternative;

>

> <http://fl.net23.net/>

>

> Cheers.

If one needs to deal with FORTRAN unformatted binary files (as I do), this is not an option since, as I learned recently, this feature is not implemented (`/f77` or `/f77_unformatted` will lead to "keyword not allowed" message). However, with GDL this works nice.

Cheers,
Florian
