
Subject: C syntax for IDL

Posted by [martin](#) on Thu, 05 Dec 1996 08:00:00 GMT

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

I program mostly in IDL, but every once and a while I program in C. I find the switch to be unnecessarily painful. What I would really like is an alternative syntax for IDL that would be C-like. For example:

```
for i=0,10 do begin
  x(i)=i
endfor
```

Could become

```
for (i=0; i<10; i++) {
  x[i]=i
}
```

It seems like the mapping from one syntax to the other is pretty straight forward. You could put a command at the beginning of each program to tell it which interpreter to use.

This alternative syntax would be helpful to me in 2 ways. First, it would help me keep my C programming skills alive. Second, it would help me recruit the assistance of C programmers here where I work.

This would also solve that function-array ambiguity that everyone else is talking about.

Charles Martin
University of Texas

Subject: Re: C syntax for IDL

Posted by [Uwe Knorr](#) on Tue, 10 Dec 1996 08:00:00 GMT

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

Charles Martin wrote:

```
>
> I program mostly in IDL, but every once and a while I program in C. I find
> the switch to be unnecessarily painful. What I would really like is an
> alternative syntax for IDL that would be C-like. For example:
>
> for i=0,10 do begin
>   x(i)=i
> endfor
>
```

> Could become
>
> for (i=0; i<10; i++) {
> x[i]=i
> }
>
> /* a few lines later */
>
> Charles Martin
> University of Texas

You took the words right out of my mouth ...

As a (mainly) C programmer it always takes me a while to switch to IDL.

(And if you do some perl in between, you may go crazy)

My tip:

Copy & Paste the HandiGuide (using a copy-machine and some glue) to your needs.

If someone will ever change the syntax, please please be
consistant. If degree to radiant is !DTOR , then
why is the reverse !RADEG (and not !RTOD) ?

But nevertheless, if you once get used to the syntax (and
you have the HandiGuide at your fingertips)
you have a fantastic product ;-)

Uwe Knorr

\ Uwe Knorr
\ MNR-Klinik / Neurologie / Uni Duesseldorf
\ mailto:knorr@neurologie.uni-duesseldorf.de
\ http://www.neurologie.uni-duesseldorf.de/~knorr/

Subject: Re: C syntax for IDL

Posted by [David Fenyes](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 1996 08:00:00 GMT

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

martin@uthscsa.edu (Charles Martin) writes:

>
> I program mostly in IDL, but every once and a while I program in C. I find
> the switch to be unnecessarily painful. What I would really like is an
> alternative syntax for IDL that would be C-like. For example:
>

```
> for i=0,10 do begin
>   x(i)=i
> endfor
>
>
> Could become
>
> for (i=0; i<10; i++) {
>   x[i]=i
> }
>
```

If this is what you want, then try yorick. It has syntax very much like C, with all of the array-handling capabilities of IDL, and probably better numerical libraries (LAPACK, etc. vs. Numerical Recipes) However, it doesn't have quite the array of functions that IDL has, and is weaker on graphing, file formats, etc.

Personally, I don't understand why, given the obvious similarities between IDL and lisp, RSI doesn't provide a lisp syntax as an alternative. The current kludgy syntax could easily be compiled into lisp, and would also provide a path to producing compiled binaries using a linkable runtime library.

--

David Fenyes University of Texas Medical School
dave@msrad71.med.uth.tmc.edu Dept. of Radiology
