Subject: Linux vs Win95
Posted by Richard Link on Fri, 30 Oct 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

I'm considering purchasing IDL for a Pentium system, and I will have both
Linux and Win95
mounted on separate disks. I've been using IDL on SunOS/Solaris for several
years, but
I've never used the Windows version. Any recomendations, pro/con?

I have an extensive Fortran F77/90 & C++ development environment installed
under Windows,
so it would probably make sense to get IDL for Windows. However, Linux may
be a better
option

TIA,
Rick

Subject: Re: Linux vs Win95
Posted by R.Bauer on Tue, 24 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Richard Link wrote:

> Hi,
>
> I'm considering purchasing IDL for a Pentium system, and I will have both
> Linux and Win95
> mounted on separate disks. I've been using IDL on SunOS/Solaris for several
> years, but
> I've never used the Windows version. Any recomendations, pro/con?
>
> I have an extensive Fortran F77/90 & C++ development environment installed
> under Windows,
> so it would probably make sense to get IDL for Windows. However, Linux may
> be a better
> option
>
> TIA,
> Rick

I am using a unix system and a PC too. In the past I have written a lot of
sources with emacs and idl mode. As the idl developmet comes to the windows
platforms I am myself switched more and more to this development. The

difference to emacs on the unix is that it is not color coded but on the PC it
is.
This colorcoding of procedures, functions, own procedures and own functions is
very helpfull.

It seems momentanly to me that's some features if neccessary or not are only
builded for the windows platforms e.g. a widget_builder

R.Bauer

Subject: Re: Linux vs Win95
Posted by Vapuser on Wed, 25 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"R.Bauer" <R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de> writes:

  (snip original question about pc .vs. unix development options)

> I am using a unix system and a PC too. In the past I have written a lot of
> sources with emacs and idl mode. As the idl developmet comes to the windows
> platforms I am myself switched more and more to this development. The
> difference to emacs on the unix is that it is not color coded but on the PC it
> is.
> This colorcoding of procedures, functions, own procedures and own functions is
> very helpfull.
>

  I'm a little unclear what you're saying here.

If you're saying that the emacs development environment doesn't allow
for color coding of procedures, functions and other syntactically
significant strings in IDL you should check out font-lock mode
(font-lock.el) used in conjunction with idl-mode. Font-lock mode color
codes the items which idl-mode.el defines as syntactically significant
(strings like PRO, FUNCTION, GE, LE, THEN, BEGIN...)

I do all my development, and 90% of my running, of IDL from
within an emacs buffer. None of the other development packages I've
seen are as flexible or as fast, for me.

If you want more information on this, send me some email and I'll
forward you my .emacs file, to show you how to set it up.

If I've misconstrued your statement, forgive the interruption.

> It seems momentanly to me that's some features if neccessary or not are only
> builded for the windows platforms e.g. a widget_builder
>

In answer to the orignal question: personaly, I'd opt for the Linux
version, which I have at home. About the only thing that might tempt
me into switching to a windows development env is the widget builder,
but only if I was doing a lot of production code. At the moment, I
don't do that, I write mostly analysis routines and do command line
data analysis. Most of my widget development is easily done by hand
(inside the emacs/idl-mode development env) That being the case, the
power of the unix environment tips the balance heavily in it's favor.

> R.Bauer

Subject: Re: Linux vs Win95
Posted by Karsten Rodenacker on Thu, 26 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The thread has turned to emacs vs idlde.

I'm also using (x)emacs on unix and idlde on NT, however I prefer xemacs
(and the development under unix). Idl under the latter behaves IMHO more
reasonable.

Still I would appreciate to get some improvements of idl.el and
idl-shell.el e.g. the color-coding of user and inbuilt procedures and a
key for 'widget_control,/reset&heap_gc&close,/all&retall '.

--
 Karsten Rodenacker
 --- ------------:-)
 GSF - Forschungszentrum   Institute of Biomathematics and Biometry
 D-85758 Oberschleissheim   Postfach 11 29
 Tel: +49 (0)89 3187 3401 | FAX: ...3369 | MAILTO:rodena@gsf.de
 http://www.gsf.de/institute/ibb/Rodenacker/

Subject: Re: Linux vs Win95
Posted by Vapuser on Mon, 30 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

Karsten Rodenacker <rodena@gsf.de> writes:

>
>
> The thread has turned to emacs vs idlde.
>
> I'm also using (x)emacs on unix and idlde on NT, however I prefer xemacs
> (and the development under unix). Idl under the latter behaves IMHO more
> reasonable.
>
> Still I would appreciate to get some improvements of idl.el and
> idl-shell.el e.g. the color-coding of user and inbuilt procedures and a
> key for 'widget_control,/reset&heap_gc&close,/all&retall '.
>

  Are you using 'font-lock' mode, defined in the lisp file
'font-lock.el'? If you don't know about font-lock mode, it is a
general minor mode that colorizes entities in a given major mode (C,
C++, Fortran,IDL, Lisp, Dired,...) according to whatever is defined as
syntactically significant by that major mode.

>
>
> --
> Karsten Rodenacker
> -- -------------:-)
> GSF - Forschungszentrum   Institute of Biomathematics and Biometry
> D-85758 Oberschleissheim   Postfach 11 29
> Tel: +49 (0)89 3187 3401 | FAX: ...3369 | MAILTO:rodena@gsf.de
> http://www.gsf.de/institute/ibb/Rodenacker/

Subject: Re: Linux vs Win95
Posted by J.D. Smith on Tue, 01 Dec 1998 08:00:00 GMT

Karsten Rodenacker wrote:
>
> The thread has turned to emacs vs idlde.
>
> I'm also using (x)emacs on unix and idlde on NT, however I prefer xemacs

> (and the development under unix). Idl under the latter behaves IMHO more
> reasonable.
>
> Still I would appreciate to get some improvements of idl.el and
> idl-shell.el e.g. the color-coding of user and inbuilt procedures and a
> key for 'widget_control,/reset&heap_gc&close,/all&retall '.

You can add your own abbreviations to idl mode as follows:

In .emacs or wherever is being sourced... add something like this:

```
(setq idl-abbrev-start-char ".")
(add-hook 'idl-mode-hook
    (function
     (lambda ()
 (font-lock-mode 1)          ; font-lock mode
     (fast-lock-mode 1)
     (idl-auto-fill-mode 0)      ; Turn off auto filling
 (define-abbrev idl-mode-abbrev-table  (concat idl-abbrev-start-char
"on"
) "obj_new()"
(idl-keyword-abbrev 1))
)))
```

You can add in whatever else you like into this hook too (see the
beginning of the idl.el file), and make as many abbrevs as suits you.
The thing to remember is that the number after "idl-keyword-abbrev" is
how many characters to move back from the end of the expansion after it
is performed.
Hope it helps.

As far as adding key command shortcuts to the idl command line, you can
use "define_key" in your startup file...

e.g.

 define_key,'F3','widget_control,/reset&heap_gc&close ,/all&retall',/TERMINATE

Good Luck,

JD
--
 J.D. Smith |*| WORK: (607) 255-5842
 Cornell University Dept. of Astronomy |*| (607) 255-6263
 304 Space Sciences Bldg. |*| FAX: (607) 255-5875
 Ithaca, NY 14853 |*|

Vapuser wrote:

> "R.Bauer" <R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de> writes:
>
>   (snip original question about pc .vs. unix development options)
>
>> I am using a unix system and a PC too. In the past I have written a lot of
>> sources with emacs and idl mode. As the idl developmet comes to the windows
>> platforms I am myself switched more and more to this development. The
>> difference to emacs on the unix is that it is not color coded but on the PC it
>> is.
>> This colorcoding of procedures, functions, own procedures and own functions is
>> very helpfull.
>>
>
>   I'm a little unclear what you're saying here.
>
> If you're saying that the emacs development environment doesn't allow
> for color coding of procedures, functions and other syntactically
> significant strings in IDL you should check out font-lock mode
> (font-lock.el) used in conjunction with idl-mode. Font-lock mode color
> codes the items which idl-mode.el defines as syntactically significant
> (strings like PRO, FUNCTION, GE, LE, THEN, BEGIN...)
>
> I do all my development, and 90% of my running, of IDL from
> within an emacs buffer. None of the other development packages I've
> seen are as flexible or as fast, for me.
>
> If you want more information on this, send me some email and I'll
> forward you my .emacs file, to show you how to set it up.
>
> If I've misconstrued your statement, forgive the interruption.
>
>> It seems momentanly to me that's some features if neccessary or not are only
>> builded for the windows platforms e.g. a widget_builder
>>
>
> In answer to the orignial question: personaly, I'd opt for the Linux
> version, which I have at home. About the only thing that might tempt
> me into switching to a windows development env is the widget builder,
> but only if I was doing a lot of production code. At the moment, I
> don't do that, I write mostly analysis routines and do command line
> data analysis. Most of my widget development is easily done by hand
> (inside the emacs/idl-mode development env) That being the case, the
> power of the unix environment tips the balance heavily in it's favor.

>
>> R.Bauer

I did a mistake, emacs is color coded but idlde I use often is only colorcoded at
Windows.

R.Bauer