Re: A question on Newton's Method

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math.num−analysis/2005−04/msg00064.html

- *From*: Jon Harrop <usenet@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Mon, 04 Apr 2005 02:12:44 +0100

kia wrote:
> Jon Harrop wrote:
>> archaic theoretical foundation, other languages aren't. Unless you are
>> forced to use old code, I see no reason to use Fortran.
>
> Here's your reason, several million times over.
>
> http://netlib.org
> http://gams.nist.gov
>
> Until another language comes along with a multi million *open* book
> repository there's every reason to join Fortran literacy club.

No, not at all. Firstly, the quality of most of the code on those sites is very poor. The minority of codes that are well written are already bundled into libraries with APIs, have bindings to decent languages and are put into most Linux distributions. The vast majority of users are not going to want to tinker with the innards (if they do, it's the sign of a badly written library) so there isn't even any point in these being open−source.

As far as recommending Fortran to a new programmer, that voluminous quantity of mostly−hideous code is an excellent counter−example. The "conv2b.f90" program posted by James Van Buskirk is exactly the kind of abomination I'm talking about. New programmers should never see that kind of code.

In contrast, the code in Mathematica is vastly more robust. The ability to do a Fourier transform by simply using the "Fourier" function is hugely beneficial, for example. If I wanted to do a Fourier transform from Fortran I'd probably use FFTW which is written in OCaml and C and I wouldn't even dream of fiddling with the source to FFTW, for fear of breaking it.

−−
Dr Jon D Harrop, Flying Frog Consultancy
http://www.ffconsultancy.com
.

- ***References***:

- ***A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* David M
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* Jon Harrop
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* beliavsky
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* Jon Harrop
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* beliavsky
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* Jon Harrop
- ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
  - ◊ *From:* kia

- Prev by Date: ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
- Next by Date: ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
- Next by thread: ***Re: A question on Newton's Method***
- Index(es):
  - ***Date***
  - ***Thread***