

Re: a big limit of mathematica?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math.symbolic/2005-09/msg00074.html>

- *From:* "Daniel Lichtblau" <dani@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 13 Sep 2005 15:11:27 -0700
-

carlos@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

> I agree; the kernel is well overdue for a thorough
> rewrite. It should facilitate numerical mathematics with
> zero-overhead MD arrays as primitive (atomic
> types)

What exactly do you think a packed array is in Mathematica?

and direct access to LAPACK and PETS.

> But I cannot "fund" the study. Sorry, I dont have
> that kind of money.

A considerable amount of interface to Lapack and BLAS is there but not documented. To get some idea of the functions involved, have a look at

??LinearAlgebra`*

and

??LinearAlgebra`**

None of this has anything much to do with "a full rewrite" of the Mathematica kernel, whatever that might mean.

Daniel Lichtblau
Wolfram Research

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ *Re: a big limit of mathematica?*
 - ◇ *From:* carlos

Re: a big limit of mathematica?

- **References:**

- ◆ **[a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: LumisROB
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: Peter Pein
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: LumisROB
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: Richard Fateman
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: carlos
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: Richard Fateman
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: carlos
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: LumisROB
- ◆ **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
◇ From: carlos

- Prev by Date: **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: a big limit of mathematica?](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**