

Re: Troll-o-Matic

Source: <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Lisp/comp.lang.lisp/2006-02/msg01673.html>

- *From:* "funkyj" <funkyj@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 16 Feb 2006 10:18:28 -0800
-

Tin Gherdanarra wrote:

The Compleat Troller's Guide To C.L.L.

Excellent post Tin!

[...]

=== A note to the c.l.l. regulars

The idiot who is unable to use google might be well served by another participant who *can* use google and is still enthusiastic enough to help out. If you see a trivial technical question, try to ignore it. It takes two to fan poor trolling and you probably DO NOT WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN SUCH NONSENSE.

Hear hear! I'm an example of the idiot who can not use google (see "macros and lisp-2" posting of mine a few weeks back), Pascal is an example of a very knowledgeable lispnik who *can* use google and is tolerant of idiots and Kaz is the curmudgeon with a short fuse who, underneath it all, has a heart of gold even if he does not suffer fools willingly.

I must compliment c.l.l on the fairly low ratio of flames to serious answers I got to my stupid question. Heck, even the spanking Kaz gave me was useful.

=====

Going a little off topic (or perhaps going more on topic) ...

http://www.ffconsultancy.com/free/ray_tracer/languages.html

I recently read about the benchmark above and boy did ocaml (and stalin) kick Lisp's ass 3 ways to sunday.

Re: Troll-o-Matic

You'd think Lisp could at least be competitive with Java on the verbosity front if not beat it on performance. Is ocaml really that much better than lisp? What major language features, if any are present in CL and ocaml and not in the other (e.g. macros)?

Also, what is the secret of Stalin's success? Perhaps SBCL can be converted to despotism and reap similar rewards.

(for all you other noobs who are even more clueless than I, that was an example of "D-" trolling. I obviously have much to learn before I can troll with the big boys)

--jfc

.