Subject: Re: Passing optional parameters through a wrapper routine
Posted by Mark Hadfield on Wed, 09 Feb 2000 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Kenneth P. Bowman <bowman@null.tamu.edu> wrote in message
news:bowman-0802002243470001@tl6-218-199.tca.net...
> In article <MPG.130a910d141f1260989a21@news.frii.com>, davidf@dfanning.com
> (David Fanning) wrote:
>
>> Having said that, it absolutely behooves you to check
>> each and every variable you plan to use in your program
>> to make sure you have a defined variable at the time
>> you use it. This is normally done with the N_Elements
>> function, since this function returns a 0 if its argument
>> is undefined.

Responding to the excerpt from David's message (which I haven't seen in full yet)..

I don't see anything generally wrong with passing variables on without knowing what they are or whether they are defined. That's what a wrapper routine does -- it concerns itself with some subset of the information passed to it and let's the "wrappee" deal with the rest. RSI in their wisdom invented inheritance mechanisms to do this with keywords. For a general wrapper routine with an unknown number of positional parameters I favour the "case n_params()" syntax originally proposed by Kenneth. If I get a chance tomorrow I may illustrate this using my (almost completely) general wrapper routines that report on the execution time of the wrappee.

Mark Hadfield
m.hadfield@niwa.cri.nz http://katipo.niwa.cri.nz/~hadfield/
National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research
PO Box 14-901, Wellington, New Zealand