
Subject: Re: Top 10 IDL Requests
Posted by [davidf](#) on Tue, 25 Jul 2000 07:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Craig Markwardt (craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu) writes:

```
> davidf@dfanning.com (David Fanning) writes:
>> Vinay L. Kashyap (kashyap@head-cfa.harvard.edu) writes:
>>> 2. _EXTRA
>>>
>>> Please consider having all built-in commands accept _EXTRA as a keyword.
>>
>> Uh, this is the way it works. :-)
>
> Uh, not quite. There are some built in commands that don't accept any
> keywords at all. The _EXTRA keyword doesn't work for them, *even* if
> the value passed is empty!
>
> Why is this important? Makes it a pain to write a wrapper procedure
> or function.
```

Alright, I must be obtuse today, but I can't figure out why it would be hard to write wrapper routines for commands that don't take keywords. Surely in writing the wrapper you give at least *some* thought to what keywords you might expect to be passed. Adding an _Extra to such a command seems excessively anal at the very least, and certainly unnecessary. :-)

And what commands did you have in mind? I've never encountered a built-in command that didn't accept this keyword mechanism.

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting
Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155
