Subject: Re: check for duplicate routine names?
Posted by Pavel A. Romashkin on Fri, 19 Jan 2001 16:42:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If I had a vote, I'd be strongly against such checking.

This means that any time I try to compile a routine which is already compiled, I'd be stopped by a warning message?! That would be a disaster for developing the code.

My take on it, avoid routines with generic names. It is tempting to write a program called "Just\_Doit.pro", but it pays to add "prj1\_just\_doit.pro", unless you are writing a \*library\* function that will be used universally by your other projects. In that case, there better not be more than one version. I use these prefixes all the time, and it gives some side benefits, too (less so now with Projects available) - sorting by name in file manager puts all related files together, etc.

Cheers, Pavel

## Michael W Asten wrote:

>

- > It is a stupid error to have a two routines of the same name
- > DoitNow.pro , in two different library files MyLib1.pro and MyLib2.pro

>

- > But your correspondent is sometimes stupid. The consequence of course
- > is that the second compilation (of MyLib2.pro ) over-rides the first (of
- > MyLib1.pro), so whatever was intended by maintenance of the code in
- > MyLib1.pro does not execute. Or worse, when the two libs are compiled
- > in different sequences, results become unpredictable.

>

- > IDL does not appear to give any warning of the compilation of a routine
- > of same name as one already compiled. Has anyone any ideas on how such
- > errors can be trapped?

>

- > I suggest that at least in an IDL Project, the command "Compile all
- > routines" should include such checking as a debugging tool. Or am I
- > merely shifting blame for my stupidity onto the compiler? (you know how
- > it is when you bang your head the second time, on the same kitchen
- > cupboard door?).

>

- > Regards,
- > Michael Asten