Paul van Delst wrote:
> Umm, I haven't had my requisite 4 cups of coffee yet this morning so I may be fading in
> and out here, but if you specify a keyword TIME=something, how is the interpreter supposed
> to know if you are specifying TIME,

if you specify TIME=something, then you are specifying TIME, or <see subject>

> TIMEUNIT abrreviated to "TIME",

"Keywords can be abbreviated to their shortest unique length", which would be TIMEU
(considering that TIME would not be unique, ambiguous with both TIME and TIMESTEP).
Therefore there is no way you could be abbreviating TIMEUNIT to "TIME". (Well, you could
of course, but the interpreter should not allow it.)

> or TIMESTEP abbreviated to "TIME"?

"Keywords can be abbreviated to their shortest unique length", which would be TIMES
(considering that TIME would not be unique, ambiguous with both TIME and TIMEUNIT).
So again, abbreviating TIMESTEP to "TIME" would be illegal.

Simple as that. If a routine only accepted TIMESTEP and TIMEUNIT keywords, then "TIME"
would be ambiguous. If the routine also accepts a TIME keyword, then "TIME" should just
be, well, TIME.

Maybe it's just that I have been drinking coffee all day...

Cheers,
  Jaco

P.S.: My only point is that the IDL behaviour is not logical and not documented. In
my own codes I am of course using your suggested fix: TIMEVALUE.

Jaco van Gorkom   gorkom@rijnh.nl
FOM-Instituut voor Plasmafysica `Rijnhuizen', The Netherlands