
Subject: Re: Am I stupid?

Posted by [Paul van Delst](#) on Thu, 12 Jul 2001 15:01:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Bill wrote:

- >
- > A better way to describe what could, but is not, implemented for IDL's keywords is a multise
- > stage process
- >
- > 1. If a keyword on an invocation exactly matches a keyword in the functions's definition then it
- > is that keyword, else
- >
- > 2. if the keyord on invocation is an abbreviation for exactly one keyword in the functions's
- > definition then it is that keyword, else
- >
- > 3. It is an error that can be determined statically.

I understand your point (and Jaco's and James'.... and Craig's too I think) but, to me, the above rules are defined with only the programmer's (i.e. the person that wrote the code that has some potential for ambiguousness (?) in the keywords) viewpoint.

My main, err, discomfort with allowing "The keyword is too short to be unique, therefore it is unabbreviated" type of behaviour is that it does not take into account the person who is using this code cold and is not an IDL whiz. I think that with a little bit of forethought, these issues can be eliminated by the code writer to save the poor unsuspecting future IDL user from some code that was written with potential ambiguous keyword problems. To paraphrase Reverend Lovejoy's wife: "will somebody *please* think of the users!" :o)

Phew.

O.k., no more poking pointy sticks at windmills for me. :o)

paulv

--

Paul van Delst A little learning is a dangerous thing;
CIMSS @ NOAA/NCEP Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;
Ph: (301)763-8000 x7274 There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
Fax:(301)763-8545 And drinking largely sobers us again.
 Alexander Pope.
