

---

Subject: Re: Am I stupid?

Posted by [R.Bauer](#) on Thu, 19 Jul 2001 06:47:38 GMT

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

---

Paul van Delst wrote:

>  
> 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 pur wee  
> 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)

So this means no keywords only \_extra and own rules to interpret  
\_extra as keywords.

Only a few new idl programmers will understand what's \_extra is doing.

With one of the rsi internal routines we can create inside the routine  
the variables

A and A1 and then they are not ambiguous.

But what do we win and what not if we do so?

The routine itself has no keywords and normally these keyword names

well  
defined and described and normally I see by this keywords what's the  
routine is able to  
do and what is missing.

A routine written in this way has different rules which are defined only  
by the programmer.

Only a few special things will be better to use.

```
pro stupid,_extra=e
  tn=tag_names(e)
  print,tn[0]+'='+string(e.(0))
  print,tn[1]+'='+string(e.(1))
end
```

Please could we make a list which rsi idl library routines has these  
problems.

regards  
Reimar

--  
Reimar Bauer

Institut fuer Stratosphaerische Chemie (ICG-1)  
Forschungszentrum Juelich  
email: R.Bauer@fz-juelich.de  
<http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/>

=====

a IDL library at Forschungszentrum Juelich  
[http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/idl\\_icglib/idl\\_lib\\_intro.html](http://www.fz-juelich.de/icg/icg1/idl_icglib/idl_lib_intro.html)

<http://www.fz-juelich.de/zb/text/publikation/juel3786.html>

=====

read something about linux / windows  
<http://www.suse.de/de/news/hotnews/MS.html>

---