
Subject: Re: `_ref_extra`

Posted by [John-David T. Smith](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2001 20:07:32 GMT

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

"Pavel A. Romashkin" wrote:

>
> Oh well. Just thought I'd ask. I got around it after all, although it
> took me extra 20 lines of code. Basically, I did not want to write
> `get_property` methods the old way anymore, inspired by David's complaint
> that then you have to revisit them every time you need to alter the
> object. I have one `get_property` for everything now, and it works :-)
> Thank you,
> Pavel

And do you mind sharing it? I once did this (in the pre-`_REF_EXTRA` days) by changing `GetProperty` to a function, returning a structure with keyword:value pairs, and chaining down the inheritance tree by concatenating the structures returned. I abandoned it when `_REF_EXTRA` arrived.

Despite the inconvenience, `GetProperty` as it is does have one thing in its favor: if you just allow those fields to be "gotten" that you won't mind keeping the same, you can isolate yourself from your own (OK, my own) tendency to perform quick-fixes by digging deeper than you should. My recommendation: only add `GetProperty` keywords when you run into the first time you actually **need** that value, and even then spend some time convincing yourself that you're happy to fix that field in stone, no matter what other changes the remainder of the class undergoes.

JD
