Subject: Re: ROUTINE_INFO problems
Posted by David Burridge on Thu, 11 Apr 2002 16:08:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oops - sorry to reply to my own post, but I made an error:-(

It *still* doesn't work for system stuff (which was the point, I guess),
even though I'm checking for it. My test case, DIST, is of course source
code so it worked nicely. PLOT etc look pretty impossible. I'll let you know
if I find anything more.

Cheers,

Dave

"David Burridge" <davidb@clogic.f9.co.uk> wrote in message
news:Rmit8.13177$51.441837@wards...
> Hi Guys,
>
> Having *just* finished a routine to do exactly this I stumbled on your
> question. Glad I didn't see it before .... I think!-)
>
> You need to use the /SYSTEM keyword to ROUTINE_INFO and, assuming you want
> to resolve it first, the /IS_FUNCTION keyword to RESOLVE_ROUTINE .....
both
> of which you need to know in advance. I managed to sidestep that by
putting
> a couple of catches in the code so that if it failed to find a procedure
> routine, it searched the functions next.
>
> Anyhow, the net result is a routine that'll tell you the positionals and
> keywords for any named routine (I have a similar thing for objects). If
> you're still interested I'd be happy to send the code off list. And the
> keyword inheritance thingy ..... not a clue:-(Maybe an answer lies
around
> in the _STRICT_EXTRA stuff, but solving this bit is enough for me!
>
> Cheers,
>
> Dave
>
> "Ted Cary" <tedcary@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:3CB4EB28.B1B5854E@yahoo.com...
>>
>>
>> Mark Hadfield wrote:
>>
>>> I think the answer is "Just because".

>>
>> Man, that's always the answer. But thanks again for the help. At least
I
>> won't spend more time barking up the wrong tree. I had a feeling it was
a
>> longshot.
>>
>> Ted Cary
>>
>>
>
>
