
Subject: Re: Copying (Duplicating) Objects

Posted by [Mark Hadfield](#) on Thu, 06 Jun 2002 21:38:10 GMT

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

"Randall Skelton" <rhskelto@atm.ox.ac.uk> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.33.0206061044560.10439-100000@mulligan.atm.ox.ac.uk...

> I agree with Ben... I too use Martin's copy method and it works very
> well. It does have problems when you try and clone a class that has
> required positional parameters though as internally it relies on
> 'clone = obj_new(obj_class(self))'. My 'I do not have time to
> think about this now' solution was to make classes with no required
> positional parameters and write an 'isValid' method that ensures the
> object is correctly populated with 'quasi-required' parameters
> before it is used. Of course, failing to use positional arguments
> for required parameters goes against some well established IDL
> programming conventions and therefore tends to upset some of the IDL
> Expert Programmer's Association Executive Committee members ;)

Well, I can't comment on that since the IEPAEC has unaccountably
failed to invite me to join. But just to spin this thread out a little
longer, I would like to make a couple of observations:

- Few, if any, standard IDL classes require parameters during
initialisation
- Where standard IDL classes have positional parameters, they tend
to "echo" them with keyword parameters.

The first means that you can create a blank object then set its
properties later. Allowing for this is good OO practice IMHO. The
second lets you take advantage of the power of IDL's keyword handling
(inheritance, keyword-structure equivalence).

--

Mark Hadfield "Ka puwaha et tai nei, Hoea tatou"
m.hadfield@niwa.co.nz
National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)
