
Subject: Re: Optional parameters

Posted by [Pavel Romashkin](#) on Tue, 24 Feb 2004 21:45:09 GMT

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

And what exactly would be the purpose of such sequence of calls, other than actually trying to *define* foo in the first function call? If I didn't need foo re-defined, I'd not even mention it on the first line.

So this *is* the case for 3 copy-paste calls, I guess :-)

I never tried to use keywords for this sort of creative purposes. If I have a large dataset I don't want to re-compute, I keep it in a pointer (or object, allright, David? :-) and I try to always know when it gets passed into a function to avoid redefinition and other mishaps.

After all, how is this behavior different than simply

```
foo = 100 ; foo is now defined, too...
```

If we did want to get funny I suppose we could try

```
a=myfunc(test,FUNNY_VARIABLE=[foo]) ; foo didn't change
```

but if foo is BIG, we'd get a dramatic slowdown.

Pavel

JD Smith wrote:

>

> I'd offer another real life example where read-write keyword variables
> can get you into trouble. When you call a function several times in a
> row, expecting the same results each time, but in actuality the
> keyword variable is defined after the first invocation, which can
> change the function's behavior:

>

```
> a=myfunc(test,FUNNY_VARIABLE=foo) ; foo undefined
```

```
> a=myfunc(test,FUNNY_VARIABLE=foo) ; foo defined
```

```
> a=myfunc(test,FUNNY_VARIABLE=foo) ; foo defined
```

>

> For this reason, I try to make keywords either exclusively read
> (i.e. pass in a value), or exclusively write (i.e. return a value),
> and not both. It is rather convenient, though, to append a keyword
> for the sole purpose of keeping some expensive-to-compute data around
> between calls to the function: this is usually where I get tripped up.

>

> JD
