

---

Subject: Re: wrapper functions

Posted by [Dominic Metzger](#) on Fri, 06 Oct 2006 21:06:41 GMT

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

---

Hey Ken,

Yeah, I am still trying to find a solution that will allow my to write more or less completely transparent wrappers. Not quite there yet... or in other words havent figured out to what extend this is possible or not.

thanks for your input!

dometz

Kenneth Bowman wrote:

> In article <MPG.1f8f75b654670c76989d07@news.frii.com>,

> David Fanning <davidf@dfanning.com> wrote:

>

>> Kenneth P. Bowman writes:

>>

>>> I find that N\_PARAMS() with SWITCH is very handy for setting defaults in

>>> procedures where optional positional parameters make sense.

>>>

>>> PRO BLAH, A, B, C

>>>

>>> SWITCH N\_PARAMS() OF

>>> 0 : A = ...

>>> 1 : B = ...

>>> 2 : C = ...

>>> ENDSWITCH

>>

>> In thinking about it, I guess I use N\_ELEMENTS for

>> all my parameters because I can throw better errors

>> since I know \*exactly\* which parameter is missing:

>

> As I said, this is only useful in cases where optional positional parameters

> makes sense. That is, where some positional parameters are optional AND they

> have a logical ordering such that you can pass A, or A and B, or A and B and C,

> but not A and C or B and C. In that case, keyword parameters make more sense.

>

> And, of course, KEYWORD\_SET should only be used with binary keyword parameters,

> that is, parameters that are set like this: /KEYWORD.

>

> Ken