

---

Subject: Re: Ambiguous keyword abbreviation error  
Posted by [Rick Towler](#) on Wed, 12 Sep 2007 16:27:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lajos, why aren't you working for ITT? Boulder is very nice.

Who am I kidding. Boulder is nice but it can't compete with Budapest.  
:) Maybe you can telecommute?

-r

Fig 1/2LDY Lajos wrote:

```
>
> On Wed, 12 Sep 2007, David Fanning wrote:
>
>> Conor writes:
>>
>>> You would think that since the keyword I'm using exactly
>>> matches an actual keyword, IDL could figure out that I'm referencing
>>> that keyword, rather than using an abbreviation.
>>
>> What algorithm would you use to do that? How could
>> you do it unambiguously?
>>
>> Cheers,
>>
>> David
>>
>
> FL does exactly this. The interpreter searches for an exact match first,
> and looks for abbreviations only if an exact match can not be found.
>
> Eg. let's have a simple procedure:
>
> pro INT, long=l32, long64=l64
> end
>
> Now INT can be called succesfully with keywords LONG, LONG6 or LONG64,
> only L, LO and LON will fail.
>
> regards,
> lajos
>
```

---