
Subject: Re: Bug in N_PARAMS?

Posted by [Kenneth P. Bowman](#) on Tue, 25 Nov 2008 14:29:28 GMT

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

In article <MPG.2394d6a934f41609989775@news.giganews.com>,

David Fanning <news@dfanning.com> wrote:

> Kenneth P. Bowman writes:

>

>> I have been having some very odd problems with the N_PARAMS function lately.

>> ...

>> Am I missing something obvious here?

>

> N_PARAMS only tells you *how many* parameters the

> command is called with. It tells you nothing about

> the *type* of the parameter. Since "undefined" is

> a valid variable type in IDL, it is possible to

> pass an "undefined" variable and have it counted

> as a passed *number* of variables by N_PARAMS.

>

> If you are concerned with if a variable is undefined

> or not, you can't use N_PARAMS to determine this. The

> only way to tell is to use N_ELEMENTS.

Ah. That significantly restricts the utility of

SWITCH N_PARAMS() OF

0 : ...

ENDSWITCH

to provide default values for optional parameters. I suppose that is the only way it could work with positional parameters, as you might have an undefined parameter in the middle of the list.

Ken
