
Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure
Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Tue, 22 Jan 2013 17:41:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If "accidental" overwrites are that big of an issues for you, how come you are not checking that the file exists before you try to create it -- and thus clobber existing ones?

I agree it's an annoyance but it's a relatively standard requirement that the programmer be responsible for their output. Typically after the first time this sort of thing happens one changes one's programming habits to prevent further finger-burning.

I would most definitely not want the default behaviour to change since it's well established that the default behaviour is to clobber existing filenames of the same name. That sort of default pretty much crossing language boundaries too.

<tongue-in-cheek>

Maybe you should write your own save file creation wrapper with a

"do_what_I_mean"

keyword? And perhaps a

"ignore_what_I_ask_for_but_do_not_mean"

keyword for others?

</tongue-in-cheek>

:o)

cheers,

paulv

On 01/22/13 10:50, lefsky@gmail.com wrote:

> I've been wanting this for a while:

>

> Sometimes I type save and (for a variety of reasons) overwrite an old

> idslave file that I didn't want to overwrite. What I'd like to see is

> the default behavior include a query to the user if a) no filename is

> provided (i.e. the idlsave.dat file is going to be used) and b) the

> command is issued from the command line. This should prevent

> accidental over-writes but not impact program behavior.

>

> What would be the negative implications of such a change? Are others

> interested in this modification?

>

> Exelisvis: Is this possible?
