
Subject: Re: Undocumented functions in IDL
Posted by [wlandsman](#) on Fri, 01 Mar 2013 04:30:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thursday, February 28, 2013 10:52:42 PM UTC-5, timoth...@gmail.com wrote:

> ; The reason for doing this is so that if a user has their own
>
> ; STRSPLIT in their local user library, their version will superceed
>
> ; this one. RSI does not recommend this practice, but it is
>
> ; allowed for backwards compatability reasons. ...
>
>
>
> This seems a bit messy.

It's definitely messy, but I am not aware of other examples like it,. Thirteen years ago, RSI was overeager to respond to a user complaint that the new STRSPLIT function name stepped on an existing user function name. The solution of having a STRSPLIT wrapper around a new intrinsic function STRTOK() made things permanently more messy, but the mistake has not been repeated as far as I know.

But the situation could startle a user, unaware of the undocumented STRTOK(), who wrote a simple function

```
function strtok,x  
return,x  
end
```

and then finds

```
IDL> print,strtok(3)  
7
```

I'll leave the question of why strtok(3) -- or strsplit(3) -- has a value of 7 as an exercise for the reader.

--Wayne
