

---

Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure  
Posted by [Carsten Lechte](#) on Tue, 22 Jan 2013 16:10:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On 22/01/13 16:50, lefsky@gmail.com wrote:

> 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 [...]

I would suggest that instead of adding interactivity where previously there was none, idl rename the old file (e.g. to idlsave-001.dat, -002.dat etc.) before writing the new.

This will placate the users who do a little type-ahead on their command lines and expect their commands to be obeyed without question. It will anger the users whose disks are filled up with unwanted savefile backups.

chl

---

---

Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure  
Posted by [Phillip Bitzer](#) on Tue, 22 Jan 2013 16:51:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

How about rolling your own? This certainly not complete, but feel free to change/modify/improve from here. Right now, it just tests if the file exists and issues an error. (BTW, you'll need Coyote's Error\_message.pro to run it...or you could change the error handler).

Cheers,  
Phillip

PRO mysave, var1, var2, var3, \_extra = extra

compile\_opt idl2

```
;error catcher:
CATCH, theError
IF theError NE 0 THEN BEGIN
  CATCH, /cancel
  ok = ERROR_MESSAGE(TRACEBACK=1, QUIET=1)
  RETURN
ENDIF
```

```
IF N_TAGS(extra) NE 0 THEN BEGIN ;make sure some keywords were defined
  ind = WHERE(STREGEX(TAG_NAMES(extra), '^f', /FOLD_CASE, /EXTRACT), count) ;find the
  filename tag
```

```
file = extra.(ind)
ENDIF ELSE file = 'idlsave.dat' ;this is the default of IDL's SAVE pro

IF FILE_TEST(file) THEN MESSAGE, 'File exists!'

save, var1, var2, var3, _extra=extra

END

;main level program for testing:
a = findgen(10)

mysave, a, f='hello.sav', /var

END
```

---

---

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?

---

Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure  
Posted by [lefsky@gmail.com](mailto:lefsky@gmail.com) on Tue, 22 Jan 2013 19:36:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

This has only happened to me 4 or 5 times and the sequence usually looks like this:

It's late at night  
I have a workspace with large variables to save  
A process is running  
I want to clear that process off as soon as possible because it is using so much memory.

So I type save, and then exit on the command line. (Stupid- but remember it's late at night and I want to get out of the office)

Then the process I'm running dies (inevitably this is a new error)  
And "save and exit" are run  
Leaving me with the variables that exist within the function  
Not the ones I wanted.

If this (or something similar) has never happened to you in some part of your life- congratulations.

For the rest of us, an interactive save function would be nice. Perhaps this could be implemented with a system variable that we can set from our startup scripts.

M

---

Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure  
Posted by [Haje Korth](#) on Tue, 22 Jan 2013 21:19:34 GMT

Sounds like a can of worms to me if command behavior from the command line is different from that executed in code. I would not touch that. Just my 2 cents.

On Tuesday, January 22, 2013 10:50:43 AM UTC-5, lef...@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 idsave.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?

---

Subject: Re: Requested change to "SAVE" procedure  
Posted by [Matthew](#) on Wed, 23 Jan 2013 17:33:07 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?

The SAVE command works without any arguments. If SAVE is called without arguments, I would assume that the user wants a new file, not to overwrite existing files. In this case, a '-001' appended to the filename seems like the right move. Either that, or make FILENAME required.

If SAVE is called with the FILENAME keyword, then clobbering should take place. It is definitely the user's fault this time.

My two cents...

---