
Subject: Re: Dumb Dumb Question

Posted by [Richard G. French](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

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

> Does this mean no IDL procedure will ever work if one keyword is a left
> substring of another keyword? Can I force IDL to interpret the "x" as "x"
> and not an ambiguous abbreviation for "x2"?
>
> --

I KNEW that I had run into this problem awhile ago, and I posted something about it, but I did not realize at the time that the problem was the left substring. I'm quite sure this is what happened to me. Thanks for restoring my sanity on this one, since I could not find the code segment that had caused the problem and I was unable to reproduce it.

Dick French
Wellesley College

Subject: Re: Dumb Dumb Question

Posted by [davidf](#) on Tue, 17 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

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

Colin Rosenthal (rosentha@asp.hao.ucar.edu) writes:

> This may be really stupid, but is there a way around the following
> feature:
>
> pro x_test,x=x,x2=x2
> if n_elements(x) ne 0 then print, 'x=',x
> if n_elements(x2) ne 0 then print, 'x2=',x2
> end
>
> when I run it with
>> x_test,x=1
> I get
> % Ambiguous keyword abbreviation: X.
> % Execution halted at: \$MAIN\$
>
> Does this mean no IDL procedure will ever work if one keyword is a left
> substring of another keyword? Can I force IDL to interpret the "x" as "x"
> and not an ambiguous abbreviation for "x2"?

As far as I know, there is no way around this. But would you believe that with as many IDL programs as I've written, I've only run into this problem a handful of times. (But once last week, as a matter of fact.)

Cheers,

David

Subject: Re: Dumb Dumb Question

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

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

Liam Gumley <Liam.Gumley@ssec.wisc.edu> writes:

>
>
> "When calling a routine with a keyword parameter, you can abbreviate the
> keyword to its shortest, unambiguous abbreviation".
>
> Cheers,
> Liam.
>

I have been bitten by this alot. I have often wanted to have keywords like TIME, TIMEBIN, TIMECOL in the same procedure. For some reason it's perfectly legal to compile such a procedure, but I can never use the "TIME" keyword because it's ambiguous.

I would much prefer that the IDL byte compiler would issue a *warning* when an ambiguity like that appears. I think that when a procedure is called with "TIME=xxx", and that exact keyword exists, then there should be no ambiguity.

Craig

--

Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@astro.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: Dumb Dumb Question

Posted by [Liam Gumley](#) on Wed, 18 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT

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

Colin Rosenthal wrote:

>
> This may be really stupid, but is there a way around the following
> feature:

```

>
> pro x_test,x=x,x2=x2
>   if n_elements(x) ne 0 then print, 'x=',x
>   if n_elements(x2) ne 0 then print, 'x2=',x2
> end
>
> when I run it with
>> x_test,x=1
> I get
> % Ambiguous keyword abbreviation: X.
> % Execution halted at: $MAIN$
>
> Does this mean no IDL procedure will ever work if one keyword is a left
> substring of another keyword? Can I force IDL to interpret the "x" as "x"
> and not an ambiguous abbreviation for "x2"?

```

According to the IDL 5.1 online help under 'Building IDL Applications | Defining Procedures and Functions | Parameters', it says

"When calling a routine with a keyword parameter, you can abbreviate the keyword to its shortest, unambiguous abbreviation".

Cheers,
Liam.

Liam E. Gumley
Space Science and Engineering Center, UW-Madison
1225 W. Dayton St., Madison WI 53706, USA
Phone (608) 265-5358, Fax (608) 262-5974
<http://cimss.ssec.wisc.edu/~gumley>

Subject: Re: Dumb Dumb Question
Posted by [Martin Schultz](#) on Thu, 19 Nov 1998 08:00:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Craig Markwardt wrote:

```

> Liam Gumley <Liam.Gumley@ssec.wisc.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>> "When calling a routine with a keyword parameter, you can abbreviate the
>> keyword to its shortest, unambiguous abbreviation".
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Liam.
>>

```

>
> I have been bitten by this alot. I have often wanted to have keywords
> like TIME, TIMEBIN, TIMECOL in the same procedure. For some reason
> it's perfectly legal to compile such a procedure, but I can never use
> the "TIME" keyword because it's ambiguous.
>
> I would much prefer that the IDL byte compiler would issue a *warning*
> when an ambiguity like that appears. I think that when a procedure is
> called with "TIME=xxx", and that exact keyword exists, then there
> should be no ambiguity.
>
> Craig
>
> --
> -----
> Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@astro.physics.wisc.edu
> Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
> -----

I fully agree! I always run into this problem when I try to specify a PS
keyword to turn postscript output on and a PSFILENAME keyword to direct it
into a specific file....

Martin.

--

Dr. Martin Schultz
Department for Engineering&Applied Sciences, Harvard University
109 Pierce Hall, 29 Oxford St., Cambridge, MA-02138, USA

phone: (617)-496-8318
fax : (617)-495-4551

e-mail: mgs@io.harvard.edu
Internet-homepage: <http://www-as.harvard.edu/people/staff/mgs/>
