

Subject: More information about GET_COMMAND[_ARGUMENT] failure
From: Van Snyder
References: J3-029, 04-352, 04-400

1 **1 Number**

2 TBD

3 **2 Title**

4 More information about GET_COMMAND[_ARGUMENT] failure.

5 **3 Submitted By**

6 J3

7 **4 Status**

8 For consideration.

9 **5 Basic Functionality**

10 Provide more information if GET_COMMAND or GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT fails.

11 **6 Rationale**

12 It would be useful to know more precisely why GET_COMMAND or GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT
13 fails.

14 **7 Estimated Impact**

15 Trivial for standard, probably trivial-to-small for processors. Estimated at meeting 169 to be at 3 on
16 the JKR scale.

17 **8 Detailed Specification**

18 Set the STATUS argument of GET_COMMAND to -2 if the processor does not support the concept of
19 a command line.

20 Set the STATUS argument of GET_COMMAND_ARGUMENT to -2 if the value of the NUMBER
21 argument is negative or more than the number of command arguments.

22 **8.1 Suggested edits**

23 The following suggested edits give an idea of the effect on the standard.

24 [Editor: Within the description of the STATUS argument in 13.7.41, replace “a processor-dependent ... 317:17
25 fails” by “the value -2 if the processor does not support the concept of a command line. It is assigned
26 a processor-dependent positive value if the command retrieval fails for any other reason”.]

27 [Editor: Within the description of the STATUS argument in 13.7.42, insert “It is assigned the value -2 318:6
28 if NUMBER is negative or greater than the number of command arguments.” after “NUMBER.” Insert
29 “for any other reason” after “fails”.]

30 **9 History**

04-352 m169
04-400 m170