

## Re: FAQ 1.12--auto keyword

---

*Source:* [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-04/msg01023.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-04/msg01023.html)

---

- *From:* [mwojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mwojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Michael Wojcik)
  - *Date:* 11 Apr 2006 14:02:37 GMT
- 

In article <443ba09c.512134160@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, [rlb@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rlb@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Richard Bos) writes:

[mwojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mwojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx) (Michael Wojcik) wrote:

That, to me, is a more significant feature of nested functions than their limited scope, which I imagine is what would justify yet another application of "static".

Yes, but re-using "static" for purposes only tangentially related to those it had before is Traditional.

True – Seeb's Principle probably applies to extensions as well as revisions of the standard. (And there's also Dennis' story of prenatal new-keyword trauma...)

Though to be honest I think reusing any of the existing keywords was a bad idea; if they want to invent a new language, they should invent a new language.

I agree. But that would not be as kewl as claiming you've written a C compiler.

I suppose not. There does seem to be (or at least have been) a fair bit of "133t ski11z" sentiment among the GCC contributors. Could it be that Stallman encouraged that?

—

Michael Wojcik [michael.wojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:michael.wojcik@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)

As always, great patience and a clean work area are required for fulfillment of this diversion, and it should not be attempted if either are compromised.

— Chris Ware

Re: FAQ 1.12--auto keyword