

## Re: pattern equality test?

**Source:** <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/General/comp.programming/2004-03/1518.html>

---

**From:** Arthur J. O'Dwyer ([ajo\\_at\\_nospam.andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:ajo_at_nospam.andrew.cmu.edu))

**Date:** 03/19/04

Date: Thu, 18 Mar 2004 20:36:12 -0500 (EST)

On Fri, 19 Mar 2004, Michael Mendelsohn wrote:

>  
> *"Arthur J. O'Dwyer" schrieb:*  
> >  
> > *I was going to post code, but when I started writing the code was*  
> > *when I found the bugs in my algorithm. And now that I've clarified*  
> > *the algorithm, the code is trivial enough to make it not worth my*  
> > *while. ;-)*  
>  
> *Personally, I like explanations of algorithms better than unexplained*  
> *code (which is likely not what you intended to do, but I've been*  
> *thinking about this, and you gave me the opportunity to say it). I*  
> *realize this is not comp.explanations, but rather comp.programming, but*  
> *after all it's supposed to be neither language nor OS-specific, and some*  
> *C code that gets posted is pretty language specific (using array index*  
> *-1, for example)...*

That's not specific to C --- it's not even part of C! :) I agree with you that explanations are usually more useful to a wider audience, and more fun to read; but it's easier to test a piece of C code than a paragraph of English. ;-) Also, code is less ambiguous than English. If I'd just dumped two pages of C code on the newsgroup, instead of my algorithm in English, you wouldn't have needed me to clarify what I meant by two prefixes' "matching," for example.

-Arthur