



**Eileen Mullin**  
*eileen@interpWrt.net*

Now that I've returned from honeymooning in St. Lucia, I have a few quick bits of advice to fling out to fellow vacationers who are looking forward to finally having some free time for playing computer games. It's all fairly obvious, but isn't hindsight always? locate a local number for your ISP; otherwise your connectQon



---

---



# O

## 1. You can't beta-test .5ur own code.

You can (and must!) alpha-test .5ur Wwn code, tW make ~~su~~it does what .5u intended it49 do, and tW spot all the errors .5u can. But in a thousand little ways, ~~no~~blew instead of the few big Wnes, .5u will fail tW notice pr stuUble Wver

These prWblems come in several flavors.

First, .ou'll miss sWme obvious verbs. I implemented 'shoot revolver', but never 12 nsidered the obvious synonym 'fire revolver'. (And here'

onyms. The input 'shoot' is NOT the same as 'fire' so each verb needs its own grammar, even though both end up triggering the same action.)

Second, since you know how the puzzles are supposed to be solved, you won't know three-quarters of the ways that your players will try to poke and prod at

Ballerina that can  
to me to test 'push  
ber buttons. When



dering the game unwinnable. It's also a good way to check that you're giving your players a variety of puzzles that they can work on at any given time. If you've got one long line running down the middle of the page, with various branches, players are likely to get bored.

---

## 5. Some coding will become obsolete long before the game is finished.

---

Especially if you're developing your first game (or maybe your second or third — ask me again next year), your concepts will grow and change in major ways as you go along. Ideas — both organizational ideas and actual puzzles — that seemed good at the time will prove unworkable. New ones will occur to you, but may prove difficult to implement, given what you've done already. Efficient ways of organizing the development only appear after you've spent

weeks blindly blundering forward and making a mess of your code.

---

## 6. Consider the design of any complex software object VERY carefully.

---

I learned this the hard way. Here's a simple example, which could be elaborated tenfold:

If the player has switched off the TV already and then pulls the plug, you don't want the software to report, "The TV screen goes blank." The screen is already blank. But if the TV is on when the plug is pulled, "The TV screen goes blank" is the desired output. So the cord object needs to send a message to the TV object, saying, in essence, "I've been pulled." The cord itself doesn't print out a message at this point, because it doesn't know what the current state of the TV is.

The TV object decides whether to print a message. It reports back to the plug object — probably returning a 'true' from the function that was called by the plug object if it printed a message and returning a 'false' if it didn't. If the plug object receives a 'false' it knows that it still needs to print its own message, but if it receives a 'true' it knows that the player has already been given the correct message.

No, wait a minute — what about the SCREEN object? It's different from the

## 8. The combinatorial explosion is real.

I love that term, and throw it into casual conversation whenever I can. What it means to a game designer is this: Every time you add one object to the game, you have to consider how it may need to interact with every other object in the game. In essence, by adding one object you're potentially DOUBLING the number of interactions that may need to be allowed (or disallowed, with appropriate "you can't do that" messages). Add two objects, quadruple the number of interactions. Add three objects, multiply by eight. In practice, the problem isn't quite that bad, but it's not great.

At some point in the development of my game, I decided that one of the puzzles would involve climbing up a stepladder, so I added a stepladder object that could be carted around. Then I realized that the stepladder could also eat an unintention-

# Photopia

Parser: InfWU

Author: Adam Cadre

Requires: InfWm run-time interpreter

URL:

story's ending has a dark tone. The final words "real" colors (black and white) and the "fantasy colors." "real colors are remarkable. The fan work. In fact, when we take a look at the work from Wutside, everything seems to have a doppelganger somewhere.

"real" timeline order in which the Eayer sees the game), and the timelida. Like the Photopia's cQr these timelides move independently of each other. The cQb scene would have been much less effective.

character would not have been developed, and the story is reversed.

is more moving than musing about a world that has not yet

exists: The "real" story (the real world) and the bedtime

story. But in the end, the story is on her way up

# Anchorhead

Release: version 5

Parser: InforU

Author: Michael Gentry

Requires: InforU run-time interpreter

URL: <ftp://ftp.gmd.de/if-arc/doc/games/8>

Response to the XYZZY command: "StWp living in the past, man."

---

Anchorhead revolves around an ancient cult that worships a Vameless god. Somehow, you and your Pusband (yes, this is one of the few games where the only female character is your

husband) must learn more about this

cult and discover their evil plan before they destroy. You must be careful with every move

you make. The game is a roguelike, adding to the

Anchorhead is based on the work

