

# Re: Spelling Error Fequency

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Word/microsoft.public.word.vba.general/2005-04/msg00163.html>

---

- *From:* "Jezebel" <[warcimes@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:warcimes@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 3 Apr 2005 12:43:46 +1000
- 

Don't be too concerned about it, Greg. Bubble sort is the worst of methods in that it uses the highest number of processing steps for the number of elements to be sorted; on the other hand it is simple and doesn't require a lot of code. For relatively small lists (such as, one hopes, your list of spelling errors) it is not as unreasonable a choice as Howard suggests.

"Greg" <[gmaxey@xxxxxxx](mailto:gmaxey@xxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:1112491226.502254.112540@xx](mailto:news:1112491226.502254.112540@xx)  
> Howard,  
>  
> Is there supposed to be code somewhere on that page for the methode of  
> sorting that you recommend that I used in place of "Bubble" sort? If  
> there is, I didn't see any.  
>

- 
- *Follow-Ups:*
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Greg Maxey
  - *References:*
    - ◆ ***Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Greg Maxey
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Jezebel
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Greg Maxey
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Jezebel
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Howard Kaikow
    - ◆ ***Re: Spelling Error Fequency***
      - ◇ *From:* Greg

Re: Spelling Error Fequency

- Prev by Date: [\*Re: Macros Disabled in Word 2003\*](#)
- Next by Date: [\*Re: Spelling Error Fequency\*](#)
- Previous by thread: [\*Re: Spelling Error Fequency\*](#)
- Next by thread: [\*Re: Spelling Error Fequency\*](#)
- Index(es):
  - ◆ [\*Date\*](#)
  - ◆ [\*Thread\*](#)