
Subject: Re: Core chat...

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 12:06:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Thu, 25 October 2007 05:33

Consider composition `a.At(x).At(y)...` It can become tedious.

yes, but finding `At()` kind of bugs can be even more tedious...

There you could write :

```
a.CheckSize(x).CheckSize(y);  
a[x][y];
```

if `[]` operators can be joined, if not

```
a.CheckSize(x).CheckSize(y);  
a.At(x).At(y)
```

You need only `CheckSize` to return a reference to array `a` as usual in `upp`.

Quote:

Also, this is not the only place you need be aware of the problem:

```
a.Add() = a[0];
```

That could be solved with a construct like

```
a.Dup(0);
```

where `Dup()` should have an obvious function.or

```
a.Grow(1);  
a.Last() = a[0]
```

for example, or something similar. The point is to avoid potentially dangerous cases.

Of course, all that cost something in term of code lines, (besides the `Dup()` example...) but nothing in terms of code speed, but avoids many possible caveats.

I **do not** criticize retourning references, that's needed for speed sakes, but I think a generic class like an array should make potentially dangerous constructs impossible.

Ciao

Max
