

---

Subject: Re: Core chat...

Posted by [mirek](#) on Thu, 25 Oct 2007 12:34:15 GMT

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

---

mdelfede wrote on Thu, 25 October 2007 08:06luzr 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...

Well, sometimes finding bugs IS tedious. But this one was the first `At` related I had to spend more than 10 minutes.

Quote:

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`.

Hey, think about it a little bit more. To make what you suggest work, `CheckSize` has to return a reference to contained element. So it behaves exactly the same as `At`.

Quote:

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.

Actually, would be a bit slower, as you get the variable address evaluated in the `At` once. Your version evaluates it twice (and in composition example, access the outer container twice too).

Mirek

---