Subject: Re: Rect_ operators overloading suggestion
Posted by mirek on Sat, 05 Jan 2008 10:33:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

chickenk wrote on Fri, 04 January 2008 12:25I would like to make a suggestion. I may have missed an important point so my suggestion would not make sense; don't hesitate to blame me for that.

I can see these overloads:
Rect_& operator+=(Sz sz){ Offset(sz); return *this; }
Rect_& operator+=(Pt p) { Offset(p); return *this; }
[...]
Rect_& operator-=(Sz sz){ Offset(-sz); return *this; }
Rect_& operator-=(Pt p) { Offset(-p); return *this; }
I agree with the Pt-argumented functions but I think it would make more sense for Sz-argumented functions to modify the size of the Rectangle instead of translating it...

For example, the following code could be used (I've not tested it):
Rect_& operator+=(Sz sz){ SetSize(Size()+sz); return *this; }
[...]
Rect_& operator-=(Sz sz){ SetSize(Size()-sz); return *this; }
What do you think about it ?

regards,
Lionel

I think this classically ambiguos case.... I see good reasons for current overload as well for the proposed one...

Mirek