
Subject: Re: Upp 2008.1beta2 v2 released
Posted by [mr_ped](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 07:33:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Thu, 10 April 2008 02:59mr_ped wrote on Tue, 08 April 2008 08:13
Also the -Wall switch for GCC throws many warnings in Core package, some of them can be easily fixed (like for example:
C:\upp\uppsrc/Core/Parser.h:2: warning: suggest parentheses around && within ||

Sorry. I am not gonna to fix this. I am no slave of some idiot who does not remember that && has higher priority than || and thus adds such idiotic warning.

What will be next? What about $(x * y) + 10$?

The whole purpose of operator priorities is to reduce the number of parenthesis. Do you really think this code is more readable

```
return ((c >= 'a') && (c <= 'z')) || ((c >= 'A') && (c <= 'Z')) || (c == '_');
```

??

Mirek

Actually, I'm one of those idiots, and I prefer exactly that return like you wrote it. I have 2 reasons to do so... from my historic experience I don't believe compilers (it's not like I hit a bug in them every month or so, actually probably less than 1 bug per year, but it made my faith gone), and for me it's easier to "parse" parentheses in head, than to think about interaction between operators, as the parentheses is one *single* rule, and there are *many* operators. I got so far that in my source I already see $((a * b) + c)$;

edit: but this is the least important "problem" from those I reported. Look rather at that weird LanguageInfo without return issue.
