## Subject: Re: N\_ELEMENTS and WHERE: Scalar or Array? Posted by wmc on Wed, 03 Feb 1999 08:00:00 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Stein Vidar Hagfors Haugan <steinhh@ulrik.uio.no> wrote:

- > In article <36b5d66b.0@news.nwl.ac.uk> wmc@bas.ac.uk writes:
- >> If this is necessary for legacy reasons, it might be possible to make
- >> () and [] behave differently in this case? Possibly a missed
- >> opportunity when [] came in!
- > How'bout {}?:-) I'm not \*just\* kidding. [] work as both array
- > constructors and indexing brackets, so {} could work as both
- > structure constructors and indexing brackets..

Hmm, having three different sorts of brackets to make arrays is a bit of overkill. Anyway, {} might be needed for associative arrays one day!

```
>>> array[NaN] = 5 ; Would be allowed, but does nothing >>
```

- >> This could well be possible as an easy-to-do work-around. In that
- >> case, where would have to return NaN not -1.
- > (Yes though with a WHERE(.../nan) switch)

Hmm, that would be acceptable. Or an nwhere function (a bit less typing).

- >> Incidentally, I've just realised how dangerous the out-of-bounds stuff
- >> is:
- >>
- >> array([where(array eq false)])='stoat'
- >>
- >> assigns to the first element...
- > And you can \*bet\* some program(mer)s out there are counting on
- > exactly this as a \*feature\*! Sorry to say so, but...that's why
- > you'd have to introduce a keyword switch in WHERE.

Well, they are very silly people then. Does anyone on this newsgroup want to confess to using this "feature"?

-W.

\_\_

William M Connolley | wmc@bas.ac.uk | http://www.nbs.ac.uk/public/icd/wmc/Climate Modeller, British Antarctic Survey | Disclaimer: I speak for myself