Subject: Re: bitwise operators in IDL?
Posted by Craig Markwardt on Wed, 23 May 2001 18:19:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

JD Smith <jdsmith@astro.cornell.edu> writes:
> Marc Schellens wrote:
>> To late for short circuitry.
>> Consider a case when the second function in the if case
>> has a side effect (e.g. modifying a global variable).
>> After once defining the language this way, to change it
>> would mean to introduce incopatibility.
>
> Not if you introduce another operator set all together for short
> circuiting. People will use them increasingly, and AND,OR will go back
> to being used primarily for their bitwise function, as they should be.
> Sort of like C has "&&" and "&". I can't think of good replacement
> names (I assume RSI won't allow the sensible && and ||). Ideas? (ANDS?
> ORS?).
>
> JD

I like the idea of short-circuiting logical operators as well. Some time ago I proposed LAND and LOR (for Logical-AND and Logical-OR). Of course what do you do about backwards compatibility? Namely people who have written code with their own LAND or ANDS variables. Imagine this :-)

```
if LAND LAND 1 then ...
```

What would it mean?

Also, short-circuiting operators are not well-defined for vector operands. With vector operands it is possible in an element-by-element comparison for one element to evaluate true, while the other evaluates false. E.g.

```
if [1,1] LAND [0,1] then ...
```

So, both of these issues would at least have to be dealt with, and my guess is that the RSI folks will decide not to deal with it. Still, I think it's worth exploring.

Craig

--
Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@cow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response

---------- ----------