Subject: Re: IDL killer
Posted by marc schellens[1] on Mon, 14 Mar 2005 15:56:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

David Fanning wrote:
> m_schellens@hotmail.com writes:
>
>> ++(((a=1))=3)
>
> I think it must be a general rule by now that any time
> you fail to have a LHS of an expression in IDL (by, for
> example, putting the RHS in parentheses and thereby
> making it a temporary variable) there is an excellent
> chance you will crash IDL. Just on the face of it,
> I would guess there must be an almost unlimited
> number of these expressions.

Well, I am sure it also crashes with other values,
what makes it almost infinite :-)

But here we DON'T fail to have a LHS!

```
IDL> help,(((a=1))=3)
A               INT      =       3
```

> I'm not so sure this is a bug as much as it is a peek
> into the underlying structure of the IDL code. In any
> case, I'm not surprised by it any longer.

Even though I would call it a bug, there is hardly a
case where such a construct would make sense (please post
whoever can think of one).
Generally assignment expressions shouldn't be alowed on LHS
of expressions.

Ah, did I mention that GDL (http://gnudatalanguage.sf.net)
refuses them, but does not crash :-)

Cheers,
marc