
Subject: Re: Name of arrays

Posted by [Paul Van Delst\[1\]](#) on Tue, 21 Feb 2012 22:35:53 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning wrote:

> Paul van Delst writes:

>

>> But, to get back to David's original point, one should
>> not treat syntactic sugar with disdain. IMO, for the 99.9%
>> of programmers out there (most definitely including moi),
>> a fancy interface for pointers -- that does not expose the
>> pointer-y-ness -- is **exactly** what is needed (I cringe
>> when I look at some of my older widget programs...).

>>

>> Long live the hash().

>

> I'm not sure the correct term for people who desire syntactic
> sugariness is "programmer". "Scientist", more like. ;-)

au contraire, mon ami.

Increased productivity has to come from somewhere. My (almost completely vicarious) experience with the harder core programmer-y types is that if a language provides the mechanism to express something in fewer keystrokes, it will catch on.

Look at ruby. (although the fun-ness factor shouldn't be brushed off).

Mind you, the use of an editor that is language-aware, in the hands of a master, is something to behold. I watched a web video once of a guy demonstrating how easy it was to set up a ruby application using rails. He hardly had to type more than two/three characters of the reserved words before they auto-completed. Five minutes later, he had a functioning blogging site set up, hooked into a database, accepted comments, etc. Coded from scratch. Took my breath away.... and made the fancy piece of paper from the university that is hanging on my wall seem, uh, not so special. :o)

cheers,

paulv
