

Ruby - Feature #1432

decrement and increment

05/04/2009 07:19 PM - OlegPuchinin (Oleg Puchinin)

Status:	Rejected	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:		
Target version:		
Description =begin What about (C) ++/-- ? =end		

History

#1 - 05/04/2009 07:56 PM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

- Status changed from Open to Rejected

=begin

You can't define object-oriented semantics for increment/decrement operations. They are assignments in theory.

=end

#2 - 05/06/2009 11:02 AM - rogerdpack (Roger Pack)

=begin

at times I do miss the elegance of being able to do ++
though it does hide the fact that it's internally assignment. Primitives aren't quite as objecty as "normal" objects, so might be an appropriate fit. Just thinking out loud.

--r

=end

#3 - 05/06/2009 11:31 AM - brent (Brent Roman)

=begin

Why is

a+=1

less elegant than

++a

However, I admit that using

(x=a; a+=1; x)

to replace

a++

is pretty evil looking. (The postfix variants *are* a pain to emulate correctly)

Are there other commonly used languages besides 'C' that support the ++ and -- operators?

I always thought they were added to 'C' primarily to support efficient pointer arithmetic -- something quite foreign to Ruby.

- brent

Nobuyoshi Nakada-3 wrote:

Issue [#1432](#) has been updated by Roger Pack.

at times I do miss the elegance of being able to do ++
though it does hide the fact that it's internally assignment. Primitives
aren't quite as objecty as "normal" objects, so might be an appropriate
fit. Just thinking out loud.

-==r

<http://redmine.ruby-lang.org/issues/show/1432>

<http://redmine.ruby-lang.org>

--

View this message in context: <http://www.nabble.com/-ruby-core%3A23357---Feature--1432--decrement-and-increment-tp23366229p23399031.html>
Sent from the ruby-core mailing list archive at Nabble.com.

=end

#4 - 05/09/2009 12:33 PM - rogerdpack (Roger Pack)

=begin

yeah ++ is the one I miss.

-==r

=end

#5 - 05/09/2009 08:42 PM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

=begin

Hi,

In message "Re: [\[ruby-core:23405\]](#) Re: [Feature [#1432](#)] decrement and increment"
on Sat, 9 May 2009 15:38:53 +0900, "C.E. Thornton" admin@hawthorne-press.com writes:

[The question comes down to this:

|

| Are we going to allow "Syntactic Sugar" of this
| sort into Ruby? We already do in sense - By allowing
| more than one way to do things in most situations.

The answer is

we have to mind to add sugars easily

just because syntax sugar is modifying the syntax, and you have to be
slow to modify the syntax.

If we decide to add this particular sugar after serious consideration,
the following question arise:

what is the result of "syntax sugar" conversion. simple += 1 is
suffice, or no?

matz.

=end