# CoCoALib - Design #1467

# Change syntax apply(phi,M) into phi(M)?

22 Jun 2020 10:39 - John Abbott

Status:	Closed	Start date:	22 Jun 2020	
Priority:	Normal	Due date:		
Assignee:	John Abbott	% Done:	100%	
Category:	Improving	Estimated time:	2.01 hours	
Target version:	CoCoALib-0.99800	Spent time:	1.95 hour	
Description				
Currently to apply a	RingHom to the entries of a matrix	or a C++ vector we must use the	fn <b>apply</b> .	
Is it better to use sim	pler notation where the RingHom	can be applied directly: <i>e.g.</i> phi(M	) or phi(v)?	
		can be applied directly: <i>e.g.</i> phi(M	) or phi(v)?	
Pros and cons? Opi	nions?	can be applied directly: <i>e.g.</i> phi(M	) or phi(v)?	
Pros and cons? Opi Relevant source file	nions?	can be applied directly: <i>e.g.</i> phi(M	) or phi(v)?	
Pros and cons? Opi Relevant source file Related issues:	nions?	can be applied directly: <i>e.g.</i> phi(M	) or phi(v)?	16 Jun 2021
Pros and cons? Opi Relevant source file Related issues: Related to CoCoALib -	nions? is apply.H			16 Jun 2021 10 Jun 2021

#### History

## #1 - 22 Jun 2020 10:44 - John Abbott

I noticed this while making a prototype impl for automatic ringelem promotion. In particular for ringelem times matrix the code ended up like this (!!!note!!! the code has changed slightly due to issue #635)

```
const RingHom promote = AutomaticConversionHom(Rx,R,"RingElem*Mat");
if (codomain(promote) == Rx)
return x * apply(promote,M);
return promote(x) * M;
```

It would be slightly neater if I could write promote(M) instead of apply(promote,M).

A feature of writing apply(...) is that it is obvious to the reader that M is not a plain ringelem (but that ought to be clear anyway).

At the moment, it seems to me to be "useless clutter". Some might argue that applying a ringhom directly to a matrix is an "abuse of notation" (but it is also clear, unambiguous and compact...)

NOTE aha! I see that CoCoA-5 wants to use apply when applying a ringhom to MAT, LIST or RINGELEM (why this last one???)

#### #2 - 22 Jun 2020 10:54 - John Abbott

- Status changed from New to In Progress

#### - % Done changed from 0 to 10

We could permit both syntaxes, perhaps making **apply(...)** obsolescent? [JAA does not much like having two different but semantically equivalent syntaxes]

Or we could change CoCoA-5 too? Making apply(...) there obsolescent?

Opinions?

## #3 - 22 Jun 2020 11:00 - John Abbott

- Description updated

# #4 - 29 Oct 2020 13:35 - John Abbott

- Target version changed from CoCoALib-0.99800 to CoCoALib-0.99850

## #5 - 02 Aug 2021 09:53 - John Abbott

- Related to Bug #1601: Compilation ambiguity added

## #6 - 04 Oct 2021 11:50 - John Abbott

- Assignee set to John Abbott

- % Done changed from 10 to 90

#### In the end my hand was forced.

Some future version of C++ (maybe C++17?) defines a template fn **apply** which matches better than the CoCoA fns; there really seemed to be no way to make C++ use the CoCoA fns, so compilation failed. Perhaps the problem could be resolved using C++20 (with restrictions on when templates will match)? Anyway, not practicable at the moment.

So I have removed **apply** from CoCoALib, and changed all code which used it. Everything compiles, and all tests pass.

Moving to "feedback".

#### #7 - 17 Feb 2022 19:33 - John Abbott

- Target version changed from CoCoALib-0.99850 to CoCoALib-0.99800

## #8 - 18 Feb 2022 15:02 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Related to Feature #1598: RingHom: implement phi(X) as apply(phi, X) also for X vector and matrix added

## #9 - 18 Feb 2022 15:03 - Anna Maria Bigatti

This issue overlaps with Feature #1598.

## #10 - 18 Feb 2022 15:04 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Related to Design #1615: apply: remove for RingHom added

## #11 - 18 Feb 2022 15:24 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Status changed from In Progress to Closed

- % Done changed from 90 to 100
- Estimated time set to 2.01 h