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## History

\#1-08 Oct 2020 14:02-John Abbott

- Related to Feature \#657: use command, ring syntax, RingOf added


## \#2-08 Oct 2020 14:02-John Abbott

- Related to Feature \#1003: New syntax for creating poly rings? added


## \#3-08 Oct 2020 14:11-John Abbott

We discussed this over lunch today.
JAA thinks that this is not incompatible with \#657.
Which term order should be used in the implicitly created ring $\mathrm{QQ}[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}]$ ?
JAA thinks the default order can be used; if the user really wants to specify some other order then the current "cumbersome" approach can be used.

If we want to implement this then we must change the parser/interpreter... ouch!
Relevant places in the source code are:
Parser.C: 356 inside parseUseStatement
Parser.C: 1397 inside parseFunBodyStatement
Parser.C: 1428 inside parseRingDefinition
Looks pretty scary to me!
\#4-08 Oct 2020 14:16 - John Abbott
How flexible/limited should a new syntax be?

Should it be possible to make arbitrarily long extensions? Such as

## QQ (a) [x] (b) [y][z]

A first attempt should probably allow just two levels (incl. QQ[x][y]???)
JAA is inclined to exclude quotient rings; so it would not be possible to write something like
(QQ[sqrt2]/ideal(sqrt2^2-2)) [x]

