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## Assignment

Calls to **Get**, **Set** and **Use** commands might not be seen directly usually. Those may be more likely to be called indirectly by *assignment* commands. An assignment command might execute a **Get** on one object and a **Set** on another object, attempting to yield over an aspect from one symbol to another.

Different aspects (such as a value, object or class) might have different types of assignment. Below would be an attempt to list more common types of assignment.

The overview also attempts to illustrate, which **Get**, **Set** and **Use** commands might be called while performing the assignment.

Because assignments might occur commonly, an implicit simplified notation is suggested here.

To demonstrate the difference between object-bound aspects and reference-bound aspects, the following notation is employed. When a reference-bound aspect might be **Get** or **Set** then a reference may be displayed with a parent around it:



When an object-bound aspect might be **Get** or **Set** then a targeted object may be displayed without a parent around it:



|  |
| --- |
| **Value Assignment** |
| Value Get 🡪  Value Set 🡨  *Aims to copy a value of one object*  *to another.*  *The result might be:* |
| Object Assignment |
| Object Get 🡪  Object Set 🡨  *Tries to let one symbol point to*  *the same object as the other.*  *So attempts to yield over the object aspect.*  *The result might be:* |
| Class Assignment |
|  |
| Use As Class (~= Object Get) 🡪  Class Set 🡨 |
| *Tries to use the one object as*  *the class for another.*  *The result might be:* |

In this assignment notation the line type (dashed, wavy) might indicate which aspect would be yielded over. The access mark (the smaller line crossing the longer line) might indicate direction. The diamond shape in the middle would indicate a call to an assignment command.

### Cross-Aspect Assignments

Perhaps a more common way to use the **Class** aspect in an assignment might be to **Get** the **Object** aspect from one reference and assign it to the **Class** aspect of another reference. But it might also be done the other way around: attempting to get the **Class** aspect from one reference and assign it as the **Object** of another reference. It might be called *Class-to-Object* assignment or a *Class-Get* *assignment* perhaps. Less conventional ways of yielding over aspects like that, might be called *cross-aspect* assignment.

Also noteworthy might be, that there could be two ways to get the **Class** aspect: **Get** the **Class** aspect of an *object* or **Get** the **Class** aspect of a *reference*.

|  |
| --- |
| **Reference-Bound Class to Object Assignment** |
| <Put the direction mark at the other end?>  <Mirror image left to right?> |
| Reference-Bound Class Get 🡨  Object Set 🡪 |
| *The result might be:* |
| <Perhaps do not use a double border>  <Mirror image left to right?>  *The object reference on the right may now point to the class of the object reference on the left.* |
|  |
| **Object-Bound Class to Object Assignment** |
| <Put the direction mark at the other end?>  <Mirror image left to right?> |
| Object-Bound Class Get 🡨  Object Set 🡪 |
| *The result might be:* |
| <Perhaps do not use a double border>  <Mirror image left to right?>  *The object reference on the right may now point to the class of the object on the left.* |

### Ideas about Assignment

There were some ideas let go of in the main text. They are mentioned here, in case they might be used somewhere or might be worth reconsidering at one point.

#### Leaving out Diamond in Value Assignments

There used to be an idea that value assignments:

<Picture with diamond in it>

Might not need a diamond shape:



At one point there was a thought, that value lines might always mean assignment. But later it was valued there might be some use to differently expressing value *assignment* from value *correspondance*.

<Pictures to demonstrate? a) value correspondence b) value assignment?>

But a next idea might be that if a value line has an access mark to indicate direction, what else could it mean but value assignment?



*Value assignment?*

So there still seems to be some wiggle room around the idea, that might make it more useful at one point. But the choice was made to make a notation leading, that has less implicit rules and more equal ways of notating things: a line means correspondance, line type means aspect, access mark means direction, diamond means assignment in this case.

#### Opposite Direction Indication

<Pictures?>

There used to be an idea to flip the indication of direction in assignment notation.

Access marks seem to indicate direction in this language. It may make sense that the access mark might indicate the assignment direction and that the assignment direction means from source to target. But what might make less sense is when the result of the assignment would seem to be in the opposite direction of the assignment direction. Perhaps it can be imagined seeing live changes in a diagram, assignment calls be executed live, seeing their effect, it would perhaps not be so intuitive when lines would seem to flip direction all the time.

That is why the suggestion was made to make the assignment look more like it has the direction the result would have, rather than the source to target assignment direction.

The idea to put the assignment direction mark at the opposite end, might have some intuitivity to it, when looking at value assignments.

But the price of inconsistency might not be worth this intuitivity, and might actually be less intuitive.

That said, since there is a little bit of doubt, this other idea is still expressed here.