Compound assignment operators

The compound assignment operators are:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{+=} & \quad \text{-=} & \quad \text{ *=} & \quad \text{/=} & \quad \%= \\
\end{align*} \]

Consider variable \( k \):

\[
\text{int } k = 5;
\]

Each of the following two lines contains equivalent assignment statements, so it looks like the compound assignment operators simply provide syntactic sugar:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{k += 20; } & \quad \text{k = k + 20; } \quad \text{// both add 20 to } k \\
\text{k *= 20; } & \quad \text{k = k * 20; } \quad \text{// both store in } k \text{ the value } k \times 20.
\end{align*}
\]

The compound operators are different in two ways, which we see by looking more precisely at their definition. The Java language specification says that:

The compound assignment \( E1 \ op= E2 \) is equivalent to [i.e. is syntactic sugar for]

\[
E1 = (T) ((E1) op (E2))
\]

where \( T \) is the type of \( E1 \), except that \( E1 \) is evaluated only once.

We note two important points:

1. The expression is cast to the type of \( E1 \) before the assignment is made (the cast is in red above)
2. \( E1 \) is evaluated once.

Investigation of the effect of (1)

For type \( \text{int} \) it doesn’t matter because primitive operations of type \( \text{int} \) always produce an \( \text{int} \). But consider type \( \text{byte} \). A value of type \( \text{byte} \) lies in the range \(-128..127\). The first line below is syntactically incorrect because the type of expression \( b1+1 \) is \( \text{int} \), which is wider than \( \text{byte} \). The second line is okay because the second statement is equivalent to \( b2= (\text{byte})(b2 + 1) \). It changes \( b2 \) to \(-128\) because of wraparound.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{byte } b1 = 127; & \quad b1 = b1 + 1; \quad \text{// syntactically incorrect: } b1+1 \text{ has type } \text{int} \\
\text{byte } b2; & \quad b2 += 1;
\end{align*}
\]

Since \( \text{char} \) is a number type, you can even do this:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{char } c = 'a'; & \quad c += 1; \quad \text{// after execution, } c \text{ contains the character 'b'}.
\end{align*}
\]

Investigation of the effect of (2)

Let \( d \) be an \( \text{int-array} \) and \( f(\text{int}) \) some function. In the first assignment below, \( f \) is called twice. In the second assignment, it is called only once. So the use of the compound operator is more efficient.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d[f(5)]} &= \text{d[f(5)]} + 1; \\
\text{d[f(5)]} &+= 1;
\end{align*}
\]

There is even more of a difference between using \( += \) instead of \( = \) if one considers side effects. Evaluation of \( d[k++] \) increments \( k \) after the value of \( d[k] \) is retrieved. So execution of the first line below stores \( d[1] + 1 \) in \( d[0] \) and adds 2 to \( k \). Execution of the second line increments \( d[h] \) and \( h \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{int } k = 0; & \quad d[k++] = d[k++] + 1; \\
\text{int } h = 0; & \quad d[h] += 1; \quad \text{(second statement equivalent to } d[h] = d[h++] + 1;) \end{align*}
\]

We don’t approve of such side effects, for they are confusing. Theories of program correctness indicate that proof systems for programs that allow such side effects are far more complicated than those that don’t.