Subject: Re: texture_coord
Posted by Karl Schultz on Fri, 02 Nov 2001 17:49:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

"David Fanning" <david@dfanning.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.164c860d201596a9989748@news.frii.com...
> Pavel A. Romashkin (pavel.romashkin@noaa.gov) writes:
>
>> As this thread became more and more technical, I am beginning to wonder:
>> isn't it easier to just create a temporary blank image that matches the
>> dimensions of the entire surface, then insert the sub-image into it,
>> then map it over the whole surface? Or does this just take all the fun
>> out of it?
>
> While this might appear to be an easier solution,
> it not only takes all the fun out of a hyper-technical
> programming operation, it introduces a whole host of
> new problems that have to be solved. For one, reducing
> your image to the resolution of the surface will make
> that image awfully ugly. (I can't really think of a
> way to solve this limitation, to tell you the truth.)
>
> Another problem would be matching the image to a
> particular location on the surface. This, presumably,
> is the whole point of putting the image on there in
> the first place. Getting the correspondence correct
> would be an awfully tedious process, it seems to me,
> and could only really be accomplished easily if the
> surface and image data had the same aspect ratio.
> Pretty rare in practice, I think.

Another thought I had was to put the sub-image on its own fully-textured polygon and then draw that polygon on top of the polygon that you want the image to be a sub-image of. Then you run into z-buffer stitching problems, which can be partly or fully addressed by the DEPTH_OFFSET property. But that's no fun either. I sent David an updated program that fixes the problem by fully specifying the texture coordinates. It wasn't so bad..