
Subject: Re: - unsigned variables
Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Fri, 24 Sep 2004 00:53:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 23 Sep 2004 15:56:16 -0700, Holger Fleckenstein wrote:

```
> A strange behavior in IDL occurred to me.  
>  
> In C++ if I do:  
>   unsigned short x=1;  
>   printf("%d",-x);  
> I get  
>   -1  
> like I would expect.  
>  
> In IDL however:  
>   x=1U  
>   print, -x  
> gives  
>   65535  
> So it basically treats it like I had done:  
>   print, uint(-1)  
>  
> Does anybody have an explanation for this? Is this, because of a typecast  
> before executing the print? (Can create bugs, which are hard to localize.)
```

Nope, it's because your print format is treating it as a signed long integer. Try:

```
unsigned short x=1;  
printf("%hu",-x);
```

which gives:

```
65535
```

The difference is, IDL *knows* your integer is an unsigned short. C doesn't know or care, and so is happy to print it however you like. You can always change IDL's mind by explicitly casting it:

```
IDL> print,fix(-1U)  
-1
```

Note that short -1 and 65535 are actually represented by the exact same bit pattern, namely:

```
1111111111111111
```

JD
