
Subject: Re: Feature, or bug?

Posted by [whdaffer](#) on Wed, 23 May 2012 19:32:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On May 21, 10:13 am, fawltylangu...@gmail.com wrote:

>> Hmmmm... Well check_math _does_ claim that it will report integer

>> overflow, in bit 1.

>

>> But I wouldn't be using check_math to check for that condition in the

>> construct I was using anyway, so it's moot that check_math apparently

>> falls down on the job, at least in this case.

>

>> Thanks for the explanation.

>

>> whd

>

>>> regards,

>>> Lajos

>

> The check_math help says: "Some hardware/operating system combinations may not report all of the math errors listed." Integer overflow is listed, but not checked and reported :-)

Why yes! So it does. And just one line after the table where it claims to report integer overflows!

The right hand giveth, and the left taketh away, I guess ;-)

>

> Integer overflow is "undefined behaviour" in standard C, so it can not be done in a portable way. The glibc manual says:

>

> FPE_INTOVF_TRAP

>

> Integer overflow (impossible in a C program unless you enable overflow trapping in a hardware-specific fashion).

Which, means, effectively, that check_math for integer overflow is worthless since I doubt that ITT or whatever they're called this week is going to enable overflow trapping in a hardware-specific fashion.

Is the situation similar for the other errors?

whd
