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