```
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message
Craig Markwardt <craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu> writes:
> Would anybody call this a bug in IDL?
>
 IDL> print, ishft(6UL,40UL)
      1536
> IDL> print, ishft(6UL,8UL)
      1536
>
 ISHFT only seems to handle integers up to 32 bits, and then wraps
 around.
... or rather, I had a bug in my brain. Somehow I was mixing up
unsigned long and unsigned long64. My mistake.
Craig
Craig B. Markwardt, Ph.D. EMAIL: craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu
Astrophysics, IDL, Finance, Derivatives | Remove "net" for better response
```

Subject: Re: Bug in ISHFT? (NOT) Posted by marc schellens[1] on Tue, 01 Jun 2004 06:07:08 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Posted by Craig Markwardt on Mon, 31 May 2004 04:06:20 GMT

Subject: Re: Bug in ISHFT? (NOT)

```
Craig Markwardt wrote:
> Craig Markwardt <craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu> writes:
>> Would anybody call this a bug in IDL?
>>
>> IDL> print, ishft(6UL,40UL)
        1536
>> IDL> print, ishft(6UL,8UL)
        1536
>>
>> ISHFT only seems to handle integers up to 32 bits, and then wraps
>> around.
>
  ... or rather, I had a bug in my brain. Somehow I was mixing up
> unsigned long and unsigned long64. My mistake.
```

I think there was a point in bringing it up:

At least its not really consistent:

```
IDL> print,ishft(1b,8)
0
IDL> print,ishft(1,16)
0
IDL> print,ishft(1L,32)
1
IDL> print,ishft(1LL,64)
```

One could think that for 8 and 16 bit there is no wrap-around, but for 32 and 64 there is.

But:

IDL> print,ishft(2ULL,63) 0 IDL> print,ishft(2ULL,64)

So for 32 and 64 bits, ISHFT divides the second paramter modulo 32 or 64 respectively before applying it, but not for 8 and 16 bit.

marc