
Subject: Re: Bug in ISHFT? (NOT)

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Mon, 31 May 2004 04:06:20 GMT

[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](#)

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)
```

```
1
```

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)
```

```
2
```

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
