Subject: Re: A bug in Mac OS version?
Posted by Richard G. French on Tue, 15 Dec 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Saeid Zoonematkermani wrote:
>
> Hello,
>
> This is a rather curious bug that I noticed after I upgraded to 5.2. Of
> course this may not be a bug but if I am being really stupid, please let
> me know.
>
> IDL> print, !version
> { PowerMac MacOS MacOS 5.2 Oct 30 1998}
> IDL> print, '0000FF'x
>   255
> IDL> print, '00FF00'x
>   -256
> IDL> print, 'FF0000'x
>   16711680
>
> Shouldn't '00FF00'x be equivalent to 65280? Is this behavior also repeated
> on other platforms?
>
>
on my 5.1 version, i do indeed get 65280:

IDL> print, '00FF00'x
       65280
IDL> print,!version
{ alpha OSF unix 5.1 Apr 13 1998}

Subject: Re: A bug in Mac OS version?
Posted by davidf on Tue, 15 Dec 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Olof Hellman (hellman@ksan.ms.nwu.edu) writes:

> I would agree with you that
>
> IDL> print, '00FF00'x
>   -256
>
> might be reasonable, but then I'd expect
>
> IDL> print, 'FF0000'x
>   0

>
> If the behaviour shown above isn't wrong, then IDL is a very perverse language.

Perverse!? IDL? *Our* IDL? The one we use the make filled contour plots?
Nah... :-)

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting
Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Progamming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: A bug in Mac OS version?
Posted by hellman on Tue, 15 Dec 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In article <MPG.10e0810a9c715cf9896ad@news.frii.com>, davidf@dfanning.com
(David Fanning) wrote:

> Saeid Zoonematkermani (Saeid.Zoonematkermani@sunysb.edu) writes:
>
>> IDL> print, !version
>> { PowerMac MacOS MacOS 5.2 Oct 30 1998}
>> IDL> print, '0000FF'x
>>   255
>> IDL> print, '00FF00'x
>>   -256
>> IDL> print, 'FF0000'x
>>   16711680
>
> In fact, this value you are trying to create here is really
> a LONG integer. You, of course, are creating it as a SHORT
> integer. Now, I'll give you that IDL didn't used to behave
> so boarishly, but what it is doing (i.e. wrapping), IMHO,
> is entirely within its rights.

I would agree with you that

 IDL> print, '00FF00'x
    -256

might be reasonable, but then I'd expect

```
IDL> print, 'FF0000'x
     0
```

If the behaviour shown above isn't wrong, then IDL is a very perverse language.

- Olof

Subject: Re: A bug in Mac OS version?
Posted by davidf on Tue, 15 Dec 1998 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Saeid Zoonematkermani (Saeid.Zoonematkermani@sunysb.edu) writes:

> This is a rather curious bug that I noticed after I upgraded to 5.2. Of
> course this may not be a bug but if I am being really stupid, please let
> me know.
>
> IDL> print, !version
> { PowerMac MacOS MacOS 5.2 Oct 30 1998}
> IDL> print, '0000FF'x
>   255
> IDL> print, '00FF00'x
>   -256
> IDL> print, 'FF0000'x
>   16711680
>
> Shouldn't '00FF00'x be equivalent to 65280? Is this behavior also repeated
> on other platforms?

Yes, I noticed this the other day too on my Windows NT machine.
I was well into a nasty note to RSI technical support when I
thought to do just a bit more testing.

In fact, this value you are trying to create here is really
a LONG integer. You, of course, are creating it as a SHORT
integer. Now, I'll give you that IDL didn't used to behave
so boarishly, but what it is doing (i.e. wrapping), IMHO,
is entirely within its rights. I'm guessing that something
changed internally with the new unsigned integer stuff.

In any case, you get what you expect if you make these
values LONG integers:

```
IDL> Print, '00FF00'xL
       65280
IDL> Print, 'FF0000'xL
     16711680
```

Cheers,

David

--
David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting
Phone: 970-221-0438 E-Mail: davidf@dfanning.com
Coyote's Guide to IDL Progamming: http://www.dfanning.com/
Toll-Free IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

[Note: This follow-up was e-mailed to the cited author.]