

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

Source: http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2008-03/msg01032.html

- *From:* santosh <santosh.k83@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 07 Mar 2008 21:38:58 +0530
-

Richard wrote:

santosh <santosh.k83@xxxxxxxx> writes:

Richard wrote:

santosh <santosh.k83@xxxxxxxx> writes:

Richard wrote:

santosh
<santosh.k83@xxxxxxxx>
writes:

Robbie
Hatley
wrote:

"Richard"
<devr_@xxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Richard
Heathfield
<rjh@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
writes:

<snip>

x
<
30
is

Re: How printf() works???????

a
relational
expression,
and
all
expressions
have
values.
Relational
expressions
have
the
value
0
if
they're
false,
and
1
if
they're
true.
So
x
<
30
will
evaluate
to
0
if
x
is
less
than
30,
and
1
otherwise.

It
won't
actually.

How
do
you
figure?
It

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

does
in
standard
C.
If
it
doesn't
for
you,
then
your
compiler
is
broken
and
you
should
get
a
better
one.

The
expression
 $x < 30$ will
evaluate to
1 if x is less
than 30 and
zero
otherwise.
Richard
said the
reverse, by
mistake I'm
sure.

Getting something totally
backwards is, of course, a
mistake. There
is no evil intent in my
correction. Why you feel the
need to
confirm his "mistake" is
very strange.

Because he did not spot RJH's error and
therefore, could not
understand your correction.

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

So therefore, maybe he should post nothing? Did that cross your mind?

He misread RJH's statement and that is what I brought to his notice. What he said to you about your compiler is beside the point and did not strike me as being important enough to comment on.

Are you joking? It was the WHOLE crux of things. He informed me that if my compiler did not agree with RH then I needed a new one.

What is it with you and apologising for other peoples mistakes?

Er no. It was the crux of anything as far as I was concerned. If it was important enough to you, *you* should have replied promptly to him, instead of correcting third-party replies.

he waffled on about my broken compiler and its as clear as day he never tried the code with his wonderful, all singing, all dancing compiler.

OP's code was not relevant to spotting RJH's mistake. Compiling OP's

Yes it was. RHs whole reply was based on explaining the OPs code.

But compiling OP's code was not relevant to spotting RJH's typo.

code (which would require some completion to make it compilable) would do nothing towards spotting (or not spotting) RJH's typo.

I commented on RHs English response not the code. It was not me who brought compilers into it-

Neither was it me. So it begs the point - why are you making a big fuss over *my* reply instead of answering directly to Robbie Hatley, perhaps along the lines of:

"Hey Robbie, you are an idiot to have said that my compiler is not good

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

enough! You can't even get a simple thing right. You shouldn't open your mouth!"

So in this case debating about his compiler and your compiler are irrelevant.

It's really simple:

1. RJH made a *genuine* mistake.

All mistakes are "genuine". or are trying so suggest he makes mistakes on purpose. What are you trying to say here?

2. You made a *genuine* correction to his mistake.

I made a correction. Nothing "genuine" about it. It was a correct correction.

Forgive me for not being able to read your mind before framing my reply so as not to upset you. Yes, I meant a "correct correction".

3. Robbie Hatley misread RJH's statement so that he read what RJH had meant to say, not what he wrote.

He made a mistake. And your corrected him. No need for me to do so.

Exactly. There was also no need for you to reply to RJH or me either.

4. Therefore Robbie Hatley took your statement as correcting a (to him) correct statement.

Because he was wrong.

Because he made a mistake, just like RJH two posts before.

The "to him" bis the crux here. If you are going to tell people that their compilers are fucked and they need new ones then (a) ensure that compilable code was involved (it wasnt) and (b)

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

check you're right so you dont look like a total fool.

Perhaps. OTOH everyone makes a mistake now and then. If find Robbie Hatley's comment regarding your compiler objectionable, then might I suggest, once again, that you take it up with him, either here or via private mail?

5. I pointed out to Robbie Hatley that he misunderstood your correction because he had misread RJH's erroneous statement.

Fine And obvious to anyone.

But not to you it seems.

6. Robbie Hatley acknowledged his misreading and we thought everything was done and dusted, but...

7. You have taken exception with my *well* *intentioned* correction of Robbie Hatley's misunderstanding, saying that I should have instead flamed him for a comment that was essentially irrelevant and beside the point, and one that was moreover, aimed at you.

Rubbish. I never mentioned YOUR correction of Robbie. I mentioned your saying this:

"Richard said the reverse, by mistake I'm sure."

My point was it was a mistake. No being sure about it. Do you not understand the subtle differences here?

No, the difference is too subtle for me. Apologies.

8. You have also responded (at least) twice to RJH about this whole mess

Politely.

Undoubtedly.

including also a tedious recap of your well known opinions about this group.

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

And you're rapidly reinforcing them. Which surprises me. As an infrequent visitor I can assure you that your tone has taken on that of the clique. A shame.

I presume that anyone who contradicts you or disagrees with you must be a member of this "clique"?

9. Surprisingly, you have not yet responded to Robbie Hatley, the poster

Why should I? You already corrected him.

Because you are the one who has taken exception with his comment that you should get another compiler.

who has apparently offended you with his remarks about your compiler,

He hasn't offended me in the slightest. His reply was unnecessarily rude IMO. No skin off my back.

If you say so.

And all the more embarrassing for him since he was wrong. Or should be that "genuinely mistaken" in your speak :-; ?

I saw his mistake as only as embarrassing to him as RJH's would have been to him.

instead choosing to snipe at posters whose only intention was to clear up the misunderstanding that started this subthread and thus to get it closed.

You had no need to excuse RHs "mistake I am sure".

I don't need an excuse for every word I write here.

Re: How printf() works???????

Re: How printf() works???????

It was simple enough to say "No, RH was wrong there". had you wanted to clear anything up as opposed to defend RH at all costs your reply would simply have been

I am sorry to see you sniping at well intentioned posts and posters because of your near paranoid fixation with RJH.

"Sorry Robbie, but you are wrong. RH made a mistake there".

No need to add "genuine" or "reverse of what he meant" or etc etc etc.

Forgive me if I don't send every draft post of mine to you for your proofreading and approval stamp before posting it.

.