
Subject: StrToDate(Date& d, const char *s, Date def)
Posted by [sapiency](#) on Thu, 07 Jan 2010 18:32:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

this function works nice for a lot of situations, but IMHO it make things it not should do ..

1.1.10 -> 01.01.2010 is OK
1.1.1 -> 01.01.2001 is not OK

I modified it and now it should work as I expect:

1.1.10 -> 01.01.2010
1.1.0 -> 01.01. 0
1.1.1 -> 01.01. 1
1.1.01 -> 01.01.2001
1.1.011-> 01.01. 11

It is still not possible to insert Dates bevor year "0", but this seems not be supported by the popup too ...

btw. I extended the code to accept 2 digit input for years +20/-80 from current year.

Maybe you find the modification helpfull.

regards and a Happy New Year

reinhard

ps: I set the level for blank to 1, so it is still allowed to insert "1 1 01" to get "01.01.2001"

```
const char *StrToDate(Date& d, const char *s, Date def)
{
    const char *fmt = s_date_scan;
    if(*s == 0) {
        d = Null;
        return s;
    }
    d = Nvl(def, GetSysDate());

    int cc = ( d.year / 100 );
    cc *= 100;
    int oc = cc -100;
    int level = d.year - cc + 20;

    //RLOG( oc << " " << cc << " " << level );
}
```

```

while(*fmt) {
    bool y2 = false;
    int blank = 0;

    while(*s && !IsDigit(*s) && !IsAlpha(*s) && (byte)*s < 128 )
    {
        if ( 0 == cmp( *s, ' ' ) ) blank++;
        s++;
    }
    int n;
    if(IsDigit(*s)) {
        char *q;
        n = strtoul(s, &q, 10);
        if( 2 == (q-s) ) y2 = true;
        s = q;
    }
    else
    if(IsAlpha(*s) || (byte)*s >= 128) {
        if(*fmt != 'm')
            return NULL;
        String m;
        while(IsAlpha(*s) || (byte)*s >= 128)
            m.Cat(*s++);
        m = ToUpper(m);
        for(int i = 0; i < 12; i++)
            if(m == ToUpper(MonthName(i)) || m == ToUpper(MonName(i))) {
                n = i + 1;
                goto found;
            }
        return NULL;
    found:
        ;
    }
    else
        break;

    switch(*fmt) {
    case 'd':
        if(n < 1 || n > 31)
            return NULL;
        d.day = n;
        break;
    case 'm':
        if(n < 1 || n > 12)
            return NULL;
        d.month = n;
        break;
    }
}

```

```
case 'y':
    d.year = n;
    if (y2 && ( 2 > blank ) )
    {
        if(d.year < level)
            d.year += cc; // Check again in 2015.... or maybe never ...
        else
            d.year += oc;
    }
    break;
default:
    NEVER();
}
fmt++;
}
return d.IsValid() ? s : NULL;
}
```

Subject: Re: StrToDate(Date& d, const char *s, Date def)
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 08 Jan 2010 16:40:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, it is not unreasonable, but is not it a bit nitpicking?

Besides, at year 1, current calendar did not even existed yet...

Also, what you expect as "expected" does not really sound expected to me...

I would like to hear somebody's else opinion first..

Mirek

Subject: Re: StrToDate(Date& d, const char *s, Date def)
Posted by [sapiency](#) on Fri, 08 Jan 2010 21:14:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Mirek,

luzr wrote on Fri, 08 January 2010 17:40 Well, it is not unreasonable, but is not it a bit nitpicking?

you are right . I noticed the same effect when I checked this input in openoffice - calc. It is not possible to insert a Date before 1.1.1000

luzr wrote on Fri, 08 January 2010 17:40

Besides, at year 1, current calendar did not even existed yet...

Also, what you expect as "expected" does not really sound expected to me...

I would like to hear somebody's else opinion first..

Mirek

That's right, and not many dates are known so detailed from the years before 1582 . And for this it seems to be much more comfortable to use a EditString. I just stumble over this lines of code, when I looked for the reason of the other problem I posted and found it interesting to understand what happens.

Now I'm curious if anybody else is nitpicking too

reinhard

Subject: Re: StrToDate(Date& d, const char *s, Date def)

Posted by [koldo](#) on Fri, 08 Jan 2010 21:38:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello sapiency

Quote:this function works nice for a lot of situations, but IMHO it make things it not should do ..

1.1.10 -> 01.01.2010 is OK

1.1.1 -> 01.01.2001 is not OK

I modified it and now it should work as I expect:

1.1.10 -> 01.01.2010

1.1.0 -> 01.01. 0

1.1.1 -> 01.01. 1

1.1.01 -> 01.01.2001

1.1.011-> 01.01. 11

Well, for me

1.1.1 -> 01.01.2001 is OK

1.1.1 -> 01.01. 1 is not OK

1.1.0 -> 01.01.0 sound logical, but strange

1.1.10 -> 01.01.2010 is OK and does not match with the later... it should have to be

1.1.10 -> 01.01.10, that sound logical, but strange

Perhaps if you are working in something about Roman Empire it sounds clever, but for events happened nowadays, it is not simple to understand.

So I prefer the actual implementation . Sorry !

Best regards
Koldo
