Subject: Re: IDL 8.0 bug -- line number of errors not given
Posted by wlandsman on Wed, 13 Oct 2010 03:34:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Oct 12, 4:54 pm, Paulo Penteado <pp.pente...@gmail.com> wrote:

> Not showing the full trace is consistent with returning to the caller.

Perhaps there are two issues here.   I can agree with not showing the
full trace when an error occurs inside a procedure with ON_ERROR,2
set.   But an error message is still being displayed

% Specified offset to array is out of range: A.

As Bil Nei and others have mentioned - why not include the line number
and at least the procedure name as part of the error message?   For
example, the default behavior of the MESSAGE facility is to always
include the procedure name along with an error message.

On Oct 12, 3:45 pm, Chris Torrence <gorth...@gmail.com> wrote:

> workings of the library. If you are writing your own routines, or are
> debugging an existing routine, then I would recommend that you disable
> the on_error,2 command until you have completed your routine and are
> ready to "release" it.

One minor problem with this is that it is not easy to disable ON_ERROR,
2 commands.   I am currently upgrading a well-established library of
~50 routines, so I would need to first comment out all the ON_ERROR
statements, install the upgrades, and then uncomment the ON_ERROR
lines.
Besides Paul van Delst's warning of the need to edit "fixed" code, it
is all a bit of a pain.

I always wished there was a global way to change the ON_ERROR
values.   I could do this now by creating a new system variable, say !
ON_ERROR, and starting all my code with On_ERROR, !ON_ERROR.   Then
if I wanted to go into debug mode, I would set !ON_ERROR = 3.   But
there are other problems with introducing a new system variable. --
Wayne