
Subject: Re: CATCH inside a FOR loop and out?

Posted by [Craig Markwardt](#) on Wed, 16 Apr 2014 19:50:44 GMT

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

On Tuesday, April 15, 2014 3:31:19 PM UTC-4, Chris Torrence wrote:

> One important point - "catch" is expensive. It's better to put it outside of the for loop, and just use a "start" index to continue. Something like:

Hey Chris, is there any chance of making IDL exception handling more modern? The C language 'setjmp' exception handling model is not the best. The catch variable is kind of a clunky nuisance, and having to remember to /CANCEL your catch handler is also a bit of a chore.

A revised grammar could be as simple as this,

```
CATCH BEGIN
```

```
;; ... possibly failing code ...
```

```
END ELSE BEGIN
```

```
;; ... exception handler here ...
```

```
ENDELSE
```

No extra keywords required to be added to the language, no nuisance variables, and cleaner flow. (and no backward compatibility problems) The exception handler can look at any of the crumpteenth million !ERR* variables to decide what went wrong.

Craig
