Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by David Fanning on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 02:30:06 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mwallace.removethismunge@swri.edu.invalid writes:

- > I'm quite new to IDL, so hopefully this will be a simple question for
- > the rest of you.

>

- > How can I prevent IDL from printing out all the nominal messages such as
- > "% Compiled Module: FOO" or "% Loaded DLM: BAR"? I'd rather that IDL
- > just be quiet and only report something to the terminal if there were a
- > serious error or if I use a print statement from within my program.

>

- > I also have a couple places in my code where an error could be expected.
- > In those particular cases, I still want the error handling on and
- > !ERROR STATE to be filled with the correct values, but I don't want to
- > show this error since I will be handling it and the program will
- > continue execution. So, in short, how do I get control over what's
- > written to the terminal?

I'm sure you *think* this is what you want to do. But I'm also sure that if you succeed in doing it, it won't be long before you see what a really bad idea this is. :-)

Cheers,

David

P.S. Let's just say after spending 3 hours in an iTool chasing down strange behavior that turned out to be a silent Catch that I don't have too much sympathy for silence. :-(

--

David W. Fanning, Ph.D. Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/ Phone: 970-221-0438, IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by Craig Markwardt on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 03:44:54 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

David Fanning <davidf@dfanning.com> writes:

> mwallace.removethismunge@swri.edu.invalid writes:

>

- >> I'm quite new to IDL, so hopefully this will be a simple question for
- >> the rest of you.

>>

- >> How can I prevent IDL from printing out all the nominal messages such as
- >> "% Compiled Module: FOO" or "% Loaded DLM: BAR"? I'd rather that IDL
- >> just be quiet and only report something to the terminal if there were a
- >> serious error or if I use a print statement from within my program.

>>

- >> I also have a couple places in my code where an error could be expected.
- >> In those particular cases, I still want the error handling on and
- >> !ERROR_STATE to be filled with the correct values, but I don't want to
- >> show this error since I will be handling it and the program will
- >> continue execution. So, in short, how do I get control over what's
- >> written to the terminal?

>

- > I'm sure you *think* this is what you want to do.
- > But I'm also sure that if you succeed in doing it,
- > it won't be long before you see what a really bad
- > idea this is. :-)

...

> a silent Catch that I don't have too much sympathy for

Despite David's current peevishness, CATCH is definitely a strong contender for what you want. David is right though, you need to have pretty good policy regarding how errors get handled and get passed up the chain.

Other contenders are ON_ERROR and ON_IOERROR. ON_ERROR doesn't give you much control; sometimes ON_IOERROR is required to catch I/O errors I believe (and "I/O" includes typecasts).

As to your first question, there is some newfangled compile option which can turn off the "compiled" messages, but I don't bother. Eventually you learn coping skills.

Craig	
•	EMAIL: craigmnet@REMOVEcow.physics.wisc.edu Derivatives Remove "net" for better response

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by marc schellens[1] on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 12:18:42 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Michael Wallace wrote:

- > I'm quite new to IDL, so hopefully this will be a simple question for
- > the rest of you.

>

- > How can I prevent IDL from printing out all the nominal messages such as
- > "% Compiled Module: FOO" or "% Loaded DLM: BAR"? I'd rather that IDL
- > just be quiet and only report something to the terminal if there were a
- > serious error or if I use a print statement from within my program.

>

- > I also have a couple places in my code where an error could be expected.
- > In those particular cases, I still want the error handling on and
- > !ERROR STATE to be filled with the correct values, but I don't want to
- > show this error since I will be handling it and the program will
- > continue execution. So, in short, how do I get control over what's
- > written to the terminal?

>

> Mike W.

>

Check out the !QUIET system variable.

HDH, marc

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by Pepijn Kenter on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 12:21:55 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Michael Wallace wrote:

- > I'm quite new to IDL, so hopefully this will be a simple question for
- > the rest of you.

>

- > How can I prevent IDL from printing out all the nominal messages such as
- > "% Compiled Module: FOO" or "% Loaded DLM: BAR"? I'd rather that IDL
- > just be guiet and only report something to the terminal if there were a
- > serious error or if I use a print statement from within my program.

>

!quiet=1

This system variable turns informational messages on/off.

HTH, Pepijn Kenter.

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by David Fanning on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 13:19:03 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Marc Schellens writes:

> Check out the !QUIET system variable.

Maybe this isn't *quite* like doctor assisted suicide, but it certainly has that flavor to it. :-(

Cheers.

David

David W. Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: http://www.dfanning.com/ Phone: 970-221-0438, IDL Book Orders: 1-888-461-0155

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet

Posted by dcw_yip on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 19:21:18 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On a similar note, is there anyway to have IDLDE call "heap_gc" and not "heap gc, /verbose" everytime I stop a program with ctrl-r? It takes it minutes to print out all that stuff I never look at.

David

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet Posted by Michael Wallace on Wed, 17 Dec 2003 20:08:21 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

- >> I'm sure you *think* this is what you want to do.
- >> But I'm also sure that if you succeed in doing it,
- >> it won't be long before you see what a really bad
- >> idea this is. :-)

> ...

>

>> a silent Catch that I don't have too much sympathy for

>

- > Despite David's current peevishness, CATCH is definitely a strong
- > contender for what you want. David is right though, you need to have

- > pretty good policy regarding how errors get handled and get passed up
- > the chain.

>

- > Other contenders are ON_ERROR and ON_IOERROR. ON_ERROR doesn't give
- > you much control; sometimes ON_IOERROR is required to catch I/O errors
- > I believe (and "I/O" includes typecasts).

Thanks to everyone who's responded (and so quickly too)! !QUIET, ON_ERROR, ON_IOERROR, CATCH, and message seem to be the set of commands I want.

And David, I understand your concern that turning off messages is a Bad Idea(TM). And I completely agree with you on this. My original question was not asked just so I could turn off error handling and ignore everything, but so that I could do my own error handling and my own messages. Yes, I am taking on an extra responsibility by doing this and accept this responsibility.

> Eventually you learn coping skills.

Tell me about it! Isn't it enough to cope with just the language in general?! I'm a software developer and the past several years I've been mainly working with Java, a little C/C++, and a couple other languages.

I've started learning IDL since that's the language of choice of the physicists I work with and I need to start incorporating the advanced plotting capabilities into my other software. It was a little culture shock laying eyes on IDL for the first time -- so-called 'objects' and pointers just made me grimace. But, I'm slowly learning how to cope. ;-)

Mike W

Subject: Re: How to make IDL be quiet

Posted by dcw_yip on Thu, 18 Dec 2003 19:37:11 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Mike:

I'm there with you man. I feel your pain. But there is light at the end of my tunnel. I wake up everyday and check off one more day until we switch the project over to C++ and into the 21st century.

David

Michael Wallace <mwallace.removethismunge@swri.edu.invalid> wrote in message news:<vu1dtmcgncq86@corp.supernews.com>...

> Tell me about it! Isn't it enough to cope with just the language in

- > general?! I'm a software developer and the past several years I've been
- > mainly working with Java, a little C/C++, and a couple other languages.
- > I've started learning IDL since that's the language of choice of the
- > physicists I work with and I need to start incorporating the advanced
- > plotting capabilities into my other software. It was a little culture
- > shock laying eyes on IDL for the first time -- so-called 'objects' and
- > pointers just made me grimace. But, I'm slowly learning how to cope. ;-)

> Mike W