
Subject: Re: catch and I/O errors

Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Wed, 02 Mar 2005 22:05:28 GMT

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

Benjamin Hornberger writes:

- > is there any way to handle I/O errors with catch? What's the distinction
- > between I/O errors and other errors good for anyway?

Good questions. I've forwarded them to the Book Club secretary. Perhaps we will get an answer. In the meantime, here is an article that pretty much exhausts what I know about the subject:

http://www.dfanning.com/misc_tips/conversion_errors.html

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

Subject: Re: catch and I/O errors

Posted by [Michael Wallace](#) on Wed, 02 Mar 2005 22:35:30 GMT

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

- > http://www.dfanning.com/misc_tips/conversion_errors.html

David's webpage says: 'The Catch documentation says that "all errors that can be handled by IDL" can be trapped in this way.'

However, new and improved IDL documentation on Catch says : 'The CATCH procedure provides a generalized mechanism for the handling of exceptions and errors within IDL. Calling CATCH establishes an error handler for the current procedure that intercepts all errors that can be handled by IDL, excluding non-fatal warnings such as math errors.'

David, looks like it's time to get that secretary to do something! ;-)

Because the math errors are included in the non-fatal category, they wound up grouped with the I/O errors. The I/O error handling was what was needed for math errors, so the math errors just piggy-backed on the same mechanism. Keep in mind that this is a wild and crazy guess based

on what I've seen. Someone correct me if I'm wrong. I really wish that there were consistent error handling where you could differentiate between the error types with a fatal/non-fatal flag or something similar.

-Mike

Subject: Re: catch and I/O errors
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2005 00:59:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael Wallace writes:

> David, looks like it's time to get that secretary to do something! ;-)

She quit. Something about going "on and on about those women in your yoga class." Guess I'll fix it myself. :-(

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.
Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>

Subject: Re: catch and I/O errors
Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 03 Mar 2005 17:11:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

David Fanning writes:

> Good questions. I've forwarded them to the Book Club
> secretary. Perhaps we will get an answer. In the meantime,
> here is an article that pretty much exhausts what I know
> about the subject:
>
> http://www.dfanning.com/misc_tips/conversion_errors.html

OK, I'm trying to fix this, but I am running into semantic problems.

According to the documentation, CATCH can catch any error that occurs within IDL except "non-fatal warnings such as math errors." My original understanding is that CATCH

could not catch input/output errors, and that a type conversion error was a kind of input/output error.

But, I have verified that CATCH **can** catch normal input/output errors. For example, you can catch the error of reading past the end of a file. What it **can't** catch is type conversion errors. So, using the elementary logic I learned in 8th grade, a type conversion error must be a non-fatal math error.

All well and good EXCEPT that you can trap a type conversion error with an ON_IOERROR condition, which would appear to make it an input/output error. :-(

Anyone have any ideas about this?

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.

Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
