
Subject: Syntax errors

Posted by [Dominic Metzger](#) on Wed, 18 Oct 2006 21:19:06 GMT

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

Hi,

Me again. Why isnt it possible to suppress syntax errors in
RESOLVE_ROUTINE unless I use EXECUTE and IDL_IDLBRIDGE instead? How
come !QUIET or CATCH, ERROR wont take of it?

Or is there another way than using execute so that any errors caused by
RESOLVE_ROUTINE (including syntax errors) wont be shown / printed to
screen?

```
PRO LOAD_ROUTINE, ROUTINE
    !QUIET=1
    CATCH, ERROR
    IF (ERROR NE 0) THEN RETURN
    RESOLVE_ROUTINE, ROUTINE, /EITHER
END
```

```
PRO MY_PROCEDURE
...
    LOAD_ROUTINE, ROUTINE
...
END
```

gracias

dometz

Subject: Re: Syntax errors

Posted by [Allan Whiteford](#) on Thu, 19 Oct 2006 12:46:38 GMT

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

Dometz,

How about:

```
resolve_all,/continue_on_error,/quiet
```

This, of course, just won't compile routines which have errors but I
guess that's what you want?

Thanks,

Allan

Dometz wrote:

```
> Hi,  
>  
> Me again. Why isnt it possible to suppress syntax errors in  
> RESOLVE_ROUTINE unless I use EXECUTE and IDL_IDLBRIDGE instead? How  
> come !QUIET or CATCH, ERROR wont take of it?  
>  
> Or is there another way than using execute so that any errors caused by  
> RESOLVE_ROUTINE (including syntax errors) wont be shown / printed to  
> screen?  
>  
>  
> PRO LOAD_ROUTINE, ROUTINE  
>     !QUIET=1  
>     CATCH, ERROR  
>     IF (ERROR NE 0) THEN RETURN  
>     RESOLVE_ROUTINE, ROUTINE, /EITHER  
> END  
>  
> PRO MY_PROCEDURE  
> ...  
>     LOAD_ROUTINE, ROUTINE  
> ...  
> END  
>  
> gracias  
>  
> dometz  
>
```

Subject: Re: Syntax errors

Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Thu, 19 Oct 2006 16:47:43 GMT

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

Dometz wrote:

```
> Me again. Why isnt it possible to suppress syntax errors in  
> RESOLVE_ROUTINE unless I use EXECUTE and IDL_IDLBRIDGE instead? How  
> come !QUIET or CATCH, ERROR wont take of it?
```

Is this a philosophical question? I guess I'm practically minded (or used to this kind of thing in IDL).; accept it or file a feature request with ITTVIS.

```
> Or is there another way than using execute so that any errors caused by  
> RESOLVE_ROUTINE (including syntax errors) wont be shown / printed to
```

> screen?

I went up the "ladder of sledgehammer to pound in a nail" for suppressing error messages:

1. CATCH
2. !quiet = 1
3. EXECUTE(..., 1)
4. IDL_IDLBridge
5. Callable IDL

The first three didn't do it. So I did #4 (I'm not going to do #5, but feel free). There may be other techniques out there, but I didn't think of any others.

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com

Subject: Re: Syntax errors

Posted by [David Fanning](#) on Thu, 19 Oct 2006 16:55:10 GMT

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

mgalloy@gmail.com writes:

> I went up the "ladder of sledgehammer to pound in a nail" for
> suppressing error messages:
>
> 1. CATCH
> 2. !quiet = 1
> 3. EXECUTE(..., 1)
> 4. IDL_IDLBridge
> 5. Callable IDL
>
> The first three didn't do it. So I did #4 (I'm not going to do #5, but
> feel free). There may be other techniques out there, but I didn't think
> of any others.

I think you forgot "Get Lajos to put the damn thing into FL and use that." :-)

Cheers,

David

--

David Fanning, Ph.D.

Fanning Software Consulting, Inc.
Coyote's Guide to IDL Programming: <http://www.dfanning.com/>
Sepore ma de ni thui. ("Perhaps thou speakest truth.")

Subject: Re: Syntax errors
Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Mon, 23 Oct 2006 20:08:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Thu, 19 Oct 2006 09:47:43 -0700, mgalloy@gmail.com wrote:
> Dometz wrote:
>> Me again. Why isnt it possible to suppress syntax errors in
>> RESOLVE_ROUTINE unless I use EXECUTE and IDL_IDLBRIDGE instead? How
>> come !QUIET or CATCH, ERROR wont take of it?
>
> The first three didn't do it. So I did #4 (I'm not going to do #5, but
> feel free). There may be other techniques out there, but I didn't think
> of any others.

Why not simply call IDL like:

```
idl -arg routine verify_routine.pro 2>/dev/null
```

then you won't be bothered with all those pesky error messages?

JD

Subject: Re: Syntax errors
Posted by [Dominic Metzger](#) on Wed, 25 Oct 2006 20:48:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey Mike,

I used the code from:
http://groups.google.com/group/comp.lang.idl-pvwave/tree/browse_frm/thread/3440e343f95bdd62/0b00aaec3e114be9?num=11&_done=%2Fgroup%2Fcomp.lang.idl-pvwave%2Fbrowse_frm%2Fthread%2F3440e343f95bdd62%2F071a7131acc5184b%3F#doc_c3f7eca04ca4e94f
to create an idl-bridge.

The syntax error messages are gone :-D BUT it doesnt seem that the methods are loaded in the original idl instance but only in the newly created IDL sessions.

thanks,

dometz

mgalloy@gmail.com wrote:

> Dometz wrote:
>> Me again. Why isnt it possible to suppress syntax errors in
>> RESOLVE_ROUTINE unless I use EXECUTE and IDL_IDLBRIDGE instead? How
>> come !QUIET or CATCH, ERROR wont take of it?
>
> Is this a philosophical question? I guess I'm practically minded (or
> used to this kind of thing in IDL).; accept it or file a feature
> request with ITTVIS.
>
>> Or is there another way than using execute so that any errors caused by
>> RESOLVE_ROUTINE (including syntax errors) wont be shown / printed to
>> screen?
>
> I went up the "ladder of sledgehammer to pound in a nail" for
> suppressing error messages:
>
> 1. CATCH
> 2. !quiet = 1
> 3. EXECUTE(..., 1)
> 4. IDL_IDLBridge
> 5. Callable IDL
>
> The first three didn't do it. So I did #4 (I'm not going to do #5, but
> feel free). There may be other techniques out there, but I didn't think
> of any others.
>
> Mike
> --
> www.michaelgalloy.com

Subject: Re: Syntax errors

Posted by [Michael Galloy](#) on Thu, 26 Oct 2006 05:23:22 GMT

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

Dometz wrote:

> I used the code from:
> http://groups.google.com/group/comp.lang.idl-pvwave/tree/browse_frm/thread/3440e343f95bdd62/0b00aaec3e114be9?num=11&_done=%2Fgroup%2Fcomp.lang.idl-pvwave%2Fbrowse_frm%2Fthread%2F3440e343f95bdd62%2F071a7131acc5184b%3F#doc_c3f7eca04ca4e9_4f
> to create an idl-bridge.
>
> The syntax error messages are gone :-D BUT it doesnt seem that the
> methods are loaded in the original idl instance but only in the newly

> created IDL sessions.

That's right. If you need a single session with all the routines in it, I would make a single IDL_IDLBridge and then repeatedly compile routines in it. If you are going to check a lot of routines, I would do this anyway since there is so much overhead in creating an IDL_IDLBridge.

Mike

--

www.michaelgalloy.com

Subject: Re: Syntax errors

Posted by [JD Smith](#) on Thu, 26 Oct 2006 17:19:59 GMT

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

On Wed, 25 Oct 2006 23:23:22 -0600, Michael Galloy wrote:

> Dometz wrote:

>> [quoted text muted]

>

> That's right. If you need a single session with all the routines in it, I
> would make a single IDL_IDLBridge and then repeatedly compile routines in
> it. If you are going to check a lot of routines, I would do this anyway
> since there is so much overhead in creating an IDL_IDLBridge.

How much overhead is it? How much processing do you need to do in a the Bridge for it to be worth it to start up?

JD
