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Exception handling

26.1 OVERVIEW

During the execution of an Eiffel system, various abnormal events may occur. A hardware or operating system component may be unable to do its job; an arithmetic operation may result in overflow; an improperly written software element may produce an unacceptable outcome.

Such events will usually trigger a signal, or exception, which interrupts the normal flow of execution. If the system’s text does not include any provision for the exception, execution will terminate. The system may, however, be programmed so as to handle exceptions, which means that it will respond by executing specified actions and, if possible, resuming execution after correcting the cause of the exception.

This chapter presents the exception mechanism by explaining what conditions lead to exceptions, and how systems can be written so as to handle exceptions.

--- REWRITE It also introduces the EXCEPTION Kernel Library class and some of its descendants, which provides tools for fine-tuning the exception mechanism.

When using the exception facility, remember to take its name literally. The constructs discussed in this chapter — Rescue clause, Retry instruction — are not control structures on a par with those of the previous chapter; they should be reserved for those unexpected cases which cannot be detected a priori. Complex algorithmic structures, if any, should appear in Feature_body parts, not in exception handlers. If your system has many sophisticated exception handling clauses, it is probably misusing the mechanism.
26.2 WHAT IS AN EXCEPTION?

**DEFINITION**

*Failure, exception, trigger*

Under certain circumstances, the execution or evaluation of a construct specimen may be unable to proceed as defined by the construct’s semantics. It is then said to result in a failure.

If, during the execution of a routine, the execution of one of the components of the routine’s Body fails, this prevents the routine’s execution from continuing the Body’s execution normally; such an event is said to trigger an exception.

Examples of exception causes include:

- Assertion violation (in an assertion monitoring mode).
- Failure of a called routine.
- Impossible operation, such as a Creation instruction attempted when not enough memory is available, or an arithmetic operation which would cause an overflow or underflow in the platform’s number system.
- Interruption signal sent by the machine for example after a user has hit the “break” key or the window of the current process has been resized.
- An exception explicitly raised by the software itself.

Common exception types that do not arise in Eiffel, other than through mistakes in the definition of the language as specified by the Standard, are “void calls” (attempts to execute a feature on a void target) and “catcalls” (attempt to execute a feature on an unsuitable object).

These categories distinguish the manifestation of the exception, not its real cause. Causes of exceptions essentially boil down to two possibilities: an error (a bug) in the software, or the inability of the underlying machine to carry out a certain operation. Assertion violations are a clear example of the first cause – a correct program always satisfies its assertions at run time – whereas running out of memory for a Creation is an example of the second.

In a way, the second of these types of cause is a variant of the first: if systems never executed an operation without checking first that it is feasible, then a correct system would never run into an exception. But it would be hardly practical to have every Creation instruction preceded by a check for available space, or every addition preceded by a check that the result will fit in the machine’s number system – assuming such checks were possible.
In cases like these, a priori checking is expensive, and only a small percentage of executions are likely not to pass the checks. These are the cases requiring exceptions – ways to detect an abnormal situation, and possibly recover from it, after it has occurred.

26.3 EXCEPTION HANDLING POLICY

What can happen after an exception? In other words, what can we do when the unexpected occurs?

To answer this question properly, we must remember that a routine or other software component is not just the description of some computation. What transcends that particular computation is the goal that it is meant to achieve – what in the Eiffel theory is called the contract. The component provides just one way to achieve the contract; often, other implementations are possible. For simple components the contract is defined by the language: for example the contract of a Creation instruction is to create an object, initialize its fields and attach it to an entity. For more complex components you may express the contract through assertions: for example, a routine’s contract may be defined by a precondition, a postcondition, and the class invariant. Even if there are no explicit assertions, the contract implicitly exists, perhaps expressed informally by the routine’s Header_comment.

If we want to remain in control of what our software does, we must concentrate on the notion of contract to define possible responses to an exception. The contract of a software component defines the observable aspects of its behavior, those which its clients expect. Any exception handling policy must be compatible with that expectation.

An exception is the occurrence of an event which prevents a component from fulfilling the current execution of its contract. An unacceptable reaction would be to terminate the component’s execution and to return silently to the client, which would then proceed on the wrong assumption that everything is normal. Since things are not normal – the client’s expectations were not fulfilled – such a policy would almost inevitably lead to disaster in the client’s execution.

What then is an acceptable reaction? Depending on the context, only three possibilities make sense for handling an exception:

• A favorable albeit unlikely case is one in which the exception was in fact not justified. This is called the false alarm.

• When writing the component, you may have anticipated the possibility of an exception, and provided for an alternative way to fulfil the contract. Then the execution will try that alternative. This case is called resumption.

See "Object-Oriented Software Construction" for more in-depth discussions of exception handling principles. References in appendix C.
• If you have no way of fulfilling the contract, then you should try to return the objects involved into an acceptable state, and signal your failure to the client. This is called organized panic.

The language mechanism described below – Rescue clauses and Retry instructions – directly supports resumption and organized panic. The rather infrequent case of false alarm is handled through features of the Kernel Library class EXCEPTIONS.

These mechanisms are defined at the routine level. For components at a lower level, such as an instruction or a call, you have no language mechanism to specify potential recovery. This means that for an unsuccessful attempt at executing such a component (for example an attempt at object creation when there is not enough memory, or at feature call on a void target) only policy E3 is possible: the component's execution will fail immediately, causing an exception. The exception interrupts the last started routine, called the recipient of the exception--- NOT TRUE, SEE FOLLOWING RULES, REMOVE

Depending on the recipient routine and its class, the exception will be handled through one of the three techniques listed:

For the rest of this chapter, then, the unit of discourse is the routine. Any exception has a recipient, which is a routine. By writing an appropriate Rescue clause, you may specify the routine’s response as resumption or organized panic; through the appropriate calls to library features, you may in some cases proceed with the routine’s execution after a false alarm.

The next sections explain how to specify one of these three possibilities as your choice for exception handling.

### 26.4 Rescue Clauses and Organized Panic

The construct which specifies a routine’s response to exceptions that may occur during an execution of the routine is the Rescue clause.

This is an optional part of a Routine declaration, introduced by the keyword rescue.
Here is a sketch of a routine with a Rescue clause:

```plaintext
attempt_transaction (arg: CONTEXT)
    --Try transaction with arg; if impossible,
    --reset current object
require
    ...
do
    ...
ensure
    ...
rescue
    reset (arg)
end
```

Any exception triggered during the execution of the Feature_body (do... clause) will cause execution of the Rescue clause. Here this clause calls procedure `reset`, meant to restore the current object to a stable state; such a state should satisfy the class invariant.

Termination of the Rescue clause also terminates the routine execution; in this case, however, as opposed to what would happen if the do.. clause was executed to the end with no exception, the call to `attempt_transaction` will fail. This is indeed the only way for a routine call to fail: being the recipient of an exception and executing its Rescue clause to the end, not ending with a Retry instruction (described below).

In other words, the routine illustrates the policy defined above as organized panic – put back the object in an acceptable state (satisfying the invariant) and terminate, notifying your caller, if any, of the failure. The technique used for this notification is to trigger a new exception, with the caller as recipient.

As noted, organized panic should restore the invariant. The formal version of this requirement, given below as part of the definition of exception correctness, is that any branch of a Rescue clause not terminating with a Retry should yield a state satisfying the invariant, independently of the state in which it is triggered.

As you may remember from the definition of class consistency, this requirement of ensuring the invariant also applies in another context: creation procedures of a class. This suggests that it is sometimes possible to write a Rescue clause as a call to a creation procedure, which will reset the object to a state which it could have reached just after creation. Of course, other situations may require more specific Rescue clauses, taking into account the routine that failed and the context of the failure.
26.5 THE DEFAULT RESCUE

In most systems, the vast majority of routines will not have an explicit Rescue clause. What happens if an exception is triggered during the execution of such a routine?

The convention a routine of a class $C$ is considered, if it has no explicit Rescue clause, to have an implicit Rescue of the form

```
rescue
  def_sec
```

where $\text{def\_sec}$ is the version of $\text{default\_rescue}$ in the enclosing class. Procedure $\text{default\_rescue}$ is introduced in the universal class $\text{ANY}$, where it is defined so as to have no effect:

```
default\_rescue
  do
  end
```

Any developer-defined class, which is automatically a descendant of $\text{ANY}$, may redefine this routine to serve in case of organized panic. The redefined version will be called by any routine of the class which does not have a specific Rescue clause. Like any other routine, the redefined version is passed on to every heir, which will use it as default Rescue clause unless there is a new redefinition in the heir.

The reason for using the name $\text{def\_sec}$ rather than $\text{default\_rescue}$ in expressing the above equivalence is that in the process of inheriting from $\text{ANY}$, directly or indirectly, classes may rename features. For clarity, however, it is recommended to keep the original name $\text{default\_rescue}$. 

\[\text{\textcopyright } \text{ANY}\text{, }6.6, \text{page }172; \text{see also chapter }35\text{ for more details.} \]
If, following the possibility suggested above, you use a creation procedure as default Rescue, you may rely on the following scheme, where `default_rescue` and the creation procedure are declared as synonym features:

\[
\text{class C create} \\
\quad \text{make, ... other creation procedures if any ...} \\
\text{inherit} \\
\quad \text{ANY} \\
\quad \text{redefine default_rescue end}
\]

\[
\text{...} \\
\text{feature} \\
\quad \text{make, default_rescue} \\
\quad \quad \text{-- No precondition} \\
\quad \quad \text{do} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{... Appropriate implementation;} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{... must ensure the invariant.} \\
\quad \quad \text{end} \\
\quad \text{. Other features ...} \\
\text{end}
\]

With this scheme, since `default_rescue` has no argument, there must also be no argument for the creation procedure chosen as synonym, here `make`.

The `default_rescue` convention explains what happens if a routine such as `attempt_transaction` above fails and its caller had no explicit Rescue. The caller will simply execute its version of `default_rescue` – which means doing nothing at all if it still has the original version inherited from `ANY` Then it will fail and trigger an exception in its client, which will itself be faced with the same situation. The effect of executing this Rescue chain all the way to the original root call will be described below.

26.6 RETRY INSTRUCTIONS AND RESUMPTION

Sometimes you can do better than just conceding defeat and cutting your losses. This is where the Retry instruction is useful.

This instruction, which supports the resumption policy, may only appear in a Rescue clause. It has a very simple form, being just the keyword

```
retry
```

The effect of a Retry is to execute again the body of the routine. A Rescue clause which executes a Retry escapes failure – perhaps only temporarily, of course, since the body may again cause an exception.
Here is a general scheme that covers many uses of Retry. To solve a problem, you normally use method 1; if that method does not work, however, it may trigger an exception, and method 2 may yield the desired result.

```ruby
try_once_or_twice
  -- Solve problem using method 1 or, if unsuccessful, method 2
  local
    already_tried: BOOLEAN
  do
    if not already_tried then
      method_1
    else
      method_2
    end
  rescue
    if not already_tried then
      already_tried := true
    retry
  end
end
```

This example relies on the default initialization rules for local variables: `already_tried`, being of type `BOOLEAN`, is initialized to `false` on routine entry. This initialization is not repeated if the rescue block executes a Retry.

If `method_2` triggers an exception, that is to say if both methods have failed, the Rescue clause will execute an empty Compound (since the Conditional has no Else_part). So the routine execution will fail, triggering an exception in the caller. This is because `try_once_or_twice` had two methods to reach a goal, and neither succeeded.
You may of course prefer a routine that behaves less dramatically when it cannot produce a result. Rather than sending an exception to the caller, it will just record the result in a boolean attribute `impossible` of the enclosing class:

```plaintext
try_once_or_twice
    -- Solve problem using method 1 or, if unsuccessful, method 2
    -- if unsuccessful, method 2. Set impossible to true
    -- if neither method succeeded, false otherwise.

local
    already_tried: BOOLEAN

    do
        if not already_tried then
            method_1
        elseif not impossible then
            method_2
        end
    rescue
        if not already_tried then
            impossible := true;
        end;
        already_tried := true;
        retry
    end
```

This routine will never fail, since its Rescue clause always terminates with a Retry. This is not a paradox: the contract here is simply broader. As opposed to the contract for `try_once_or_twice`, it does not require the routine to solve the problem, but, more tolerantly, either to solve the problem (and set attribute `impossible` to true) or to set `impossible` to false if it is unable to solve the problem. Clearly, it is always possible to satisfy such a requirement; so there is no cause for failure.
You may easily generalize either version – \textit{try\_once\_or\_twice}, which may fail, and \textit{try\_and\_record}, which never fails but sets a boolean success indicator – to try more than two alternative methods: just replace \textit{already\_tried} by a local variable \textit{attempts} of type \textit{INTEGER}, which will be initialized to zero.

As a special case, the resumption may in some situations simply amount to trying the same policy again. This applies when the exception was caused by an intermittent malfunction in external device, for example a busy communication line, or by an erroneous human input; by trying the line again, or outputting an error message asking the user to correct his input, you may hope to succeed. Here is the general scheme:

```
try\_repeatedly\_and\_record
   -- Attempt to solve problem in at most Maximum trials.
   local
      attempts: INTEGER
   do
      if attempts <= Maximum then
         attempt\_to\_solve
      else
         impossible := true
      end
   rescue
      attempts := attempts + 1
      ... Other corrective actions, such as outputting
      an error message ...
      retry
   end
```

\textit{Maximum} is a constant attribute with a positive value. The integer attribute \textit{attempts} will be initialized to zero on routine entry.

The strategy used by \textit{try\_repeatedly\_and\_record} derives from \textit{try\_and\_record} rather than \textit{try\_once\_or\_more}: if unable to perform its duty, it does not fail but simply sets attribute \textit{impossible} to true. Adapting to the other style, which causes the routine to fail and trigger an exception in its caller, is easy and is left as an exercise.

\textbf{26.7 SYSTEM FAILURE AND THE EXCEPTION HISTORY TABLE}

In the organized panic case, a failed execution of a routine \textit{r} triggers an exception in the caller. But what if there is no caller?
This can occur only if the execution that fails is the "original call": the execution of the root's creation procedure which started system execution. Remember that executing a system means creating an instance of its root class and applying a creation procedure to that instance. The creation procedure usually calls other routines, which themselves execute further calls. This means that any routine execution except the original call has a caller.

A failure of the original call produces a system failure. Execution of the system terminates, producing an appropriate diagnostic about the system's inability to fulfil its task.

This rule does not just apply to exceptions triggered directly by the original call – an infrequent case since root creation procedures tend in practice to perform only simple actions before creating other objects or calling other routines. The more interesting case is the failure of a routine execution deep down in the call sequence, for which all direct and indirect callers eventually fail because they are not able to apply resumption. Then the failure bubbles up the call chain until it finally causes system failure.

This scenario in fact applies to the simplest case, in which no routine of the system has a Rescue clause, and no class redefines default_rescue: then any exception occurring during execution will propagate to the root's creation procedure, and result in a system failure.

What happens after a system failure? As noted, the tool that handles execution (the run-time system) should produce a diagnostic. The exact form of that diagnostic is not part of the language specification. Here is the format used in one particular implementation. After a system failure, that implementation prints an error message and an exception history table such as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Nature of Exception</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2FB44INTERF</td>
<td>4FACE</td>
<td>m_creation</td>
<td>Feature &quot;quasi_inverse&quot;:</td>
<td>Called on void reference Retry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F188MATH</td>
<td>quasi_inverse</td>
<td>&quot;positive_or_null&quot;:</td>
<td>(from BASIC_MATH) Precondition violated Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For an exception whose recipient was a routine \( r \), during a call on an object OBJ, the first column identifies OBJ (through an internal object identifier), the second column identifies the generating class of OBJ (the base class of its type), and the "Routine" column identifies \( r \). The next column indicates the nature of the exception; for developer-defined exceptions and assertion violations this includes a tag (the Assertion_tag for assertions clauses). The last column indicates the effect of the exception: resumption (appearing as \textit{Retry}) or organized panic (appearing as \textit{Fail}).

The table contains not just a trace of the calls that led to the final failure but also the entire history of recent exceptions. Some exceptions may have been caught and handled through resumption, only to lead to further exceptions. This is why the exception history is divided into periods, each terminated by a Retry. The table shows these periods separated by a double line; exceptions appear in the order in which they occurred, which is the reverse of the order of the calls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ObjectClass</th>
<th>Routine</th>
<th>Nature of exception</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2F188MATH</td>
<td>raise &quot;Negative_value&quot;:</td>
<td>Developer exception</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F188MATH</td>
<td>filter &quot;Negative_value&quot;:</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Retry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F32MATH</td>
<td>new_matrix &quot;enough_memory&quot;:</td>
<td>Check violated</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2FB44INTERFACE</td>
<td>setRoutine failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an exception whose recipient was a routine \( r \), during a call on an object OBJ, the first column identifies OBJ (through an internal object identifier), the second column identifies the generating class of OBJ (the base class of its type), and the "Routine" column identifies \( r \). The next column indicates the nature of the exception; for developer-defined exceptions and assertion violations this includes a tag (the Assertion_tag for assertions clauses). The last column indicates the effect of the exception: resumption (appearing as \textit{Retry}) or organized panic (appearing as \textit{Fail}).

The table contains not just a trace of the calls that led to the final failure but also the entire history of recent exceptions. Some exceptions may have been caught and handled through resumption, only to lead to further exceptions. This is why the exception history is divided into periods, each terminated by a Retry. The table shows these periods separated by a double line; exceptions appear in the order in which they occurred, which is the reverse of the order of the calls.
The case illustrated on the table, which resulted from a specially contrived system meant to illustrate the various possibilities – involving exceptions of many kinds, and resumptions that trigger new exceptions – is unusual. Exception handling in well-written systems should remain simple, and as much effort as possible should go into avoiding exceptions rather than handling them a posteriori. Exception handling does play a crucial role, however, for those hard to prevent cases which, in the absence of an appropriate exception mechanism, would leave defenseless the system, its users and its developers.

26.8 SYNTAX AND VALIDITY OF THE EXCEPTION CONSTRUCTS

It is time now to look at the precise properties of the two constructs associated with exceptions: rescue clauses of routines and retry instructions.

The grammar is straightforward: I

```
Rescue clauses

Rescue Δ rescue Compound
Retry Δ retry
```

A Rescue clause is part of a Routine. A Retry instruction is one of the choices for the Instruction construct.

A constraint applies to Rescue clauses:

```
Rescue clause rule VXRC
It is valid for a Routine to include a Rescue clause if and only if its Feature_body is an Effective_routine of the Internal form.
```

An Internal body is one which begins with either do or once. The other possibilities are Deferred, for which it would be improper to define an exception handler since the body does not specify an algorithm, and an External body, where the algorithm is specified outside of the Eiffel system, which then lacks the information it would need to handle exceptions.

The constraint on Retry instructions has already been mentioned:

```
Retry rule VXRT
A Retry instruction is valid if and only if it appears in a Rescue clause.
```

See page === for the syntax of Routine and page === for the syntax of Instruction.

The various kinds of Feature_body are discussed in 8.5, page 218.
26.9 EXCEPTION CORRECTNESS

As described in a later chapter, every routine has a rescue block, syntactically a Compound, which takes over whenever an execution of the routine triggers an abnormal condition (an exception). The rescue block is the contents of the routine’s Rescue clause, if any; otherwise it consists of a call to the routine default_rescue, which has a null effect in its default version (from class ANY) but may be redefined by any class.

The execution of the rescue block may end in either of two ways:

1. A rescue block which executes a Retry instruction causes the Routine_body to be executed again.

2. If it terminates without executing a Retry, the rescue block causes the routine execution to fail, triggering an exception in the routine’s caller (which will handle it in one of the same two ways).

To be correct, the rescue block must be such that any branch terminating with --- FiX --- a Retry (case 1) ensures the precondition and the invariant, and that any other branch (case 2) ensures the invariant. This provides for a first definition of exception correctness:

**Exception-correct**

A routine is exception-correct if any branch of the Rescue clause not terminating with a Retry ensures the invariant.

26.10 SEMANTICS OF EXCEPTION HANDLING

**Default Rescue Original Semantics**

Class ANY introduces a non-frozen procedure default_rescue with no argument and a null effect.

As the following semantic rules indicate, an exception not handled by an explicit Rescue clause will cause a call to default_rescue. Any class can redefine this procedure to implement a default exception handling policy for routines of the class that do not have their own Rescue clauses.
To define the semantics of exception handling, it is convenient to consider that every feature has an implicit or explicit "rescue block":

**Rescue block**

Any Internal or Attribute feature \( f \) of a class \( C \) has a rescue block, a Compound defined as follows, where \( rc \) is \( C \)'s version of ANY's `default_rescue`:

1. If \( f \) has a Rescue clause: the Compound contained in that clause.
2. If \( r \) is not \( rc \) and has no Rescue clause: a Compound made of a single instruction: an Unqualified_call to \( rc \).
3. If \( r \) is \( rc \) and has no Rescue clause: an empty Compound.

The semantic rules rely on this definition to define the effect of an exception as if every routine had a Rescue clause: either one written explicitly, or an implicit one calling `default_rescue`. To this effect they refer not to rescue clauses but to rescue blocks.

Condition 3 avoids endless recursion in the case of `default_rescue` itself.

The procedure `default_rescue` in class ANY has, by default, no effect. Any class can redefine
Exception Semantics

An exception triggered during an execution of a feature \( f \) causes, if it is neither ignored nor continued, the effect of the following sequence of events.

1. Attach the value of \( \text{last\_exception} \) from \( \text{ANY} \) to a direct instance of a descendant of the Kernel Library class \( \text{EXCEPTION} \) corresponding to the type of the exception.

2. Unlike in the non-exception semantics of \( \text{Compound} \), do not execute the remaining instructions of \( f \).

3. If the recipient of the exception is \( f \), execute the rescue block of \( f \).

4. If case 3 applies and the rescue block executes a \( \text{Retry} \), this terminates the processing of the exception. Execution continues with a new execution of the \( \text{Compound} \) in the \text{Feature\_body} of \( f \).

5. If neither case 3 nor case 4 applies (in particular in case 3 if the rescue block executes to the end without executing a \( \text{Retry} \)), this terminates the processing of the current exception and the current execution of \( f \), causing a failure of that execution. If the execution of \( f \) was caused by a call to \( f \) from another feature, trigger an exception of type \( \text{ROUTINE\_FAILURE} \) in the calling routine, to be handled (recursively) according to the present rule. If there is no such calling feature, \( f \) is the root procedure; terminate its execution as having failed.

After failure and termination, the run-time should normally produce a diagnostic similar to the exception history table of page ===.

False alarm was response E1 introduced on page === as part of the exception handling policy discussed in 255.
As usual in rules specifying the “effect” of an event in terms of a sequence of steps, all that counts is that effect; it is not required that the execution carry out these exact steps, or carry them in this exact order.

In step 1, the Retry will only re-execute the Feature_body of $r$, with all entities set to their current value; it does not repeat argument passing and local variable initialization. This may be used to ensure that the execution takes a different path on a new attempt.

In most cases, the “recipient” of the exception (case 3) is the current routine, $f$. For exception occurring in special places, such as when evaluating an assertion, the next rule, Exception Cases, tells us whether $f$ or its caller is the “recipient”.

In the case of a Feature_body of the Once form, the above semantics only applies to the first call to every applicable target, where a Retry may execute the body two or more times. If that first call fails, triggering a routine failure exception, the applicable rule for subsequent calls is not the above Exception Semantics (since the routine will not execute again) but the Once Routine Execution Semantics, which specifies that any such calls must trigger the exception again.

**Type of an exception**

The type of a triggered exception is the generating type of the object to which the value of last_exception is attached per step 1 of the Expression Semantics rule.
Exception Cases

The triggering of an exception in a routine \( r \) called by a routine \( \text{caller} \) results in the setting of the following properties, accessible through features of the exception class instance to which the value of \( \text{last_Exception} \) is attached, as per the following table, where:

- The **Recipient** is either \( f \) or \( \text{caller} \).
- “**Type**” indicates the type of the exception (a descendant of \( \text{EXCEPTION} \)).
- If \( f \) is the root procedure, executed during the original system creation call, the value of \( \text{caller} \) as given below does not apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exception during evaluation of invariant on entry</td>
<td>( \text{caller} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant violation on entry</td>
<td>( \text{caller} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception during evaluation of precondition</td>
<td>( \text{caller} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception during evaluation of Old expression on entry</td>
<td>See Old Expression Semantics rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precondition violation</td>
<td>( \text{caller} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception in body</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception during evaluation of invariant on exit</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invariant violation on exit</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception during evaluation of postcondition on exit</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcondition violation</td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This rule specifies the precise effect of an exception occurring anywhere during execution (including some rather extreme cases, such as the occurrence of an exception in the evaluation of an assertion). Whether the “recipient” is \( f \) or caller determines whether the execution of the current routine can be “retried”: per case 3 of the Exception Semantics rule, a Retry is applicable only if the recipient is itself. Otherwise a ROUTINE_FAILURE will be triggered in the caller.

In the case of an Old expression, a special rule, given earlier, requires the exception to be remembered, during evaluation of the expression on entry to the routine, for re-triggering during evaluation of the postcondition on exit, but only if the expression turns out to be needed then.

### Exception Properties

The value of the query \texttt{original} of class \texttt{EXCEPTION}, applicable to \texttt{last_exception}, is an \texttt{EXCEPTION} reference determined as follows after the triggering of an exception of type \texttt{TEX}:

1. If \texttt{TEX} does not conform to \texttt{ROUTINE_FAILURE}: a reference to the current \texttt{EXCEPTION} object.
2. If \texttt{TEX} conforms to \texttt{ROUTINE_FAILURE}: the previous value of \texttt{original}.

The reason for this query is that when a routine fails, because execution of a routine \( f \) has triggered an exception and has not been able to handle it through a Retry, the consequence, per case 5 of the Exception Semantics rule, is to trigger a new exception of type \texttt{ROUTINE_FAILURE}, to which \texttt{last_exception} now becomes attached. Without a provision for \texttt{original}, the “real” source of the exception would be lost, as \texttt{ROUTINE_FAILURE} exceptions get passed up the call chain. Querying \texttt{original} makes it possible, for any other routine up that chain, to find out the \texttt{Ur}-exception that truly started the full process.

### 26.11 EXCEPTION CORRECTNESS

The role of Rescue clauses is to cope with unexpected events. Although in a well-designed system Rescue clauses will only be executed in rare, special conditions, they still have an obligation to maintain the consistency of objects.
In particular, a routine failure should leave the current object (corresponding to the target of the latest call) in a consistent state, satisfying the invariant, so as not to hamper further attempts to use the object if another routine is able, through resumption, to recover from the failure. Also, a Retry instruction, which will restart the Feature_body, should re-establish the routine’s precondition, if any, since the precondition is required for the Feature_body to operate properly.

These two requirements yield the notion of exception correctness, one of the conditions which make up class correctness. As you may recall, a class is correct if it is consistent (every Feature_body, started in a state satisfying the precondition and the invariant, terminates in a state satisfying the postcondition and the invariant), loop-correct (loops maintain their invariant and every iteration decreases the variant), check-correct (the conditions of Check instructions are satisfied) and exception correct, a notion which was sketched in the general discussion of correctness but may now be made more precise.

Here , INV_C is the class invariant and prer is the precondition of r.

The definition involves the rescue block of a routine. Remember that the rescue block always exists: if the routine has a Rescue clause, then its Compound is the rescue block; otherwise the rescue block is the local version of ANY’s procedure default_rescue.

As with other correctness conditions, exception correctness should ideally be provable automatically, but in practice you will most likely have to ascertain it through informal means.
26.12 FINE-TUNING THE MECHANISM

Ignoring, continuing an exception

It is possible through routines of the Kernel Library class EXCEPTION, to ensure that exceptions of certain types be:

- **Ignored**: lead to no change of non-exception semantics.
- **Continued**: lead to execution of a programmer-specified routine, then to continuation of the execution according to non-exception semantics.

The details of what types of exceptions can be ignored and continued, and how to achieve these effects, belong to the specification of class EXCEPTION and its descendants.

--- REWRITE In some cases it is useful to have finer control over the handling of exceptions. Features from the Kernel Library class EXCEPTIONS address this need. These features will be available to any descendant of EXCEPTIONS: to use them in a class $C$ which is not already a descendant, just add a Parent part for EXCEPTIONS to the Inheritance clause of $C$.

Let us take a look at the facilities offered. A later chapter gives the full short-flat form of EXCEPTIONS.

First, EXCEPTIONS introduces an integer code for every possible type of exception. Examples include

- **Precondition** (code for a violated precondition)
- **Routine_failure**
- **Incorrect_inspect_value**
- **Void_call_target**
- **No_more_memory**

See chapter 37 about the details of class EXCEPTIONS.
The integer-valued feature `exception` is then guaranteed, after an exception occurs, to have the value of the code for that exception. This makes it possible to write Rescue clauses such as

```
rescue
  if exception = No_more_memory
then
  ... Specific treatment...
else
  default_rescue
end
```

The call to `default_rescue` in the Else_part is not required, of course, but as a general guideline if you do need to treat certain categories of exception in a special way then such treatment should remain simple and apply to a small number of categories. You should handle the remaining categories through `default_rescue` or another general-purpose mechanism.

Another integer-valued feature, `original_exception`, complements the information given by `exception`. It yields the "real" cause of an exception, disregarding any resulting failures of intermediate routines. Consider for an example a Postcondition violation which causes a routine `t` to fail, triggering an exception whose recipient is `t`'s caller, `s`; the Rescue clause of `s`, if any, does not execute a Retry, so `s` in turn fails, sending an exception to its own caller, `r`. If the Rescue clause of `r` looks at `exception` to determine what happened, it will find as exception code the value of `Routine_failure`. This gives the immediate cause of `r`'s exception (the failure of `s`) but not the real source of the problem – `t`'s Postcondition violation. Feature `original_exception` provides more precise information in such cases. Its value is the code of the oldest exception not handled by a Retry. In the example, this will be the value of `Precondition`.

Features which provide further information about the original exception include `routine_name` (name of the original recipient) and `tag_name` (tag of the violated Assertion_clause, for an assertion violation).

Class `EXCEPTION` also provides a way to raise an exception on purpose. This is called a `developer exception` and is triggered by the procedure call

```
raise (code, name)
```
whose arguments are an exception code `code`, which must be a negative integer (non-negative values are reserved for predefined exceptions), and a string `name` describing the nature of the exception. To obtain that string when handling the exception, use feature `developer_exception_name`.

To know the general category of an exception given of a given `code` (usually `exception` or `original_exception`), use one of the boolean functions

```plaintext
is_assertion_violation (code)  
is_developer_exception (code)  
is_signal (code)
```

To prescribe a false alarm response you may use one of the procedure calls

```plaintext
ignore (code)  
continue (code)
```

A call to `ignore` simply prescribes that later occurrences of the event with the given `code` must not cause an exception.

After a call to `continue` with `code` as argument, any occurrence of the corresponding signal will cause execution of the appropriate version of procedure `continue_action`, followed by continuation of the Feature_body which was the signal’s recipient. Procedure `continue_action` is introduced in class `EXCEPTIONS` with an empty body, but (like `default_rescue`) may be redefined in any class to yield specific behavior. The procedure has an integer argument `code` to which the exception handling mechanism, when calling `continue_action` as a response to an exception for which "continue" status has been prescribed, will attach the code of that exception.

The false alarm policy would not make sense for exceptions which cause irrecoverable damage to the current routine execution. For example, an assertion violation indicates a breach of some consistency condition, making it impossible to continue normal execution. For this reason, `continue` has the precondition `is_signal(code)`. No such precondition has been imposed on `ignore` in deference to the potential needs of developers of low-level systems software; except in very special cases, however, `ignore` must only be applied to signals.

To restore the default behavior after a call to `ignore` or `continue`, use the call

```plaintext
catch (code)
```
To know the behavior specified for \textit{code}, use

\begin{center}
\texttt{status (code)}
\end{center}

whose result, an integer, is given by one of the constants \textit{Caught} (the default), \textit{Continued} and \textit{Ignored}.

As a final comment, it is useful to note once again that the best exception handling is simple and modest. The facilities of class \texttt{EXCEPTIONS} are there to give you full access to the context of exceptions if you need it; remember, however, that if you are trying to do something complicated in a Rescue clause, you are probably misusing the mechanism.

Non-trivial algorithms belong in the \texttt{Feature\textunderscore body}; the Rescue clause is there to recover in a simple and non-committing way from abnormal situations which it was absolutely impossible to avoid.

\textbf{26.13 OVERVIEW}

As explained in the discussion of exceptions, it is sometimes useful to control the details of the exception handling mechanism. Applications include:

- Finding out the nature of the latest exception (such as assertion violation, running out of memory or platform signal) and any other property, such as the \texttt{Assertion\textunderscore tag} of a violated assertion clause.
- Handling certain kinds of exception in a special way.
- Raising special developer-defined exceptions.
- Prescribing that certain exceptions must be ignored at run-time, or must let execution continue after a call to a specified procedure.

All these facilities for fine-tuning the exception mechanism are available through features of class \texttt{EXCEPTIONS} from the Kernel Library, which is the subject of this chapter. To use these facilities in a class \texttt{C}, it suffices to ensure that \texttt{C} is a descendant of \texttt{EXCEPTIONS}.

Since the key concepts were introduced in the general discussion of exceptions, the rest of this chapter will simply give the flat-short form of class \texttt{EXCEPTIONS}, after a few comments about platform-dependent signal codes.

\textbf{26.14 PLATFORM-DEPENDENT SIGNAL CODES}

The exception codes introduced in class \texttt{EXCEPTIONS}, such as \texttt{No\textunderscore more\textunderscore memory} or \texttt{Precondition}, cover exceptions which will arise in the same manner on every platform.

\textit{Chapter 26} discussed exceptions.

"Platform" means hardware plus operating system. See \textit{2.12, page 101}.

See the explanations in \textit{26.12, page 701}. 
Some platform-dependent machine signals, however, will also trigger exceptions. Unix systems, for example, may raise signals such as "change of child process status" or "writing on a pipe with no one to read it".

To enable systems to specify platform-specific exception handling when appropriate, Eiffel implementations may include library classes extending the features of `EXCEPTIONS` with platform-specific exception handling features, in particular exception codes. The recommended names for such classes are of the form `platform_EXCEPTIONS`, for example `UNIX_EXCEPTIONS`, `MS_DOS_EXCEPTIONS` and so on. Classes which need the specific features should have one of these classes, in addition to `EXCEPTIONS`, as one of their ancestors.

A system which uses one of these platform-specific classes will of course require some adaptation to be ported to other platforms. If you do need platform-specific exception handling, you should severely restrict the number of classes that inherit from the appropriate `platform_EXCEPTIONS` class, so as to facilitate any eventual porting effort.
26.15 CLASS EXCEPTIONS

Here is the short form of class EXCEPTIONS.

```
-- Facilities for controlling exception handling.
class interface EXCEPTIONS exported features
  assertion_violation: BOOLEAN
  -- Was last exception due to a violated assertion or
  -- non-decreasing variant?
  catch (code: INTEGER)
  -- Make sure that any exception of code code will be caught.
  -- This is the default. (See continue, ignore.)
ensure
  status (code) = Caught
Check_instruction: INTEGER
  -- Exception code for violated Check
Class_invariant: INTEGER
  -- Exception code for violated class invariant
class_name: STRING
  -- Name of the class containing the routine which
  -- was the recipient of oldest exception not leading to a Retry.
continue (code: INTEGER)
  -- Make sure that any exception of code code will cause
  -- execution to resume after a call to continue_action (code).
  -- This is not the default. (See catch, ignore.)
require
  must_be_a_signal: is_signal (code)
ensure
  status (code) = Continued
continue_action (code: INTEGER)
  -- Action to be executed before resuming normal execution for an
  -- exception of code code, resulting from a signal,
  -- on which continue has been called.
  -- By default, does nothing; redefine it to get specific behavior.
```
## §26.15  CLASS EXCEPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement/Ensure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>require</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>must_be_continued: status (code) = Continued</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>developer_exception_name: STRING</code></td>
<td>Name of last developer-raised exception (see raise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>exception: INTEGER</code></td>
<td>Code of last exception that occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ignore (code: INTEGER)</code></td>
<td>Make sure that any exception of code code will be ignored. This is not the default. (See catch, continue.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ensure</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>status (code) = Ignored</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Incorrect_inspect_value: INTEGER</code></td>
<td>Exception code for inspect value which is not one of the inspect constants, if there is no Else_part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>is_developer_exception (code: INTEGER): BOOLEAN</code></td>
<td>Is the code of a developer-defined exception (see raise)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>is_assertion_violation (code: INTEGER): BOOLEAN</code></td>
<td>Is the code of an exception resulting from the violation of an assertion (precondition, postcondition, invariant, check)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>is_signal (code: INTEGER): BOOLEAN</code></td>
<td>Is code the code of an exception due to a hardware or operating system signal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Loop_invariant: INTEGER</code></td>
<td>Exception code for violated loop invariant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>Loop_variant: INTEGER</code></td>
<td>Exception code for non-decreased loop variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>meaning (code): STRING</code></td>
<td>Nature of exception of code code, expressed in plain English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>message_on_failure</code></td>
<td>Print an Exception History Table in case of failure. This is the default; see no_message_on_failure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
no_message_on_failure
-- Do not print an Exception History Table in case of failure.
-- (This is not the default; see message_on_failure.)
No_more_memory: INTEGER
-- Exception code for failed memory allocation
original_exception: INTEGER
-- Code of oldest exception not leading to a Retry
Postcondition: INTEGER
-- Exception code for violated postcondition
Precondition: INTEGER
-- Exception code for violated precondition
raise (code: INTEGER; name: STRING)
-- Raise a developer exception of code code and name name.
require
negative_code: code < 0
reset_all_default
-- Make sure that all exceptions will lead to their default handling.
reset_default (code: INTEGER)
-- Make sure that exception of code code will lead
-- to its default action.
Routine_failure: INTEGER
-- Exception code for failed routine
routine_name: STRING
-- Name of routine that was recipient of oldest exception
-- not leading to a Retry
status (code: INTEGER): INTEGER
-- Status currently set for exception of code code (default: Caught)
ensure
Result = Caught or Result = Continued or Result = Ignored
Caught, Continued, Ignored: INTEGER is unique
-- Possible status for exception codes
tag_name: STRING
-- Tag of last violated assertion clause
Void_assigned_to_expanded: INTEGER
   -- Exception code for assignment of void value to expanded entity

Void_call_target: INTEGER
   -- Exception code for feature called on void reference

void_call_feature: STRING
   -- Name of feature that was called on a void reference

end interface -- class EXCEPTIONS