

Choose Your Poison: Exceptions or Error Codes?

Andrei Alexandrescu
Petru Marginean

1

Agenda

- ◆ Exceptions: WTF?
 - Why The Frenzy?
- ◆ Top 3 problems with exceptions
- ◆ Help from the type system
 - The None type, type erasure, and variants, oh my!
- ◆ The Likely<T> type
- ◆ Conclusions

2

Exceptions: teleology

- ◆ Most of us took them non-critically
 - “Here’s the construct... use it”
- ◆ What’s a proper baseline?
- ◆ What were their design goals?
- ◆ What were their intended use cases?
- ◆ How do their semantics support the use cases?
- ◆ What were the consequences of their design?
- ◆ How to write code playing on their strengths?

3

A Case for Dual Errors

- ◆ “One man's constant is another man's variable”
 - Alan Perlis
- ◆ “One person's fatal error is another person's common case”
 - W.P.P.

4

Desiderata

- ◆ General: learn once use many
- ◆ Minimize soft errors; maximize hard errors
 - Avoid metastable states
- ◆ Allow centralized handling
 - Keep error handling out of most code
- ◆ Allow local handling
 - Library can't decide handling locus
- ◆ Transport an arbitrary amount of error info
- ◆ Demand little cost on the normal path
- ◆ Make correct code easy to write

5

Inventing Exceptions

```
int atoi(const char * s);
```

- ◆ What's wrong with it?
 - Returns zero on error
 - "0", " 0", " +000 " are all valid inputs
 - Zero is a commonly-encountered value
 - atoi is a *surjection*
- ◆ Distinguish valid from invalid input a posteriori is almost as hard as a priori!

6

Inventing Exceptions

- ◆ Four solutions for returning error information:
 1. Set global state
 - The errno approach
 2. Encode error information as a special returned value
 - the out-of-band value approach
 3. Encode error information as a value of a distinct type
 - the “error code return” approach
 4. Exceptions

7

errno

- ◆ + General
- ◆ - Minimize soft errors
- ◆ + Centralized handling
- ◆ + Local handling
- ◆ - Arbitrary amount of error info
- ◆ + Little cost on the normal path
- ◆ - Make correct code easy to write
 - Error handling entirely optional
 - Threading issues

8

Special Value

- ◆ - General (won't work with surjective functions)
- ◆ - Minimize soft errors
- ◆ - Centralized handling
- ◆ + Local handling
- ◆ - Arbitrary amount of error info
- ◆ ? Little cost on the normal path
- ◆ - Make correct code easy to write
 - Error handling often optional
 - Error handling code intertwined with normal code

9

Value of separate type

- ◆ + General
- ◆ ? Minimize soft errors
- ◆ - Centralized handling
- ◆ + Local handling
- ◆ + Arbitrary amount of error info
- ◆ + Little cost on the normal path
- ◆ - Make correct code easy to write
 - Error handling requires much extra code & data
 - `strtol(const char* s, const char ** e, int r);`

10

Exceptions?

- ◆ We want to pass arbitrary error info around:

```
class invalid_input { ... };
int|invalid_input atoi(const char * str);
int|invalid_input r = atoi(some_string);
typeswitch (r) {
  case int x { ... }
  case invalid_input err { ... }
};
```

11

Exceptions? (cont'd)

- ◆ We want to allow centralized error handling

- Break the typeswitch => covert return types!

```
overt<int>|covert<invalid_input>
atoi(const char*);
```

- ◆ Local code should afford to ignore invalid_input
- ◆ => A function has an overt return type plus one or more covert return types
- ◆ Q: Where do the covert return values go?

12

Exceptions (cont'd)

- ◆ Covert values must “return” to a caller upper in the dynamic invocation chain
- ◆ Only certain callers understand certain errors
- ◆ => Covert returned types come together with covert execution paths!
- ◆ => Callers plant return points collecting such types
- ◆ => Type-based, first-match exception handling

13

Exceptions: Aftermath

- ◆ + General
- ◆ ? Minimize soft errors
- ◆ + Centralized handling
- ◆ - Local handling
- ◆ + Arbitrary amount of error info
- ◆ + Little cost on the normal path
- ◆ ? Make correct code easy to write
 - 1987: yes
 - 1997: no
 - 2007: maybe

14

Top 3 Issues with Exceptions

- ◆ **Metastable states**
 - User must ensure transactional semantics
 - Destructors
 - ScopeGuard
- ◆ **Local error handling unduly hard/asymmetric**
 - By-value semantics prevent library approaches
 - Can't say `GuardedCall(Function(args))`
- ◆ **Hard to analyze**
 - By human and by machine

15

Today

- ◆ + Local handling
- ◆ + Minimize soft errors
- ◆ + Make correct code easier to write

- ◆ Must start with a few background items

16



1. The None type

- ◆ Returned by a function with no overt returns:

None Abort();

None Exit(int code);

None LoopForever();

- ◆ Properties:

- Can be substituted for any type
 - The bottom of the type hierarchy
- Destructor throws
- Noncopyable

17



2. Type Erasure

- ◆ Cloaks an arbitrarily typed object under a uniform interface
- ◆ Used in e.g. ScopeGuard, boost::dynamic_any
- ◆ Typical implementation:

```
class Cloak {
    auto_ptr<Interface> p_;
public:
    template <class T> Cloak(const T& t)
        : p_(new InterfaceImpl<T>(t)) {}
    ...
};
```

18



3. Union Types

- ◆ Discriminated unions
- ◆ Defined by e.g. `boost::any`, `Variant`
- ◆ Typical implementation:

```
template <class T, class U> class Variant {  
    union {  
        char[appropriate_size] buf_  
        AppropriateAlignType align_  
    } data_  
    bool isT;  
    ...  
};
```

19

Likely<T>

- ◆ Idea: We want to express the *union* of an overt type and a covert type
 - Normal case: value of overt type is there
 - Erroneous case: a value akin to `None` is there
 - `None` has extra info using *type erasure*!

- ◆ Unify local and central error handling

```
Likely<int> atoi(const char *);
```

- ◆ Wanna local? Check `Likely<T>::HasValue()`
- ◆ Wanna centralized? Use `Likely<T>` as you'd use a `T`

20

Creating Likely<T>

```
template <typename T> struct Likely {
    Likely();
    Likely(const T& v);
    Likely(const Likely& obj);
    Likely& operator=(const Likely&);
    ~Likely() throw(something);
    enum InvalidT { Invalid };
    template <typename E>
    Likely(const E& obj, InvalidT);
    operator T&();
    operator const T&() const;
    bool HasValue() const;
    template <typename E> const E* Probe() const;
private:
    Variant<T, auto_ptr<CovertInterface> > data_;
};
```

21

Using Likely<T>: Centralized

- ◆ Centralized error handling: convert Likely<T> to T& liberally
- ◆ Exception is thrown if the object is a dud
- ◆ Code is similar to that with entirely covert returns

```
int x = atoi(some_string);
```

- ◆ Separate normal path from error path
- ◆ Just like with exceptions

22

Using Likely<T>: Local

- ◆ Localized error handling:

```
Likely<int> r = atoi(some_string);
if (r.HasValue()) {
    auto p = r.Probe<ConvException>();
    ... local error handling ...
}
```
- ◆ Just like good ol' error handling with special values
 - Exacts a tad more cost
- ◆ No more issues with surjections => general!

23

Using Likely<T>: Ignoramus

- ◆ If:
 - A Likely<T> object is a dud &&
 - Nobody attempts to dereference it &&
 - Nobody checks IsValue() &&
 - !std::uncaught_exception()
- ◆ Then:
 - Likely<T>'s destructor throws an exception (ouch!)
- ◆ Keeps error handling required
- ◆ Avoids metastable states
- ◆ Easy to supress: IGNORE_ERROR(atoi(str));

24

The Covert Side

```
struct CovertInterface {  
    virtual ~CovertInterface() throw() {}  
    virtual void Throw() const = 0;  
    virtual bool IsEnabled() const = 0;  
    virtual void Disable() = 0;  
};
```

25

The Covert Side

```
template <typename E> struct Covert : CovertInterface, E  
{  
    Covert(const E& obj) : E(obj), enabled(true) {}  
    virtual void Throw() const {  
        if (!std::uncaught_exception())  
            throw static_cast<const E&>(*this);  
    }  
    virtual bool IsEnabled() const { return enabled; }  
    virtual void Disable() { enabled = false; }  
private:  
    Covert(const Covert&);  
    Covert& operator =(const Covert&);  
    bool enabled;  
};
```

26

The MI trick

- ◆ Multiple inheritance allows implementing Probe

```
template <typename E>
const E* Likely<T>::Probe() const {
    auto p = dynamic_cast<E*>(getCovertPtr());
    if (!p) return 0;
    const E& e = *pPtr;
    return &e;
};
```

27

Conclusions

- ◆ Exceptions' design address a complicated web of desiderata
 - Fails to provide complete solution
 - Better than others
 - Requires a shift in code writing style
- ◆ Possible to make local and central error handling interchangeable
 - Type system can help
 - Keeps error handling required
 - Avoid asymmetry

28