

CoCoA-5 - Design #1501

testing for syntax errors

07 Oct 2020 11:55 - John Abbott

Status:	Rejected	Start date:	07 Oct 2020
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	John Abbott	% Done:	100%
Category:	enhancing/improving	Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:	CoCoA-5.4.0	Spent time:	0.80 hour
Description			
In CoCoA-5 test files, computational errors can be captured inside a try...entry block, but syntax errors cannot.			
I wanted to create a test file for the new export skip capability. Unfortunately, although the file is entirely read and produces the expected error mesgs (all on cout for some reason!), CoCoAInterpreter exits with non-zero code; so the test script regard the test as having failed (which is the intention).			
Is it worth trying to modify the testing mechanism so that some tests can be marked as "should fail"?			
Related issues:			
Related to CoCoA-5 - Design #1495: Package exporting nothing?		Closed	02 Oct 2020

History

#1 - 07 Oct 2020 12:02 - John Abbott

I am quite undecided about this.

For "run-time" errors we have the possibility of handling them via try...endtry; so they can be *e.g.* verified and discarded.

On one hand it would be nice to have a means of checking that syntax errors are properly detected and reported; on the other, we only very rarely change the interpreter, so only rarely would we need to check that parsing works as desired. Such rare checks could perhaps be performed by hand?

At the moment I do have much desire to meddle with the existing testing mechanism (which has been working fine for quite some time).

NOTE syntax errors inside a package are handled specially: parsing continues after the syntax error, whereas a syntax error elsewhere seems to stop further parsing (though possibly not absolutely immediately)

#2 - 07 Oct 2020 12:04 - John Abbott

- Related to Design #1495: Package exporting nothing? added

#3 - 04 Nov 2021 23:07 - John Abbott

The idea itself is not so bad, but actually implementing looks to be nightmarish.

I am inclined to reject this issue on the grounds that it would be too costly/tricky to implement, and that the gains are not so great. Opinions?

#4 - 05 Nov 2021 16:53 - John Abbott

- *Subject changed from tests which produce errors to testing for syntax errors*
- *Status changed from New to Rejected*
- *Assignee set to John Abbott*
- *% Done changed from 0 to 100*

Since we cannot see how to do this in a reasonable way, we reject the issue.