

Why exceptions?

▶ Returning error codes

```
error_code f()
{
  auto rc1 = g1();
  if ( rc1.bad() )
    return rc1;
  auto rc2 = g2();
  if ( rc2.bad() )
    return rc2;
  return g3();
}
```

Run-time cost

- small if everything is OK
- small if something wrong

Throwing exceptions

```
void f()
{
   g1();
   g2();
   g3();
}
```

Run-time cost

- none if everything is OK
- big if something wrong

▶Exceptions are "jumps"

- Start: throw statement
- Destination: try-catch block
 - Determined in run-time
- The jump may exit a procedure
 - Local variables will be properly destructed by destructors
- Besides jumping, a value is passed
 - The type of the value determines the destination
 - Typically, special-purpose classes
 - Catch-block matching can understand inheritance

```
class AnyException { /*...*/ };
class WrongException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
class BadException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
void f()
 if ( something == wrong )
  throw WrongException( something);
 if (anything != good)
  throw BadException( anything);
void g()
 try {
  f();
 catch (const AnyException & e1) {
  /*...*/
```

▶Exceptions are "jumps"

- Start: throw statement
- Destination: try-catch block
 - Determined in run-time
- The jump may exit a procedure
 - Local variables will be properly destructed by destructors
- Besides jumping, a value is passed
 - The type of the value determines the destination
 - Typically, special-purpose classes
 - Catch-block matching can understand inheritance
 - The value may be ignored

```
class AnyException { /*...*/ };
class WrongException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
class BadException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
void f()
 if ( something == wrong )
  throw WrongException();
 if (anything != good)
  throw BadException();
void g()
 try {
  f();
 catch (const AnyException &) {
  /*...*/
```

▶Exceptions are "jumps"

- Start: throw statement
- Destination: try-catch block
 - Determined in run-time
- The jump may exit a procedure
 - Local variables will be properly destructed by destructors
- Besides jumping, a value is passed
 - The type of the value determines the destination
 - Typically, special-purpose classes
 - Catch-block matching can understand inheritance
 - The value may be ignored
 - There is an universal catch block

```
class AnyException { /*...*/ };
class WrongException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
class BadException
 : public AnyException { /*...*/ };
void f()
 if ( something == wrong )
  throw WrongException();
 if (anything != good)
  throw BadException();
void g()
 try {
  f();
 catch (...) {
  /*...*/
```

▶ Exception handling

- Evaluating the expression in the throw statement
 - The value is stored "somewhere"
- Stack-unwinding
 - Blocks and functions are being exited
 - Local and temporary variables are destructed by calling destructors (user code!)
 - Stack-unwinding stops in the try-block whose catch-block matches the throw expression type
- catch-block execution
 - The throw value is still stored
 - may be accessed via the catch-block argument (typically, by reference)
 - "throw;" statement, if present, continues stack-unwinding
- Exception handling ends when the accepting catch-block is exited normally
 - Also using return, break, continue, goto
 - Or by invoking another exception

▶Materialized exceptions

- std::exception_ptr is a smartpointer to an exception object
 - Uses reference-counting to deallocate
- std::current_exception()
 - Returns (the pointer to) the exception being currently handled
 - The exception handling may then be ended by exiting the catch-block
- std::rethrow_exception(p)
 - (Re-)Executes the stored exception
 - like a throw statement
- This mechanism allows:
 - Propagating the exception to a different thread
 - Signalling exceptions in the promise/future mechanism

```
std::exception ptr p;
void g()
 try {
  f();
 catch (...) {
  p = std::current exception();
void h()
 std::rethrow exception( p);
```

C + +11

- Throwing and handling exceptions is slower than normal execution
 - Compilers favor normal execution at the expense of exception-handling complexity
- Use exceptions only for rare events
 - Out-of-memory, network errors, end-of-file, ...
- Mark procedures which cannot throw by noexcept

```
void f() noexcept
{ /*...*/
}
```

- it may make code calling them easier (for you and for the compiler)
- noexcept may be conditional

```
template< typename T>
void g( T & y)
  noexcept( std::is_nothrow_copy_constructible< T>::value)
{
  T x = y;
}
```

- Mark procedures which cannot throw by noexcept
- Example: Resizing std::vector<T>
 - When inserting above capacity, the contents must be relocated to a larger memory block
 - Before C++11, the relocation was done by copying, i.e. calling

T(const T &)

- If a copy constructor threw, the new copies were discarded and the insert call reported failure by throwing
- Thus, if the insert threw, no observable change happened
- Note: Correct destruction of copies is possible only if the destructor is not throwing:

~T() noexcept

- In C++11, the relocation shall be done by moving
 - If a move constructor throws, the previously moved elements shall be moved back, but it can throw again!
 - The relocation is done by moving only if the move constructor is declared as

T(T &&) noexcept

- ... or if it is declared implicitly and all elements satisfy the same property
- Otherwise, the slower copy method is used!

▶Standard exceptions

- <stdexcept>
- All standard exceptions are derived from class exception
 - the member function what() returns the error message
- bad_alloc: not-enough memory
- bad_cast: dynamic cast on references
- Derived from logic_error:
 - domain_error, invalid_argument, length_error, out_of_range
 - e.g., thrown by vector::at
- Derived from runtime_error:
 - range_error, overflow_error, underflow_error
- Hard errors (invalid memory access, division by zero, ...) are NOT signalized as exceptions
 - These errors might occur almost anywhere
 - The need to correctly recover via exception handling would prohibit many code optimizations
 - Nevertheless, there are (proposed) changes in the language specification that will allow reporting hard errors by exceptions at reasonable cost



- Using throw a catch is simple
- Producing code that works correctly in the presence of exceptions is hard
 - Exception-safety
 - Exception-safe programming

```
void f()
{
  int * a = new int[ 100];
  int * b = new int[ 200];
  g( a, b);
  delete[] b;
  delete[] a;
}
```

- If new int[200] throws, the int[100] block becomes inaccessible
- If g() throws, two blocks become inaccessible

```
void f()
{
  int * a = new int[ 100];
  int * b = new int[ 200];
  g( a, b);
  delete[] b;
  delete[] a;
}
```

- If new int[200] throws, the int[100] block becomes inaccessible
- If g() throws, two blocks become inaccessible

Safety is expensive

```
void f()
  int * a = new int[ 100];
  try {
    int * b = new int[ 200];
    try {
       g(a, b);
    } catch (...) {
      delete[] b; throw;
    }
    delete[] b;
  } catch (...) {
    delete[] a; throw;
  delete[] a;
```

```
void f()
{
  int * a = new int[ 100];
  int * b = new int[ 200];
  g( a, b);
  delete[] b;
  delete[] a;
}
```

- If new int[200] throws, the int[100] block becomes inaccessible
- If g() throws, two blocks become inaccessible

Smart pointers can help

```
void f()
{
   auto a = std::make_unique<int[]>(100);
   auto b = std::make_unique<int[]>(200);
   g( &*a, &*b);
}
```

 Exception processing correctly invokes the destructors of smart pointers

There are more problems besides memory leaks

```
std::mutex my_mutex;

void f()
{
   my_mutex.lock();
   // do something critical here
   my_mutex.unlock();
   // something not critical
}
```

 If something throws in the critical section, this code will leave the mutex locked forever!

- ► RAII: Resource Acquisition Is Initialization
 - Constructor grabs resources
 - Destructor releases resources
 - Also in the case of exception

```
void f()
{
    std::lock_guard< std::mutex>
        lock( my_mutex);
    // do something critical here
    }
    // something not critical
}
```

- There is a local variable "lock" that is never (visibly) used beyond its declaration!
- Nested blocks matter!

 An incorrectly implemented copy assignment

```
T & operator=( const T & b)
{
  if ( this != & b )
  {
    delete body_;
    body_ = new TBody( b.length());
    copy( * body_, * b.body_);
  }
  return * this;
}
```

- Produces invalid object when TBody constructor throws
- Does not work when this==&b

Exception-safe implementation

```
T & operator=( const T & b)
{
   T tmp(b);
   operator=(std::move(tmp));
   return * this;
}
```

- Can reuse code already implemented in the copy constructor and the move assignment
- Correct also for this==&b
 - although ineffective

▶Language-enforced rules

- Destructors may not end by throwing an exception
- Constructors of static variables may not end by throwing an exception
- Move constructors of exception objects may not throw

- Compilers sometimes generate implicit try-catch blocks
 - When constructing a compound object, a constructor of an element may throw
 - Array allocation
 - Class constructors
 - The implicit catch block destructs previously constructed parts and rethrows

▶Theory

- (Weak) exception safety
 - Exceptions does not cause inconsistent state
 - No memory leaks
 - No invalid pointers
 - Application invariants hold
 - **.** ...?
- Strong exception safety
 - Exiting function by throwing means no change in (observable) state
 - Observable state = public interface behavior
 - Also called "Commit-or-rollback semantics"

```
void f()
{
    g1();
    g2();
}
```

- ▶ When g2() throws...
 - f() shall signal failure (by throwing)
 - failure shall imply no change in state
 - but g1() already changed something
 - it must be undone

```
void f()
   g1();
   try {
     g2();
   } catch(...) {
     undo_g1();
     throw;
```

- Undoing is sometimes impossible
 - e.g. erase(...)
- Code becomes unreadable
 - Easy to forgot the undo

Observations

- If a function does not change observable state, undo is not required
- ➤ The last function in the sequence is never undone

```
void f()
   g1();
   try {
     g2();
     try {
       g3();
     } catch(...) {
       undo_g2();
       throw;
   } catch(...) {
     undo_g1();
     throw;
```

- Check-and-do style
 - ▶ Check if everything is correct
 - Then do everything
 - These functions must not throw
 - Still easy to forget a check
 - Work is often duplicated
 - It may be difficult to write nonthrowing do-functions

```
void f()
{
    check_g1();
    check_g2();
    check_g3();
    do_g1();
    do_g2();
    do_g3();
}
```

- Check-and-do with tokens
 - ▶ Each do-function requires a token generated by the check-function
 - Checks can not be omitted
 - Tokens may carry useful data
 - Duplicate work avoided
 - It may be difficult to write nonthrowing do-functions

```
void f()
{
    auto t1 = check_g1();
    auto t2 = check_g2();
    auto t3 = check_g3();
    do_g1( t1); // or t1.doit();
    do_g2( t2);
    do_g3( t3);
}
```

- Prepare-and-commit style
 - Prepare-functions generate a token
 - ▶ Tokens must be committed to produce observable change
 - Commit-functions must not throw
 - If not committed, destruction of tokens invokes undo
 - If some of the commits are forgotten, part of the work will be undone

```
void f()
{
    auto t1 = prepare_g1();
    auto t2 = prepare_g2();
    auto t3 = prepare_g3();
    commit_g1( t1); // or t1.commit();
    commit_g2( t2);
    commit_g3( t3);
}
```

- Two implementations:
 - Do-Undo
 - Prepare-functions make observable changes and return undo-plans
 - Commit-functions clear undo-plans
 - Token destructors apply undo-plans
 - Prepare-Commit
 - Prepare-functions return do-plans
 - Commit-functions perform doplans
 - Token destructors clear do-plans
 - Commits and destructors must not throw
 - Unsuitable for inserting
 - Use Do-Undo when inserting
 - Destructor does erase
 - Use Prepare-Commit when erasing
 - Commit does erase

```
void f()
{
    auto t1 = prepare_g1();
    auto t2 = prepare_g2();
    auto t3 = prepare_g3();
    commit_g1( t1); // or t1.commit();
    commit_g2( t2);
    commit_g3( t3);
}
```

Problems:

- Some commits may be forgotten
- Do-Undo style produces temporarily observable changes
 - Unsuitable for parallelism

Atomic commit required

- Prepare-functions concatenate doplans
- Commit executes all do-plans "atomically"
 - It may be wrapped in a lock guard
- Commit may throw!
 - It is the only function with observable effects

Inside commit

- Do all inserts
 - If some fails, previous must be undone
- Do all erases
 - Erases do not throw (usually)

```
Chained style
void f()
{
   auto t1 = prepare_g1();
   auto t2 = prepare_g2( std::move(t1));
   auto t3 = prepare_g3( std::move(t2));
   t3.commit();
   Symbolic style
void f()
{
   auto t1 = prepare_g1();
   auto t2 = std::move(t1) | prepare g2();
   auto t3 = std::move(t2) | prepare_g3();
   t3.commit();
```