
Subject: Re: Include option for specific package
Posted by [mirek](#) on Tue, 23 Jun 2009 18:06:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sender Ghost wrote on Tue, 23 June 2009 11:25 In my current opinion, you just want to use unsuitable tool.

Packages are independent from absolute paths, therefore they are portable.

If you saw U++ code organization you can understand how your code must be organized to accomplish U++ modules approach.

Assembly "knows" about absolute paths and where to find Packages (which is disguised form of include search path directories for compiler). So, changes for paths should be on Assembly level. I suggest you to use new Assembly, e.g. XlsLibApps with following options:

```
Package nest: C:\XlsLibApps;C:\XlsLibApps\lib\src\oledoc; \  
C:\XlsLibApps\lib\src\xlslib;C:\XlsLibApps\lib\src\common; \  
C:\XlsLibApps\lib\src\data;C:\MyApps;C:\upp\uppsrc  
Output directory: C:\upp\out  
Assembly name: XlsLibApps
```

to Mirek:

You can improve selection of Package nest directories or just add new option (e.g. ArrayCtrl) for include search paths.

Actually, the intended place for include path is build method...

Anyway, the problem we are trying to solve here is that when adapting existing code as U++ package (in this case, existing library capable of parsing XLS files), you have to solve the issue that sources can have its own directory structure, including special folders for .h.

Up to now, we usually fixed the issue by editing sources (`#include <foo/bar.h>` -> `#include "bar.h"`). Anyway, I have to agree that it can get long in teeth over time.

That is why I agree there is some problem to solve. But based on experience with "Add any file" to package, I would like to stay clean of any form hinting to the idea that the package is the place to define include path...

Mirek
