
Subject: namespace upp

Posted by [am_upp](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 17:03:43 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm planning to use U++ together with another class lib. But I fear that I will get name clashes because the other library also defines classes named String and Point etc.

Putting all U++ symbols into a namespace (e.g. "namespace upp {...}) would avoid this kind of problems.

Good idea?

Andreas

PS: I could also blame the authors of other class lib for not using namespace. But this lib has been designed before namespaces were introduced to C++ (it's very old) and the class lib is no longer supported.

Subject: Re: namespace upp

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 17:18:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

am_upp wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 12:03 I'm planning to use U++ together with another class lib. But I fear that I will get name clashes because the other library also defines classes named String and Point etc.

Putting all U++ symbols into a namespace (e.g. "namespace upp {...}) would avoid this kind of problems.

Good idea?

Andreas

PS: I could also blame the authors of other class lib for not using namespace. But this lib has been designed before namespaces were introduced to C++ (it's very old) and the class lib is no longer supported.

Well, I am glad somebody opens this topic.

To tell the truth, we were considering "upp" namespaces many times over the years, but always came to conclusion that the only "benefit" it would have would be adding "using upp;" into all sources...

At the times of VC6.0 (which are now gone for good), there was also the problem that some of our template techniques make compiler even more confused.. (no koening lookup available).

Therefore we have deferred this until first problems appear Which seems to be now....

Mirek

Subject: Re: namespace upp
Posted by [am_upp](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 17:44:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 12:18

To tell the truth, we were considering "upp" namaspecs many times over th years, but always came to conclusion that the only "benefit" it would have would be adding "using upp;" into all sources...

It would be a minor change to source code but would solve a major problem (at least for those who have that problem).

For the time being do you know a workaround to avoid these name clashes? Should I try to put the U++ symbols into a namespace by myself?

Andreas

Subject: Re: namespace upp
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 17:49:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

am_upp wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 12:44luzr wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 12:18

To tell the truth, we were considering "upp" namaspecs many times over th years, but always came to conclusion that the only "benefit" it would have would be adding "using upp;" into all sources...

It would be a minor change to source code but would solve a major problem (at least for those who have that problem).

For the time being do you know a workaround to avoid these name clashes? Should I try to put the U++ symbols into a namespace by myself?

Andreas

Actually, that would be an interesting experiment and very useful experiment (However, I am not sure whether the change will be as "minor" as you expect).

Tell us how it goes!

Mirek

Subject: Re: namespace upp
Posted by [am_upp](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 18:08:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

luzr wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 12:49: Actually, that would be an interesting experiment and very useful experiment (However, I am not sure whether the change will be as "minor" as you expect).

With "minor change" I referred to the changes that will be necessary in user code, not in U++ itself.

All I could do is putting "namespace upp { ... }" all around the U++ source code. But I fear that is not the complete solution.

Andreas

Subject: Re: namespace upp
Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 15:17:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote]
luzr wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 17:49
For the time being do you know a workaround to avoid these name clashes? Should I try to put the U++ symbols into a namespace by myself?

Andreas [/quote]

Actually, that would be an interesting experiment and very useful experiment (However, I am not sure whether the change will be as "minor" as you expect).

Tell us how it goes!

Mirek

I was forced to do that with one of my packages. It seems to work but only if I "harmonize" the order of #include's...

Subject: Re: namespace upp
Posted by [mirek](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 15:56:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

[quote title=fudadmin wrote on Tue, 02 May 2006 11:17]Quote:

luzr wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 17:49

For the time being do you know a workaround to avoid these name clashes? Should I try to put the U++ symbols into a namespace by myself?

Andreas [/quote]

Actually, that would be an interesting experiment and very useful experiment (However, I am not sure whether the change will be as "minor" as you expect).

Tell us how it goes!

Mirek

I was forced to do that with one of my packages. It seems to work but only if I "harmonize" the order of #include's...

I am afraid "one of packages" is not enough. Correct experiment should put everything needed for minimal GUI application into upp namespace...

Mirek

Subject: Re: namespace upp

Posted by [fudadmin](#) on Tue, 02 May 2006 16:04:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I didn't "insulate" upp with namespace upp. I just "adapted" one more "namespaced" library (maybe I'll post it later...) and have been trying various "connection" with upp variants...
