Subject: Re: How to write a dll using Ultimate++?
Posted by Oblivion on Sun, 26 Aug 2007 01:15:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:That means, you have got some extra-terrestrial (not U++) GUI code like wxWidgets, Fox etc., does it?
(additional question: Why not to convert all the GUI into U++, then)?

I was using MFC (as a dll) in my project(s). Actually, I was nearly a "diehard" MFC user. But after considering the disadvantages of the age-old MFC and the advantages or the possible benefits of the ultimate++, I decided to convert my MFC based multi-protocol IM project into U++. I've already finished converting the main framework into U++ without any problems. The main executable (which consists of a service handler and a GUI) is now working fine (And I have to admit that, with the u++ it looks and acts much more better ).

Quote:And lastly, why not to make U++ your main part and to load other parts as dlls?

Firstly; U++ is the main part of my project and I use some other parts of GUI code (gui-extension plugins) as dlls. But as I stated before,

Quote:3. Yes, I have successfully compiled the template. But it is an ordinary win32 dll template and the problem is that whenever I load any U++ GUI class through the dll (eg. opening a TopWindow), The main or child windows layouts (eg, borders, colors) get corrupted or not drawn. In MFC, for example, AFX_MANAGE_STATE() macro is used to prevent such misfunctioning. Is there any macro, or method needed to be called before initalization of the dlls in u++?

Is there any solution to this odd behaviour? Upp based GUI-extension dlls compile without any errors or warnings. But the gui components looks corrupted every time I load them through the dlls. I didn't come by any special dll entry point (dllmain()) function or macro in the documentation or in the upp source code, which I should invoke. Am I missing something?

It's no problem for me to code these dll's in any other framework. But U++ has many benefits as far as I can see. So that's why I'm insisting on the dll issue.

Secondly; as to a U++.dll, ok I give up this idea for some time

Regards.