Subject: Re: Possible solution of "icpp problem"
Posted by dolik.rce on Sun, 28 Aug 2016 11:57:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Mirek,

That would be great! It would also make U++ much easier to use without theide. Using other IDEs or makefiles, cmake, etc. would lower the barrier for new users and could allow many more people to adopt U++.

Mindtraveller wrote on Sun, 28 August 2016 10:07First of all, let's think do we really need to keep icpp-compatibility at all. Or it is possible to forget about them once and for all.I'm definitely for dropping icpp completely, if possible. There are other uses, not only plugin-like stuff (e.g. files with Skylark handlers), but those could be solved in similar way I presume. Could there be a simple utility class for automatic initialization that could be used in all cases, even in user code?

Mindtraveller wrote on Sun, 28 August 2016 10:07Talking about the solution proposed (to inject registration calls with header - if I understand it correctly), I think this is possible way, but it has one [possible] issue with initialization order. We can't predict the way headers are included and we can't predict the sequence of initialization.If I remember how it works now with icpp, the order is not really well defined either. I think the init blocks are called in the order in which the icpp files are passed to the compiler.

Best regards,
Honza