Subject: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Oblivion on Mon, 04 Mar 2019 13:49:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,

As it happens I'll have some free time in the first quarter of this year. (This is becoming a habit:))
And I thought it would be fun to contribute to my favorite RAD tool.

For example, I use DBUS, the de facto IPC standard on linux destkop, a lot.
But it is tedious to copy-paste the same C code, and then modify it to suit my applications need, over and over again.
So in my opinion it might be a good idea to have a DBUS (a client-side, at least) package (a wrapper or a complete U++ implementation).

Or, IIRC, as I Klugier suggessted somewhere else, a breakpoint table/view (with actions) in TheIDE would be helpful for debugging large applications.
Or, language/translation interface can benefit from an overhaul?

Or anything else?

Whatever it would be, this time I'd like to lay out a plan (its requirements, etc.) collectively.

What do you think?

Best regards,
Oblivion

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Novo on Mon, 04 Mar 2019 17:20:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oblivion wrote on Mon, 04 March 2019 08:49
What do you think?

IMHO, it would be great to upgrade PCRE from 8.X to 10.X first because it won't compile with C++17 (Clang, for example, is complaining about the keyword "auto"). I'm not sure this problem is fixed in pcre 10.X, but it worth trying.

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Oblivion on Tue, 05 Mar 2019 11:20:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Novo wrote on Mon, 04 March 2019 20:20Oblivion wrote on Mon, 04 March 2019 08:49
What do you think?

IMHO, it would be great to upgrade PCRE from 8.X to 10.X first because it won't compile with C++17 (Clang, for example, is complaining about the keyword "auto"). I'm not sure this problem is fixed in pcre 10.X, but it worth trying.

Hello Novo,

You are right. On Linux with CLANG 7.01, the only error I get with the supplied pcre package (in U++ nightly builds) is about the "register" (if you mean "automatic duration") keyword, which is dropped since C++17.
In theory, removing them shouldn't make a big impact (I haven't tested it yet), as the compilers are already free to take that keyword into account or not.
I'll see what I can do about it.

OTOH, Pcre v.10 is not API-compatible with 8.x, so it needs a whole new package. (I need to study it in detail, first).

Best regards,
Oblivion

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Novo on Tue, 05 Mar 2019 16:46:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sorry, I meant "register", "auto" is a new keyword ...
Probably, it is easier to remove "register" manually from the PCRE source code. UPP includes source code, so, this should't violate any license.

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Oblivion on Tue, 05 Mar 2019 18:44:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Please find attached the -hopefully- working, test version.
I replaced the keyword, using:

#if __cplusplus <= 201402L

#define REGISTER register
#else
#define REGISTER
#endif

Best regards,
Oblivion

File Attachments

1) pcre.zip, downloaded 374 times

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by Novo on Tue, 05 Mar 2019 19:28:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oblivion wrote on Tue, 05 March 2019 13:44Please find attached the -hopefully- working, test version.

Thanks! It compiles with both Clang and Gcc. IMHO, it is better to remove the "register" keyword. Compilers ignore it these days. It had a lot of meaning back 30 years ago when optimizers petty much didn't exist.

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019
Posted by mirek on Sat, 13 Apr 2019 11:07:19 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

These are things I would like to have solved, but do not have resources to:

- Flatpak support.

BTW, what I plan to work on for the next release(s):

- Another round of Core improvements - tweaking memory allocator, CoWork, randomized hashing, maybe Index (say 2019.2)

- I expect to incorporate coolmans's patch tool (2019.2)

- Migrate to GTK3 (say 2019.3 or 2020.1)

Subject: Re: Possible new package or overhaul proposals for U++ in 2019

Posted by Oblivion on Wed, 17 Apr 2019 19:28:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello Mirek,

I think flatpak support would be great. It might be a good option on Linux for easy U++ deployment and "first impression", if done right.
I can look into that. (As I am mostly working on linux nowadays.)

Best regards,
Oblivion