CEX – The Standard v2.2.0

Amendments since the previous version (v2.1.0)

- 1. Polymorphism was re-introduced to support the Type::from(...) feature.
 - This would also support multiple ways to Type::make(...) a struct.

Amendments to the previous version (v2.2.0)

- 1. Introduced **Explicit template specialization** as an allowed feature.
 - This comes with the caveat of NO header function definitions.
- 2. Banned Implicit templates and Header function definitions.
 - The motive for this is simple: terrible compile times and the blasphemy of writing source code in headers.
- 3. Added the free special method.
 - Exists as the associated method equivalent of the destructor.
 - Some structs allocate / open / initialize things which need to be deallocated / closed / uninitialized.

Motive

C++ is a powerful tool. Some may argue too powerful. Constraints in a setting of abundance can prevent mind-splintering and inconsistent paradigms.

CEX (or C-Extended) aims to be a C++ subset *in between* C and C++ which takes advantage of existing C++ compilers, community and libraries while providing enough stylistic/implementation restrictions for an "idiomatic approach" to be meaningful.

Values

- Explicitness,
- · Consistency,
- Transparency,
- · Human readability,

Bottom-up design,

Caveats

- CEX is non-OOP as is conventionally understood (no inheritance, polymorphism).
- Constructors/destructors are also not used in the conventional sense (see make).
- No 'class' keyword (yes structs are technically the same more on this later).
- No getter/setter mentality. Struct members are accessed directly.
- Value-initialized structs must be complete (else see default).

Permitted Features

- Structs,
- Namespaces,
- Polymorphism (v2.1.0),
- Methods (member/static),
- Explicit template specialization (v2.2.0),
- Operator overloads (<< , == , >> , etc),
- Struct member and associated (static) functions,

Disallowed Features/Keywords

- Classes,
- · Exceptions,
- · Getters/setters,
- Virtual methods,
- Default arguments,
- Constructors/Destructors,
- Implicit templates (v2.2.0)
- Header function definitions (v2.2.0)
- Polymorphism (one name, one function) (v2.1.0),

Recommended Alternatives

- Structs,
- Return values.
- Struct member access.
- Composition and templates,
- See std::optional,
- Use make / free,
- Use Explicit template specialization,
- Use Explicit template specialization with source function definitions,

Adapting to a C++ World

It must be said that many of CEX's idioms are fundamentally incompatible with much of the existing C++ codebases out in the world. This must be reconciled by:

- 1. CEX being a personal/organizational choice,
- 2. By design, working within the C++ ecosystem unlocks vast resources,
- All other C++ libraries/codebases will work in CEX projects if included as intended,
- 4. When preferred or absolutely necessary, incompatible features/implementations can be wrapped within a CEX compliant API.

Naming

Special Methods

There are a list of reserved method names for structs which perform *generally* similar behaviours which can be intuitively reused across different types.

Namely, make, from, to, preset and free.

- make reserved for the generation of a blank or empty struct (NOT for default values see default),
- from reserved for type conversions from another type,
- to reserved for type conversions to another type (usually of an external or standard library),

- preset similar to make but initializes the struct members to a set of default values rather than 0-values (or the equivalent thereof).
- free the opposite of make if anything was initialized / dynamically allocated / opened and needs to be de-initialized / deallocated / closed, this is the place.

As of (v2.1.0), polymorphism is supported. As a result, structs can be made from a variety of different types and by extension made *into* a bunch as well.

Rationale:

Examples

```
struct Fahrenheit {
        float temp;
        static Fahrenheit make(void);
        static Fahrenheit from(Celcius& t);
        static Fahrenheit preset(void);
        // Primary template for `to()`
        template<class T>
        T to(void);
        // Explicit specialization for T=Celsius
        template<>
        Celsius to<Celsius>(void);
}
struct Celsius {
        float temp;
        static Celsius make(void);
        static Celsius from(Fahrenheit& t);
        static Celsius preset(void);
        // Primary template for `to()`
        template<class T>
        T to(void);
```

```
// Explicit specialization for T=Fahrenheit
        template<>
        Fahrenheit to<Fahrenheit>(void);
}
Fahrenheit Fahrenheit::make() {
        return Fahrenheit {
                .temp = 0,
        };
}
Fahrenheit Fahrenheit::from(Celsius& t) {
        return Fahrenheit {
                temp = t.temp * 9 / 5 + 32,
        };
}
Fahrenheit Fahrenheit::preset(void) {
        return Fahrenheit {
                .temp = 212.0f
        }
}
template<>
Celsius Fahrenheit::to<Celsius>() {
        return (this->temp - 32) * 5 / 9;
}
Celsius Celsius::make(void) {
        return Celsius {
                .temp = 0,
        };
}
Celsius Celsius::from(Fahrenheit& t) {
        return Celsius {
                temp = (t.temp - 32) * 5 / 9,
        };
}
```

File extensions

All CEX projects must use the .cpp file extension for source files and the .hpp file extension for header files.

Rationale: Although the __c++ and __c extensions are disqualified by default due to special characters or filesystem indifference to capitalization, __cxx and __cc were considered to be less popular than __cpp . In the spirit of setting a consistent standard, the most common extension was the chosen one.

Namespaces

All namespaces must be named with lower-case and underscore-separated names (no upper/lower camel case) and match the name of the header/source file is encapsulates.

Example:

```
// project.hpp
namespace project {
        void act() { ... }
}

// project.cpp
void project::act() { ... }
```

Rationale: Exposing code modules or source files to the global scope of symbols increases the risk of collisions to no benefit when done correctly.

Informal module system

Matching the namespace name with the header/source combo informally introduces the concept of modules in the build scheme. Although modules are officially being streamlined into newer C++ standards, <u>it's hardly catching on or working</u>

An example project structure could resemble the following:

```
inc
\_ project.hpp
\_ module1.hpp

src
\_ project.cpp
\_ module1.cpp
```

In which each header/source pair are implicitly glued as modules by the namespace convention.

Alternatively:

In both cases, namespace and filesystem layouts are used to group code in logical modules as much as possible.

Multiple headers/sources in one module

In case multiple header/source files are wanted to share the same namespace, the module must instead be created under it's own directory (project/) in this case and contain a separate src and inc directory in which all of the sub-sources and sub-headers will be stored, respectively.

For example:

At which point the module2.hpp header would declare the module's matching namespace and allow sub-sources and headers to complete the implementation therein.

One could evaluate an expanded tree of this as:

```
\_ submodule1.cpp
\_ submodule2.cpp
```

Where,

```
// module2.hpp
namespace module2 {
    namespace submodule1;
    namespace submodule2;
}

// subheader1.hpp

// subsource1.cpp
```

Structs

Remember there are no class declarations.

Structs must be named in the upper camel case format, namely prevent name collisions with parent namespaces which could have good reason to match (a project namespace containing a Project struct).

Example:

```
// project.hpp
namespace project {
        struct Project { ... }
}

// project.cpp
using project::Project;
```

Rationale: The default accessibility is public and structs are typically thought of passive data carriers. This encourages the model of associated functions and

transparent data types as opposed to the tightly encapsulated getter/setter model typically associated to classes.

Inheritance vs Composition

Under long a chain of inheritance (entity, animal, mammal, dog, pitbull, etc.), any changes in the parent types have immediate back-propagating consequences throughout the codebase.

These changes need not be breaking – a monolithic type hierarchy will inevitably impose greater leverage on parent types such that minor changes have greater and greater impact on the rest of the code.

To make matters worse, standard library and otherwise large/complex objects are strongly discouraged from being inherited to expand functionality. Thus, alternatives and workarounds are needed depending on the types involved (subject to developer preference).

Instead, lateral type conversions (to and from) mixed with composition/wrappers are encouraged to minimize (albeit not eliminate) monolithic type hierarchies within code.

Rationale: Prevents back-propagated changes to entire codebases and monolithic type dependency hierarchies. Also encourages lateral type conversions.

Using Directives

When there are no collisions with other dependencies, apply using directives to structs/objects by default.

Example:

```
using project::Project;

void Project::act() { ... }
```

In cases where there may be a conflict or confusion, apply a using directive to the nearest parent namespace or struct (like using io and using rf) such that it becomes possible to have a succinct but clear distinction between the two (io::Reader and rf::Reader, for example).

Example (needs to be redone – I don't advocate namespaces within namespaces):

```
// util.hpp
namespace util {
        namespace io {
                struct Reader { ... }
        }
        namespace rf {
                struct Reader { ... }
        }
}
// main.cpp
using namespace util::io;
using namespace util::rf;
int main(void) {
        io::Reader a;
        rf::Reader b;
        return 0;
}
```