

Chapter 3 Unsafe Features

In trying to cede control to the client as to whether the declared or imported abc::i() function is to be used, we have, in effect, invited the defect illustrated in the above example whereby the client was expecting the abc::i() from abc_header2.h and yet picked up the one from abc_header1.h by default. Had the nested namespace in abc_header2.h been declared inline, the qualified name abc::i() would have automatically been rendered ambiguous in namespace abc, the translation would have failed safely, and the defect would have been exposed at compile time. The downside, however, is that no method would be available to recover nominal access to the abc::i() defined in abc_header1.h once abc_header2.h is included, even though the two functions (e.g., including their mangled names at the ABI level) remain distinct.

Potential Pitfalls

inline namespace

inline-namespace-based versioning doesn't scale

The problem with using **inline** namespaces for ABI link safety is that the protection they offer is only partial; in a few major places, critical problems can linger until run time instead of being caught at compile time.

Controlling which namespace is **inline** using macros, such as was done in the <code>my::VersionedThing</code> example in Use Cases — Link-safe ABI versioning on page 1067, will result in code that directly uses the unversioned name, <code>my::VersionedThing</code> being bound directly to the versioned name <code>my::v1::VersionedThing</code> or <code>my::v2::VersionedThing</code>, along with the class layout of that particular entity. Sometimes details of using the <code>inline</code> namespace member are not resolved by the linker, such as the object layout when we use types from that namespace as data members in other objects:

```
// my_thingaggregate.h:
// ...
#include <my_versionedthing.h>
// ...
namespace my
{
```

1076

