

# Re: Why We Use C Than C++...

---

*Source:* [http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C\\_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-01/msg01891.html](http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/C_CPP/comp.lang.c/2006-01/msg01891.html)

---

- *From:* Richard Heathfield <[invalid@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:invalid@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Fri, 13 Jan 2006 15:10:12 +0000 (UTC)
- 

henryk.mueller@xxxxxx said:

> Sorry, I used the wrong word \*sophisticated\*. A better word is  
> \*elegant\*.

Fair enough.

> And you are right. You can do the same thing in C as in C++. But it's  
> not build in! You have to code it first – like virtual functions,  
> inheritance, overloading and stuff...

Why would you want any of \*that\*? If I wanted that stuff, I'd be using C++!

> Ok, and then write me a working equivalent to the C++ template  
> mechanism... ;o)

Why bother?

—

Richard Heathfield

"Usenet is a strange place" – dmr 29/7/1999

<http://www.cpax.org.uk>

email: rjh at above domain (but drop the www, obviously)

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**  
◇ *From:* Imre Palik

• *References:*

- ◆ **[Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**  
◇ *From:* sonugeetha@xxxxxxxxxx
- ◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**  
◇ *From:* Richard Heathfield
- ◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**  
◇ *From:* Dag-Erling Smørgrav
- ◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**

Re: Why We Use C Than C++...

◇ *From:* henryk . mueller

◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**

◇ *From:* Dag-Erling Smørgrav

◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**

◇ *From:* henryk . mueller

◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**

◇ *From:* Richard Heathfield

◆ **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**

◇ *From:* henryk . mueller

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: c and webservice?](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Why We Use C Than C++...](#)**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **[Date](#)**
  - ◆ **[Thread](#)**