Message-ID:
Date: Mon, 4-Feb-85 13:54:10 EST
Article-I.D.: ho95b.303
Posted: Mon Feb 4 13:54:10 1985
Date-Received: Wed, 6-Feb-85 01:34:29 EST
Organization: AT&T-Bell Labs, Holmdel, NJ
Lines: 35

[color=blue]> 4. Has anyone out there got 'Deep Blue C' or whatever; I'd like to use 'C'[/color]
[color=blue]>   on my Atari, and I'm not impressed by C/65. Appraisals, please.[/color]

I've got it. Not too bad (though my version has a bug in
setting graphics modes). However, I find I don't use it much.
Most things for which I want quick development, I just do in BASIC.
Two reasons:
   1. Compile time. I write something, start compiling, and take a nap.
      Later (much later) I then have to link it all. Take another nap.
      Oops. I really want the output to look like this. Take two
      more naps. What if I change that? Take two more naps.
   2. Run speed. When I ran a program, it didn't seem all that fast,
      so I tried running
      10 look at atari built in clock
      20 FOR I=1 TO 1000
      30 FOR j=1 TO 1000
      40 NEXT J
      50 NEXT I
      60 look at atari clock again
      70 print difference
      80 END
      and a C equivalent. Deep Blue C was faster by a factor of 3.
      Somehow, I thought a compiled vs interpreter should do better than that.
Anyways, C usually isn't worth the trouble. If I'm going to the trouble,
I'd just as soon do it in assembly, and make it *fast*.

--

". . . and shun the frumious Bandersnatch."
Robert Neinast (ihnp4!ho95c!ran)
AT&T-Bell Labs