Subject: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible (was Re: Audio Interrupt vector)
Posted by Anonymous on Tue, 25 Nov 1986 22:08:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: c55-grig&#64buddy.Berkeley.EDU (Ted Griggs)

Article-I.D.: zen.1133
Posted: Tue Nov 25 17:08:35 1986
Date-Received: Tue, 25-Nov-86 21:22:50 EST
References:
Sender: news@zen.BERKELEY.EDU
Reply-To: c55-grig@buddy.Berkeley.EDU.UUCP (Ted Griggs)
Organization: University of California, Berkeley
Lines: 17
Keywords: Will there ever be a good C complier?

[]

I discovered the bug! (note "the" not "my")
I was compiling and assembling the program under Manx (tried both 16 & 32 bit ints..neither had a chance at working). I sadly had to compile and assemble it with Lattice 1.0? to make it work.

My complaint with C on the Amiga is that of the two compilers: 1) Lattice has 2 100K compilers and the slowest linker I have ever seen, and 2) Manx compiles fast, link fast, and produces small code but on many occasions produces incorrect code.

I have heard Lattice came out w. version 3.?? and a much faster linker.
I hope that this is true.

Ted Griggs
zen!buddy!c55-grig

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible (was Re: Audio Interrupt vector)
Posted by Anonymous on Wed, 26 Nov 1986 19:51:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: cmcmanis&#64sun.uucp (Chuck McManis)

Article-I.D.: sun.9705
Posted: Wed Nov 26 14:51:35 1986
Date-Received: Wed, 26-Nov-86 20:58:10 EST

References:
Organization: Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Lines: 48
Keywords: Will there ever be a good C complier?
Summary: Passing along information on the new Lattice compiler

In article , c55-grig@buddy.Berkeley.EDU (Ted Griggs) writes:
>
> ... edited stuff about bugs and such ...
> My complaint with C on the Amiga is that of the two compilers: 1) Lattice
> has 2 100K compilers and the slowest linker I have ever seen, and 2) Manx
> compiles fast, link fast, and produces small code but on many occasions
> produces incorrect code.
> I have heard Lattice came out w. version 3.?? and a much faster linker.
> I hope that this is true.
>

Yes it is true, I sent in my Lattice Update card and got my new compiler
on Monday. (about three weeks after they announced it on BIX) The update
cost $75, and included a new manual and the Lattice Text Management
utilities (grep, wc, splat, file, etc) All I need say is "get the update!"
Some initial reactions :

* New stuff with the compiler includes the TMU package as mentioned above,
  a macro assember called asm (not MetaCompCo compatible), Blink 6.7 (that
  wonderfully fast Alink compatible linker), and a completely rewritten
  frontend 'lc'. New documentation includes the TMU manual and a new compiler
  manual that is spiral bound (yea!) and more complete. Oh, and a zillion
  new library routines are available too.

* Two things strike you about the compiler when you use it, first it is
  much faster, and second the user interface is a lot 'cleaner'.

* New options to the lc command are -M to recompile only those files that
  have been modified, and -L which automatically invokes the linker when
  all compiles complete successfully. The compiler still doesn't recognize
  control C during the phases, but if one of the modules in a multimodule
  compile fails to compile you are given the option to exit.

* Two library routines that really stood out were the time routines
  (unix compatible time(), asctime()) and the wild card expansion
  routines for file names that can programmatically accept MS-dos
  type wild cards or Amiga wildcards.

* And finally Fork() support. But only for programs that were originally
  C sources. BCPL programs don't fork.

Highly reccomended.

--
--Chuck McManis
uucp: {anywhere}!sun!cmcmanis BIX: cmcmanis ARPAnet: cmcmanis@sun.com
These opinions are my own and no one elses, but you knew that didn't you.

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible (was Re: Audio Interrupt vector)
Posted by root on Fri, 28 Nov 1986 16:25:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: sbcs.245
Posted: Fri Nov 28 11:25:55 1986
Date-Received: Mon, 8-Dec-86 23:56:13 EST
References:
Organization: Computer Science Dept, SUNY@Stony Brook
Lines: 15

Chuck,

Gee, the C compiler I am using for my Amiga is sooo bad - in fact it is made by your company. Seriously, the Sun C compiler produces good, correct code for either 68000/68010/68020's. All one has to do to use it is to rewrite a few multiply/divide routines, and get/write a C library (Manx commercial version comes with lib source, right?). I have been doing development using a system similar to this for several months now, and am convinced that cross development is the _only_ way to go for serious development. If memory serves, I believe I read somewhere that Amiga does their development using the (expensive) GreenHills compiler system that also runs on a SUN. Why suffer the slings and arrows of Manx, Lattice, etc if you have access to a Sun workstation??

Rick Spanbauer

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible (was Re: Audio Interrupt vector)
Posted by papa on Sun, 30 Nov 1986 21:55:23 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: bacall.2205

Posted: Sun Nov 30 16:55:23 1986
Date-Received: Tue, 2-Dec-86 21:57:07 EST
References:
Organization: CS&CE Depts, U.S.C., Los Angeles, CA
Lines: 44

> In article , c55-grig@buddy.Berkeley.EDU (Ted Griggs) writes:
>>
>> ... edited stuff about bugs and such ...
>> My complaint with C on the Amiga is that of the two compilers: 1) Lattice
>> has 2 100K compilers and the slowest linker I have ever seen, and 2) Manx
>> compiles fast, link fast, and produces small code but on many occasions
>> produces incorrect code.
^^^^^^^^^

Yes, it is DEFINITELY true! We bought MANX C and recompiled A-Talk. Code size went down from 145K (lattice C 3.03) to 99K (MANX 3.20a). The problem is that when we sent the new version out to the beta testers we received complaints of GURU meditations on the MANX version. This is with code that works perfectly with Lattice, and we used the 32-bit integer option which is supposed to allow complete porting of programs that use 32-bit integers and libraries. We also tried beta MANX 3.30c but this version has at least as many bugs as the current commercial version (3.20a). Telephone calls to MANX tech support always result in "we will be coming out with the new update in the fall", "maybe next month". We have ba

---

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible
Posted by rokicki on Tue, 09 Dec 1986 04:13:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: navajo.1189
Posted: Mon Dec 8 23:13:14 1986
Date-Received: Tue, 9-Dec-86 06:18:40 EST
References:
Organization: Stanford University
Lines: 15

In article , root@sbcs.UUCP (Root) writes:
> If memory serves, I believe I read somewhere that Amiga
> does their development using the (expensive) GreenHills compiler system
> that also runs on a SUN. Why suffer the slings and arrows of Manx,
> Lattice, etc if you have access to a Sun workstation??
> Rick Spanbauer

Depends on your application. For development, I *want* the smaller
and faster code that using 16-bit ints allows. Manx with 16-bit
ints still generates code far smaller than on any 68000 compiler I
have run across, including the Sun and Greenhills compiler.
Also, Manx is a nice enough system that development on the machine
is less painful than downloading stuff to test.

-tom

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible (was Re: Audio Interrupt vector)
Posted by Anonymous on Tue, 09 Dec 1986 18:24:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: cmcmanis&#64sun.uucp (Chuck McManis)

Article-I.D.: sun.10253
Posted: Tue Dec 9 13:24:46 1986
Date-Received: Wed, 10-Dec-86 04:20:34 EST
References:
Organization: Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Lines: 18

In article , root@sbcs.UUCP (Root) writes:
> ... If memory serves, I believe I read somewhere that Amiga
> does their development using the (expensive) GreenHills compiler system
> that also runs on a SUN. Why suffer the slings and arrows of Manx,
> Lattice, etc if you have access to a Sun workstation??
>
> Rick Spanbauer

Well, for one thing my Amiga is at home and my Sun Workstation is at
work. (Which would really cut into the compile/test time) And second because
obviously Sun doesn't pay me to do Amiga programs, when I use this
50K workstation I try to maximize the benefit to my employer. Now if
I could buy a Workstation for use at home, why would I want an Amiga?

--
--Chuck McManis
uucp: {anywhere}!sun!cmcmanis BIX: cmcmanis ARPAnet: cmcmanis@sun.com
These opinions are my own and no one elses, but you knew that didn't you.

Subject: Re: C-compilers for Amiga are Terrible
Posted by miner on Wed, 10 Dec 1986 00:16:16 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: ulowell.838
Posted: Tue Dec 9 19:16:16 1986
Date-Received: Wed, 10-Dec-86 05:29:03 EST
References:
Reply-To: miner@ulowell.UUCP (Richard Miner)
Organization: University of Lowell
Lines: 43

In article root@sbcs.UUCP (Root) writes:
(Talks about a Sun development environment)
 > ...development using a system similar to this for several months now, and
 > am convinced that cross development is the _only_ way to go for serious
 > development.   Why suffer the slings and arrows of Manx,
 > Lattice, etc if you have access to a Sun workstation??
 >   Rick Spanbauer

A few months ago I would have agreed with you Rick, but today I think the
ideal Amiga development environment would be native: A turbo Amiga w/2.5meg,
just about as fast as the new Sun/Apollo workstation and much faster then
older models; The latest Manx or Lattice compiler, they are both shaping
up quite well; hard disk; Ethernet and NFS, or ArcNet (call Ameristar in NJ);
A recoverable ram disk ,I wish I could get Perrys over the self for my C-Ltd
ram; Zorro expansion box for ethernet, memory, 68020, and home grown
hardware; And the most important ingrediant, a second Amiga to test your
code on so your development machine does not have to be rebooted after
each compile when you visit the Guru.

All of this equipment is still less then a Sun or Apollo, and look at all
the toys you get to play with! In addition to the above being close to
a Sun environment of today; as soon as source level debuggers are around
for Manx or Lattice C the Amiga will become even more attractive.

Don't get me wrong, I think Suns and Apollo's are great workstations I use
them both and am trying to them and my Amiga's all talking. I would
rather do Amiga specific development on the Amiga. To bad they can't
programmed at a more abstract level. Just call OpenLibrary on all of
them, forget CrossCompiling they could be object compatable;

This is getting longer then I want to but one last note. The ideal developmet
enviroment in the eyes of EA, as presented at the developers conference in
thier talk "Developing a Workstation Environment", was a 10MHz IBM-AT :-(.
Its worked for them but ugg...

--
Rich Miner ...!wanginst!ulowell!miner
ULowell, Center for Productivity Enhancement (617) 452-5000 x2693
HAL hears the Amiga9000 series is not selling. "Please explain Dave. Why aren't Amiga9000's selling?" Bowman hesitates, "You aren't IBM compatible."
