Subject: C compilers; request for info
Posted by Anonymous on Sat, 29 Nov 1986 16:38:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: 4526P&#64NAVPGS.BITNET (Lt. Scott A. Norton, USN)

Article-I.D.: ulowell.795
Posted: Sat Nov 29 11:38:20 1986
Date-Received: Sun, 30-Nov-86 19:32:47 EST
Sender: page@ulowell.UUCP
Organization: USN
Lines: 18

I am planning to get a C compiler, and would appreciate your comments
and suggestions on which compiler I should buy. In particular:
  a. comparative efficiency of object code produced (time and space)
  b. Completeness of the implementation (I know C is not standardized...)
  c. Known bugs.
  d. Compatability with public domain C programs. (It looks like most
     of these are Lattice dialect...)
  d. Should I get the "Developer's version," "Personal version," or what?
     I am not planning to be a developer and write DeLuxe Paint, but I am
     a proficient 68000 assembly programmer, and it seems you must buy an
     upscale version to get the assembler.

Please send comments to:
BITnet: 4526P@NAVPGS
ARPAnet: 4526P%NAVPGS.BITNET@wiscvm.wisc.edu
Tks/ Scott Norton.

Disclaimer: "My friend Lenny, he just ain't too smart." (- Of Mice and Men)

Subject: Re: C compilers; request for info
Posted by Anonymous on Sun, 30 Nov 1986 17:43:26 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: chiu&#64princeton.UUCP (Kenneth Chiu)

Article-I.D.: princeto.1992
Posted: Sun Nov 30 12:43:26 1986
Date-Received: Sun, 30-Nov-86 20:43:29 EST
References:
Reply-To: chiu@princeton.UUCP (Kenneth Chiu)

Organization: Princeton University Computer Science Department
Lines: 10

In article 4526P@NAVPGS.BITNET (Lt. Scott A. Norton, USN) writes:
>   I am not planning to be a developer and write DeLuxe Paint, but I am
>   a proficient 68000 assembly programmer, and it seems you must buy an
>   upscale version to get the assembler.

The Manx assembler is not directly compatible with the include files. This is
a major headache if you want to write programs that interface with kernel.
--
Kenneth Chiu   UUCP: princeton!chiu
Princeton University Computer Science Department   BITNET: 6031801@PUCC

Subject: Re: C compilers; request for info
Posted by Anonymous on Mon, 01 Dec 1986 20:00:10 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

Article-I.D.: sun.9776
Posted: Mon Dec 1 15:00:10 1986
Date-Received: Tue, 2-Dec-86 02:07:14 EST
References:
Organization: Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Lines: 54
Summary: C compiler answers

In article , 4526P@NAVPGS.BITNET (Lt. Scott A. Norton, USN) writes:
> Please send comments to:
> BITnet: 4526P@NAVPGS
> ARPAnet: 4526P%NAVPGS.BITNET@wiscvm.wisc.edu
> Tks/ Scott Norton.
I tried both of these addresses and they bombed, such are the vagaries of
this hodge podge of networks...

Comments on the Lattice C compiler version 3.10

>   a. comparative efficiency of object code produced (time and space)

Lattice has made great gains in this area, I would speculate that this
is due to pressure put on them by Manx. Load modules that don't use
printf are comparable now.

>   b. Completeness of the implementation (I know C is not standardized...)

Lattice is going straight for the ANSI standard. This is probably a good
thing, they don't seem to know which way to jump with the library yet
but this version has lots of neat new functions, including support for
the FFP routines and some new ieee routines.

>   c. Known bugs.

I just found one in the *library* that causes file pointers to switch
back from unbuffered to buffered. Luckily this version of the compiler
comes with an Object Module Librarian so putting in the fix is easy.

>   d. Compatability with public domain C programs. (It looks like most
>   of these are Lattice dialect...)

Since Lattice comes with the developers package this is not unusual, it
is also easier to port your programs back to to a PC this way (should you
ever want to) Generally most stuff will compile on either compiler again
the biggest problem is the libraries and the fact that the Amiga system
calls really want 32 bit ints not 16 bit ones.

>   d. Should I get the "Developer's version," "Personal version," or what?

A matter of personal preference, the cheapest version of Lattice ($225)
now, comes with the text utilities grep, files, splat, wc, etc and an
assembler, and the Blink linker, and the compiler. Combined with microemacs
and the Software Distilleries make program you have a pretty complete
development environment.

In general for serious Assembly work you will probably want the MetaCompCo
assembler (Scotts Valley, CA) or the DevPAC from the guys in britain.

[These are definitely my own opinions here!]
--
--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; request for info
Posted by root on Thu, 04 Dec 1986 05:08:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: sbcs.248

Posted: Thu Dec 4 00:08:55 1986
Date-Received: Tue, 9-Dec-86 04:59:50 EST
References:
Organization: Computer Science Dept, SUNY@Stony Brook
Lines: 18

[possible repost of this message - hit 'n' if you have seen it]

Chuck,

The C compiler I am using for my Amiga is not 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?), and of course, cook
up a format converter from a.out -> AmigaDOS executable. 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
work. 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; request for info
Posted by Anonymous on Thu, 04 Dec 1986 12:44:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Originally posted by: john13&#64garfield.UUCP

Article-I.D.: garfield.3068
Posted: Thu Dec 4 07:44:06 1986
Date-Received: Fri, 5-Dec-86 09:43:49 EST
References:
Sender: perry@garfield.UUCP
Reply-To: john13@garfield.UUCP (John Russell)
Organization: Memorial U. of Nfld. C.S. Dept., St. John's
Lines: 47
Summary:

In article cmcmanis@sun.uucp (Chuck McManis) writes:
 > In article , 4526P@NAVPGS.BITNET (Lt. Scott A. Norton, USN) writes:
 >>   d. Compatability with public domain C programs. (It looks like most

```
>>      of these are Lattice dialect...)
>
> Since Lattice comes with the developers package this is not unusual, it
> is also easier to port your programs back to to a PC this way (should you
> ever want to) Generally most stuff will compile on either compiler again
> the biggest problem is the libraries and the fact that the Amiga system
> calls really want 32 bit ints not 16 bit ones.
```

On this point I must beg to differ, as I have *never* gotten any of the PD
programs, from Amicus or Fish disks, or here off the net. All that I have tried
have worked fine with Manx (I still try Lattice on a source every now and then
just to make sure). Most older sources seem to have been broken by fixes made
to bugs in the compiler; I can't say for sure, but you would think it would at
least get past the include files without streams of errors!

Of Lattice's recent improvements I can't comment; a Lattice C ordered from
the mainland that arrived here yesterday was still v3.03, so I'd check the
version number before buying (although this might not be such a problem in
the States).

One of the biggest advanages that Manx has, in my opinion, I very rarely see
mentioned: this is Manx's use of pre-compiled symbol tables. For example, say
you are compiling the VT100 source, composed of several modules. Each one
would begin with several #includes, such as

#include

For each module to churn through these takes an eternity, and you can't put
all of your include files in ram unless you have a meg or two. However, Manx
only needs to read these in once, at which time it can save all the #defines,
structure definitions, etc. When compiling subsequent modules that reference
the symbols, you can have the symbol table loaded in almost instantaneously!
The real beauty of this scheme is that it requires no change in the source
code; any #includes that your program tries to perform will be disabled if
the symbols are already present in memory.

Needless to say this results in a dramatic increase in speed. What is the
fastest Lattice could compile and link a file that uses the intuition
include files, without packing absolutely everything into ram? Manx, with
only "cc" and the c.lib library, can do it in 35 seconds.

Hardly gives you time to put on the coffee, quite a change after Lattice :-)

John

Subject: Re: C compilers; request for info
Posted by jones on Thu, 04 Dec 1986 18:47:22 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: dg_rtp.729
Posted: Thu Dec 4 13:47:22 1986
Date-Received: Fri, 5-Dec-86 10:38:42 EST
References:
Reply-To: jones@dg_rtp.UUCP (Greg Jones)
Organization: Data General, RTP North Carolina
Lines: 23

In article cmcmanis@sun.uucp (Chuck McManis) writes:
 >
 > Comments on the Lattice C compiler version 3.10
 >
 >>   d. Should I get the "Developer's version," "Personal version," or what?
 >
 > A matter of personal preference, the cheapest version of Lattice ($225)
 > now, comes with the text utilities grep, files, splat, wc, etc and an
 > assembler, and the Blink linker, and the compiler. Combined with microemacs
 > and the Software Distilleries make program you have a pretty complete
 > development environment.
 >
 > In general for serious Assembly work you will probably want the MetaCompCo
 > assembler (Scotts Valley, CA) or the DevPAC from the guys in britain.
 >
I have the 3.10 lattice compiler and have found that an assembler is also
included on the release. It is called asm, but I don't know how it compares
to the one mentioned above.
--

  Greg Jones
  Data General, RTP, NC
  ...!seismo!mcnc!rti-sel!dg_rtp!jones

Subject: Re: C compilers; request for info
Posted by grr on Wed, 10 Dec 1986 07:17:56 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Article-I.D.: cbmvax.1077
Posted: Wed Dec 10 02:17:56 1986
Date-Received: Sun, 14-Dec-86 00:07:46 EST

In article root@sbcs.UUCP (Root) writes:
 > 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
 > work. 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

What you say may be true, but there are some philosophical issues with cross
development vs. native mode. Contemplate the effect on the state of Amiga CLI,
Utilities and Development tools if Amiga had switched to native mode development
somewere along the line...

Of course much of the code was written before there was an operating system or
a fully functional chip set. The Sun setup also contains a hardware device to
control and download to an amiga.

--
George Robbins - now working for, uucp: {ihnp4|seismo|rutgers}!cbmvax!grr
but no way officially representing arpa: cbmvax!grr@seismo.css.GOV
Commodore, Engineering Department fone: 215-431-9255 (only by moonlite)