

---

Subject: Re: 640x400

Posted by [CC004049%BROWNVM.BITN\[1\]](#) on Tue, 21 Jan 1986 03:33:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Article-I.D.: caip.1042

Posted: Mon Jan 20 22:33:29 1986

Date-Received: Thu, 23-Jan-86 09:14:04 EST

Sender: daemon@caip.RUTGERS.EDU

Organization: Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, N.J.

Lines: 26

From: George S. Musser Jr.

Mike Farren writes:

- > The necessary fix would be fairly expensive. The biggest reason for the
- > 640 X 200 limitation on each field is to reduce the bandwidth requirements
- > of the coprocessor and the memory, and to allow the CPU more cycles.
- > Maintaining the current hardware capabilities and adding the extra capability
- > you describe isn't an easy job. (Before I hear anything about the Atari ST
- > and its 640X400, 70Hz screen, let me remind you that that is a one-bit-per-
- > pixel monochrome screen. It's ONLY color option is 320X200. If you are
- > willing to accept THAT limitation, then the problem isn't too hard. If you
- > want a color screen such as the Amiga's, at a reasonable cost, compromises
- > have to be made.)

Why couldn't the custom chips be modified to accept a 640x400 non-interlaced display with a maximum of one or two bit planes? The machine is already limited to 4 bit planes when the horizontal resolution is 640 pixels.

The interlacing of 640x400 is my biggest complaint about the machine. In its ads, CBM-Amiga stresses that the 640x400 resolution outdoes IBM and Mac, yet the interlacing makes this mode all but useless. I live for the day when the beautiful characters shown by SetLace won't leave me with a headache after 30 seconds.

George