Subject: Re: C++ FQA
Posted by Mindtraveller on Sun, 11 Nov 2007 23:58:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mdelfedenot too many bugs... often less than M$ counterparts.
It was quite usable.
I`ve used BCB until this autumn, when I found U++. And I had problems with it`s bug. The worst compiler bug is that it sometimes ignores source code line next to the "}". Also, debugging multithreaded applications frequently lead BCB IDE to hang. There are more some critical bugs and issues. VCL also may show different behaviour on Win98 and WinXP systems with the same code (ini files, etc).

mdelfedenot so ineffective nor poor... at least, an order of magnitude better than M$ one. Yes, as I mentioned, it`s much better than MFC and much more lightweight than .NET.
My common BCB application has something like 30% of code with Win32 API calls (threads and core objects, serial i/o, grid cells drawing, advanced registry work, ...). This shows for me that VCL is rather poor when we discuss what we can do with it. Yes, it`s much-much more than nothing but it is still insufficient.
Again VCL is good, it was wonderful back in 90-s, but now after so much time passed, Borland could do much, but they didn`t.
So VCL is still a pascal-derived library, ignoring most of C++ features.
So, adding notes about efficiency, do you know how VCL handles it`s forms? Forms and components are converted to textual representation. The borland IDE gives text to linker, which adds these text resources to the end of .exe files. When you start any BCB application, it runs special parser (which is by default in dll!). Text resources are parsed. How? Application gives this text to internal engine, then to newly-created components which serialize their properties from text parts. That is how BCB application starts.
Also, BCB has it`s own memory manager which gives you something like 1Mb-size pool for variables. And there is no way to switch to any other memory manager, as soon as you use VCL components or even VCL strings.
The greatest issue for me personally is that IDE "insists" on the only one programming style. More your application uses VCL forms and components, more time you must spend making your code the way you need, not BCB IDE. For example, BCB makes you having all your form and component event handler in one file. Even when they are logically belong to very different parts of program logics (different classes).
And, yes, it`s .lib files are incompatible with Microsoft ones. The utility for coversion (implib) isn`t that good also.
Isn`t that enough? I can count more critical issues if it`s not clearly fow now. All I say is that VCL was good in 90-s, but it was abandoned by Borland. VCL had to be improved, upgraded, optimized for general-purpose applications. Then - for specific needs. It had a chance to become much more popular than M$ thumb "framework" like MFC.

mdelfedeI don't like database apps, too, but if they did so, maybe it was for some reason. They thought that their reason was serious enough and they lost. BCB is nearly dead for last years and according to the information I have, Borland`s made a decision to abandon VCL completely, switching all development to QT or .NET.