
Subject: Re: Great (and funny) Linus' speach about GIT

Posted by [mdelfede](#) on Fri, 11 Jan 2008 15:09:00 GMT

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

luzr wrote on Fri, 11 January 2008 14:29

While plugin system would be fine (but is pretty difficult with C++ in fact), I do not see how it is going to fix the problem, or more precisily, how it is better than packages.

It isn't better, is just different.

Packages are **very** good for developers, plugins are the best for users.

With a package you must :

- drop source inside upp tree
- recompile theide

AND, not having a stable interface, usually you must also mantain the extension along upp changes.

With a plugin, you get a dll (or .so), you just drop it on a plugin folder and you have a ready to use extension.

AND, if you've got a stable and documented sdk, you must recompile plugin only on major ide changes (i.e. changes on binary format, compiler, ecc), which does a big difference, IMHO.

That was the cause of success of Borland products, with their components.

We spoke about that a time ago, about the way controls are made and drawn. Your choice of having ontrols as part of upp (and drawn by esc code on layout editor) is not bad, but then if you add a control you must recompile the full ide **and** write an esc code for layout editor. Double job....

About the problems of c++, I don't see any big caveat.

Of course, the plugin must be recompiled for every compiler choice, but that's true even with c if you change platform.

BTW, plugins are inside code::blocks and they work.

OTOH, if you're concerned about c++ problems, you could make a c interface both on theide side and on sdk side... that would open the plugin system to other languages too.

Ciao

Max
