Subject: POSIX releases...
Posted by mirek on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 21:52:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi,

now when we have new release infrastructure for win32, I think it is the time to reconsider Linux/*BSD releases as well.

I think goals should be:

- make it more standard (autoconfig) etc...

- make it possible for other maintainer to release

- include posix src release into the new MakeInstall2

- anyway, the most important part to keep is that file structure of makefile has to be *generated* from TheIDE.

I think that it should work by adding new Makefile option that would be somewhat prepared for autoconfig, not listing those variables at the beggining.

This generated stuff should be universal across platform and would be generated for each release (I will add umk option for that). Then there would be community contributed building files (I really do not undestand fine details well for various OSes that would be much more stable, manually created and using this synthetic file.

Please, comment!

Mirek

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by masu on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 22:16:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I agree on using autotools to use for POSIX platforms, since this is the most elegant solution.

Somebody has to write needed files first, that are at least:
  acinclude.m4
  configure.ac
  Makefile.am

An integration into theIDE should be possible later.
If my spare time allows it, I will begin working on files for autotools.

Matthias

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by mirek on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 22:21:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I believe that our part is to investigate how that Makefile.am looks like and then create Makefile.am export from TheIDE.

Is this correct? Is this enough?

Mirek

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by masu on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 22:28:40 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, we have to investigate what header files, functions and libraries are needed on the host system and create the mentioned files accordingly.
Theoretically it should be possible to generate them from theIDE, cause all information is there for a given package.
But we must also include the check results into the sources, otherwise the autotool chain does not make sense, cause a config.h and Makefile will be generated from the autotools. And definitions in config.h must be used to differentiate between different platforms.

Matthias

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by mirek on Thu, 02 Mar 2006 22:36:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

masu wrote on Thu, 02 March 2006 17:28Yes, we have to investigate what header files, functions and libraries are needed on the host system and create the mentioned files accordingly.
Theoretically it should be possible to generate them from theIDE, cause all information is there for a given package.
But we must also include the check results into the sources, otherwise the autotool chain does not make sense, cause a config.h and Makefile will be generated from the autotools. And definitions in config.h must be used to differentiate between different platforms.

Matthias

Hm... actually, regarding libraries and headers, it is a simple "all or nothing" situation I believe. There is a very limited set of libraries needed to compile, if any of them is missing, compilation is not possible....

Means the only information that is needed

* platform
* CPU type (and perhaps the mode)

As for config.h inclusion, I guess something like

```
#ifdef AUTOMAKEFILE
#include "Config.h"
#endif
```

should work?

Mirek

P.S.: I am a bit undereducated here, I never used even the Makefile during my career;) (First Linux IDE was build using remote development capabilities, not makefiles). Do not laugh..

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by dr_jumba on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 20:53:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Are you talking about using autotools for building ide or for all buildings?

IMHO UPP uniqeness is that it needs minimal set of third party libs/tools. E.g. it doesn't need monstrosity autotools.
The number of configuration for particular POSIX system is not so big to use special build tools.

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by mirek on Fri, 03 Mar 2006 21:29:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

dr_jumba wrote on Fri, 03 March 2006 15:53Are you talking about using autotools for building ide or for all buildings?

Only TheIDE.

Quote:
IMHO UPP uniqeness is that it needs minimal set of third party libs/tools. E.g. it doesn't need monstrosity autotools.
The number of configuration for particular POSIX system is not so big to use special build tools.

Yes, that was the intent

Mirek

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by masu on Sat, 04 Mar 2006 21:15:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Maybe you are right and it is a kind of overkill to use autotools, but we should at least try to provide a better (more flexible) Makefile for theIDE.
Maybe we should at least provide a file containing important build parameter definitions, which is included in the final Makefile.
For example to define output dir, install dir, include and library definitions, etc.

What do you think?

Matthias

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by dr_jumba on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 10:11:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I think the ide with config files is not so bad.
We could make several files such as freebsd.mk.inc, linux.mk.inc, etc. There we could define UPPDIR1, UPPOUT, includes, libs, Outfile and other required stuff.

Regarding U++ home dir, UPP_DIR and others. May be we can provide more flexible and intelligent way for installation?
I propose the following subject to discuss:
When user starts TheIDE for the first time it propose user to select the desired directory (checking the rights) or create a new working directory.

And regarding GCC32.bm. Where should it appear from? I have created it manually and it is still empty.

People on NetBSD have followed the same way, creating it manually
 http://www.arilect.com/upp/forum/index.php?t=msg&S=9b572
76efafa5d8c266f16fe31ac191c&th=365&goto=1393#msg_139 3

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by masu on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 14:50:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

dr_jumba wrote on Sun, 05 March 2006 11:11Regarding U++ home dir, UPP_DIR and others. May be we can provide more flexible and intelligent way for installation?
I propose the following subject to discuss:
When user starts TheIDE for the first time it propose user to select the desired directory (checking the rights) or create a new working directory.

Actually I thought of doing it that way, but as a first attempt I ended up with what I have done for the FreeBSD port. A dialog asking for the personal installation directory would be a good thing and should not be that complicated.

Quote:And regarding GCC32.bm. Where should it appear from? I have created it manually and it is still empty.

I generate it on the fly in the FreeBSD port. I submitted it in the Anouncement section. Maybe we can do similar things on other platforms, too.

For *BSD there is the pkgsrc tree and OpenBSD also has a ports system, which can be used to generate an initial GCC32.bm file.

Matthias

Subject: Re: POSIX releases...
Posted by mirek on Sun, 05 Mar 2006 20:13:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Just some naive ideas:

* what about providing bash based install script, that would play the role of autoconfig, invoked makefile, gave options to install files, asked questions etc?

* one my related petty idea:

what about creating bash file that actually contains gzipped (or bzipped) content?

I mean, find a way how bash file itself somehow rebuilds archive, decompresses it, then gives installation options (detects platform/CPU, compiles, installs, etc...)?

I would consider that cool - universal, CPU independent, single file installer

Mirek