

Re: Looking for speed increases in "make index" and pkg\_version for ports

## Re: Looking for speed increases in "make index" and pkg\_version for ports

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Mailing-Lists/FreeBSD/hackers/2007-05/msg00403.html>

---

- *From:* "Rick C. Petty" <[rick-freebsd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rick-freebsd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 28 May 2007 23:15:08 -0500
- 

On Sun, May 27, 2007 at 03:30:48PM -0700, Jeremy Chadwick wrote:

That said, I'll ask this out in the open: am I the only one who sees the benefit of GNU make in regards to this? There's a lot of built-in functions in GNU make which could help in regards to ports. I have no qualms with PMake per se, but if another tool gives us what we need, then maybe we should consider the pros and cons of adapting that. There's also CMake, which is incredibly fast.

Yes, you are. What gmake benefits?

Gmake does not provide the flexibility and power that pmake provides. Off the top of my head: gmake does not have ".for" loops, variable expansion modifiers, or even the "!=" shell command variable assignment. I use these in almost every Makefile I write, and the ports uses these things quite a bit. Also, gmake syntax is horrendous compared to pmake. People are already complaining about how ugly the ports makefiles are-- they'd be worse under gmake. Might as well rewrite the whole infrastructure in /bin/sh ...

Also, there's the licensing issues. Remember-- any significant changes to this infrastructure has to work with the core utilities.. this leaves out gmake, python, ruby, etc. I doubt anyone will find anything as powerful as pmake without sacrificing the much-used flexibility it provides.

-- Rick C. Petty

---

freebsd-hackers@xxxxxxxxxxx mailing list

<http://lists.freebsd.org/mailman/listinfo/freebsd-hackers>

To unsubscribe, send any mail to "freebsd-hackers-unsubscribe@xxxxxxxxxxx"