

Betreff: Re: [Sdcc-user] stm8.h
Von: Philipp Klaus Krause <pkk@spth.de>
Datum: 09.01.18, 15:59
An: sdcc-user@lists.sourceforge.net

Am 09.01.2018 um 06:12 schrieb Georg Icking-Konert:

hi Philipp,

great to hear that - also the upcoming GDB support! Consequently I will (have to) modify my templates under https://github.com/gicking/STM8_templates to use the new headers instead. Therefore I have some questions:

- when is 3.7.0 scheduled to be released?
- for the meantime: do the headers happen to be same or similar than the (patched) SPL ones?
- are there any other features, e.g. language changes, I need to consider?
- are similarly big changes (for the end-user) planned in future releases? While common headers are great, adapting my projects is a lot of effort. And I would hate to do that repeatedly...

For a short feedback thanks a lot in advance!

Regards,
Georg

Am 09.01.2018 um 00:07 schrieb Philipp Klaus Krause:

Am 08.01.2018 um 19:58 schrieb Eric Neblock:

Hey everyone,
I was wondering if there was a "missing" header for the stm8.
>From the wiki, I found this site:

<http://www.colecovision.eu/stm8/STM8SVLDISCOVERY%20LED.shtml>

and in the code example, it has things that we'd expect to be in a header file.

So I don't know if I'm not calling things correctly or if this needs to go to the devel list or something else.

Let me know and thanks for your time!

Regards,
Eric

Such header files exist as part of ST's STM8 SPL, but due to the unclear license situation the headers will not be included in SDCC before 3.7.0.

Philipp

Well, I was only referring to the headers in the SPL, and "the headers will not be included in SDCC before 3.7.0" doesn't mean we'll have headers immediately after 3.7.0 either.

The main problem is the same as with the pic headers: The unclear license situation. In both cases a vendor wishes to impose non-free terms upon the headers for their hardware. Changing their mind hasn't worked so far, and thus is unlikely to work in the short term.

However there is another important question here: Does the vendor have the right to impose license terms on their headers? Are the headers even copyrightable? Are the register locations just noncopyrightable facts?

IANAL, but IMO, in many restrictions, the contents of the header files would be considered non-copyrightable facts. See e.g.:

<http://lkml.iu.edu/hypermail/linux/kernel/0301.1/0362.html>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oracle_America,_Inc._v._Google,_Inc.

After the 3.7.0 release, I'll look into reaching out to entities/places

dedicated to discuss legal issues related to free software, to get these questions clarified.

I hope the resolution will allow SDCC to

- 1) Ship PIC headers as free
- 2) Include free STM8 headers

Philipp

Check out the vibrant tech community on one of the world's most engaging tech sites, Slashdot.org! <http://sdm.link/slashdot>

Sdcc-user mailing list

Sdcc-user@lists.sourceforge.net

<https://lists.sourceforge.net/lists/listinfo/sdcc-user>