

Re: Painless micro program

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-05/msg02505.html>

- *From:* krw <krw@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 19 May 2007 20:54:19 -0400
-

In article <1179616199.332790.162650@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, kensmith@xxxxxxxx says...

On May 19, 12:43 pm, Rich Grise <r...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
[...]

Actually, the 8051 is quite repulsive, at least as far as the on-board timer goes.

What problem did you have with the timer? It seems to work quite well for me. Perhaps you didn't get it set up correctly. There are quite a few options on how to use it.

I'm with you. FOr a processor with an overly complicated memory architecture and horrible ISA, it's a nice processor for many embedded projects. The selection of peripherals makes it very nice.

[...]

I've never used an 1802, but from the data sheet it looks like it's not very friendly.

It is a good example of how not to make a micro. It acts a great deal like the registers were one chip and the ALU part was another and they just grafted them together.

It was extremely slow because each instruction took 12 clocks and didn't do much. There are a few nice things about it. The fact that it was one of the few processors with DMA built in was one. It was also very low powered. It was CMOS at a time when others were NMOS.

Well, the 8051, at least in its original incarnation, isn't much of a screamer either (12 clocks per op, as well).

Re: Painless micro program

But I've used a 6502 to make a keyboard scanner with N-key rollover – I found its architecture very pleasant to work with, except for the 256-byte limit on the stack, but how deep do you need to call when all you're doing is scanning a keyboard? :-)

Not very. Almost every computer keyboard on the planet has an "8048" in it.

Sorry for contributing to the religious uP wars. ;-)

No you're not. ;-)

--

Keith

.