Subject: Re: DirectColor on linux
Posted by Vincent Favre-Nicolin on Tue, 23 Nov 1999 08:00:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Tom Holub wrote:
>
> David Fanning <davidf@dfanning.com> wrote:
>)Vincent FAVRE-NICOLIN (favre@polycnrs-gre.fr) writes:
>)
>)> 3) expensive : buy a commercial X-Windows driver that supports
>)> DirectColor in 24 or 32 bpp.
>)
>)Uh, uh. No. The boss ain't goin' for THAT solution! :-(
>
> Actually my boss would be quite happy with it (And I responded to Vincent
> already in e-mail; I can't imagine why people send e-mail when they've
> also posted a response to Usenet).

Sorry ! I don't spend much time on Usenet unless necessary, so I'm used to sending also answers via email. Been a bad Useneter :-(, won't do it again ;-)

> The problem is, it doesn't seem to help.
> Accelerated X claims to support DirectColor, but the behavior
> I saw running in demo mode was the same as under XFree86.

[...]

> That's what I believed, also, but IDL at least lets me set device,direct=24.
> I also tried it while using XIG's Accelerated X server, which does claim
> to support Direct Color, and the behavior, unfortunately, was the same.
> Yes, that's how it looks under XFree86. Under Accelerated X there's
> also a DirectColor entry, but it doesn't seem to have any effect.

IDL will always let you set device, direct=24. It does not mean the visual is available, until you really use it (use device,/help to test that).

As for Accelerated X, I do not have any experience. If the available mode for Accelerated X is Directcolor, 24 bit, it is very strange, since this is the default mode for IDL. What are the modes proposed by xdpyinfo ? It may be that the DirectColor mode proposed in AcceleratedX is not 24 bit (?), so that IDL reverts to TrueColor ??
Depending on what xdpyinfo gives, you could use a PseudoColor mode, and still be able to have a private color map.

Vincent