

Re: Dual Boot Possibility

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/WinXP/microsoft.public.windowsxp.general/2005-01/2911.html>

From: Scott (*Scott_at_discussions.microsoft.com*)

Date: 01/04/05

Date: Mon, 3 Jan 2005 17:31:01 -0800

Dear Barry,

I also intended to do what you have done, but encountered a problem. I have partitioned my HDD with XP and formatted in FAT32, with each partition size 3.2GB. Last time when I try to install Win98, it can install successfully but cannot perform first startup (hanged at the startup screen). I just wonder if I need to partition my HDD with Win98? Or should the partition size be reduced?

Scott

"Barry Watzman" wrote:

> *BS.*
>
> *I still set up most of my systems dual boot, 98SE on C:, XP on D: and*
> *all data for both operating systems on E:.*
>
> *And it works just wonderfully with the default Microsoft setup (install*
> *98 first, then XP). Some of the systems have the recovery console*
> *installed on the hard drive, which is effectively a 3rd OS, still with*
> *the MS basic multi-boot software.*
>
> *For more than 2 OS', it's better to use a boot manager, but for 2 OS',*
> *and certainly 2 MS OS', the standard MS software works fine.*
>
>
> *Rick "Nutcase" Rogers wrote:*
> > *Hi,*
> >
> > *It's not a matter of trouble setting up, it can be if done properly, and it*
> > *can be maintained infinitely. It's a matter of configurability and ease of*
> > *use, and Windows is notorious for liking to think it's the only operating*
> > *system on the drive. If someone is going to multiboot several systems as a*
> > *regular thing, then a boot manager is the way to go. Using the native Win*
> > *functions is fine as a temporary thing, or for the classic dual-boot (and*
> > *most of the time people discover that they primarily only use one anyways,*

> > *they just had a hard time letting go of an older operating system).*

> >

>

>