

BIJLAGE Q**The Document Style Designer as a separate Entity****Victor Eijkhout & Andries Lenstra****Abstract**

An argument for the need for a programmable meta format: a format that introduces a new syntactic level in \TeX for document style designers.

\TeX has a number of characteristics that set it apart from all other text processors. Its unsurpassed quality of text setting and its capabilities for handling mathematics are some of the more visible aspects. On a deeper level, however, the extreme programmability of \TeX is just as big an asset. Any layout can be automated to an arbitrary extent. (It is strange that *The \TeX book* gives almost no hint of this.)

The form such automation usually takes is what is called ‘generalized markup’. The person who keys in the text has at his or her disposal commands that describe the logical structure of the document, and as little as is possible of the visual structure.

Document styles as they appear in \LaTeX are examples of this. Here the layout is not merely automated, it is completely hidden from the end user. In particular, the same input can produce widely different output by letting it be interpreted by different styles.

With \LaTeX , however, the problem is the production of document styles. This is a major task, and consequently most people use either the standard styles, or minor modifications of these. Furthermore, \LaTeX does not offer sufficient tools to produce even moderate variations on the layout of the standard styles.

For scientific use of \TeX one can become reconciled to this situation. A scientist should be more concerned with the contents than with the looks of a document, so if there is a format that offers all the tools to get those contents across to the reader, the visual appearance is of secondary concern. We may conclude that, for scientists, \LaTeX fits the bill.

When a document is not a scientific article, however, the inflexibility of \LaTeX renders it useless. The alternative would seem to be plain \TeX , but there the objection is the long and slow learning curve.

One way out of this dilemma is the ‘front end to \TeX ’ approach taken in *The Publisher* from Arbortext and *Grif* from Gipsi. Both systems present almost a ‘wysiwyg’ (what you see is what you get) interface to the user (the term ‘wysipn’, what you see is pretty neat, has been used), and allow altering style parameters via dialog

boxes and menus. In both cases, however, programming the basic style structure and appearance is still less than trivial.

In this article we describe an approach which brings down the complexity of programming a style to that of using it. We propose a front end programming language for style design, which is itself implemented in \TeX .

The ‘Checklist’ Approach to Style Definition

If one compares \TeX to mouse-and-menu text processor packages, one runs into two basic characteristics of programming that constitute a disadvantage when learning \TeX .

The obvious first point is that \TeX has a *syntax*. Every \TeX programmer knows that you can have no end of fun with missing or mismatched braces. Mouse riders are not bothered by this. One can, at most, click the wrong item, but one cannot click in the wrong way.

The second point is more subtle: programming involves and imposes algorithmic thinking. Consider the ordinary loop statement

```
for  $\$i\$ := \$1\$$  to  $\$n\$$ 
```

In many cases, all that is meant is

```
for all  $\$i\$$  between  $\$1\$$  and  
 $\$n\$$  inclusive
```

Thus, the syntactic formulation contains a sequentiality that may semantically not be present. Similarly, the statements in a macro definition are sequentially ordered, even when the corresponding actions are in no such relation.

But even when actions are sequentially ordered, it should not always be necessary for a style designer to specify them in that same order. For instance, in the design of a list environment the amounts of white space above and below the list, and the amount of indentation of the list, should be specifiable in any order, even though they correspond to sequentially ordered actions. Also, the decision whether or not to break a page above a certain

type of heading should be specifiable at any point in the definition.

Such actions do not really correspond to design decisions, rather they are the specific incarnations of general parameters and switches. Thus, it would be a valid approach to style design to offer the person implementing the style a small number of basic constructs (these could for instance be headings, lists, and page layouts), each of which has a ‘checklist’ of parameters and switches controlling the final layout.

Abandoning sequentiality, and making most specifications optional with default values, is then a sensible way to facilitate \TeX programming. An implementation of these demands could take the form of lists of keyword-value pairs. Such lists can be presented in extremely simple syntax, and as matching is performed by keyword instead of by position, such an approach would meet some of the criticism of algorithmic specification above.

As an example, the layout of unnumbered section headings could be given in Lisp ‘property list’ syntax as,

```
\defineheading:section
  (white_above 6pt plus 2pt minus 1pt)
  (white_below 6pt plus 2pt minus 1pt)
  (caption (size 12pt) (style bold)
   (shape ragged_right))
```

but any other syntax is just as valid. It is advisable, however, to steer clear of the idiosyncrasies of the pure \TeX syntax.

Metaformats

Checklists may capture a large part of the variation in basic constructs, but for any set of parameters there will be a layout that eludes classification in terms of these parameters. Thus, it seems inevitable that a style implementer needs to do some programming. However, it is possible to make a very smooth transition between marking a checklist and programming macros. For this, we need the distinction between formats and ‘metaformats’.

Let us denote by the term ‘format’ any collection of macros that gives the end user commands of a higher level than those of pure \TeX . By ‘metaformat,’ we will mean a format such that the commands for the end user are in majority not defined in the format. Metaformats offer the tools with which a style implementer constructs the commands for the end user.

In a restricted sense, the \LaTeX format is a metaformat. A good example here is the `\@startsection` macro, which is basic to \LaTeX , and in terms of which commands like `\section` are defined in the style files. The parameters of this command are mainly numeric parameters determining the layout. One parameter functions as a switch.

As another example, the `\list` command, which is the basis for various environments in \LaTeX , offers the style designer the possibility for programmable extension. Such extensions are specified by passing a piece of \TeX code as the second parameter, that is, \LaTeX does not really provide the style implementer with a separate syntactic level.

Calling \LaTeX a ‘parameterized metaformat,’ we can also envision ‘programmable metaformats.’ There is no objection against implementing a new programming language in \TeX which would be easier to learn and to use.

The challenge is then to find primitives that allow formulation in a simple syntax and that are sufficiently powerful for producing a wide range of layouts.

By any other name . . .

One choice for the primitives of a metaformat is immediately clear: the boxes and glue of \TeX itself. Any \TeX programmer knows that you can do all typesetting with boxes and glue, so why not give them to a style designer? The problem of course is how to simplify their declaration. It is here that the writer of the metaformat takes certain decisions.

Consider, as an example, section headings such as they appear in the \LaTeX article style.

1. Section title
 - 1.1. Subsection title

These take the form (but not the implementation) of two boxes on the same line: one containing the number, the other containing the text. Also the headings of the ‘artikel’ style can be described thus.

1. Section title
 - 1.1. Subsection title

But the box of the number then has a prescribed width. In both cases, however, the sum of the width is the text width. We can therefore imagine that these two layouts were specified as

```
\defineheading:section
  (inline
   ((value sectionnumber)
    (spaces 2))
   (title))
```

for the standard \LaTeX heading, and

```
\defineheading:section
  (inline
   ((value sectionnumber)
    (FillUpTo labelwidth))
   (title))
```

Here the metacommand ‘inline’ is just an `\hbox` to `\hsize` in disguise. It takes all boxes and sets them at natural or specified width, and the width of the box containing the actual heading is calculated to fill the remainder of the text width.

Headlines and footlines provide a nice example of how a programmable metaformat can make intelligent use of

\TeX 's glue. Like section headings, footlines are a disguised \hbox to \hsize . A footline with just a left aligned page number can be specified like

```
(footline (value pagenumber))
```

where the format supplies a trailing \hfil to prevent an underfull box. Cases where the number should be right aligned can be specified as

```
(footline (whitespace fillerup)
          (value pagenumber))
```

where the 'whitespace' is an \hfill , squashing the trailing \hfil at the end of the line.

A syntax and instruction set, such as sketched in these examples, tax the programming capabilities of the format designer, but not those of the style designer. In effect, the format designer implements a new programming language on top of \TeX with a simple syntax, a small instruction set, and at the same time, sufficient generality to produce a wide range of layouts.

Obviously, a smaller instruction set makes learning the format easier. Another advantage is less immediately clear: it reduces the chance of errors. More compact instructions will likely have a more defined function; so on the one hand the style implementer need not specify those actions that must be taken anyway, and on the other hand the format can perform some consistency checking on the intentions of its user.

Conclusion

We have argued the need for a 'programmable metaformat:' a format that introduces a new syntactic level in \TeX for document style designers. Such a level should probably have a different syntax from pure \TeX , and it should contain a relatively small instruction set in which the actual user macros are written. We have indicated that elements of such a format can, to a large extent, be captured in 'checklists.' Others can take the form of intelligently disguised \TeX primitives. We believe that a format incorporating these principles is possible, and that it can be taught to people with little knowledge of \TeX .

As an illustration of these ideas we present the style definition of this article in the 'Lollipop' format.

Example

The following piece of code is the style definition for this article given in the 'Lollipop' format.

```
\typeface:Computer
\fontsize:10 \fontstyle:roman

%declare \parindent
\distance:indentation=20pt
%white space around text elements
\distance:whiteline=6pt plus 2pt
      minus 2pt
\distance:leadingwhite=whiteline
\distance:trailingwite=0pt

%lots of defaults used here
\defineheading:section
      fontstyle:bold stop

%very simple page layout
\definelayou:twocolumn
      height:22.5cm width:16.5cm
      band:start column
            whitespace:0.6cm
            column
      band:end
      stop
\twocolumn %install output routine

%paragraph shape
\defineparagraph:flushright indent:yes
      rightjustified:yes stop
\flushright %install paragraph shape

%bibliography
\definelist:literature counter:1
      item:left
            litteral:[ value:itemnumber
            litteral:]
      item:end stop
\externalreferences:yes
```

Bibliography

Braams, Johannes, Victor Eijkhout, and Nico Poppelier, "The development of national \LaTeX styles," *TUGboat*, Vol 10(4), 1989.

Grif manual / Les langues de Gipsi, Gipsi 1989

Knuth, Donald E. *The \TeX book*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1984.

Lamport, Leslie. *\LaTeX , a document preparation system*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1986.