

The Text Research Site

<http://the-text.net>

By Francesc Hervada-Sala (mail: francesc at the-text.net)

Copyright © 2014, 2015, 2016 by Francesc Hervada-Sala. All rights reserved.

Status as of December 3, 2016.

Contents

Articles	3
1. The Future of Text	3
Concept of Text	3
Past	3
Future	4
2. Symbolic Figures	5
Symbolic Figures: From the Clay Tablet to the Text Engine	5
3. More Unixy Than Unix	6
Unix: The Design Principle	6
Characteristics of the Unix Environment	6
Current Software Landscape	7
Why didn't the Unix Principle take over the world?	7
UText: The Precursor	8
The Universal-Text Interpreter	8
UText Samples	9
Text Engine: The Experiment	10
Data Representation: Symbolic Language	10
Code Representation: Script Language	11
Text Engine v. 1.0 — Applications	12
Text Engine v. X.0 — Graphical UI	14
Text-Oriented Software	15
Text Engine — The Principle	15
TextOS: The Dream	16
Characteristics of Text-Oriented Software	18
4. The Text Engine	18
Fundamentals	19
Data: Text Structure	19
Code: Text Transformation	21
Parsers	24
Basic Features	26

Applications	26
Document Generation	26
Virtual Files	28
Repository	30
Archive	32
Personal Organizer	34
Workbench	35
Windows	35
Views	37
User Interaction	41
Conclusion	42

Blog 43

Representation	43
Information: a Bad Metaphor	43
The Book of Nature	43
Text Experience and Text Reality	43
History of Text	44
Definition of Text	44
Computer = Text Machine	44
Science is Text	45
Text as Experience	46
Speech, Writing, Computing	46
Basic Research	47
Text-Oriented Operating System	47
Physical Basis of Computing	48
Language and Text	49
Human Sciences	49
Common Concept of Text	50
Common Concept of Scientific Knowledge	50
The Next Document System	50
Bare Bones	51
Articulation vs. Partition	52

Articles

1. The Future of Text

The speakers at the next Future of Text Symposium will be asked three questions: What is text? What is the number one thing we can learn from the past? Where do you see the future of text going? I find these questions very interesting, so I will deal with them here.

Concept of Text

What is text? The word “text” stems from the craftsmanship-related verbs “to web” (Latin *texere*), “to build,” and “to carpenter” (Sanskrit *taksati*, Ancient Greek *tex*) [1].

[1] Maximilian Scherner: *Text* in ‘Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie’, Schwabe u. Co. AG Verlag, Basel, 1998, Volume 10, p. 1038.

Let us return to this first, accurate intuition and redefine “text” in modern terms: the noun “text” means an articulated symbolic figure. A symbol is a unit of mental reference, and a text is not a bunch of symbols but an articulated series of symbols, that is, a collection of symbols which refer to each other. This definition is meant as a bijective assertion: if something is text, then it is an articulated symbolic structure, and if something is an articulated symbolic structure, then it is text.

Natural language productions are text. To uncover the text, one can perform a syntactic analysis of the sentences and a morphological analysis of the words. The text is the resulting figure which consists of symbols, such as speech parts and lexemes that refer to each other (e.g., the subject of this sentence is that word, which consists of this lexeme plus this termination). However, natural language productions also carry semantic text. For example, a sentence can state that a woman has a particular characteristic. That sentence can be reduced to a text consisting of symbols (for her, the characteristic, and its assignment to her) that relate to each other. Note that the semantic text of a natural language expression is not unique; each can be analyzed by applying many different symbols and relationships. This ambiguity corresponds to the vagueness of meaning in natural language. In contrast, formal languages have a unique semantic text which corresponds to the syntactic text. Consequently, formal languages are unambiguous, and their processing can be automated.

Beyond language, other phenomena, such as science, are based on text. Scientific knowledge is not merely linguistic. A theory can be described in many different human and artificial languages, and what constitutes a theory is not its linguistic expression but its meaning. The linguistic expression is simply the interface of the theory. Thus, science can be expressed in prose, mathematical language, and computer algorithms. This does not result in three independent knowledge spheres but in one knowledge sphere: the unique text built by all language productions.

The ancient Indian and Greek words for “text” were also used as verbs. Let us restore this usage. To text is to handle with text. It is a special skill that must be learned and can be perfected and passed down to the next generation. For millennia, to text has been a handicraft. Let us also make it into a science and engineering to prepare for the huge challenges humankind will face.

Past

The number one thing we can learn from the past is that text shapes civilization in crucial ways. The first ancient civilizations rose long before the invention of written language but surely not before the invention of the text form of hierarchy, which enabled a ruler to organize a city-state for the first time. An early, crude iteration of the text form of algorithms permitted the emergence of complex cities based

on the division of labor. The development of key text forms is a very slow process that still continues today. For example, the concept of money has evolved for millennia and is still advancing toward becoming a pure text form as an interchange unit.

Even more importantly, text empowers civilization. For example, text enables science. In mathematical studies in ancient Greece, science was born as knowledge about pure text forms. The next big step in science did not occur until the emergence of modern physics three centuries ago. Then, scientists began using the text of knowledge in new ways. They were no longer content with continually extending and complicating the text of knowledge. Instead, they emphasized clear, short sentences, formalized them with mathematical language, and tested them against reality. Moreover, scientists strove to simplify the whole text of knowledge, discovering more general laws. Modern physics changed how science handled the text of knowledge, and an explosion of knowledge and technological applications resulted.

Text empowers not only knowledge but also human collaboration and cohabitation. For example, the European Union has established an unprecedented, decade-long period of peace in a historically belligerent region. This has been achieved through treaties, democratic rule, and diplomacy, all of which are text-based phenomena.

Future

I see that the future of text lies in its computerization, especially in the construction of a global computer network as a universal text system. Let's call it the World Wide Text.

As this name suggests, the World Wide Text will be the successor to the World Wide Web. While the Web consists of a collection of linked webpages, the World Wide Text will consist of a single text repository and text engine. More precisely, it will be perceived and act as a single entity but be implemented as a massively distributed computer network.

The World Wide Text system will be capable of storing and manipulating text at a global scale for numerous purposes. Text is not only writings but also knowledge and algorithms, so the World Wide Text will include all human writings, knowledge, and software. This integrated system's applications will be scientific, legal, journalistic, diplomatic, personal, and more.

Let's take a look at some examples of these applications. Through digitization, all communication media will converge in the World Wide Text. Instant messaging, books, telephone, television, and other media will no longer be separate technologies as mixed-message forms develop. All information, including reflexive information, will be available in real time from a single source. Tailored, proactive informing will become the leading norm. Readers will not merely consume pre-built content but determine what and how content is presented.

The World Wide Text will be groundbreaking in science. Each discipline will first gather and store its own knowledge in a central repository and then increasingly formalize its knowledge. Many disciplines now mere battlefields for different approaches will advance as they abandon prose and move to formal languages. Even more importantly, the World Wide Text can lead science to definitively overcome the problem of fragmentation. Fragmentation arises when particular persons or groups own particular knowledge. If, instead, practitioners put knowledge in a shared, central repository, then all facts and theories could be evaluated and applied by other disciplines. Disciplines will no longer use private languages no-one else understands but translate their specific language productions to the universal text structure that everyone understands and computers can process. New scientific disciplines transversal to other disciplines will arise, such as the study of methodological issues (which concerns all disciplines and cannot flourish in a fragmented landscape).

The World Wide Text will have similar effects on all of human text production. Gradually, text will no longer consist of chunks physically separated, incompatible and expressed in different languages, notations, and diagrams. Instead, text will consist of a single, integrated unit that can be automatically converted into a myriad of different presentations.

The World Wide Text will have the same kinds of effects as all improvements in text technology. As the written word and the printing press did in the past, the World Wide Text will deepen human understanding, empower human capabilities, and improve human coexistence.

2. Symbolic Figures

Symbolic Figures: From the Clay Tablet to the Text Engine

Future of Text Symposium. Palo Alto, California, Dec 9, 2015

Today I am going to talk first about some ideas regarding text, then about the application of these ideas to computing, and last about my research projects.

While writing, science, and computing are big achievements of human history, they also show important limitations at the present time. Whatever area you are interested in, you can be overwhelmed by the amount of material to read and not be able to keep up with it. Science is fragmented into many disciplines, each of which has its own language, even its own culture, and communication between disciplines is difficult and insufficient. Also computer software comes in separate applications that do not work well together.

It is interesting that we find the same kind of problems appear everywhere. Why is this? Well, writing, science and computing are not completely different things, they share a common basis. Fundamentally, all of them work with symbols. When we speak, we use symbols. When we write, we produce symbolic structures that become fixed. When we do science, we build symbolic expressions and check them against reality. And computers are machines that can store and manipulate symbolic expressions.

The key point is that all symbolic expressions have the same kind of structure. I call «text» an articulated symbolic figure. And any articulated symbolic figure is a text. My thesis is that any text can be represented using a simple formula that can be expressed mathematically. This thesis also suggests a plan for action. If we build computer systems that manage text, then these systems will allow us to manage all writings, all sciences, and more as an integrated whole.

Although this plan can be applied to any field, my research is now concentrated in computing. What is the current software paradigm? Software comes in separate applications, each of which has its own functions, its own data, and stores the data in its own files. This has many disadvantages. Data and functionality are redundant. For example, you have a spell checker in your word processor application, and another one in your email application, if it happens to be from another vendor. Both spell checkers have the same function, but they perform differently, have different user interfaces, and use different dictionaries. You add a word into a custom dictionary in one application and you miss it in the other one. Functionality is not only redundant, but also very often missing. You cannot spell check your document names, just because the programmers have not prepared this particular case, although your system has several spell checkers installed. With the current paradigm, applications become big and complex, because they must provide all functionality that the user needs in a particular context. Applications are expensive to develop and difficult to use. Additionally, applications cannot be combined and the user is confined to the functions that were anticipated by the developers.

I propose a new software paradigm. There should be a text layer underneath all applications. The operating system would have a text engine. A text engine is a software artifact that can represent text structures and manipulate them. That is, it can represent arbitrary symbols and set cross-references between them, and it can query and transform these structures. When an application wants to store some data, it stores the data through the text engine. And when the application needs to retrieve some data, it queries the text engine. There are no more files at all.

Imagine such a system. You would install a spell checker and it would be available to all your applications. You install an application to take notes and you are able to add notes to any sentence, to a

document name, to a timestamp, to a menu option. You change the name of a document and all references update automatically. You would be able to choose the application that you want to use with your data. If you are writing a document, you can open a mind mapping tool that shows the document's outline, you update the mind map and the word processor updates automatically. At present, interfaces between applications must be programmed for each pair of applications. This is expensive and, as a result, many interfaces are missing. In the new paradigm, each application communicates only with the text engine, this way every application can collaborate with any other application. Applications are smaller and can be combined, this is better for the user, and better for the developer.

I have been working on two research projects to explore this idea. The first project was a program that I wrote some years ago with the programming language Perl. It is called the Universal-Text Interpreter, and it is a document generation system. To use it, you enter the information in some source files and write a script to generate output files in several formats. For example, you write some articles and then you generate a website and a PDF file from the same source.

This program is the precursor to the Text Engine, which is my current research project. The first version of the Text Engine will be used as a document generation system, but later on some applications will be built on the top of it. For example, support for virtual files. With a virtual file system you will use a conventional application to work on a conventional file, but the data will not be stored in the disk, instead it will be managed by the Text Engine. This way you can work on the same data using different applications. Imagine a word processor and a spreadsheet both having access to the same data. And when you make changes in one of them, they reflect automatically in the other one.

With these research projects I am beginning to explore the principle of using a layer of text to integrate different components. The Universal-Text Interpreter has proven that my text definition can represent any kind of information. The Text Engine will extend text usage to application programming. And in the future, this approach can be scaled to the level of the operating system, and why not even to the level of the Internet. Then we will have big collections of data that are well integrated and operations with this data that are simple and can be combined and work well together. I see this as an extremely promising path to follow.

Thank you.

3. More Unixy Than Unix

Unix implemented a brilliant design principle several decades ago. Could this principle be applied consistently in all kinds of software, from server applications like databases to rich client applications? Yes, provided we deepen in the concept of text and redefine it as a parsed structure instead of as a human readable string. This will lead to software applications that are simpler to build, easier to use, and much more powerful than current ones.

Unix: The Design Principle

Characteristics of the Unix Environment

Let us bring into mind the design principle behind the Unix operating system.

There is a file system which provides access to all entities the system is aware of from a unified name space. Files contain raw strings for representing both data and source code, this way generic file editors—be it interactive such as vi or command-based such as sed— can manipulate all data and all source code in the system.

Programs are filters that get a string stream as input and generate a string stream as output. That makes it possible to combine each program with any other one. Strings can be passed to a program as arguments when calling it in order to control its behavior. Additionally, program configuration parameters

are held in raw string files, so that any generic file editor —interactive or automatic— can regulate all aspects of the system's functionality.

The shell is an interactive environment in which the user can edit commands and execute them. It uses a simple grammar that provides uniform access to all installed functionality. Also the language used is extensible —via aliases and function definitions—.

The key concept in Unix is the concept of a string stream. A string stream is a sequence of human readable and writable sequences of characters. The system supports sequences of character sequences; users represent their data and code as character sequences using multiple notations, formats and languages. To use the system, a user builds a command and instructs the system to execute it. The system provides generic tools that the user combines and applies to her particular needs. If the available commands for the application are well-thought-out —each of them is simple and orthogonal to each other—, a proficient and smart user has a powerful system at her fingertips.

Current Software Landscape

Yet when you look at current software, you realize that even Unix installations are not unixy at all. There are lots of components like databases, office applications, non line-oriented file formats such as XML and many more things that do not integrate well with the described principle. You cannot use `vi`, `sed`, `grep`, `cp`, `rsync` or `xargs` with them. For example, you cannot `rsync` a table in MariaDB to replicate it, you cannot `grep` inside a LibreOffice document, you cannot `vi` a PDF document.

Current mainstream software is based on applications. Each application has its own data, provides access to users through a proprietary UI and to applications through a proprietary API and uses a proprietary file format for exchanging data through static files. Web applications are an extreme case of this: even data storage and application services are hosted on the publisher's servers.

The key concept in mainstream software is the concept of the standalone application. The system contains some installed applications, which are responsible for particular tasks and the sole owners of particular data. For a particular job, the user must choose an application and use its built-in functionality. The user is treated like a little child whom a mentor must provide everything, like a prisoner that cannot freely decide where to go. In contrast, in a unixy environment the user feels like an adult, free citizen.

Why didn't the Unix Principle take over the world?

The Unix Principle is superior, but if it is really such a better approach, why didn't it take over the world? Why don't all software systems currently work that way?

I posit that there are some implementation constraints in Unix —which was conceived over forty years ago— that impede the thorough use of this approach for all purposes.

Unix presents some scalability issues. Static files work well for many purposes, but cannot be generalized for everything. You cannot use static files to store millions of data records accessed concurrently by hundreds of users, you wouldn't be able to manage them and query them with good performance. Also the fact that every command runs in a dedicated process poses a limitation. You cannot use this model for small functions that are used repeatedly during the program execution. Scalability is also constrained by the lack of strong referencing. The names of entities are represented by strings in files and resolved at run time, therefore references brake when files are renamed or deleted.

Unix also suffers from usability problems, because only power users feel comfortable with its user interface.

There are two flaws regarding these implementation constraints. While Unix hits the mark by using text as a universal interface, it fails by reducing text to a string representation. It also fails by coupling interfaces to their implementation (i.e. commands, pipes, streams are always implemented the same way).

Let's now take a look at some experiments I've been working on to overcome these flaws.

UText: The Precursor

The Universal-Text Interpreter

The Universal-Text Interpreter is a file generation tool that I wrote some years ago with Perl. It provides a shell with which you can generate files in multiple formats (i.e. HTML, LaTeX, OpenDocument, PDF) from a set of source files in Universal-Text Language (UTL) or custom formats.

To use the tool, you declare a data structure, then you enter data, and last you define a transformation script. For example, you can declare a data structure this way to represent websites that consist of pages, each page having a title and a body that contains heading and paragraph strings:

```
^ website {
  ^ page {
    ^ title : string
    ^ body {
      ^ tag : string
      ^ h1 : tag
      ^ p : tag
    }
  }
}
```

Having declared a data structure, you can enter some data:

```
=web1 ~website
=index ~page
~title Welcome
~body
~h1 Welcome to my great new site!
~p You may ask what is this site about.
~p Well, I am asking myself that, too!
```

Then you define a transformation script that determines how to generate HTML files:

```
select website.page begin
  save [u].html begin
    out <html><head><title>[v title]</title></head><body>
    select body.:tag do out <[u.role]>[v]</[u.role]>
    out </body></html>
  end
end
```

When you run the script, the interpreter visits all pages inside websites and generates, for each page, a file with its name and the extension .html. Each file contains, besides a header and a footer, a line for each tag (heading or paragraph) inside the body of the page expressed as an HTML tag. Usage example:


```

$ ut -b web1.utl
Creating file index.html
$ cat index.html
<html><head><title>Welcome to my great new site!</title></head><body>
<h1>Welcome</h1>
<p>Welcome to my new site!</p>
<p>You may ask what is this site about.</p>
<p>Well, I am asking myself that, too!</p>
</body></html>

```

UText Samples

This is the beginning of a real blog post written with UTL. Prose is entered unformatted, as regular writing, and there are just some structural marks preceded with a tilde or an equal sign.

```

~post =computer-text-machine
~title Computer = Text Machine
~timestamp 2014-08-16 16:01:50 CET
~content

```

Given that computers are capable of many different things, it is easy to get the impression that they are universal machines. Yet this cliché is absolutely wrong. Let us take a closer look at what computers really are.

Software systems are typically divided into applications. An application is used for word processing, another for email, and others to respectively manage a spreadsheet, browse the Web, or edit a photo.

The Universal-Text Interpreter can also be used for software development. For example, a C module description could look similar to this:

```

=text ~module
~title Text
~file text.c
~description This module implements basic services to
        define and query text units.

```

This describes a C code module implemented in the source file `text.c`. Then you declare which other modules this module depends on.

```

~uses base
~uses transaction
~uses event

```

Last you define some constants that this module exposes.

```

~error E_UNIT
    ~caption Unknown text unit
    ~description There is no text unit with the given Id.
~error E_TYPE
    ~caption Incorrect type
    ~description The given type does not correspond to the unit role.

```

When you run the Universal-Text Interpreter, it generates a website with the documentation of all the code modules and it generates also some source code. For example, a file `text.i`, the only file to be included in `text.c`, that includes all modules needed:

```

$ cat text.i
#include "base.h"
#include "transaction.h"
#include "event.h"
#include "constants.h"

```

It generates the makefile:

```

[...]
text.o: text.c base.h transaction.h event.h constants.h
[...]

```

Also a module implementing the constants is automatically generated:

```

$ cat constants.h
char * str_constant(int c);
#define E_UNIT 1 //Unknown text unit
#define E_TYPE 2 //Incorrect type

$ cat constants.c
char * str_constant(int c) {
    switch(c) {
        case E_UNIT: return "Unknown text unit";
        case E_TYPE: return "Incorrect type";
    }
}

```

With this approach you generate documentation and code from the same source. This ensures that the documentation is accurate and up to date, and you save programming and debugging effort because parts of the code are automatically generated.

We've seen the general notion of the Universal-Text Interpreter. Text is used here as a universal data structure, and you generate strings by transforming text units through a script language. Regular use of it for many purposes has shown that it can represent all kinds of data. Data structures are easily defined and can be flexibly changed at any time, without requiring much rework of the source files.

Now let's consider the Text Engine, which is the next step in my exploration.

Text Engine: The Experiment

I am currently developing the Text Engine. It is a user space tool written in C. It will provide a shell with which text can be parsed, queried, transformed and generated. Yet text is here implemented not as a string, but as structured data.

Data Representation: Symbolic Language

The Text Engine supports a symbolic language that can represent any text as a set of symbols with cross-references between them. Data is implemented as text. For example, you can define a data structure for to-do lists with this symbolic language expression:

```

~=to-do list {
    ~=task {
        ~=description :string;
        ~=due :date;
        ~=done :boolean;
    }
};

```

The above defines a text unit named «to-do list» that contains text units for single tasks, each of which has a description—which is a text unit of type «string»—, a due date and a flag indicating whether the task has been completed. Once you have defined a unit, you can instantiate it. You can enter data for your task list with the following expression:

```
~to-do list =conference work {
  ~task {
    ~description "book airplane ticket";
    ~due "09/14/2015";
  };
  ~task {
    ~description "book accommodation";
    ~due "09/28/2015";
    ~done #true;
  };
  ~task {
    ~description "travel";
    ~due "10/14/2015";
  };
};
```

This defines three tasks for the to-do list with name «conference work», each with a description and a due date.

Code Representation: Script Language

The Text Engine provides a script language designed to represent code. To show all tasks of all to-do lists, you can execute this:

```
select ~to-do list . task;
```

To get all tasks of the to-do list «conference work» that are not completed, run this:

```
select =conference work . ~task (not having ~done);
```

You can specify the output of a select statement. For example, if you want to get a line with the description for each task, you do:

```
select ~to-do list . task (order by ~due) {
  println ~description;
}
```

Or, to output the description and due date of each task:

```
select ~to-do list . task (order by ~due) {
  println "[v ~due] [v ~description]";
}
```

In the Text Engine, code is text. Any script language expression is represented internally as a text unit—its parse tree—and can therefore be expressed with symbolic language. For example, the last instruction is equivalent to the following expression in symbolic language:

```

~transformation :select {
  ~selector {
    ~level { ~target role #to-do list };
    ~level { ~target role #task };
  }
  ~order by {
    ~target role #due;
  }
  ~body {
    ~transformation :println {
      ~segment :variable { ~role #due };
      ~segment :literal { #space };
      ~segment :variable { ~role #description };
    }
  }
}

```

Text Engine v. 1.0 — Applications

The Text Engine will consist of a base layer —providing support for symbolic and script language and basic functionality— and some modules that will be used for several applications.

An application that will be available from the very beginning will be file generation. Basic functions such as `select` to query the repository, `print` to output a string and `save` to store a string as a file will allow the user to export text units as files. For example, the following script generates a file containing all to-do lists:

```

save "./todo.txt" {
  select ~to-do list {
    println "=== [u] ===";
    select ~task (order by ~due) {
      print "[v ~due] [v ~description]";
      if ~done { print " (done) " };
      println;
    }
  }
}

```

When running the above, the Text Engine creates a file named «todo.txt» with this content:

```

=== conference work ===
09/14/2015 book airplane ticket
09/28/2015 book accommodation (done)
10/14/2015 travel

```

To work with files of particular formats you proceed in the following way. You define a unit that represents the file format semantics and serializes and deserializes their instances and then you write scripts to convert your repository data to such semantics.

For example, to work with LibreOffice Writer files, you would use a module that defines a unit named `odt` similar to this:

```

~=odt {
  ~=title :string;
  ~=content {
    ~=chapter {
      ~=heading :string;
      ~=paragraph :string;
    }
    ~=save :transformation;
    ~=read :transformation;
  }
}

```

This defines an OpenDocument unit with a title and content consisting of chapters with a heading and some paragraphs. The function `save` receives a unit of type `odt` as input and serializes it into a file with LibreOffice format. The function `read` receives a file as input and generates a unit of type `odt` in the text repository.

For example, a simple document looks like this:

```

:odt {
  ~title "My Book";
  ~content {
    ~chapter {
      ~heading "Prolog";
      ~paragraph "This book is unlike any other book.";
    }
  }
}

```

If you want to export a to-do list as a LibreOffice Writer file, you execute this script:

```

save :odt "./todo.odt" {
  out ~title "To Do";
  out ~content {
    select ~to-do list {
      out ~chapter {
        out ~heading [u];
        select ~task (order by ~due) {
          out ~paragraph "[v ~due] [v ~description]";
        }
      }
    }
  }
}

```

The above generates the following text unit and stores it as an Open Document file:

```

:odt {
  ~title "To Do";
  ~content {
    ~chapter {
      ~heading "conference work";
      ~paragraph "09/14/2015 book airplane ticket";
      ~paragraph "09/28/2015 book accommodation";
      ~paragraph "10/14/2015 travel";
    }
  }
}

```

To import a to-do list from a LibreOffice Writer file, you execute this:

```
read :odt "./todo.odt" {
  select ~content.chapter {
    out ~to-do =[v heading] {
      select ~paragraph {
        out ~task [inline/][v][[/inline];
      }
    }
  }
}
```

This way you can work with conventional applications on data that is stored in the Text Engine's repository. You can use several applications on the same data. For example, if you are writing a book, you can work on the book's outline with an outliner tool, edit some or all chapters with a word processor and manage the writing process with a spreadsheet. As all data comes from a single source, changes made in one application apply automatically to the other ones.

The next step will be to implement support for virtual files in the Text Engine. Then, import and export functions will be executed automatically in the background by the Text Engine whenever required, which will simplify usage and produce a smoother user experience.

Text Engine v. X.0 — Graphical UI

When there is a demand for it, a graphical user interface based on the Text Engine can be built representing graphics as text. For example, you open a window executing the following:

```
open :window {
  ~title "Window 1";
  ~client area : stack panel {
    ~panel :string panel {
      ~content "Window 1";
      ~format #heading1;
    }
    ~panel :string panel {
      ~content "This is the first window.";
    }
  }
}
```

The above code creates a window on the screen with two lines, the first one formatted as a header:

```
== Window 1 ==
This is the first window.
```

To show the to-do list one can execute this script expression:

```
open :window {
  select =conference work {
    out ~title [u];
    out ~client area : list panel {
      select ~task (order by ~due) {
        out ~panel :string panel "[v ~due] [v ~description]";
      }
    }
  }
}
```

Such a window would look like this:

```
== conference work ==
* 09/14/2015 book airplane ticket
* 09/28/2015 book accommodation
* 10/14/2015 travel
```

Also UI controls will be represented by text units. For example, this defines a menu item:

```
~window {
  ~menu bar {
    ~menu item {
      ~caption "Insert Date";
      ~action "select #cursor position { insert ~date {#now}}";
    }
  }
}
```

If you are working with your to-do list and want to add a menu option to store the current data as a raw string file, you can execute this:

```
put #window1.~menu bar {
  ~menu item {
    ~caption "To raw string file";
    ~action [q/]
      save "[u #data source :to-do list].txt" {
        select ~task {
          println "[v due] [v description]";
        }
      }
    [/q];
  }
};
```

After that you see a new item «To raw string file» at the menu bar. When you activate it, a file with the name of the to-do list and extension «txt» is generated containing a list of all tasks.

Text-Oriented Software

Text Engine — The Principle

We have seen that with the Text Engine one can build a software system based on text. Data structures are text units, code procedures are text units, so are UI elements and everything else. The Text Engine provides support for querying and transforming text units, and thus it provides means to handle all data, all code, all UI elements and everything else in the system in a uniform way. You don't use a proprietary interface to access each system component, you use a generic interface instead, namely text.

It is important to stress that this does not imply that there is a single system-wide implementation of text. Each software piece can implement its own text units internally in a proprietary way. Only the communication between software pieces takes place through a generic data structure that represents text units.

TextOS: The Dream

One can dream of an operating system completely built upon this principle. Let us call it the «Text Operating System», TextOS. The kernel has a text engine. There is a system-wide (virtual) text repository that contains all data and all software. There are no files at all.

Let us see how a TextOS would look and feel comparing it with Unix. In Unix, you get a list of all your document names by running:

```
ls documents
```

In TextOS, you can also get all document names with:

```
ls ~document;
```

Yet you can also make a much more specific query, for example get all documents that must be completed by next week:

```
ls ~document (having ~due date (lt #next week));
```

You can also specify what output you want to get, for example each document's title followed by the status in brackets:

```
ls ~document (order by #modify date) {
    println "[v title] ([v status])";
};
```

If you want to receive an email every day with your open tasks, in Unix you proceed in the following way. First, you create a file:

```
vi generate-open-tasks.pl
```

You write a script in a programming language that retrieves your open tasks and outputs them. After that, you mark the file as executable:

```
chmod u+x generate-open-tasks.pl
```

Then you add a line at a configuration file in order to instruct the cron daemon to run a job daily:

```
echo "0 6 * * *
    mary /home/mary/generate-open-tasks.pl
    | mail -s tasks mary@example.com
    " >>/etc/crontab
```

In TextOS, you achieve the same by running a single script instruction:

```
cron #daily {
    mail "mary@example.com" (subject "tasks") {
        select :task (not having ~done; order by ~due) {
            println ~description;
        }
    }
};
```

Note that above a single language has access to several components. Additionally, it is not mandatory to use this particular language, and other languages (i.e. symbolic language) would also do. In contrast, in Unix to do the same you must use several notations and languages (Perl, bash, cron notation) that you cannot choose.

In Unix, you can see what jobs are scheduled by running `cat`:

```
cat /etc/crontab
0 6 * * * root logrotate /etc/logrotate.conf
```


In TextOS, you can do the same:

```
cat #etc.crontab;
    0 6 * * * root logrotate /etc/logrotate.conf
```

Yet you can also get the scheduled jobs shown in alternative formats, for example as a symbolic language expression:

```
cat :symbol #etc.crontab;
    ~job {
        ~time {
            ~month #all;
            ~day #all;
            ~wday #all;
            ~hour "6";
            ~minute "0";
        };
        ~user #root;
        ~command #logrotate {
            ~configuration #etc.logrotate.conf
        }
    };
```

In TextOS, you can express everything in alternative formats, which can be useful if you are unfamiliar with a particular notation. Generic languages such as symbolic language do not substitute for specific languages, but complement them. No language is imposed, the user can always choose.

The TextOS will also avoid a lot of redundant implementation of the same functionality. For example, in Unix there are multiple implementations of the mail functionality. There is a mail shell command, there are many Perl modules at CPAN that implement mail for using it in Perl programs, and the same functionality is implemented in several modules for say PHP. In TextOS a single interface for mail would suffice, for example:

```
~=mail {
    ~=from :string;
    ~=to :string;
    ~=subject :string;
    ~=body { [...] };
    ~=send :transformation;
};
```

Whenever you need to send an email, you instantiate a unit of this type and execute a `send` operation on it. Different programming languages will of course be able to express the creation and sending of email with different syntax, but the compiler will not have to implement the function itself as in today's systems, it will just refer to the generic interface.

Today, every mail implementation must be configured differently. You must put particular files under `/etc` for the mail shell command and set particular variable values in your Perl or your PHP script to control the mail functionality. The same information such as sender name, address and the SMTP server name must be defined more than once at several places and with distinct notations. TextOS will support a system-wide single configuration. And the user will be able to choose what notation to use for seeing and editing it.

In TextOS there can be obviously more than one implementation of the mail functionality available. Then, the system's administrator of the TextOS instance will be able to choose where what implementation of the mail functionality has to be used, and she will be able to change that at run time—manually or programmatically—, without having to change the configuration parameters at all.

In Unix, file content is not accessible to the operating system and file systems provide some limited metadata such as permissions and timestamps. If applications need some more metadata, they have to

implement it themselves. This way, you need special file formats for metadata of particular applications, for example in current systems you use ID3 metadata for MP3 audio files and Exif metadata for JPEG image files.

In TextOS, there is, as a matter of principle, no need for a «metadata» construct since all metadata is regular data. Even the user can define data types and add instances of them inside data from third-party applications. The operating system has access to all data by general means. The user can run queries such as:

```
select ~album (having ~guitarist (eq #Eric Clapton));  
select ~picture (having ~person (eq #mom));
```

Characteristics of Text-Oriented Software

Let us now conclude by reviewing the characteristics of a text-oriented software system and comparing them to the characteristics of a Unix system that we considered at first.

The key role in text-oriented software is played by text units.

There is a central text repository that provides a unified name space for everything. Queries can be done on everything—from data to procedures, from user customizations to applications and system software—by generic means.

All data and software is represented by text units. Thus, any text editor can update all of them. A text editor can be a programmatic or a visual one, the latter can represent text units linguistically or graphically. Also configuration parameters for software components are set through text units, so that a text editor can control all aspects of the functionality.

Procedures are text transformations, and commands are filters that receive a text unit as input and generate another text unit as output.

The system builds an interactive environment that provides uniform access to all functionality and extensibility by linguistic means. Several user interfaces are supported, from linguistic (shell) to graphical ones.

To use the system, a user builds a command and instructs the system to execute it. One can already guess that the user experience will be similar to Unix. Yet the system will be much smoother and more well-integrated, and will provide more powerful utility.

It will require hard work to get to such systems. But when we've gotten there we will look back to current systems, which we will then experience as clumsy, rough, headless, and be filled with wonder as to how we managed for so long in such an uncivilized manner.

4. The Text Engine

Abstract: This paper describes a projected experimental software for handling data that aims to serve as the foundation for further applications. This system is based on a single data structure—the «text»—and will not only facilitate data management, but also enable multiple applications to smoothly share data and cooperate. Moreover, all applications can be easily combined and extended both by other applications and by power users.

The intention of this paper is to introduce readers to a long-term project I have been working on. My motivation arises from the conviction that current software falls far short of its potential. I often asked myself, «Why is everything so complicated?» As a user, I had grown frustrated about having to deal with several stubborn autarchic applications that forced me to describe interconnected facts as unrelated pieces, and to bridge the resulting gaps through manual means (e.g., exporting and importing, copying and pasting). As a programmer, I felt discontent with having to use inflexible and clumsy programming

systems that compelled me to write very similar code anew from scratch repeatedly. We could automate so much work and exploit so many logical dependencies! This brings us to the approach that will tackle these issues. I posit that we should build software systems that «describe» facts instead of «implement,» «simulate,» or «make analogies» with them. After all, describing facts is what we do with language, and notably, a single spoken language can fit all fact-describing purposes within it. Let us make computers handle «text,» not character strings, but parsed text; not words, but their meanings—the symbolic figures that populate our minds.

I intend to develop and test this approach with the project delineated in this paper: the Text Engine. The Text Engine is experimental software that will provide mechanisms for creating, storing, manipulating, and querying a data structure simply called «text.» Applications will use the Text Engine for both data handling and as an interface between them. In the following pages, readers will become acquainted with the basic points of the system, and later, its applications.

Fundamentals

Data: Text Structure

The Text Engine supports a symbolic language with which any text can be represented by specifying symbols and references between them. To declare a symbol, precede its name with a tilde and an equal sign:

```
~=species;
```

Subordinated symbols can then be added for every attribute that «species» will have:

```
~=species { ~=common name :string; ~=scientific name :string };
```

The curly brackets identify «child» symbols. Here, the «common name» and the «scientific name» each have a particular «type» (preceded by a colon). In this case, the data type is «string.» Having already defined the type «species,» one can then declare subtypes of it:

```
~=mammal :species; ~=elephant :mammal;
```

A symbol inherits all characteristics from its type, which in turn inherits them from its own type, and so on. For example, an elephant is a mammal and a mammal is a species, therefore each elephant species has a common and a scientific name, as well:

```
=African elephant ~elephant {  
  ~common name "African bush elephant";  
  ~scientific name "Loxodonta africana";  
};
```

The expression above defines a particular elephant species with the given common and scientific name. The symbol names are not being defined here, just used; thus, they are preceded with only the tilde sign representing their «role.» We are saying that the character string «African bush elephant» plays—for this species—the role of the common name.

Suppose the user now wants to register a particular species of penguin. This can be achieved as follows:

```

~=penguin :species { ~=breeding pairs :integer };
=little penguin ~penguin {
  ~common name "Little blue penguin";
  ~scientific name "Eudyptula minor";
  ~breeding pairs "500,000";
};
=African penguin ~penguin {
  ~common name "African penguin";
  ~scientific name "Spheniscus demersus";
  ~breeding pairs "70,000";
};

```

The Text Engine allows users to create symbols and their references freely, provided they follow the text integrity rules. Every symbol used must be declared. Every child symbol must play a role compatible with its parent's type. For example, a penguin's child element can take on the role «breeding pairs,» because the definition of «penguin» includes this child element, whereas a child element of «elephant» cannot. Moreover, the data contained in this child element must be, according to the definition of «breeding pairs,» an integer.

Users can also reuse symbols. For example, to include them in a list:

```

~=threatened species { ~=endangered :species; ~=vulnerable :species };
~threatened species {
  ~endangered #African penguin;
  ~vulnerable #African elephant;
};

```

The number sign (#) represents symbolic equality. The above expression means that the symbols «African penguin» and «African elephant» themselves (not copies of them or instances of them as a type) belong to the list of threatened species.

A symbol can have more than one type. For example, elephants are worshiped in some cultures:

```

=Asian elephant ~elephant { ~scientific name "Elephas maximus" };
~=veneration object { ~=religion :world religion };
#Asian elephant :veneration object { ~religion #Hinduism };

```

This way, an Asian elephant is registered as both a biological species and an object of veneration, and the text repository holds data about both aspects under a single symbol.

To summarize, «text» in this engine consists of «text units»—each of which has a parent, a type, and plays a role. A symbol can be defined by a single text unit or by more than one if grouped by symbolic equality.

The above is not to be confused as the fundamental data structure of the Text Engine. The root data structure is the aforementioned text unit, defined as «one or more references to other text units, with each reference written as a pair (genus, reference point).» Expressed in symbolic language:

```
*genus 1 >reference point 1 *genus 2 >reference point 2 ...
```

Both the genus and reference point are text units. The genus (prefixed with an asterisk) indicates the meaning of the reference. The reference point (prefixed with a greater-than sign) is the unit that the reference targets. A unit has one or more references, while it cannot have more than one of the same genus.

The first layer of the Text Engine creates the basic genera:

```

parent
type
role
symbol

```

The colon (:), tilde (~) and number sign (#) prefixes are not primitives of the language, but shortcuts for the basic genera. Take the following symbolic language token:

```
~endangered #African penguin
```

An equivalent expression for the above is:

```
*role >endangered *symbol >African penguin
```

This encompasses how we define the data structure «text.» The Text Engine implements no other data structure.

Code: Text Transformation

The Text Engine is programmable—it can execute code for the purpose of generating, querying, or manipulating text. Its code consists of procedures that receive one text unit as an input and yield another text unit as an output. A procedure is called a «transformation» and can be perceived as text conversion; it converts one form (the input unit) into another (the output unit).

To express such code, the Text Engine supports a script language. For instance, to output a list of all penguin species contained in the text instance, one can use the script instruction:

```
select :penguin;
```

This will output specific symbols, such as «little penguin» and «African penguin.» To know which penguin species are threatened, one could write code to output only those:

```
select :threatened species.penguin;
```

The above code will output only units of type «penguin» with the parent unit type «threatened species.»

The select-transformation queries the text repository and returns any text units that meet the specified criteria. The criteria refer to the text structure; users can select units with a specific parent, type, role, or any combination thereof.

The «select» command can execute a transformation on every matching unit. For example, take the following code:

```
select :penguin { println ~common name };
```

This will execute the «println» (print line) command for each penguin species. The output would consist of two lines:

```
Little blue penguin  
African penguin
```

One can have an alphabetically sorted list returned by using:

```
select :penguin (order by ~common name) {  
  println ~common name;  
};
```

To store this list as a raw string file, execute:

```
save "./penguins.txt" {  
  select :penguin (order by ~common name) {  
    println ~common name;  
  }  
};
```

A transformation can be generated via instructions written in script language.

```

define =export penguin list :transformation {
  save "./penguins.txt" {
    select :penguin (order by ~common name) {
      println ~common name;
    }
  }
};

```

After executing the above command, the penguin list can be saved as a file with up-to-date content with the below:

```
export penguin list;
```

A transformation can have an object (in the grammatical sense of thing being acted upon):

```

define =export penguin list :transformation
  (object =file name :string)
{
  save [v ~file name] {
    select :penguin (order by ~common name) {
      println ~common name;
    }
  }
};

```

Now the file name is given upon every execution:

```
export penguin list "penguins (Aug 2015).txt";
```

Transformations can handle one or more arguments:

```

define =export penguin list :transformation
  (object =file name :string; argument =charset :string)
{
  save [v ~file name] (charset [v ~charset]) {
    select :penguin (order by ~common name) {
      println ~common name;
    }
  }
};

```

Arguments are passed through brackets when calling a transformation:

```
export penguin list "penguins (apple).txt" (charset #mac-roman);
```

Alternatively, the object can be given as an argument:

```
export penguin list (file name "penguins (apple).txt"; charset #mac-roman);
```

Calling the argument «object» instead of by name yields an equivalent result:

```
export penguin list (object "penguins (apple).txt"; charset #mac-roman);
```

Using the object as an argument is useful when it needs to be further qualified with some child units.

A transformation can have a body:

```

define =export penguin list :transformation
(
  object =file name :string;
  body :transformation;
  argument =charset :string;
)
{
  save [v ~file name] (charset [v ~charset]) {
    select :penguin (order by ~common name) { [v ~body] };
  }
};

```

Now the list can be exported with customized content on each call:

```

export penguin list "penguins (apple).txt" (charset #mac-roman) {
  println "Penguin species: [v ~common name]";
}

```

The above would save the following lines into the file:

```

Penguin species: African penguin
Penguin species: Little blue penguin

```

Object, body, and arguments can be given default values:

```

define =export penguin list :transformation
(
  object =file name :string (default "penguins.txt");
  body :transformation (default { println ~common name });
  argument =charset :string (default #utf-8);
)
{
  save [v ~file name] (charset [v ~charset]) {
    select :penguin (order by ~common name) { [v ~body] };
  }
};

```

This way, passing an argument is optional and assumes default values, if necessary. In order to output a list of common names as a UTF-8 file named «penguins.txt,» simply run:

```

export penguin list;

```

The Text Engine handles all transformations as text. For example, take the following script:

```

save "penguins.txt" {
  select :penguin (order by ~common name) { println ~common name };
};

```

This gets translated internally as the following text unit:

```

~transformation :save {
  ~file name "penguins.txt";
  ~content {
    ~transformation :select {
      ~target { ~type #penguin };
      ~order by { ~role #common name };
      ~action {
        ~transformation :println {
          ~segment :variable { ~role #common name };
        }
      }
    }
  }
};

```

Any transformation can be expressed in symbolic language. In general, everything in the Text Engine can be accessed through the symbolic language because everything is mapped into text units. This also applies, for instance, to the internal state of a program. To match unit names regardless of capitalization, execute the following script instruction:

```
set ~case sensitive names "false";
```

Or enter an expression in symbolic language:

```
#current process { ~settings { ~case sensitive names #false } };
```

Although the symbolic language does suffice, it is convenient to use the script language for transformations because the expressions it produces are more concise, easier to write, and intuitive to grasp. Symbolic language expressions, similar to assembly language code, can become too unwieldy for us humans to read or write effectively, and therefore, become a true challenge to manage.

The script language can actually be used to express some units that are not a transformation, as well. The first token is assumed to be the role (or possibly a subtype of it). For example, take the symbolic language expression:

```

~penguin {
  ~common name "African penguin";
  ~scientific name "Spheniscus demersus";
  ~breeding pairs "70,000";
};

```

This can be expressed in script language as such:

```

penguin {
  common name "African penguin";
  scientific name "Spheniscus demersus";
  breeding pairs "70,000";
};

```

The script language cannot replace the symbolic language for defining units, symbolic equivalence, or types.

Parsers

Two notations supported by the Text Engine have been introduced thus far: symbolic language and script language. There are more notations available, including user-defined ones. Users can mix notations into any string. To invoke an alternate parser for a substring, delimit the substring by containing it between two sets of square brackets indicating the alternate parser as follows:


```
~action [script/] select :threatened species [/script];
```

In the above example, the block parser scans the line and identifies three segments: before the block, inside the block, and after the block. It induces the corresponding parser to treat each segment in sequence. First, the symbolic language parser processes the string:

```
~action
```

This creates a unit with the «action» role. Next, the script language parser processes the following string:

```
select :threatened species
```

It then creates the «select» transformation. After that, the symbolic language parser processes the semicolon, which signals the end of the unit's definition. The context of the «select» transformation is the «action» unit because the substring occurs before the semicolon. Thus, the final parsed unit can be expressed as:

```
~action {
  ~transformation :select {
    ~target { ~type #threatened species };
  }
};
```

Quotation marks act as shortcuts for an alternate parser block. The following two lines have equivalent meaning:

```
~common name "African penguin";
~common name [quote/]African penguin[/quote];
```

The parser «quote» is a generic parser that invokes the implicit parser associated with the context's type. Above, the context is the role «common name,» and its type is «string.» Thus, the standard string parser is activated to load the substring «African penguin.» The longhand result is as follows:

```
~common name :string {
  ~character :letter #a { ~is upper case #true };
  ~character :letter #f;
  ~character :letter #r;
  ~character :letter #i;
  ~character :letter #c;
  ~character :letter #a;
  ~character :letter #n;
  ~character :punctuation mark #space;
  ~character :letter #p;
  ~character :letter #e;
  ~character :letter #n;
  ~character :letter #g;
  ~character :letter #u;
  ~character :letter #i;
  ~character :letter #n;
}
```

The type «string» has an implicit formatter that corresponds to the implicit parser. Consequently, the Text Engine will output this unit in symbolic language by default as:

```
~common name "African penguin";
```

The Text Engine can parse files, which must include an explicit parser block. For example, the entirety of content in file «species.te» may be:

```

*****
Scientific classification of species
(on the occasion of the Threatened Species Report)
*****
[symbol/]
~=species;
~=species {
    ~=common name :string;
    ~=scientific name :string;
};
~=mammal :species;
~=elephant :mammal;
[/symbol]
-----
Created by Mary Aug 2015

```

The lines before and after the symbolic language block are ignored.

With parser blocks, there is no longer a need to specify a file's format in order to be read. Procedures can parse arbitrarily formatted strings. Moreover, any expression can include segments of arbitrary notation, including user-defined ones. Besides providing flexibility, the block parser simplifies the implementation of specific parsers, which only need to deal with their own format because the block parser exclusively handles all parser interoperability issues.

The basics of the Text Engine have now been explored. The text repository can hold all kinds of data and code, and can be programmatically queried and modified through transformations that are included in the repository. Next, features that the program can deliver will be discussed, and then some possible applications will be considered.

Basic Features

Version 1.0 of the Text Engine will support the text model defined above and come with support for elementary data types, such as «integer» and «string,» as well as some basic coding block transformations (e.g. lists, loops, conditional statements), selectors, text and string generators, and file readers and writers. There will be parsers for both symbolic and script language, as well as support for explicit parser blocks. A shell will enable the user to interact with the system and launch batch processes in order to enter data or write and execute code.

Over time, enhanced functionalities will be added. Some planned additions include user-defined integrity constraints, triggers, automatic on-demand unit generation based on dependencies, updatable and cacheable mappings, extensibility through modules (written in the Text Engine's languages), multiple name spaces, data persistency (disc storage), remote access (web and other Internet services), and more. Enhanced parser support will allow users to customize their data entry format with ease. The resources used for programming may even evolve toward the distant but attractive goal of the Text Engine becoming a full-fledged programming system.

Applications

The Text Engine lays the foundation for building applications used for particular purposes.

Document Generation

An application that will be available from the outset will be document generation. Once information has been entered into a text repository, it can be queried to select parts of that information and output

files built by using the «select» and «print» commands. For example, the following generates a list of penguin species as an HTML page:

```
print "<ul>";
select :penguin { print "<li>[xml [v ~common name]]</li>" };
print "</ul>";
```

Now, to output the information as a L^AT_EX document:

```
print "\begin{itemize}";
select :penguin { print "\item [latex [v ~common name]]" };
print "\end{itemize}";
```

And to output the information as an XML document:

```
print "<animals>";
select :penguin { print "<species>[xml [v ~common name]]</species>" };
print "</animals>";
```

In the examples above, the tag «v» found within square brackets evaluates the «common name» role of the respective species selected. The tag «xml» prepares the string containing the common name for embedding in XML (e.g. replacing reserved characters with their XML entity references). The tag «latex» prepares the string for embedding in a L^AT_EX source file.

The Text Engine offers a mapping mechanism that simplifies text generation. The type «mapping» is defined as:

```
~=mapping {
  ~=source type { ~=is sequence :boolean };
  ~=target type { ~=is sequence :boolean };
  ~=argument;
  ~=convert :transformation;
};
```

Mapping encapsulates the conversion between unit types. For example, the «mapping» type can be used to generate HTML strings representing species lists by entering the following symbolic language expression:

```
#mappings {
  ~mapping {
    ~source type #species { ~is sequence #true };
    ~target type #html;
    ~convert {
      [script/]
      print "<ul>";
      select #source.~item { print "<li>[xml [v ~common name]]</li>" };
      print "</ul>";
      [/script]
    }
  }
};
```

The same can be achieved using this script language command:

```

define :mapping
  (source type #species { is sequence #true }; target type #html)
  {
    print "<ul>";
    select #source.~item { print "<li>[xml [v ~common name]]</li>" };
    print "</ul>";
  }
};

```

In order to convert the penguin list into HTML, execute the following:

```
map :html { select :penguin (order by ~common name) };
```

The system determines what mapping to use according to the source and target types. In the above, it will map the «species» type to HTML, since «penguin» is a species.

This approach to document generation differs from common documentation systems in that the information can be collected with regard to a document's contents (e.g. species names, a list of threatened species) instead of the document's parts (e.g. chapters, paragraphs). Users are free to create and modify type hierarchies and are not bound to those that were hardcoded. Further, data can be queried semantically in order to generate content, both to restrict the represented information and to transform it (e.g., conditional filtering, sorting lists, include or omit details). The more cross-referenced the content and the more varying its structure over time, the more advantageous the Text Engine's document generation.

The Text Engine will include an additional parser for the so-called «prose format,» which is designed for entering large amounts of written text in prose by marking paragraphs with an unobtrusive notation. The beginning of this paper, for example, would look like this:

```

The intention of this paper is to introduce readers to [...].
I intend to develop and test this approach [...].
~h2 Fundamentals
~h3 Data: Text Structure
The Text Engine supports a symbolic language [...]:
~c "~=species;"
Subordinated symbols can then be added [...]:

```

Special marks identify the document's structure. As a result, a prose document will look the same as printed, with the exception of a few marks that indicate the document's different parts. In the example above, marks signal a section title (h2, h3) and a code sample (c).

Another useful extension for prose documents includes a reader for word processor files. With such an extension, the user can take advantage of a word processor program for writing a file that the Text Engine would then accept. Avoiding the usage of special marks is entirely possible because the reader can take the document's structure and formatting into consideration. It then feeds units with corresponding roles (e.g. a header line of level 2 as a unit with role h2).

Virtual Files

The next logical step will be to implement a virtual file system based on the Text Engine. For example, a file named «threatened.odt» may contain a report that uses the word processor «LibreOffice Writer.» This file could be included in a virtual directory so that it would no longer exist as a byte sequence on the user's hard disc, but instead generate on demand by the Text Engine.

To write a report concerning threatened species, for example, first extend the unit's definition to include the report's sentences:

```
#threatened species { ~=report paragraph :string };
```

The next step is to write a transformation that generates an open document file and maps from a sequence of species to a file:

```
define :mapping
(
  source type #species { is sequence #true };
  target type #file;
  argument =title :string;
)
{
  save :open document {
    output ~title [v ~title];
    output ~content {
      output ~heading1 [v ~title];
      select #source.:species (order by ~common name) {
        output ~heading2 [v ~common name];
        select ~report paragraph { output ~paragraph [v] };
      }
    }
  }
};
```

This presupposes the existence of the «open document» type that maps the semantics of this file format into text units and offers a «save» transformation that generates the open document file. The next step is to establish a mapping between the virtual file and a particular report:

```
map ~file "threatened.odt" (title "Species Report") {
  select :threatened species.species;
};
```

From now on, whenever the file «threatened.odt» is opened with the appropriate word processor, the above script executes and generates a text unit similar to the following:

```
~open document {
  ~title "Species Report";
  ~content {
    ~heading1 "Species Report";
    ~heading2 "African bush elephant";
    ~paragraph "Threatened by illegal hunting.";
    ~heading2 "African penguin";
    ~paragraph "Threatened by commercial fisheries.";
    ~paragraph "Eggs are considered a delicacy.";
    ~paragraph "Susceptible to pollution.";
  }
};
```

This text unit would be serialized according to the open document format and be delivered to the proper word processing program, which then opens the report, that looks like this:

In order for any changes made through the external application to be merged back into the Text Engine, an additional script is necessary. The mapping, which would map from the file to the sequence of species (i.e. the opposite of before) should be flagged as updatable:

```
map ~file "threatened.odt"
  (title "Species Report"; update #on save)
{
  select :threatened species.species;
};
```

With the above settings applied, it is simple to make changes to the report that would otherwise require a lot of manual operation. For example, it becomes possible to obtain another sort order, and more or less detailed contents, by adapting the conversion script. Additionally, both the external document and the Text Engine data are kept up-to-date without any manual intervention.

Another interesting aspect is that it is possible work on the same report in more than one document simultaneously.

```
#threatened species { ~=report paragraph :string; ~=summary :string };
```

For instance, after defining a summary paragraph, users can work on two different documents—the first containing only the summary for each species, and the second containing the summary plus all other paragraphs. Note that users can update the list of threatened species and edit the summaries in any document; the other document will automatically reflect any changes made the next time it is opened.

The ability to use more than one document containing the same data is not restricted to a single application. Users could keep a file in a virtual directory called «threats chronicle.ods» that works with a spreadsheet application and collects historical data about the evolution of populations and conservation statuses for every threatened species. Again, changes to the list in the spreadsheet would be immediately reflected on the word processor document, and vice versa.

If a document cannot be updated through the Text Engine, a read-only file will result. Further updates are intended to address issues of version control.

Repository

Initially, the Text Engine can keep its data as temporary data for as long as the program runs. On each execution, all required source files would be parsed again. At some point, the system must be equipped with persistent data options. That will allow the user to store the most current data and resume it upon a subsequent execution of the program. This improves not only system performance, but also makes it possible to store changes made at runtime, which is indispensable for some features. For example, data persistence would allow users to rename the «threatened species report» symbol as «threats report» with a single operation. No longer will users need to update each and every file in which this particular term occurs.

Moreover, data persistence will make a further application possible: a text repository. A text repository can be used as a replacement for a file system. The following defines a «directory» text unit:

```
~=directory { ~=subdirectory :directory; ~=file :binary };
```

Above, a directory is defined as containing files and, recursively, other directories. Users are able to store single files as byte sequences into the directory hierarchy. For instance, to store a presentation that is still in progress into the repository, enter:

```
~file =home.mary.panels."over-hunting.odp" "./panels/over-hunting.odp";
```

To refer back to it later on, use a common selector, such as:

```
select =home.mary.panels."over-hunting.odp";
```

An implicit parser for the type «file» allows the following expression, which is equivalent to the one above:

```
select :file "/home/mary/panels/over-hunting.odp";
```

Alternatively, to store this file on a USB thumb drive, run:

```
save "/mnt/usb/over-hunting.odp" {  
  select :file "/home/mary/panels/over-hunting.odp";  
};
```

To extend the file definition with some additional metadata, for instance, use:

```

~=directory {
  ~=label :string;
  ~=subdirectory :directory;
  ~=file {
    ~=label :string;
    ~=creation time :date;
    ~=content :binary;
  }
};

```

Get a full directory list with the following:

```
select =home.mary.panels.~file { print ~label };
```

A shortcut term, «ls,» could be set for the expression above in order to list files in a way similar to a Unix shell:

```
ls "/home/mary/panels";
```

To get a list of files sorted by creation time, use the following:

```
select =home.mary.panels.~file (order by ~creation time) {
  print ~label;
};
```

Remarkably, a file system created through these means would be extensible right out of the box. For example, to add some metadata to a file:

```
~=work file :file { ~=completion :percent };
```

This way, each file has a percent number added to it, which indicates its completion degree. A query can then be run, such as:

```
select :work file (having ~completion (less than "50%"));
```

The above retrieves all files for which less than half of the work has been done. Note that a user could easily add metadata at any time both manually and by executing transformations, even when some files already exist.

In a similar manner, a user could easily add tags to files:

```
~=tagable { ~=tag :string };
#file :tagable;
#"over-hunting.odp" { ~tag "difficult" };
```

A user could also group files in predefined categories:

```
~=categorizable {
  ~=category;
  ~=job :category;
  ~=hobby :category;
};
#file :categorizable;
#"over-hunting.odp" { ~category #job };
```

An existing file could be included in additional directories without necessitating the creation of a copy by using:

```
~file #"panels.over-hunting.odp" ="drafts.over-hunting.odp";
```

The above adds an entry into the virtual directory «drafts» that shares metadata and content information with the file of the same name in the virtual directory «panels.»

If the above virtual file support is implemented, directories can include both the real and virtual files; that is, any file's contents can be either static or dynamic.

The Text Engine will eventually support customizable user-defined constraints to ensure data consistency, which is especially important for persisted data and repositories. A constraint in the Text Engine is a transformation that is automatically executed each time a particular type is instantiated, stops program execution, and rolls back the current transaction if the required conditions are not met.

For example, a user can require that each species has a common name by running:

```
define :constraint (for :species) {
  if undefined ~common name {
    throw :missing argument (for ~common name);
  }
};
```

With the above constraint, if a user creates a new species but does not enter a common name for it, the execution will abort and throw an error message for that argument stating that the common name is missing.

Archive

A Text Engine repository can be used for long-term archiving purposes. Users will not merely store their files as byte sequences, but will also register its semantics. To recall the virtual file example above, a user would store the unit «threats report» as an instance of the «open document» type along with the file «threatened.odt» in binary form.

A long-term archive should hold type definitions for every file format. For example, to store .mp3 files, one would map the file format into text units. An .mp3 file consists of frames, and each frame has a header and audio information. The header is built of segments, such as the frame sync (the first 11 bytes), the MPEG audio version ID (the next 2 bytes), and some more. Thus, the .mp3 type can be defined as follows:

```
~=mp3 :file {
  ~=frames {
    ~=frame {
      ~=header {
        ~=segment { ~=length :integer };
        ~=frame sync :segment { ~length "11" };
        ~=mpeg audio version id :segment { ~length "2" };
        ~=layer description :segment { ~length "2" };
        ~=protection bit :segment { ~length "1" };
        ~=bit rate index :segment { ~length "14" };
        ~=sampling rate :segment { ~length "2" };
        ~=padding bit :segment { ~length "1" };
        ~=private bit :segment { ~length "1" };
        ~=channel mode :segment { ~length "2" };
      };
      ~=audio { [...] };
    }
  }
};
```

This file format will be declared by a module that is programmed once and then distributed with the Text Engine, or by a third party. The mp3 module exposes the type definition along with a «save» transformation that serializes an instance of this type as a binary file, and a «read» transformation that

deserializes a file into an instance of this type. To store an .mp3 file into the repository, the user loads the mp3 module and then executes:

```
~file :mp3 =home.mary.interviews.manager "./manager.mp3";
```

Given that the file to be read has the defined type «mp3,» the Text Engine invokes the reader included in the mp3 module in order to read the file.

Proceeding in this way, the archive contains each file not only as a byte sequence, but also semantically parsed. The fact that each file is parsed before being stored ensures that its format is known and correct. Small format variations and non-conformance with standards can now be detected, and with a custom derived type, documented.

The question then arises: what will be persisted in the repository? The file as a byte sequence, the unit definitions, or both? This is actually up to the module's programmer. The mp3 module could store the units when parsing the file and generate the byte sequence on demand, or it could store both of them in the repository. It could even store only the byte sequence and generate the units on demand. The best choice, however, would be to allow the user decide for each instance:

```
~file :mp3 =home.mary.interviews.manager "./manager.mp3" {
  ~binary storage: real;
  ~unit storage: virtual;
};
```

This way, the system's performance can be tweaked. If the module also supports subsequent changes to its parameters, then the user can change the preferred storage mechanism at any time according to their system's respective space and speed requirements. The module's behavior can be changed by entering the following:

```
#home.mary.interviews.manager {
  ~binary storage: virtual;
  ~unit storage :real;
};
```

This operation can be performed unassisted by a procedure that monitors the system's usage.

A long-term archive must deal with format conversions. For example, a user may want to read a document produced with an old word processing program no longer supported by current operating systems. The whole document, or parts of it, can be converted into another document format with a script. For example, to export the open document reporting on threatened species as a raw string file:

```
save "threats.txt" {
  println "*** [v =threats report.~title] ***";
  select =threats report.content (level #children) {
    if :heading1 { println "** [v] **" };
    if :heading2 { println "* [v] *" };
    if :paragraph { println "[v]" };
  }
};
```

Note that format conversion in such a system is very straightforward. Users handle conversion with the format's logic and not with file formats by utilizing general-purpose language to access unit definitions and avoid handling low-level binary sequences. Since unit definitions are contained in the repository and can be queried, and unit names (e.g. «heading» and «paragraph») are self-explanatory, the average user does not need to consult any further documentation. Any user with entry-level programming skills can therefore write conversion scripts spontaneously when required.

Personal Organizer

Another possible application of the Text Engine is as a personal organization utility that can manage an individual's documents, addresses, calendar dates, task lists, and other items. Begin with a simple to-do list, as follows:

```
~=to-do list {
  ~=task {
    ~=description :string;
    ~=due :date;
    ~=done :boolean;
  }
};
~to-do list =conference work {
  ~task { ~description "book airplane ticket"; ~due "09/14/2015" };
  ~task { ~description "book accommodation"; ~due "09/28/2015" };
  ~task { ~description "travel"; ~due "10/14/2015" };
};
```

To link a «prepare presentation» task to a report, write:

```
~=attachment container { ~=attachment :file };
#task :attachment container;
#conference work {
  ~task {
    ~description "prepare presentation";
    ~due "09/25/2015";
    ~attachment #"home.mary.panels.over-hunting.odp";
  }
};
```

To get a list of tasks due for the next conference that have yet to be completed, execute:

```
select #conference work.~task
  (having ~done (equal #false); order by ~due)
{
  println ~description;
};
```

To get all open tasks in general, instead use the following:

```
select :task
  (having ~done (equal #false); order by ~due)
{
  println ~description;
};
```

Suppose an email facility and a job scheduler agent are available. Users can make arrangements to receive daily emails with a list of open tasks by running:

```
schedule #daily {
  email "mary@example.com" (subject "open tasks") {
    select :task (having ~done (equal #false); order by ~due) {
      println ~description;
    }
  }
};
```

To manage a user's contacts, enter the following:

```

~=contact {
  ~first name :string;
  ~last name :string;
  ~email :string;
};

```

To look up an individual's email information, enter:

```

select ~contact
  (having ~last name (like "Brewster"))
{
  println "[v ~last name], [v ~first name]: [v ~email]";
};

```

A shortcut can be set for the above expression as follows:

```

define =look up :transformation
  (object =target name :string)
{
  select ~contact
    (having ~last name (like [v ~target name]))
  {
    println "[v ~last name], [v ~first name]: [v ~email]";
  }
};

```

Then, execute:

```
look up "Brewster";
```

This would print a result similar to the below:

```

Brewster, Emily: emily.brewster@example.com
Brewster, Mike: mbrewster@example.com

```

As with tasks and contacts, users can define collections of other entities, such as documents or calendar dates. This involves defining the data structure as a type once and then instantiating it for each item. The user can freely add fields to every entity and derive subtypes of the data, even if an external module defined it. In addition, these fields are not restricted to mere character strings, but can have arbitrary types, including those defined by the user.

Thus far, it has been discussed how applications would manage their data. Nothing about the user interface has been assumed. Although the Text Engine shell is a user interface that gives access to all data and operations, each application can supply additional views and interactive surfaces. For example, a Text Engine-based organizer application could present daily, weekly, and monthly calendar views; email messages; and to-do lists in a visually rich manner. Next, graphical user interfaces based on the Text Engine will be discussed.

Workbench

The Text Engine's workbench will be a graphical user interface designed for working with the Text Engine and its applications on a workstation or desktop computer. It is targeted at power users.

Windows

The workbench displays a collection of windows. There is no generic container for these windows and no dependency with any particular window manager. The first time the workbench launches, a single

window appears, in which a Text Engine shell runs. The user can enter script instructions for the Text Engine to execute. To work on a particular word processor document, open it as follows:

```
open #over-hunting report;
```

This causes the workbench to create a new window, launch the word processor application in it, and call the application to load the document (which is a repository unit and not an operating system file). This assumes a word processor application designed to be compatible with the Text Engine and the workbench. The application fetches the document and renders it inside the window. When the user edits something, the application performs the required changes to the repository. This updating process is not a trivial issue, however; it can involve explicit or implicit transactions, moving data back and forth to temporary workspaces, and more.

In a similar regard, and assuming a spreadsheet application designed for the workbench, users can open a window showing the spreadsheet chronicling threatened species by executing:

```
open #threats chronicle;
```

So-called «views» control the look and feel of documents in the workbench. A view is a unit in the repository that defines the appearance and user interaction capabilities of a particular type. Whenever the workbench opens an item, it determines the view to the unit's type and then opens it. The user can open not only documents, but also arbitrary units. For instance, opening a transformation results in a window showing its source code:

```
open #export penguin list;
```

The above would open a new shell window containing a script similar to the following:

```
define =export penguin list :transformation
  (object =file name :string)
  {
    save [v ~file name] {
      select :penguin (order by ~common name) {
        println ~common name;
      }
    }
  }
};
```

If there happens to be no other view available for the given type, the workbench opens a window that shows an expression in symbolic language.

```
open #little penguin;
```

The above operation would result in the following:

```
=little penguin ~penguin {
  ~common name "Little blue penguin";
  ~scientific name "Eudyptula minor";
  ~breeding pairs "500,000";
};
```

If there are several views available, the user can explicitly choose one:

```
open :turbo spreadsheet "#threats chronicle";
```

The above runs the spreadsheet application under the «turbo spreadsheet» view. Users can also set specific view parameters as follows:

```
=new view ~turbo spreadsheet "#threats chronicle" {
  mode #power user;
  caption "Yearly report";
};
open #new view;
```

The same can be accomplished with a single instruction:

```
open (object :turbo spreadsheet "#threats chronicle" {
  mode #power user;
  caption "Yearly report";
});
```

Any unit can be shown in symbolic language by invoking the symbol view:

```
open :symbol view "#threats chronicle";
```

To create a document, add a unit with the desired type. For example, a report is created by entering this in the shell window:

```
put ~=new report :report document;
open #new report;
```

Each window has a source that delivers data to it. The source is a transformation. The source for the window above would be:

```
select #new report;
```

The workbench shows the source of every window in a frame on the top or the bottom of the window. The source frame contains a script expression that the user can edit and rerun, thus changing the window's contents. For example, opening the spreadsheet «threats chronicle» returns the following source frame:

```
select #threats chronicle;
```

Users can then switch to the turbo spreadsheet view of the same document by changing the source as follows:

```
select :turbo spreadsheet "#threats chronicle";
```

Any transformation can act as source, including those involving on-the-fly unit generation:

```
select :threatened species.species (order by ~common name) {
  println "[v ~common name] ([v ~scientific name])";
};
```

A window with the above source would show:

```
African bush elephant (Loxodonta Africana)
African penguin (Spheniscus demersus)
```

The source of a window can be bound to an item focused at another window. For instance, additional information can be acquired about the single species currently the focus of the spreadsheet «threats chronicle» in another window by setting its source to the following:

```
select #threats chronicle window.current item :species {
  println "[v ~common name] ([v ~scientific name])";
};
```

The workbench can implement a dynamic update mechanism in order for the contents of a window to be automatically updated whenever the focused item in the spreadsheet changes. This requires the Text Engine to support triggers (i.e. automatic execution of custom code) whenever any instance of a particular type is updated.

Views

This section will go into detail regarding views. The window's content area is comprised of rectangular, non-overlapping areas called «frames.» Every frame is bound to an instance of the type «view,» which is a type exposed by the workbench that provides input/output mechanisms. Thus, it is possible for

transformations to display something on the bound frame, as well as react to the user's keystrokes and mouse actions. Applications offer views for its visible types. When a view is instantiated, the workbench automatically launches the appropriate application, unless an instance is already running.

There are some comprehensive views, such as a word processor or a spreadsheet, that take up most of the space in a window while offering plenty of functionality. Yet there are also some very specific and much more limited views available. For instance, the «integer view» supports the standard user interface for the field type «integer» by providing transformations for displaying and editing integers on a given frame.

The workbench will furnish views for elementary data types (e.g. integer, strings) and some general container views such as list, table, and tree views. A table shows items in columns and rows, and a tree shows a hierarchy of items. Both will have the usual functionalities (e.g. resizing and moving table columns, collapsing or expanding tree nodes). Before considering the list view in more detail, the string view must be clarified.

The raw string view is the standard view for the data type «string.» The definition can be written as follows:

```
~=string view :view {
  ~=style :style;
  ~=read only :boolean;
};
```

In the shell window, users can open a window with a string view that shows a string, like:

```
open "Hello, world!";
```

To set the string in italics, use the following:

```
open (object "Hello, world!" { style #italics });
```

In order to facilitate string representations of arbitrary types, the workbench offers an intermediate view:

```
~=stringifyable {
  ~=parse :transformation;
  ~=format :transformation;
  ~=style :style;
  ~=read only :boolean;
};
~=stringifyable view :string view;
```

The «stringifyable» view calls the format transformation, gets a string instance representing the value, and passes both the string instance and the style information to the string view, which then renders the string. After a user-made change, the «stringifyable» view calls the parse transformation with the new string, returning the new value.

This view eases the implementation of views for specific data types. For instance, the integer view is implemented as «stringifyable.» This requires to program only a parser and a formatter that convert between the binary value and its decimal representation with numeric characters.

Any unit can implement the «stringifyable» interface. Take the following example:

```
#species :stringifyable {
  ~format {
    [script/] println "[v ~common name] ([v ~scientific name])" [/script]
  };
  ~read only #true;
};
```

Next, perform the following:

```
open #little penguin;
```

Rather than having the symbolic language expression returned, the result is instead:

```
Little blue penguin (Eudyptula minor)
```

It is worth mentioning that any unit whose description in symbolic language is large or complex should implement the «stringifiable» interface, or at least the formatter transformation, so that the user can inspect their instances with minimal effort.

As an example of a general container view, take the list view into account.

```
~=list { ~=item }; ~=list view :view;
```

The list view shows a stack of items. Execute the following:

```
open (object :list { item :string "one"; item :integer "12" });
```

A window with two lines will appear:

```
one
12
```

The representation of each item is handled not by the list view, but by the workbench. The workbench chooses which view is most appropriate. In the above example, the first line is generated by the raw string view and the second line by the integer view.

No restriction exists regarding item types that a list can hold. For example, if several applications include views for word processing, images, and outlines, the user can create a new window and combine instances of these types within a single list.

To use a list view to represent arbitrary types, a mapping between the given type and a list item must be established. For example, in order to open a window with a list of species names, a user must first define a mapping from species to list.

```
define :mapping
  (source type #species (is sequence #true); target type #list)
  {
    output ~list {
      select #source.~item { output ~item :string [v ~common name] };
    }
  };
```

Then, a list of selected species displays by executing:

```
map =species list ~list {
  select :threatened species.species (order by ~common name);
};
open #species list;
```

The above generates and opens this unit in a new window:

```
=species list ~list {
  ~item :string "African bush elephant";
  ~item :string "African penguin";
};
```

The window shows two lines, each containing a common name.

In order for the view to be updateable, the mapping should also be updateable, achieved through the following:

```
map =species list ~list (update #on save) {
  select :threatened species.species (order by ~common name);
};
open #species list;
```

This requires a reciprocal mapping to exist in the repository from type «list» into a sequence of type «species.»

Another available view is the prose view. It is an editor for prose writing and based on a type as follows:

```
~=prose writing {
  ~=division {
    ~=heading :string;
    ~=paragraph :string;
    ~=division :division;
  }
};
```

For example, the beginning of this paper is represented as:

```
~prose writing {
  ~=code paragraph :paragraph;
  ~division {
    ~paragraph "The intention of this paper is to [...].";
    ~paragraph "I intend to develop and test this approach [...].";
    ~division {
      ~heading "Fundamentals";
      ~division {
        ~heading "Data: Text Structure";
        ~paragraph "The Text Engine supports a symbolic language [...].";
        ~code paragraph "~=species;";
        ~paragraph "Subordinated symbols can then be added [...].";
      }
    }
  }
};
```

The prose view derives from the list view and displays each division's contents, visiting each division in preorder. Headers and paragraphs are not rendered by the prose view, but instead by the view attached to their respective type. The type, in this case, is the raw string view, since both are defined as strings. In order to give a distinct appearance to headings and code paragraphs, run the following:

```
#code paragraph :string view { ~style #monospace };
#heading :string view { ~style #header1 };
```

It may prove useful to divide paragraphs and headings into segments in order for them to include structured content, such as links, automatically generated parts, or special formatting for selected words. To redefine these types as segment containers, apply the following:

```
~=prose writing {
  ~=division {
    ~=segmented string {
      ~=segment {
        ~=content :string;
        ~=view :string view;
      }
    }
  };
  ~=heading :segmented string;
  ~=paragraph :segmented string;
  ~=division :division;
}
};
~=segmented string view :view;
```


The segmented string view will now render each segment in order of appearance, each of which with its own string view instance. Different parts of a paragraph can be formatted, as well:

```
~paragraph {
  ~segment { ~content "It is important for" };
  ~segment { ~content "every"; ~view { ~style #emphasized } };
  ~segment { ~content "species to be handled appropriately." };
};
```

The above results in a paragraph showing the word «every» in a bold font face.

After having discussed how views are implemented, the next step is to see how the user will operate with them.

User Interaction

Users control applications through the user interface provided by views. For example, a word processing view may have a menu bar with an option labeled «Insert Date» that inputs the present date at the cursor's current position. When the user applies this option, the view lets the Text Engine execute an instruction, such as:

```
select #selected paragraph { insert { now } };
```

This instruction injects the value returned by the transformation «now» into the current paragraph. A similar instruction could have been run by the user in the shell window instead and it would have had the same effect:

```
select #window1.selected paragraph { insert { now } };
```

Not only the view's data and operations, but also its user interface is mapped into repository units. For example, the aforementioned menu option is defined as:

```
=main menu ~menu bar {
  ~option {
    ~caption "Insert date";
    ~action [script/] select #selected paragraph { insert { now } } [/script];
  }
};
```

The user can list the available menu options in the shell window with the following:

```
select #window1.main menu.~option { println ~caption };
```

The user can also add a new option to the menu, binding it to an arbitrary instruction:

```
put #window1.main menu {
  option "To raw string file" {
    save "[v ~document name].txt" {
      select :paragraph (parent level #any) { println [v] };
    }
  }
};
```

After entering the above code in the shell window, the application window shows a new menu option labeled «To raw string file» that exports the document without headings, one paragraph at each line. The generated file has the same base name as the current document and the file extension «txt.»

The workbench itself is accessible through the shell window as well. For instance, the user can obtain a list of all open windows by executing the following:

```
select #workbench.layout.~window { println ~caption };
```

To induce the workbench to launch a particular document at start time, run the following:

```
put #workbench.start { open #threats report };
```

As a basic principle, everything that can be done in the workbench through the user interface—no matter which application it comes from—can also be done through scripting.

Conclusion

To recapitulate, it is now known what resources the Text Engine will seek when representing data and what coding procedures operate with it, as well as how applications will be programmed and used. Some example applications have been sketched in order to illustrate the system and to provide further evidence that it is both feasible and useful. In order of appearance, the examples became increasingly complex, and their design less clear; the undertaking progressively unsettled. While document generation is (due to a predecessor project) a well-known application to a degree, the workbench is still a personal dream. I intend to develop the Text Engine function by function in order to focus on each application in sequence, and then deploy and mature it, before moving on to the next.

What fascinates me is the experience of developing and the perspective of using such a well-integrated system. Users can enrich and detail all of an application's data and operations to adapt to their individual needs. Applications share data and operations, as well as their look and feel, despite the system's distributed architecture. Users can create interfaces between independently developed applications by simply writing sentences in familiar, generic language, and without having to deal with file formats. The same applies to user interfaces, both linguistic and graphical—they easily adjust to specific requirements and styles, and this occurs in an application-independent manner. Besides being flexible, the system is very consistent and achieves a plethora of goals by combining just a few basic features. That is because I have built the Text Engine on a single principle—software is text.

I believe that everything points to the Text Engine becoming an extremely powerful system.

Blog

Representation

An important attribute of text is that it can be represented in many ways. You can write a particular word in a variety of ways, with different materials, on different surfaces, with different dimensions and typefaces. Every person who knows the language the word is written in will agree that those different objects represent the same word even though they are materially quite different.

Therefore, text is not a visual thing. What you can see is a text representation, but not the text as such. That is why not everyone sees words, but just the people who understand the word's language. If I see a word that is written in an unknown alphabet, I won't see a word but a drawing. Text is not on the paper, it is in your mind.

Information: a Bad Metaphor

It is common to refer to text as information. Of course one can encode information as text, but that is not the only thing a text can be used for. A text can code such different realities as scientific knowledge, a law, a question or a command. Consider for example a command. It can be given to a person or a machine (through a computer). It can also be given by a person or a machine. One can perceive a coded command given by a machine to a machine as information, but this is an artificial, academical exercise that has nothing to do with what actually takes place between the machines. Machines simply cannot perceive information and hence cannot act upon it; only humans can do this. Information is not a phenomenon, it is an interpretation.

The Book of Nature

I define text reduction as the process of extracting a text out of a phenomenon. If you are walking by a lake and utter «the moon is shining over the water» then you have extracted a text from something that you have seen, that is, you have reduced an experience to text. That is essentially the same that happens in science. For example, Newton's laws of motion are a text reduction that applies to any material object in the universe.

Text reduction is the opposite process of text representation. You derive a text from reality or you depict a text as a real object. Reduction and representation of text build a mapping between textual expressions and phenomena.

Text Experience and Text Reality

We make experiences when we read and write, but we should differentiate in every single case between the object of our experience being the text as such or the text representation. As a rule, any visual or aural experience is made with a text representation. For example, it is possible to more easily read contemporary papers, with spaces between words and with paragraphs and punctuation marks, than it is to read a Roman scroll with an uninterrupted flow of capital letters. However, exactly the same text could be represented in both forms. If we want to progress, it is relevant to find out superior text representations, but this is not the only thing to be improved. We should also become better at understanding text, creating it and manipulating it. I don't mean understanding, creating and manipulating character strings, since these are mere representation, but understanding, creating and manipulating the underlying, purely logical text structure.

History of Text

Research that is yet to be carried out is a comprehensive history of text. There is of course some historical knowledge about phenomena that are related to text, but there is no history about the text as a fundamental concept as defined by me. There are some special fields that have already been cultivated, to mention some: the history of writing, the history of the book, the book trade, libraries, the history of literary genres, text forms, the history of rhetoric, the history of information technology, the history of numbers, arithmetic, numeric computation, the history of algebra, algorithms, the history of geometry, the history of logic. These special fields centre on particular human experiences and products, but they all share textual resources, because the same few forms appear everywhere. One can explore what textual resources were used, in which regions of the earth and in which centuries they appeared, and how they were reused in other fields later on. The key factor for this approach is to abstract from all aspects of the text representation and, more generally, of the human experience, and focus on the text structure.

The book «Information Ages: Literacy, Numeracy, and the Computer Revolution» (Hobart and Schiffman, 2000) is worth a mention, because it takes the right direction in considering that literacy, numeracy and computation are different aspects of a single basic phenomenon. This direction is the one to pursue, to extend and to deepen.

Definition of Text

Let us now approach the definition of text. What is text made of? A text is made out of symbols. A symbol is, generally speaking, the unity of a manifoldness. When a symbol occurs in an expression, it refers to many different things that in a particular sense are the same. For example, every common noun is a symbol, the noun «dog» embraces plenty of living beings and considers them to be, in a given sense, the same. Note that the two aspects of a symbol, the manifoldness and the unity, are entirely different. The manifoldness can be real, it can be something material, such as the many existing dogs, but the unity cannot: the fact that each and every individual dog is «a dog» can only be thought, it is just a mental occurrence.

A text consists of symbols, but a set of symbols by themselves does not make a text. For a text to be, the symbols must be articulated as a whole, that is, there must be relationships between them. For example, the array of symbols «I,» «you» and «love» is not a text, but the sentence «I love you» is. To find out the relationships between the symbols in that sentence, the reader performs a syntactic analysis of it. The sentence contains a subject and a predicate, which in turn consists of a transitive verb and a direct object. The symbol «love» applies to the relationship between the symbol «I» and the symbol «you.»

I propose the following definition of text: a text is a symbolic expression in which symbols refer to symbols as symbols. To put it algebraically:

T: A -C-> B

Symbol A relates to the symbol B as symbol C; we refer to this fact as symbol T. Each of the symbols A, B and C can in turn be divided into further symbols tied with the same formula again, making the text T more complex.

I argue for the thesis that every text can be reduced to a symbolic expression in these terms, and every text becomes fully described by it. Furthermore, the fact that you can reduce to the formula above such different things as natural language (through syntactic analysis), mathematics and logic (through semantic analysis), and software (through source code parsing) shows that they are all founded on a common basis, namely text.

Computer = Text Machine

Given that computers are capable of many different things, it is easy to get the impression that they are universal machines. Yet this cliché is absolutely wrong. Let us take a closer look at what computers

really are.

Software systems are typically divided into applications. An application is used for word processing, another for email, and others to respectively manage a spreadsheet, browse the Web, or edit a photo.

A word processing application allows you to edit documents. With my definition of text, the text of the document contains not only the visible character strings being edited, but also some hidden data that contributes to the text representation or behaviour; for example section heading marks or cross-references.

A spreadsheet application is actually a text editor, too. However, the edited text structure is not prose as in word processing, but a table instead. While prose is a hierarchy of headings containing lists of paragraphs, a table is a bi-dimensional array of cells. While headings and paragraphs are character strings, spreadsheet cells are scalar values (either constant or calculated values).

Each document of a word processing or spreadsheet application is stored as a separate file. The operating system provides a file system - a structure of directories or folders in which files can be saved. A file system is also a text: it is a hierarchy of nodes, each of which has a name (string of characters) and binary data (string of bytes).

We have seen that files edited by word processing and spreadsheet applications are text and that they are stored by the operating system in a more comprehensive text. This applies not only to these particular applications, but to all of them.

For example, let us consider a photo editor. Don't be confused by the fact that a photo is not perceived as text, yet software handles it as text. For bitmap graphics, for instance, an image file keeps record of a bi-dimensional array of pixels and stores the colour and transparency of each of them. This is a text, a table in which each cell has two values. The computer, together with help from the graphics card, transforms this text into an image on the screen. The image you see is a text representation.

To sum up, a software system is a system of text, not because everything looks spontaneously like text, but because everything has text inside. This insight brightens up the essence of computers. Computers are machines that can represent text in many different ways; they can create, manipulate, store and retrieve it. Computers are indeed text machines.

Science is Text

What is science? There are many sciences such as natural, social and formal sciences; they study general or singular phenomena (i.e. physics and history respectively), the outside world, or the human experience. Yet beneath these multiple faces is a common basis. In short: science creates knowledge, and knowledge is text. Let us consider this.

Science describes researched phenomena either in prose, mathematical language or, more recently, in form of computer algorithms. Obviously, scientific prose writings are texts. What makes up scientific knowledge, however, are not these texts as expression, but their semantic content. This is best seen in scientific handbooks that summarise the knowledge systematically. The more mature a discipline is, the more encyclopaedic handbooks of it have been published and the more mutually concordant these handbooks are.

A science that employs mathematical language uses a particularly sound language, but it does essentially the same thing as the sciences that use prose. Note that the tag «formal language» applies both to a natural language style and to mathematics - that is not a popular analogy but instinct.

Algorithmic descriptions are, like mathematical ones, an alternative way to express semantic contents. Every algorithm can be translated into plain English and has exactly the same meaning. No matter the language used to describe it, scientific knowledge can be reduced to text, because the same is true of natural language, mathematical language and software.

Text as Experience

How do we experience text? We use it all the time, send and receive information, control processes, and regulate our coexistence with text. However, we are mostly unaware of it because we master the used language and don't have to worry about it. We are more likely to be thinking about the things we are doing instead; we are busy with the information we are exchanging, the processes we are controlling, or the rules we are establishing.

We begin to experience text as such when we encounter its difficulties. For example, when we express ourselves in a foreign language we begin to learn, or when we handle a complex question. It is then that we feel the difficulty of making text, and this difficulty becomes stronger the longer and the more dense the text is. In fact, text production is a hard activity. Writers know how laborious book-writing is, programmers know how challenging the creation of software is, physicists have been struggling for decades to find an all-embracing formula, and logicians have to deal with what Bertrand Russell called «logic's hell». Text is a sound structure built of straight segments you cannot bend; it has an inexorable authority.

Yet text is also beautiful. You marvel at a short sentence that describes intricate facts with ease. You look at a good design and admire its construction, the economic use of resources, how it gets to the heart of the matter. Mathematicians praise general, tight theorems, and call them «elegant». Google currently lists 45 million hits for the «beauty of logic».

Additionally, text produces concordance. A factual language helps mediate disputes, argumentation eases the coexistence. Two people can have very different views about everything, but if it comes to clear, fact-based language, they will acknowledge it. Every human being understands text exactly; we share it, and that in turn produces agreement and harmony between us.

We experience text as hard, beautiful and unifying.

Speech, Writing, Computing

Speech is spoken, natural language. Each utterance is a sequence of symbols, symbols being phonemes and other phonemic features such as intonation. Speech is a text representation in which symbols are audible and arranged as a one-dimensional array in time.

Writing is a text representation with symbols that are visible shapes arranged in a two-dimensional space. Writings include one-dimensional structures (paragraphs) but are not restricted to them. While an oral expression is restricted to a single series, a written expression can consist of many series that relate to each other in different ways, such as columns, footnotes, tables or hierarchical trees. The characters used for writing are either alphabetical, which are related to phonemes, or ideograms, which are not, such as Arabic numerals and punctuation marks. Some ideograms have an equivalent in speech; those that represent words, for example, although some of course do not. For these reasons, any spoken text can be written, but not the other way around.

Unlike speech, humans cannot naturally produce writing, requiring tools for it. That is a significant hurdle, indeed mankind existed for many thousands of years without knowing how to write, and at present, schooling and personal effort are required for every child to learn it.

Through computing, a new form of text representation has entered the arena. Digital electronic devices operate with sequences of symbols; these symbols are neither phonemes nor characters but bits. Further research should clarify how computers represent text. The arrangement of bits is neither one-dimensional in time nor bi-dimensional in space. It is a sort of operational arrangement that has to do with processing and internal states (as described by the theory of finite automata). Digital devices can represent all texts that can be represented orally and by writings, but they add new kinds of texts that were unrepresentable before. While writing produces static texts, computer texts are dynamic. They contain not only the description of a certain state but also the specification of the rules that conduct to the next one.

Speech, writing and computing are text technologies. They allow text to be represented. Since text must be represented in order to be created, transmitted and preserved, the technology used is a key factor that determines which texts are feasible, and thus which texts exist. Oral language gave a preponderant role to the human species and made possible the creation of cities and work specialisation. Writing led to advanced civilisations first and, later on, to modern science and open, law-governed societies. Where computing will take us remains to be seen.

Basic Research

It is wrong to refer to research about subatomic particles as «basic research». It should more modestly and more properly be called «basic physical research». A matter-centred philosophical outlook on the world is surely common, but it is simply incorrect. Matter is not the basis of reality. Just consider how many things there are that are not made up of atoms. What atoms does a Tuesday consist of? How many atoms does one dollar, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or the theory underlying basic physical research contain? None. You can surely limit your knowledge to materials and energy, but then you are also narrowing your field of experience extremely and will only grasp just a few facts, leaving out most of reality.

It is not matter but text that is the really basic phenomenon. The basic phenomenon must apply directly or indirectly to everything. Matter does not, yet text does, since it applies to everything that can be described and thus to everything that science can research.

Apart from that, text is a reflexive concept, that is, the definition of text is a text that also applies to itself. This way, the concept of text resolves the gap in science between theory and reality. How can theory conform to reality? There must be a correspondence between both in order for the theory to be provable. Yet how could they correspond, if they are ontologically different? If both are perceived as having text as the common root, correspondence is possible and can be verified.

Truly basic research can only be text research.

Text-Oriented Operating System

From the insight that software actually does nothing except handle text, the idea of a text-oriented operating system naturally emerges.

The current paradigm of software consists of applications that store their data in files and an operating system that holds the files in a file system. The file is the exchange unit between applications and the operating system and their respective limit, too. Each application defines the file formats it uses and manages reading from and writing to files. Data is therefore application-owned and not shared. However, users constantly need to share data between applications, and so they must spend a lot of time providing bridges between applications; copying and pasting data or exporting and importing data files. Additionally, lots of programmers spend a lot of time working on interfaces between applications and programming export and import functions.

Better designed would be a software system in which the operating system takes care of text storage and the applications provide specialised ways to gather, manipulate and represent text parts. In such a system, an application such as a word processing program would not store the documents in separate files, but would cause the operating system to add some nodes representing the document's content to the system-wide text. Note that in such a software system there would be no need for a file system. Data would not be stored in files, but much more finely graded in text nodes such as the particular chapters and paragraphs. If the user then wanted to retrieve, for example, statistical information about chapters and paragraphs, he or she could invoke the database application, which in turn would fetch them from the operating system. Note that this way, queries could be done upon the actual document contents in real time and not on a redundant copy created by an export-import mechanism. The user could add some information to the document in the database application, and that information would

be immediately available inside the word processing application. There would be no more need for bridges between applications.

Yet a proper text-oriented operating system would have not only a central text storage but also a text-engine in its kernel. A text-engine is a software unit that apart from storing and retrieving text parts can also run queries on them and transform them. An application can run a query against the text-engine to get or update the data it needs. The user can also run queries; for example, to know what text units were updated last week or what references to a particular person are recorded.

A text-oriented operating system manages the general, unique text structure and applications need only care about their respective goals. The user can combine applications at will, because they interoperate both spontaneously and smoothly with one another.

Physical Basis of Computing

While humans work with text by understanding it, computers are material devices and therefore act exclusively on a physical basis. There is a variety of computer architectures, from smartphones to database servers and supercomputers, but all of them share a common basis that was first formulated by John von Neumann and others while constructing the first digital computers after World War II.

Von Neumann identified four units in a general-purpose computer: the arithmetic, memory, control and interface unit. A computer is an electronic device that can perform arithmetic and logical operations, keep record of data and retrieve it, and interact with other devices. The key point is the existence of a control unit that can perform operations on data depending on other data. Von Neumann introduced the notion of the «stored-program computer», in which it is not hardware (physical connections) but software (data) that determines which operations must be performed. That is what makes a computer a general-purpose machine and distinguishes it from other, special-purpose electronic devices.

Arithmetic and logical operations are possible through so-called gates, which are electric circuits that receive an electrical signal as input and send an electrical signal as output. Yet the output does not depend continuously on the input, but in a stepped way. For example, if the input is 0 to 0.5 volt, the output will be 1 volt, and if the input voltage is larger than 0.5, the output will be 0 volt. The performed operation is a symbolic one; the result does not depend on the voltage of the physical input signal, but on the fact whether the input signal represents one of two symbols: «low» or «high», «off» or «on». In other words, 0 or 1.

The main unit of a computer is a processor that can perform operations on input electrical signals to output electrical signals. Processors can perform a variety of operations. The input signal provides both the command and the data; it determines which operation has to be applied as well as which data the operation must be applied to.

Memory circuits provide an internal state that causes the processor to not always produce the same output for the same symbolic input. The order in which the symbols appear is relevant to the output. That is, not just a symbolic processing, but a text processing takes place.

Apart from that, a processor has a circuit that establishes the rhythm at which processing takes place. The so-called «clock» generates an electrical signal at regular intervals and, on each beat, all other circuits operate on their current input to produce an output.

Therefore, what makes computers possible is the existence of electronic devices that process electrical signals symbolically, have an internal symbolic state, use part of the symbolic input to control themselves, and generate symbolic output step-wise. That is, computers are devices that are driven by text, receive text as input and produce text as output.

The fact that present-day computers are electronic devices is a technological contingency. In the future, a technology could exist that would not be based on electrons, but, for instance, on photons or other subatomic particles. As long as these devices would process text and be text-controlled, they would be computers in the same sense as they are today.

Language and Text

Analysis of natural language reveals its underlying text. Each oral language expression consists of a series of audible signs. A particular expression can be pronounced differently by more than one person, for example with different accents and, as far as the linguistic content is concerned, both utterances will be considered to be the same. Therefore, an oral expression is a symbolic expression or, more precisely, since the order of the symbols is relevant, an oral expression is a text.

The phonetic signs that make up an oral expression form higher order symbolic units, the words. Analysis of the phonetic text reveals a series of words that in turn can be analysed syntactically to unveil the structure of sentences. Similarly, a written expression consists of a series of visible signs that are interpreted symbolically. These signs are grouped into series of words and sentences.

A linguistic expression is therefore a multilayered text. The first layer is physical, either phonemic or graphic, the layers above consist of pure text and build words and sentences. Sentences consist of connected text units. There is a finite number of text units, the lexemes, and a finite number of rules of syntax and morphology used to combine them.

Analysis of the meaning of sentences reveals the semantic layer. This layer is not linguistic in the narrow sense, it concerns the cultural sphere of the imaginable.

Expressions in natural language are deep, dense texts below the surface of sentences. Sentences are light, varied and original, the text beneath them robust, regular and predictable.

Language is, as a fact, the common structure of many existing texts and, as a competence, a pool of resources available for text production.

Human Sciences

The human sciences still do not deserve to be considered scientific. There is no corpus of verified knowledge, there are only concurring narratives. As both mathematics in ancient Greece and physics in modern Europe have shown, a science emerges when a discipline abandons the prose and begins using a formal language. Narrative, which creates meaning, does not produce scientific knowledge. Only a formal language production, that is, a text, can be intersubjectively verified. Human sciences will come into existence when a corpus of formal knowledge consolidates.

To become a science, human disciplines need primarily to be slimmed down. They should limit themselves to the things that can be formally expressed and work towards expanding the existing boundaries. They should abandon individual conviction and accept only intersubjective and intercultural acknowledgeability as proof.

That aside, a new area of public discussion should arise simultaneously, a space for interchanging ideas, a place where narratives could be cultivated and grow. There is currently no such place. Ideas are published indistinguishably from other contexts (sometimes inside science), with the consequence that ideas are not pertinently treated and are destroyed prematurely. A public arena for ideas should be neither regulated nor have entry barriers, it should be a free space in which each voice could speak and be heard. A critique of an opinion would not be perceived as faulting or even annihilating it, but simply as adding a new opinion. It would be the intrinsic nature of this arena to be subjective and cultural. It would be characterised by a liberal atmosphere in which every nascent idea is welcome and encouraged to grow.

Knowledge is text and as such is susceptible to being interpreted, thus producing meaning. Science (including human sciences) should concentrate on the text structure and let its meaning be interpreted in the arena for ideas. Both approaches are important and should be pursued, but separately. In doing so, both areas would grow and enrich each other.

Common Concept of Text

The definition of text does not present any difficulties at first. The word «text» is used to refer to the written word and is sometimes generalised to include other productions of natural language such as the spoken word or the lyrics of a song.

Yet obscurity arises on closer inspection. All could agree that Hamlet is a text. But what exactly is Hamlet? Is it a particular copy of the printed book? Of course not: every copy of the book is just an instance of the same work. Furthermore, there are many versions of Hamlet that differ in wording or orthography. In fact, there are also versions of it translated into other languages, which are obviously very different productions, but they can still be considered to be Hamlet. Basic questions also arise about whether a text is a syntactical or a semantic product. What is Hamlet: a particular list of words, or a particular set of fictional characters and a particular succession of events?

The word «text» is commonly used with very different meanings that are not accurately specified. This is acceptable in common language, but unacceptable in science. In science we must strive for a clear-cut, precise, stable concept of text.

Common Concept of Scientific Knowledge

It is common to consider that science produces knowledge. This seems to be an assertion that does not deserve further consideration, when in fact it actually does, because the concept of knowledge is highly problematic.

What does science know? There are a number of theses that are currently accepted, such as some laws in physics. But what exactly is a law such as Newton's second law of motion? It looks like a sentence, and it is often represented mathematically as « $F = ma$ ». The pure mathematical statement is not enough, an explanation in natural language is required in order to define «force», «mass» and «acceleration». That is, what science knows in this regard is a mathematical sentence, which is stable, well-known and formalised, plus some considerations about its meaning that are not well-documented. There is, strictly speaking, no book or article which we could point to and say: this is the scientific knowledge about the laws of motion.

If one looks at the whole scientific production, one observes that scientific knowledge is itself unknown. We do not know what we know. We assume we know some things, but we do not know what the knowledge consists of exactly. This is not just a question of precision, as we would not know perfectly what science knows, but just to some extent. It is a basic question. For example, we know that past theories have shown to be wrong, but we still assume that current theories are correct. This is nonsense. We can actually be sure that current theories are also wrong. Our knowledge is always wrong, but it can become better.

To summarise, science ought to deal with the question of scientific knowledge. It ought to establish a terminology of scientific research and define what its product is.

The Next Document System

At this post I want to imagine some aspects of a desirable future computer-assisted environment for reading and writing, following the inspiring blog post «the ultimate knowledge environment» by Frode Hegland.

Classic documents are the first step. Each classic document is an isolated static text that must be consumed by the reader as it was written by the author. The future document system is a text database that can be consumed by the reader in a variety of selections, combinations and presentation modes between which the reader can switch in real time at will. The larger the text database the better. The best would be a single world-wide (most-of-?)all-embracing text database.

Documents are richly connected, as a whole as well as paragraph-, sentence- or word-wise. The connections can be set by the author or by readers, at once or retroactively over the years (and centuries). The system maintains the reciprocal connections automatically (all items that link to the current one). The connections are themselves again documents and have, as any other document, an author, a publisher, a publishing date and other describing meta-data. Thus the connections can be filtered according to these criteria. For example, when reading an original document I can select which type of connected documents I want to be aware of, say from a particular author or group («my acquaintances», «great philosophers», «seasoned statesmen»), or from a particular publisher or type of publisher (academic, journalism, specialist, self-published), or those appeared in a selected time range («present», «17th century», «contemporary to the respective reference document»). The user interface can show connected documents in many ways, the user can optionally get the related passages for example as footnotes, superimposed on mouse hover, in separate columns, or in a 3D view with coloured transclusions such as in Xanadu. The user can change the view at any time.

The future document system includes a lexical subsystem («a dictionary»). Each word can be looked up to obtain information about it (meaning, grammar, morphology, spelling, pronunciation, lexical and semantic field, usage, translations), both in general as well as in the particular context. From each word one has immediate access to every document that uses it, too. All lexical information is exposed by regular documents in the document system and can be filtered, queried and presented using the system's regular configuration capabilities.

The future document system includes a reflexive subsystem that consists of documents that evaluate, rank, contrast, summarise and integrate other documents. It represents a sort of digestive system that assists the reader in exploiting the huge amount of available material.

A particular kind of relationship between documents that is part of the reflexive subsystem is the version. A document is called a version of another document if it reproduces the whole original document. For example, a versioned document can be an original french document translated into English, an original scientific article or legal text expressed in common language, or an old book printed with current orthography or vocabulary. When I am reading news about a political agreement between countries, I can jump to its wording. As layman I don't understand it very much, so I change to a simplified version and I choose the one made by a particular journal I like that is shortened to be read in five minutes. When I have a question about a particular point, I can fade in the original sentence or other versions.

Also part of the reflexive subsystem is a «trust profile». I can record how much I trust particular authors or publishers I come across and store this in a profile. Later on, I can filter the views to include just the ones I trust most, or to show these at the first position. Trust profiles can be chained transitively, so that the system can infer trust from my trusted sources. A trust profile can be published as document and thus be used by others, commented, enhanced, versioned etc. I am of course not restricted to a single trust profile for me. I can manage more than one of them («private», «job», «hobby»). When reading, I can select which trust profiles to apply (of mine, publicly available or shared with me by acquaintances) and switch in real time.

These were just some points for a brainstorming towards a future document system.

Bare Bones

My concept of a text as an articulated symbolic figure represents both a generalisation and a specialisation of the common concept of text as an oral or written language production.

Text is less than language, because words also carry associations, values, desires, fears and more that do not belong to the text. The ideas we want to express with texts and the ideas with which we interpret texts are not part of the respective text itself. The textual part corresponds to the bare bones of the body created by language.

Yet text is also more than language in the respect that a text or some part of it can be created by non-linguistic means. For example, the table of contents of a book can be a hierarchy of parts and chapters

that for example are represented graphically with different font sizes and begin a new page, without using words such as «chapter» or «part» explicitly. In this case, the table of contents is not a linguistic production (it is not English or French) although it obviously pertains to the text of the book.

Articulation vs. Partition

Articulation and partition are two entirely different ways to divide a whole. To partition is to divide into parts, which are distinct elements. Everything that is in the whole is in some of the parts but not in more than one part. The lexeme «part» is included significantly in the word «departure,» which means, «to go away.» In contrast, the verb «to articulate» means, «to divide into segments,» each of which is a conjunct element. The verb is related to the noun «article,» which indicates that each segment reveals an aspect of the whole or specifies a point. Articulated segments, unlike parts, are not mutually independent and do not substitute for the whole. Interestingly, «to articulate» also means «to utter or to give shape or expression,» which we do by means of language. Sentences do not reflect parts of the thought or feeling we are expressing but articulate it in its entirety. Furthermore, the meanings of sentences are not independent of each other but intertwined with each other and with the sense of the whole.

Articulation and partition lead to different results and should, therefore, be used appropriately. Unfortunately, it is common to apply partitioning when one should apply articulation. This happens most notably in software development. Confronted with the enormous complexity of software, we struggle to control it through partitioning. We strive to build stand-alone software parts that can be reused, and we build «frameworks» and «libraries,» but that does not solve the problem, and software development is just as far from sound engineering as it was forty years ago. The same error underlies the scientific method. We have partitioned scientific knowledge into «disciplines,» with the result that they evolve independently, use different languages, and produce a fragmented landscape that is, at present, completely out of control.

Instead, software should consist of articulated software units, and scientific knowledge should consist of articulated scientific disciplines. This can be achieved by using a text layer as a foundation, similar to how we use language to articulate ourselves. Software developers should consider a programming language not as a programming system (implementation) but as a resource pool to build software units (specification). Software development should not consist of combining executable modules but combining linguistic expressions that make up the source code, similar to how scientists should be aware that they are building a description of reality. Each discipline should not own a part of the whole description but better it in some way, either adding new sentences (as they do today) or enhancing (e.g. specifying, simplifying, or cross-referencing) those that already exist.

At present, we are good at partitioning but not much good at articulating. The key to articulating is to use text as an intermediary; that is, to be aware that the text exists and to apply it proficiently.

—oOo—