Production Notes

What’s different this year?

My goodness—much! This is the second annual TUG meeting to be held outside North America, and the first meeting that takes place in a country with a non-Latin alphabet.

This is also the first (and probably the last) year to attempt to present the Proceedings issue of TUGboat before the actual meeting. We have had varying success in this regard, and will most likely return to our former schedule in 1997, if only because a pre-conference publication schedule does not allow authors and editors sufficient time to properly fine-tune the final version of a text. As a result of the delay in receiving articles from some authors, there are articles in this issue which have not been reviewed. Russian typographic styles differ from those of TUGboat, and these differences may be noted in a variety of articles in this issue.

Many of our speakers present material that is actually “work-in-progress” and is in some cases dependent upon discussions and input from others in a particular area of expertise who attend the annual meetings. Therefore, some of the material to be presented at the conference in Dubna will be appearing in future issues of TUGboat. Look in the next issue for a more detailed report of the TUG’96 Conference in Dubna and list of participants.

Of the total number of articles submitted, fourteen were by Russian authors, thirteen were by authors whose primary language was not English, and two articles were submitted by North American authors—surely a tribute to the international flavor of TUG.¹

Macros

During the three-month process of editing these proceedings, I’ve had the opportunity to use at least three different versions of \TeX\_2ε macros. Look in the next issue for an article by Robin Fairbairns on the current state of the TUGboat style files.

Only five articles were submitted as plain \TeX\ source; the others were submitted as \TeX\_2ε.

Fonts

A large area of focus at the TUG’96 meeting will be on “languages”, “encoding” and “fonts”. The issue is set primarily in Computer Modern (or DC, version 1.3) fonts, using Malyshev’s BaKoMa PostScript Type 1 versions.² The Ω article by Haralambous necessitated the creation of proper .tfm files from .afm files provided by the author. The article by O. Lapko used special Cyrillic fonts, a result of the ongoing Russian Cyrillic font project. The wncyr fonts developed at the University of Washington and distributed by the American Mathematical Society were also widely used in this issue.

Owing to the wide variation in Cyrillic fonts (the two mentioned above are far from being the only ones in existence) and methods for using them, many of the Cyrillic examples were included in the form of PostScript graphics prepared by the authors, so that additional fonts would not have to be installed and incorporated into the TUGboat styles for just one use.

Output

The editor will have to confess to many problems during the editing and production of this issue and any remaining errors are mine (MB). Without help from my co-editor, Christina Thiele, and all of the production team members, final output would have been impossible. Final output was prepared at SCRI on an IBM RS6000 running AIX, using the Web2C implementation of \TeX. Output was printed on a QMS 680 print system at 600 dpi.

¹ What an experience for someone whose first language is ‘merikan and who speaks English as a ‘second language’.

² Jörg Knappen’s article on page 99 required the upgrade from 1.2 to 1.3 for this issue.