## Good old times?

Taco Hoekwater

If my memory is correct, it was sometime in the Autumn of 1996 that I convinced my bosses at what was then my employer –Kluwer Academic Publishers– to start using ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt instead of IAT<sub>E</sub>X for the in--house development of an automated XML typesetting system for scientific articles. There were three big deciding arguments in favor of ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt at that time:

- Floating figure placement, especially in combination with a two column layout, was much more reliable in ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt. IAT<sub>E</sub>X at the time had the nasty habit of putting all the figures at the very end of the article when it ran into trouble during float placement.
- ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt's interface for setting up specific layouts was much cleaner than IAT<sub>E</sub>X's, which meant that small layout tweaks could easily be carried out by a non-guru.
- Last but certainly not least, it was possible to negotiate a support contract with the actual developer: Pragma ADE. In this, it also helped that Pragma ADE is a Dutch company. Earlier, we had tried to work with overseas support companies, but correct and swift communication was not always easily obtained.

Hans Hagen personally delivered ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt to the office in Dordrecht. I assume it was on a floppy disk, but I cannot recall for certain. What I do remember is that it came with a single 4-ring binder containing 'the manual'. At that time, that was all of about 400 pages of 10pt type with fairly large margins. I still have the binder, but at some time during the zeroes I threw out the manual for being hideously obsolete. In hindsight, that was a mistake, as it would no doubt be worth some money in a ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt Group auction by now ...

I am quite certain that the ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt sources that Kluwer Academic Publishers got are still on a backup disk somewhere hidden in my office, but

searching through boxes of unlabeled 3.5 inch floppy disks and burnable CD-Roms is too daunting a task. Nor does it help that none of my current computing machines can read either types of hardware!

After some digging on-line, I did manage to find a ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt release that is reasonably close. On the NTG's 4allT<sub>E</sub>X4, there is a ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt release from October 1997. There is no exact date, because at the time the \contextversion command was defined like this:

\edef\contextversion
{\the\normalyear.\the\normalmonth.%
 \the\normalday\normlspace}

in other words: the date of format generation. While it was released a year later, not all that much seems to have been changed in that time, because I have definite memories of digging through the massive —as it appeared to me then core-01a.tex source file to find specific macro definitions.

At the time, there were 93 files in the distribution zip, but this included a few non-ConT<sub>E</sub>Xt files as well: included are a full copy of plain.tex version 3.14159, as well as a redistribution of Michael J. Wichura's table.tex, and a readme file. The zip comes in at just under 600 kilobytes.

This version of  $ConT_EXt$  was somewhere between MkO and MkI, I think. Running  $ConT_EXt$  involved starting (pdf)tex on the commandline yourself with the proper format preloaded. pdfT\_EX was still very new in 1997. I remember from the earlier release we used at Kluwer Academic that it was based on emT\_EX's tex binary and still counted on Y&Y's Dvipsone driver to generate high-quality PostScript from DVI files.

In between those hand-started T<sub>E</sub>X runs, one had to call texutil.exe to process the .tui file into a .tuo file. This was quite cumbersome, and

if I am not mistaken texexec.exe was released soon afterwards (first under the name ctex), only to itself be replaced later by texexec.pl, then texexec.rb, until its current incarnation as a stub for mtxrun.

Those early programs – there was also texedit.exe, an integrated development environment, as well a few others like a spell checker– where written by Hans in Modula.

Was this the 'Good old times'? Maybe. Hans still had hair, I still had my own teeth, and certainly  $ConT_EXt$  was easier to understand back then even if it was a lot less powerful. But how much has really

changed? Here is the end of the context.rme dated October 5, 1997:

Don't hesitate to ask questions. ConTeXt can do a lot, and the manuals are always way behind and incomplete.

Hans Hagen pragma@pi.net