

Typeset testing

Ian Mitchell

2022-10-12



Abstract.

This is my abstract for this document. It is a summary of everything in the document—though it does not *really* tell you much about what the whole paper is about. Good luck trying to get anything out of this, nerd!

Contents

1	A manifesto (of sorts)	1
2	Modern typesetting for the modern type	2
2.1	Math typesetting	3
2.1.1	Physics	4
2.1.2	Synthesizer stuff	4
2.1.3	Some thoughts	5
2.2	Code!	5
2.3	Some other nifty things	5
3	Wrapping this up a bit	5
	References	6

1. A manifesto (of sorts)

Typesetting is art, both in the sense that is beautiful, and that it is useful. Beauty is of course in the eye of the beholder—it is derived from many things; while *The Fountain* is a urinal, and not a Baroque painting, its use in demonstrating the hypocrisy in the wider avant-garde art world was beautiful in and of itself. In essence, the beauty derived from the function of the object—that is much of art in and of itself. What is aesthetically beautiful—what we find easy on the eyes—is culturally defined.

For most people, that works perfectly, but typesetters are not so lucky. Typography’s beauty doesn’t derive from process, message, or raw aesthetics—it is instead from how easy a document can be read, and whether or not the style matches the medium and purpose. If I were to print a document, with *massive* comic sans, on printer paper that says “**DO YOU’RE BEST :))))**,” and handed it out to everyone in my neighborhood, people would find it ridiculous; if I were to print that in Garamond, and place it in a book a thousand times *a-la The Shining*, people would think I’m a serial killer. If I put it on a poster, in bright Frutiger or Helvetica, give it some contrasting colors, and hang it up in some bar in a gentrified part of New York or Philadelphia—and maybe throw in a picture of an possum—people would call it graphic design—if I’m lucky, they’d call it art.

To make good typesetting, you need to know your purpose. This template is designed to do two things: make your information look decent,




Figure 1. Behold: the dude.

and make it readable. If you're not writing “***DO YOU’rE BEST***” a thousand times, you're on route to making something good. Not only is this designed to make whatever you're writing look good, it's also trying to make it as timeless as possible. I avoided design trends—I avoided those puffy serif fonts, such as [New Spirit](#). This is a pandoc template for typesetting documents that matter, not advertising that will wind up in the dustbin of history, relegated to simply being a marker of the times.

This template was created for a simple reason: I'm sick and tired of Computer Modern and Times (New Roman). I see a lot of good scientists typesetting their documents in Computer Modern—and if they're using Word, Times New Roman—and I have to just ask *why*? The backbone of modern science—the [arXiv](#)—puts all of its documents in plain LaTeX. (Either that, or they're horribly typeset in MS Word.) That's fine, but I think it can be done better. If you're going to be making non-choices, then you might as well make them look nice and print well.

2. Modern typesetting for the modern type

Much like in writing, the golden rule everyone teaches you is *readability*—many times it is a typographer's job to break that down, and make something eyecatching and unique. This is not one of those times. I need the reader to actually read this.

Luckily for me, there are plenty of readable typefaces. The main type for this document is XCharter—an extended version of Matthew Carter's original Bitstream Charter. Overall, it is *very* readable, and prints out

well at just about any resolution, making it perfect for just about any occasion; the typeface also benefits from not being anywhere near as overused as, say, Times—and, unlike Computer Modern, can be read for an extended period of time.

In a supporting role are two other nice typefaces, Inter and Julia Mono.

For a while I was under the impression that I had to settle on a mediocre sans serif typeface, but I was wrong—I found Inter. I *love* this typeface so much. Even if it's not the exact design elegance of Frutiger, I absolutely adore this typeface's customizability and general readability. There are a few features in Inter that are sorely missing from other typefaces, such as an optional serif in the uppercase *I*, curve in the lowercase *l* (not shown here), and even configurable numbers.

Inter works surprisingly well with Charter. I was actually caught off guard at first how well they work together. There are a few things that I would do differently, like give the *t* a slant, at the top, and make the dots on *i* and *j* square rather than round, but those aspects are negligible; despite the changes I would make, Inter is so perfect that I'm more than content to use it as-is. Honestly, I think this could be the age's new Frutiger—and I don't say that lightly. All it needs is a *proper italic*.

Julia Mono, on the other hand, is a simple—though feature rather complete—monospaced typeface. It has, unlike many other monospaced typefaces, *italic*, **bold**, and **bold-italic** built in, along with a *ton* of unicode characters. Like most other monospace typefaces, though, there's no full dash—while slightly disappointing, it's nothing shocking.

With all of that put together, Julia Mono could be used to typeset entire documents—though I'm not sure if doing all that with a monospaced typeface, for anything other than aesthetics, is the best idea. I don't know—I'll try it out some time.

2.1. Math typesetting

Now we can have some fun with typesetting equations. Obviously, since this is a LaTeX template, it's for people that—at least likely—do *something* with math. There are a few areas that I can test this out in, so, without further ado, I'll get to making some stuff.

Physics. Let's start with the Linblad master equation, a fine choice for starters,^[1]

$$\frac{\partial \rho(r, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_j \gamma_j \left(L_j \rho(r, t) L_j^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{ L_j L_j^\dagger, \rho(r, t) \} \right) - i[H, \rho(r, t)]. \quad (1)$$

As it stands now (2022-10-12), I'm not a huge fan of the sum sign, but oh well—that can change in the future.

There's also the Laughlin wavefunction,^[2] which got Robert Laughlin a Nobel,

$$\psi(z_i) = \prod_{i < j} (z_i - z_j)^m \exp \left[- \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|z_i|^2}{4\ell_B^2} \right]. \quad (2)$$

It shows up just about everywhere in many-body physics. I can't remember what paper it was, but if memory serves me right—it often doesn't—it appears as the wavefunction for a Tomanaga-Luttinger Liquid as well, which is pretty neat.

The general solution to the Poisson equation is

$$\phi(r) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \int \frac{n(r')}{|r - r'|} d^3r'.$$

Which, all things considered, is rather useful.

Synthesizer stuff. The transfer function for a realistic, N -pole Moog transistor ladder filter was derived by^[3] as

$$H(s) = - \prod_{u=0}^{N-1} \frac{\left(\frac{I_{cl}}{4CV_T} \right)^N}{s + \frac{I_{cl}}{4CV_T} \left(1 - \sqrt[N]{k} e^{i\pi(2u+1)/N} \right)},$$

which is different from^[4],

$$H(s) = \frac{1}{(s + 1)^4 + k}.$$

Both of these are technically correct—as they're both derived from a linearized analysis of the Moog ladder filter—the key difference is in that D'Angelo and Valimaki's transfer function is about the *poles* of the transfer function, rather than the (normalized) cutoff frequency.

Some thoughts. I really like that there's an otf math typeface for XChar-
ter, but I can say for certain that I'm *not* a fan of the sum or product
signs—they feel just a *bit* too thin and piddly. I think it would be better
if they were stretched out form of the sigma (Σ) and pi (Π) characters,
they would look much better. Conversely, the integral, partial derivative
symbol, and the rest all look great.

2.2. Code!

This has some pretty decent, albeit incomplete, code typesetting. For
example, here's a hello world in Julia.

```
println("Hello world")
```

2.3. Some other nifty things

In this template I have some pretty nice looking block quotes.

He's right. These are some pretty nice looking block quotes.
—Jeebus

However, for some reason, whenever I put in block quotes, it makes
the rules near the abstract act a bit funny. I have no idea why it does
that—perhaps it is one of TeX's great mysteries.¹

3. Wrapping this up a bit

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus
elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dic-
tum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id,
vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque ha-
bitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis
egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lec-
tus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor
gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac,
nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus.
Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Cura-
bitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi,
congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit
amet orci dignissim rutrum.

I would like to thank all the people that have suffered through TeX's
bullshit—from the overfull hboxes to the arcane syntax—you have all
made this accursed template possible.

¹Look at me, Ma! I'm in an footnote!

References

- [1] Manzano, D. [A short introduction to the Lindblad Master Equation](#). *AIP Advances* **10**, 025106 (2020).
- [2] Laughlin, R. B. [Anomalous Quantum Hall Effect: An Incompressible Quantum Fluid with Fractionally Charged Excitations](#). *Physical Review Letters* **50**, 1395–1398 (1983).
- [3] D'Angelo, S. & Valimaki, V. [Generalized Moog Ladder Filter: Part I—Linear Analysis and Parameterization](#). *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* **22**, 1825–1832 (2014).
- [4] Stinchcombe, T. [Analysis of the Moog Transistor Ladder and Derivative Filters](#). (2008).