

Comments from D. Eastwood

1.) re BC.2.02 and BC.2.03

The first paper talks about control characters within the ASCII set; what is your opinion on the extension of the ASCII set for non-hardware-specific control functions? c.f. a paper in Comm ACM (about) June 1965.

~~2.) re BC.2.02~~

The first

~~This~~ paper indicates ~~the~~ separate

control characters for

VT (with no horizontal motion)

RVT similarly

CR with no vertical motion

NL combines CR and VT

Wouldn't it be better to keep these

distinctions in the canonical form?

The capabilities for editing would be greater; the conversion required in the DIM would be greater also but that should mean extra work only for those devices or users who use the finer distinction of

$$NL = CR + VT \dots$$

2) re BC.2.03 -

I'd like to be able to introduce non-editing control ^(character) functions into an edit stream, and edit control ~~(characters)~~ functions into a non-edit stream. Since non-editing functions would not be part of the compared stream, this ability would

not conflict with the canonical form.

Would like to talk with the two of you about this possibility.

3) The proposed convention under 9) —

"Two graphic formers containing the same graphic will never appear in the same character position" —

would prevent editing of a string containing overstrikes of the same character

to get boldface type effects. Some people at our place are making plans for doing just that. The problem could be solved by saying "only the first occurrence of a given graphic in a given

character position will be used for comparison purposes unless the user asks for an 'overstrike comparison mode'.

The extra control information needed to carry along the repeated ~~graphic~~.

backspace-graphic pairs would be an example of control information not (directly) affecting the editing, as mentioned under 2).