

Authoring Mathematical Knowledge

Bruce R. Miller
NIST

2 Issues

- Extracting mathematical content
(formula level)
Challenging enough...
- Determining it's role & interrelations.
(document level)
Useful for validation.
Hope to learn more here.

Authoring for MKM: Ideal?

- Integrate document creation with derivation/proof.
- Valid, machine readable

But, for DLMF

- Are we there yet?
- Dozens of authors using compatible tools?
- What they *know* vs. willing to *prove*?

Authoring for MKM: L^AT_EX?

- A good choice...
 - Author familiarity, convenience (for some)
 - Logical document structure (sort of).
 - Expressive for mathematics
 - Beautiful typography!
- and a bad one.
 - Needs more structure
 - Quirky computational model
 - Ambiguous math markup

L^AT_EX_{ML} Goals

- L^AT_EX \Rightarrow XML Transformer
 - General purpose
 - L^AT_EX-like DTD (or other?)
 - Math to MathML, OpenMath
- Closely mimic T_EX behaviour.
- Lossless
- Extensible, not necessarily in T_EX.
- Adaptable.
- ...and finish DLMF project!

Mimic T_EX's Digestive Tract

- Mouth *Tokenizes*
- Gullet *Expands*
- Stomach *Digests* — but Augmented!
- Intestines *Builds* Document Tree
- Postprocessing per application
 - math parsing/analysis, math images,
 - graphics, table rewriting, ...

Practical Math?

- DO allow author macros
- DO cope with quirky T_EX
 $\frac{1}{2}$, a^xy vs. $a^{\{x\}y}$
- DON'T pretend to 'understand' all legacy T_EX.
(at least, not without additional info)
- DON'T require completely explicit $\add{a}{b}$
- DO preserve any semantic clues.
- DO encourage markup that reduces ambiguity
- DO allow author/document specific clarification of notations

Math: Middle Road

- Let $\text{L}^{\text{A}}\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}_{\text{M}}\text{L}$ deal with $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ quirks.
- Acts as structure-preserving Lexer.
- Bulk of math (for us) not *so* bad
- Use infix parser in postprocessing.
- Focus on ambiguities
 - author/document-specific declarations
 - higher-level markup.

Examples: Declarations

With

```
DefSymbol ('U', 'U', 'FUNCTION') ;
```

Now $\$U(x)\$$ gives $U(x)$, as before,
And, after parsing

```
<XMApp>
```

```
<XMTok meaning='U' role='FUNCTION' />
```

```
<XMTok meaning='x' role='ID' />
```

```
</XMApp>
```

instead of

```
<XMApp>
```

```
<XMTok meaning='InvisibleTimes' />
```

```
<XMTok meaning='U' role='ID' />
```

```
<XMTok meaning='x' role='ID' />
```

```
</XMApp>
```

Examples: Higher Level Markup

Define a macro such that

$$\backslash\mathrm{deriv}[n]\{f\}\{x\} \Rightarrow \frac{d^n f}{dx^n}$$

With the declaration

```
DefConstructor(' \deriv[] {any} {any}',  
  "<XMAp><XMTok meaning='deriv' />"  
  . " <XMArg>#2</XMArg><XMArg>#3</XMArg>" ...
```

the constructed tree is

```
<XMAp><XMTok meaning='deriv' />  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='f' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='x' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='n' /></XMArg>  
</XMAp>
```

Examples: Special Functions

With appropriate T_EX macrology:

$$\backslash\mathrm{HyperpFq}\{p\}\{q\} \Rightarrow {}_pF_q$$

Introduce notion of *evaluating a function at*:

$$\backslash\mathrm{HyperpFq}\{p\}\{q\}@ \{a\}\{b\}\{z\} \Rightarrow {}_pF_q(a; b; z)$$

or (alternative notation)

$$\backslash\mathrm{HyperpFq}\{p\}\{q\}@@ \{a\}\{b\}\{z\} \Rightarrow {}_pF_q\left(\begin{matrix} a \\ b \end{matrix}; z\right)$$

Palatable notation? Easier to type than

$$\backslash\mathrm{sideset}\{_ \{p\}\}\{_ \{q\}\}\{\backslash\mathrm{mathop}\{F\}\}\backslash\mathrm{left}(\{a \ \mathrm{atop} \ b\}; z \backslash\mathrm{r}$$

Examples: Special Functions II

Constructing DOM gives

```
<XMApp>  
  <XMTok meaning='HyperpFq' />  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='p' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='q' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='a' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='b' /></XMArg>  
  <XMArg><XMTok meaning='z' /></XMArg>  
</XMApp>
```

and parser can treat args individually,
avoiding guesswork.

Examples: Special Functions III

And from there, MathML

```
<m:mmultiscripts>
  <m:mi>F</m:mi>
  <m:mi>q</m:mi>
  <m:none/>
  <m:mprescripts/>
  <m:mi>p</m:mi>
  <m:none/>
</m:mmultiscripts>
<m:mo>&ApplyFunction;</m:mo>
<m:mrow>
  <m:mo>(</m:mo>
  <m:mtable>
    <m:mtr><m:mttd><m:mi>a</m:mi></m:mttd></m:mtr>
    <m:mtr><m:mttd><m:mi>b</m:mi></m:mttd></m:mtr>
  </m:mtable>
```

Problems

- Role of text and spacing in math.
- Overloading of *symbols* (scoping?)
- Palatable L^AT_EX extensions for math.