



Pieces Not Programs

The Piece as a Unit of Creative Cognition in Aesthetic Computer

@jeffrey

Aesthetic.Computer

ORCID: 0009-0007-4460-4913

<https://aesthetic.computer>

[working draft — not for citation]

Abstract. Aesthetic.Computer calls its interactive programs *pieces*—not sketches, patches, scripts, or apps. The choice of word is not cosmetic. It imports a framework from music and visual art in which a creative work is an *authored, performable, iterable artifact* rather than a specification for a machine. I trace the genealogy of the piece as a computational unit, comparing it to the Processing sketch, the Max/MSP patch, the Unix process, the Smalltalk image, and the Jupyter notebook. Then I examine what AC pieces actually are: single-file URL-addressable programs with a lifecycle (`boot`, `paint`, `act`, `sim`, `leave`) that mirrors the perception-action cycle of embodied agents [Varela et al., 1991]. Naming and designing around the piece concept—rather than the program concept—produces qualitatively different relationships between authors, platforms, and audiences: one in which software is practiced, not just deployed.

1. INTRODUCTION

When Turing defined computation in 1936, he called the basic object a “computable number” produced by a “machine” [Turing, 1936]. The word *program*—from the Greek *programma*, a public notice or written announcement—entered computing as a natural extension of this bureaucratic framing: a program is a set of instructions, a plan to be executed. Programs are correct or incorrect. They compile or they don’t. They are deployed, not performed.

The history of creative computing has been, in part, a slow erosion of this framing. The Processing sketch [Reas and Fry, 2007] replaced the program with something disposable and exploratory. The Max/MSP patch [Puckette, 1988] replaced the source file with a living dataflow graph. Scratch [Resnick et al., 2009] replaced the instruction sequence with snapping blocks. Each renaming was also a redesign: the affordances of the new unit carried new assumptions about who makes things, how long they take, and what counts as done.

Aesthetic.Computer calls its programs *pieces* [jeffrey, 2026a]. This paper examines why that matters.

2. GENEALOGY OF CREATIVE UNITS

2.1 The musical piece

In music, a *piece* is a complete, authored work that exists in at least two forms: the score (symbolic specification) and the performance (instantiation). Langer’s *Feeling and Form* [Langer, 1953] argues that art is not self-expression but the creation of “forms symbolic of human feeling”—the piece is the form, not the feeling; it is a crafted artifact that *presents* experience rather than *reports* it. These are not identical—performances differ, scores are interpreted, and pieces accumulate variants over time. A piece is never exhausted by any single performance. It is also socially situated: pieces have names, authors, premieres, and canons. They are taught, analyzed, covered, and forgotten.

This duality—spec and performance, text and enactment—is absent from the program concept. A program is typically identified with its source (or binary). Its “performance” is incidental; what matters is whether the output is correct. Nelson’s *Computer Lib / Dream Machines* [Nelson, 1974] envisioned a different relationship: the computer as a medium for dream-like interactive exploration, where the boundary between author and audience dissolves.

2.2 The Processing sketch

The Processing sketch [Reas and Fry, 2007] imported the artistic register deliberately. The word *sketch* signals incompleteness, exploration, and iteration. Sketches are not deployed; they are shared, built upon, or abandoned. The Processing environment reinforced this with an IDE organized around writing, running, and exporting—a cycle closer to drawing than engineering.

The sketch model had limits: sketches are local files, not URLs. They are not socially distributed by the platform. Their lifecycle ends at the window close.

2.3 The Max/MSP patch

Max’s *patch* [Puckette, 1988, 1996] is a dataflow graph rather than a control-flow sequence. Patches are constructed spatially, through connection rather than inscription. They are inherently performative: a Max patch is not meaningful until it is running, and its behavior is defined by the live data flowing through it. This makes patches closer to instruments than to programs—they are played, not executed.

Patches are also ephemeral in a specific way: closing a patch and reopening it returns the same structure, but the performance state is gone. The patch is the score; the running instance is the performance.

2.4 The Unix process

The Unix *process* is a different concept: not the source code or the binary, but the running instance—a program in execution, with its own address space, file descriptors, and PID. The process is the performance, not the score. Unix philosophy (one tool, one job, composition via pipes) treats processes as combinable primitives rather than authored works. The process has no author in the artistic sense; it has an owner in the administrative sense.

The Unix model is powerful and enduring, but it points in the opposite direction from the piece concept: toward correctness, composability, and system administration rather than authorship, iteration, and expression.

2.5 The Smalltalk image and Jupyter notebook

Alan Kay’s Smalltalk [Kay and Goldberg, 1977] proposed a different unit: the *image*—a persistent, living snapshot of all objects and their state. The image is not a file to be compiled; it is a world to be inhabited. Objects are sent messages; the environment responds. This is closer to the piece concept than to the program concept, but it has not transferred to mainstream creative coding because it resists the file-as-unit paradigm of modern operating systems.

The Jupyter notebook occupies an interesting middle position: it is a document (narrative) and a process (executable cells) simultaneously. Notebooks are closer to essays than to programs, but their unit is the cell, not

the whole.

3. WHAT AC PIECES ARE

An Aesthetic.Computer piece is a single `.mjs` or `.lisp` file exporting lifecycle functions:

- `boot` — initialization, runs once on load,
- `paint` — rendering, runs every frame,
- `act` — event handling (input, network, time),
- `sim` — simulation logic, runs every frame,
- `leave` — cleanup on exit.

This lifecycle is not arbitrary. It maps onto the perception-action cycle described by enactive cognitive science [Varela et al., 1991]: an agent perceives its environment (`act`), updates its internal state (`sim`), and produces an output (`paint`). The piece is not a specification for a computation; it is a description of an ongoing cognitive process.

3.1 URL addressability

Every piece is addressable by URL: `aesthetic.computer/piece-name`. This makes pieces memorable paths rather than files. The URL namespace is the piece namespace. Users discover pieces the way they discover musical works—by name, by reference, by navigating a collection. This is what distinguishes AC from IDEs and sandboxes: the piece is social before it is technical.

3.2 The immediate-mode rendering model

Aesthetic.Computer uses immediate-mode graphics: `paint` is called every frame, and the screen is rebuilt from scratch. There is no retained scene graph, no persistent DOM, no object model. This is cognitively significant: the piece is a pure function of time and state, not an accumulated structure. The programmer thinks in terms of *what to draw now*, not *what to change*. This aligns with how musicians think during performance—not “what note am I holding” but “what do I play next.” The *10 PRINT* project [Montfort et al., 2012] demonstrated that even a single line of procedural code can be the basis for rich aesthetic investigation; AC’s immediate-mode model extends this insight to interactive, real-time programs.

3.3 Authorship and iteration

Ingold [2010] argues that making is not the imposition of form on matter but a process of “following the materials”—a textility, a weaving of practitioner and medium. The piece, in AC, is the record of this weaving: not a finished product but a trace of ongoing practice. Stiegler’s concept of *idiotext*—the singular memory woven through technical prostheses [Staunæs, 2021, Stiegler, 1998]—describes exactly what a piece becomes over time: an externalized memory, irreducibly personal, that grows through iteration rather than deployment.

Pieces have authors. They are published by name, attributed, and fork-able via the `source` command. When a user issues `source piece-name`, they receive a copy of the piece’s source and become a new author. This is the musical concept of covering: taking an existing work and making it yours.

The iteration cycle—write, publish, play, observe, revise—is closer to musical composition or visual art practice than to software deployment. McPherson and Tahiroğlu [2020] document how computer music languages shape aesthetic outcomes through the idioms they make easy; the piece lifecycle shapes what gets made by making iterative, performative development the path of least resistance.

4. THE PIECE AS COGNITIVE EXTENSION

Clark and Chalmers argue that cognitive processes can extend into external tools when those tools are reliably used, available, and endorsed [Clark and Chalmers, 1998]. A notebook used for thinking is part of the cognitive system; the content in the notebook is as much “in the mind” as a remembered fact.

A piece, played regularly, becomes a cognitive extension in exactly this sense. `notepat` [Jeffrey, 2026b] is not just a tool Jeffrey uses to make sounds; it is a prosthetic for musical thinking. The 401 commits to `notepat` are not bug fixes to a utility—they are refinements to a cognitive organ. The piece and its author co-evolve.

This is what Magnusson [2010] describes as the epistemic dimension of musical instruments: instruments are “epistemic tools” that shape what their players can think and express. Digital instruments differ from acoustic ones in that they are software—and software can be modified by its user. When the tool is a piece and its author is also its player, the boundary between instrument and composition dissolves.

4.1 The named path as mnemonic

Norman’s affordance concept [Norman, 1988] describes how objects signal their possible uses. A URL-addressable piece affords memorization and return: the name `notepat` is not just an identifier but a mnemonic, a path back to a practice. The AC namespace is a mnemonic landscape. Users who know `wrl`, `grid`, `clock`, `prompt` have internalized a map of possible experiences. This is how musical canons work: the names of pieces are handles for practices, not just labels for files.

5. PIECES VS. PROGRAMS: A COMPARISON

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR PLATFORM DESIGN

The piece concept has concrete design consequences for Aesthetic.Computer:

1. **One file, one piece.** No project structure, no build

	Program	Piece
Unit of evaluation	Correctness	Expression
Primary lifecycle	Compile, run, exit	Boot, play, leave
Authorship	Owner (user/root)	Artist
Social unit	Executable binary	Named URL
Iteration mode	Debug, redepoy	Revise, republish
Relationship to time	Terminates	Ongoing
Forking metaphor	Fork (git)	Cover (music)
Done when	Tests pass	Never (only abandoned)

Table 1: Program vs. piece as creative units.

system, no dependencies outside the platform API. The piece is self-contained because a musical piece is self-contained.

2. **The prompt as instrument.** The AC command prompt is the interface through which pieces are navigated, played, and published. It is designed to be memorized, like a keyboard layout—not configured, like a GUI.
3. **Publishing as performance.** Issuing `publish` is an act of authorship, not deployment. The piece enters the namespace immediately and is playable by anyone with the URL.
4. **The browser as concert hall.** The web browser [Wyse and Subramanian, 2013] is the performance space. It is already present on every device; it is already social. Pieces play in the browser not because it is technically optimal but because it is the most accessible performance venue that exists.
5. **Live coding as rehearsal.** The module loader hot-reloads pieces on save. This is not a developer convenience—it is the equivalent of practicing at tempo: the author plays the piece as it changes, not after.

7. CONCLUSION

Calling interactive programs *pieces* is a design claim: it asserts that the right framework for thinking about creative software is not the engineering framework (correctness, deployment, maintenance) but the artistic one (authorship, iteration, performance, practice). The Processing sketch made a similar claim in 2001. Max’s patch made it in 1988. AC’s piece makes it again, in a browser, with a URL namespace, in 2024.

Each reframing carries different affordances. The piece concept in AC foregrounds: memorizable URLs over installable apps, immediate-mode rendering over retained scene graphs, lifecycle functions over event listeners, and covering over forking. These are not just naming choices—they are constraints that, as Magnus-

son [2010] argues, enable by delimiting. Shklovsky called this *defamiliarization* [Shklovsky, 1965]: art works by making the familiar strange, by forcing perception where habit would otherwise let us sleepwalk. Calling programs “pieces” is a defamiliarizing move—it disrupts the engineering frame and forces the user to perceive the creative act. Adorno’s essay on punctuation [Adorno, 1990] makes a parallel argument: that formal choices in notation are not cosmetic but constitutive—they shape what can be thought.

The deeper claim is that software designed around the piece concept treats *practice* as the fundamental relationship between a user and a program. Not installation, not configuration, not deployment—practice. The piece is something you return to, refine, and perform. It extends your cognition [Clark and Chalmers, 1998] precisely because it is stable enough to be learned and flexible enough to grow.

References

- Theodor W. Adorno. Punctuation marks. *The Antioch Review*, 48(3):300–305, 1990. Trans. Shierry Weber Nicholsen. Originally published 1956.
- Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers. The extended mind. *Analysis*, 58(1):7–19, 1998. doi: 10.1093/analys/58.1.7.
- Tim Ingold. The textility of making. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34:91–102, 2010. doi: 10.1093/cje/bep042.
- @jeffrey. Aesthetic computer ’26: A mobile-first runtime for creative computing, 2026a. arXiv preprint draft in repository.
- @jeffrey. notepat.com: From keyboard toy to system front door, 2026b. arXiv preprint draft in repository.
- Alan Kay and Adele Goldberg. Personal dynamic media. *Computer*, 10(3):31–41, 1977. doi: 10.1109/c-m.1977.217672.
- Susanne K. Langer. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art*. Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, 1953.
- Thor Magnusson. Designing constraints: Composing and performing with digital musical systems. *Computer Music Journal*, 34(4):62–73, 2010. doi: 10.1162/comj_a_00026.
- Andrew McPherson and Koray Tahiroğlu. Idiomatic patterns and aesthetic influence in computer music languages. *Organised Sound*, 25(1):61–72, 2020. doi: 10.1017/s1355771819000463.
- Nick Montfort, Patsy Baudoin, John Bell, Ian Bogost, Jeremy Douglass, Mark C. Marino, Michael Mateas, Casey Reas, Mark Sample, and Noah Vawter. 10
- PRINT CHR\$(205.5+RND(1)); : GOTO 10*. MIT Press, 2012.
- Theodor H. Nelson. *Computer Lib / Dream Machines*. Self-published, 1974. Revised edition, Microsoft Press, 1987.
- Donald A. Norman. *The Design of Everyday Things*. Basic Books, New York, 1988.
- Miller Puckette. The patcher. In *Proceedings of the International Computer Music Conference (ICMC)*, 1988.
- Miller Puckette. Pure data: Another integrated computer music environment. In *Proceedings of the Second Intercollege Computer Music Concerts*, pages 37–41, 1996.
- Casey Reas and Ben Fry. *Processing: A Programming Handbook for Visual Designers and Artists*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2007.
- Mitchel Resnick, John Maloney, Andrés Monroy-Hernández, Natalie Rusk, Evelyn Eastmond, Karen Brennan, Amon Millner, Eric Rosenbaum, Jay Silver, Brian Silverman, and Yasmin Kafai. Scratch: Programming for all. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(11):60–67, 2009.
- Viktor Shklovsky. Art as technique. In Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis, editors, *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. University of Nebraska Press, 1965. Originally published 1917.
- Asker Bryld Staunæs. Stiegler’s concept of idiotext. *Stiegler Studies*, 1(1), 2021.
- Bernard Stiegler. *Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1998. Trans. Richard Beardsworth and George Collins.
- Alan M. Turing. On computable numbers, with an application to the entscheidungsproblem. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 42(1):230–265, 1936. doi: 10.1112/plms/s2-42.1.230.
- Francisco J. Varela, Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1991.
- Lonce Wyse and Srikumar Subramanian. The viability of the web browser as a computer music platform. *Computer Music Journal*, 37(4):10–23, 2013. doi: 10.1162/comj_a_00213.