* * * * * * * * * *

MACRO MADNESS Michael Spivak 2478 Woodridge Drive, Decatur, GA 30033

This article is an extract from the documentation for the not-yet-completed AMS-TEX macro package. It discusses certain tricks and pitfalls that other macro writers might want to know about. Needless to say, none of this trickery would have been possible without the help of Don Knuth.

It should be mentioned that the AMS-TEX macro package initially \chcodes the symbol | (ASCII 174) to be a letter, and all internal AMS-TEX macros contain a | as one of their letters. At the very end of the macro file, | is re-\chcoded to be of type 12, so that the AMS-TEX user cannot redefine, or even use, these control sequences (the input \cs | will be read as \cs |). For convenience, we will omit the |s here, and we will use mnemonic names for control sequences—the actual names used by AMS-TEX are very short (at most three letters, including any |s), in order to preserve memory space.

Please report any bugs to the above address as soon as possible—before the macro package gets distributed widely!

L Branching Mechanisms.

The only branching mechanism provided by TEX is

\if (char₁)(char₂){(true text)}
\else{(false text)}

and its relatives. Unfortunately, there are certain peculiarities of \if...\else that require special care.

(a) An $if...\else$ construction is processed in TEX's "digestive system", rather than in its "mouth". Suppose, for example, that we have two control sequences csa#1 and csb#1#2, taking one and two arguments, respectively, and a control sequence flag that is sometimes defined to be T and sometimes defined to be F. We would like to define cs to be csa if flag is T, and csb if flag is F [the argument(s) for cs will simply be whatever comes next in the input text]. If we try to define

\def\cs{\if T\flag{\csa}\else{\csb}}

then a use of \cs will produce the error message

```
! Argument of \csa has an extra }
```

because T_{EX} sees the } as soon as it looks for the argument after \csa or \csb . The solution to this

problem is to define

A similar problem arises in the following situation. Suppose that we have two different macro files, mfile.1 and mfile.2, and the value of flag is supposed to determine which file to use (such a scheme is useful for saving TEX memory space). A definition like

gives a different error message:

! Input page ended on nesting level 1

but the basic problem (and the solution) is exactly the same.

$$(h)$$
 If we make the definition

then we can safely use constructions like

\If T\flag\then...\else{...}

The token $\$ made part of the syntax of $\$ so that we can have constructions like $\$ if $\$ a cs b then..., where $\$ s^{#1} is a control sequence with one argument.

(b) Although $\langle char_1 \rangle$ and $\langle char_2 \rangle$ may be specified by control sequences like $\langle flag$, which TEX expands out, they cannot involve $\langle if... \rangle$ else again. Suppose, for example, that we have already defined

so that \ab#1 is T if #1 is a or b, and F otherwise. We would now like to define \cs#1 to be {true text} if #1 is a or b, and {false text} otherwise. We cannot conveniently define

If we do this, then the input cs x will become $if T i xa{T}else{if xb{T}}$

 $\else{F}}{\langle true text \rangle} \else{\langle false text \rangle} which causes TEX to try to compare T with \if, giving an error message.$

Of course, the test for #1 being a or b could be made part of the definition of cs, but the following scheme is far more advantageous:

(c) In an if... else construction, (char₁) and (char₂) are supposed to be single characters (of type

TUGboat, Volume 2, No. 2

0 to 12), or defined control sequences, possibly with arguments, that expand out to a character. So we can't use an if... else construction in a situationwhere we don't know for sure what the next inputtext will be. Suppose, for example, that <math>cs#1 is supposed to be $\langle true text \rangle$ if #1 is a comma, but (false text) otherwise. If we define

```
\def\cs#1{\if#1, {(true text)}
\else{(false text)}}
```

there is always the possibility that our input text will contain

\cs ...

where ... is a token that can't be used with 11, or even worse, a group {...}, which might produce total chaos. In order to deal with this we will use several tricks, which are also useful in other situations.

II. Basic Kludges

```
Consider the definitions
\def\false#1{\gdef\ans{F}}
\def\tricka{A}
\def\trickc#1{\if#1A
{\gdef\result{\false}}
\else{\gdef\result{\gdef\ans{T}}}
\result}
\def\empty#1#2\tricka{\trickc}
```

The control sequence \trickc will be used only in situations where the \if is safe. In fact, \trickc will arise only from an occurrence of \empty, and the control sequences \tricka, \trickb, \trickc and \empty will be used only in the construction

\empty...\tricka\tricka\trickb

Here ... will be some input text, with perhaps a few special A_MS -TEX control sequences thrown in, but ... will never involve \tricka (remember that \tricka is really \tricka|, so it can't appear in a user's file).

We have to consider two possibilities for ... in order to determine the result of this construction. Suppose first that ... is not empty. Then argument #1 for \empty will be the first token or group of ... and argument #2 will be whatever remains (if anything). Hence

\empty...\tricka\trickb → → \trickc\tricka\trickb →

 $\rightarrow \false\trickb \rightarrow \gdef\ans{F}$

But suppose that ... is empty, so that we have

\empty\tricka\tricka\trickb

Note that argument #1 for \empty must be nonempty, since it is not followed by a token in the definition of \empty. So in the present case argument #1 for \empty will be the first \tricka. Consequently, the second \tricka will play the role of the token \tricka in the definition of \empty (and argument #2 will be empty). Thus

In other words,

\empty\tricka\tricks\trickb defines \ans to be T if is empty,		
defines \ans to be T if is empty		
and F otherwise.		

There would appear to be one exception to this rule: If ... is a blank space, or a sequence of blank spaces, then \ans will still be defined to be T, since spaces after the control sequence \empty are ignored. But in practice ... will always be an argument from some other macro, and in this case the exception does not arise. Suppose, for example, that we define

```
\def\try#1{\empty#1\tricka\trickb}
```

so that $try{#1}$ will test whether #1 is empty or not. If we give T_EX the input

\try{ } ·

then the braces will be removed from { }, so this will be translated into

```
\empty_\tricka\tricka\trickb
```

But in this situation the space indicated by \coprod is not ignored, so \ans will be defined to be F.

We might have arranged for the result of the combination \empty...\tricka\tricka\trickb simply to be T or F, rather than defining \ans to be T or F. But if we did this, a construction like

\if T\empty#1\tricka\tricka\trickb{...}
\else{...}

wouldn't work, because TEX would think that we were trying to compare T with the result of \empty#1\tricka.

The following variant of \empty is also useful:

\def\emptygp#1\endd

{\empty#1\tricka\tricka\trickb}

Then

	\emptygp\endd defines \ans to be T if	-
İ	defines $\$ to be T if	is empty or {},
	and F otherwise.	

It will be convenient to use the same flag \ans for the result of several of our macros. This won't produce problems if we ever have to perform two tests on two different arguments: we can always first use \empty, then \let\firstans=\ans, then use \emptygp, etc. We also want to be able to check if ... is a single token or group, rather than a string of several tokens or groups. One idea is to consider \single...\endd where \single#1#2\endd checks whether #2 is empty:

\def\single#1#2\endd

{\empty#2\tricks\tricks\trickb}

This won't quite work, since ... might be something like $\langle token \rangle$ {}; in this case #2 appearing in \empty#2\tricka\trickb will still be empty, since TEX removes an outer set of braces from any argument. So to be on the safe side, we add some extraneous character after ... and let \single#1#2#3\endd check if #3 is empty:

```
\def\single#1#2#3\endd
```

{\empty#3\tricka\trickb}

Then

\single...*\endd
defines \ans to be T if ... is a single token
or group, and F otherwise.

Before using \single...*\endd it is essential to check that ... isn't empty. Otherwise there will be problems, because of the very considerations that made \empty work. (An \empty check could be incorporated into the definition of \single, but whenever AMS-TEX uses \single a separate check has to be made anyway.)

As in the case of \empty, a space may legitimately occur as argument #1. For example, if we define

\def\try#1{\single#1*\endd}

then $try{X}$ defines ans to be F. (But $try{U}$) defines ans to be T—the second space never even gets read by $T_{E}X$.)

It is now fairly easy to check whether an argument #1 (which might *a priori* be an arbitrary token or even a group) is a comma. The basic idea is to define

```
\def\check#1,#2\endd
```

```
{\empty#1\tricka\tricka\trickb}
```

and then define

\def\comma#1{\check#1, \endd}

so that \comma{#1} will define \ans to be T if #1 is a comma, and F otherwise. This won't quite work for the following reasons:

- (i) If #1 is {} or {{}}, then \comma{#1} is \comma{} or \comma{}. This means that the #1 appearing in \check#1,\endd is empty or {}, and thus the #1 in \empty#1\tricka\trickb is empty.
- (ii) If #1 is a group {,...} that happens to begin with a comma, then \comma{#1} will define

\ans to be T, whereas we want it to be F (this, admittedly, is a matter of taste).

So we will use \emptygp and \single to check on these possibilities:

\def\comma#1{\emptygp#1\endd
 \if T\ans{\gdef\ans{F}}
 \else{\single#1*\endd
 \if F\ans{}
 \else{\check#1,\endd}}}

Then

\comma{#1}
defines \ans to be T if #1 is , or {,},
and F otherwise.

(The inability to distinguish between , and {,} is a minor problem that seems insurmountable.)

AMS-TEX needs many such checks, so they are all made in terms of one generalized check. For example, \comma is actually defined by

\def\comma#1{\compare*, {#1}}

```
where \compare is defined as
```

\else{\check#2#1\endd}}}

The * was made part of the syntax for \compare to allow \def\space#1{\compare*U{#1}}.

III. Saving Braces

We have just seen that there can sometimes be problems when braces are removed from the argument of a control sequence. Actually, the problem can be much more critical. For example, the A_{MS} -TEX control sequence dots#1 first examines #1 to determine what sort of dots and spacing are needed, and then produces these dots, followed by #1 (and the remaining input). The removal of braces would be a minor annoyance if #1 were something like {+}, where the braces are meant to make the + into a \mathcd (something that A_{MS} -TEX users aren't supposed to know about anyway). But it could be a major catastrophe if #1 were something like {a\frac b}. To handle such problems we define \def\braced#1{\empty}

In other words, braced puts back a pair of braces if #1 is {} or a group with more than one token or group in it. Thus, \braced{#1} defines \Braced to be #1 except when #1 is {(token)} or {{...}}, in which case the outer set of braces is removed. So, aside from the unavoidable {(token)} case, \Braced has enough braces to give the same result as #1.

IV. Recursions

There are several ways of handling recursions, all of which are used at some point in AMS-TEX.

(a) Suppose that we want to define \quas #1 so that

```
\qms 1 is ?
\qms 2 is ??
\qms 3 is ???
.....
\qms {10} is ??????????
etc.
```

We can define

```
\def\qms#1{\setcount1 #1
   \def\string
      {\ifpos1{\advcount1 by -1
        \gdef\newstring{?\string}}
        \else{\gdef\newstring{}}
        \newstring} %end of \def\string
   \string}
```

This only appears to violate the rule not to define a control sequence in terms of itself: An occurrence of $\string may produce$ $\gdef\newstring{?\string}, but TEX will simply$ record this definition, and not try to expand out the $\string that occurs in it until \newstring is ex$ $panded, at which time an \if test is made, which$ $produces a new \gdef.$

\newstring should be defined as ?\string rather than as \string? to keep TEX's internal "input stack" from growing unboundedly.

(b) Suppose that we have some input of the form

 $\langle \text{string}_1 \rangle, \langle \text{string}_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle \text{string}_n \rangle$

with strings separated by some character, like a comma, and we want the control sequence $\langle \text{operate}$ to perform some operation on each string. For example, we might want to replace each $\langle \text{string}_i \rangle$ by $A\langle \text{string}_i \rangle Z$, so that

 $\operatorname{corr}_{\langle \operatorname{string}_1 \rangle, \langle \operatorname{string}_2 \rangle, \ldots, \langle \operatorname{string}_n \rangle}$

will produce

 $A(string_1)ZA(string_2)Z...A(string_n)Z$

(We might also want to consider the case where there are no separators, so that an A and a Z will be inserted before and after each token or group.) We will use the token \marker as a "marker" to tell us when our recursion is over, so we define

\def\ismarker#1{\compare*\marker{#1}}

Now the basic idea is to define

(omitting the commas in these definitions for the case of no separators).

Unfortunately this won't work, because there are problems concerned with the removal of braces. Each time \op#1,#2 is used, argument #2 is the first token or group following the comma, and if it is a group the braces will be removed. The removal of braces again causes problems if #1 is something like {a\frac b}, and also if #2 is something like {(a, b)}, where the braces are meant to "hide" the comma. We could use \braced here, but it isn't quite foolproof, since #2 might be a "hidden" comma $\{,\}$, which \braced can't distinguish from an ordinary comma. Moreover, \braced can't help us with argument #1. Although this argument is usually a sequence, terminated by a comma, it just might happen to be a single group followed by a comma, and there is no way of distinguishing between these possibilities once argument #1 has been read.

In the cases where AMS-TEX uses a recursive scheme of this sort, the particular circumstances, or simple tricks, usually circumvent these problems. The following definition illustrates a general scheme that will always work:

```
\def\kill#1{}
\def\op#1,#2\endd{\ismarker{#2}
	 \if T\ans{A\kill#1Z\gdef\nextop{}}
	 \else{A\kill#1Z\gdef\nextop
	 {\op##2\endd}}
	 \nextop}
\def\operate#1{\op*#1,\marker\endd}
```

Notice that each time \op#1,#2\endd is used, argument #1 now begins with * (which is removed by \kill), so it can't possibly be a group. And argument #2 is always the remaining input, terminated by \marker, so it can't be a group either.

(c) A recursive procedure can be used to count the number of commas in a string:

Then

54

\countcommas(#1)
makes the value of \count1 be the
number of commas in #1.

The \endd trick is used to handle "hidden" commas, but the * trick isn't needed, since we don't care what \cm does to #1.

(d) If we do \countcommas{#1}, then \ifpos1 will tell us whether #1 contains at least one comma. But it is preferable to use the following scheme, which doesn't involve any counters, and which stops as soon as the first comma is found:

```
\def\cm#1,#2{\ismarker{#2}
	\if T\ans{\gdef\nextcm{}}
	\else{\gdef\Hascomma{T}
		\gdef\nextcm##1\marker{}}
	\nextcm}
\def\hascomma#1{\gdef\Hascomma{F}
		\cm#1,\marker}
```

(e) Suppose we want to perform the operation in part (b) on some input of the form

 $\langle \operatorname{string}_1 \rangle \setminus \langle \operatorname{string}_2 \rangle \setminus \ldots \setminus \langle \operatorname{string}_n \rangle$

where the separator is the control sequence \\ (which is never used in isolation, and is initially defined by \def\\{}). We could use exactly the same scheme, replacing \def\op#1,#2\endd by \def\op#1\\#2\endd. But we can also take advantage of the fact that the separator is a control sequence to obtain a definition that is both more elegant and more efficient:

The \def\op{} needs to be replaced by \gdef\op{} if \op puts things inside braces; in this case, the original definition of \op should be made part of the definition of \operate.

There might appear to be possible confusion if some $(string_i)$ contains $\$ within a group $\{\ldots,\ldots\}$. In AMS-TEX this occurs only in constructions like

{\align...\\...\endalign}

where \setminus is temporarily re-defined anyway.

V. Searching For Strings

TEX's method of determining where an argument in a definition ends has the following peculiar feature. Suppose we define

 $\det cs#1ab#2{...}$

Then the first argument is the smallest (possibly empty) token or group that is followed by a, *not* the smallest group that is followed by ab. So the input

\cs xayabc

gives the error message

! Use of \cs does not match its definition.

So if we want to know whether ab occurs in some string we can't simply replace the comma by ab in the method of part IV(d), because an a might occur alone. Instead we have to do something like the following:

```
\def\isb#1{\compare+b{#1}}
\def\finda#1a#2#3\endd{\ismarker{#2}
    \if T\ans{\gdef\nextfinda{}}
    \else{\isb{#2}
        \if T\ans{\gdef\Hasab{T}
            \gdef\nextfinda{}}
        \else{\gdef\nextfinda
            {\finda#2#3\endd}}
    \nextfinda
            {\finda#2#3\endd}}
\def\hasab#1{\gdef\Hasab{F}
            \finda#1a\marker\endd}
```

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * Problems

* * * * * * * * * * *

The first formatting problems posed in this column come from the videotaped TEXarcana Class taught by Don Knuth last March. Solutions will be presented in the next issue. Readers with working TEX systems are encouraged to attempt solutions to these problems, in order to better appreciate the problems and their solutions.

Lynne A. Price

Problem no. 1:

Type: \vskip 12pt \noindent\hide{--}Allan Temko

\vskip 2pt \noindent Architecture Critic

To get:

-Allan Temko Architecture Critic