

T_EX Programming: The past, the present, and the future

Abstract

This article summarizes a recent thread on the ConT_EXt mailing list.

(<http://archive.contextgarden.net/thread/20090304.193503.1c42e4d5.en.html/>)

To make the article interesting, I have changed the question and correspondingly modified the solutions.

Keywords

ConT_EXt, luaT_EX, T_EX Programming

Suppose you want to typeset (in ConT_EXt) all possible sums of roll of two dies, like this:

(+)	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
6	7	8	9	10	11	12

The mundane way to do this, *especially if you do not have too much time at hand*, is to type the whole thing by hand:

```
\bTABLE
  \bTR \bTD $(+)$ \eTD \bTD 1 \eTD \bTD 2 \eTD
    \bTD 3 \eTD \bTD 4 \eTD \bTD 5 \eTD \bTD 6 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 1 \eTD \bTD 2 \eTD \bTD 3 \eTD
    \bTD 4 \eTD \bTD 5 \eTD \bTD 6 \eTD \bTD 7 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 2 \eTD \bTD 3 \eTD \bTD 4 \eTD
    \bTD 5 \eTD \bTD 6 \eTD \bTD 7 \eTD \bTD 8 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 3 \eTD \bTD 4 \eTD \bTD 5 \eTD
    \bTD 6 \eTD \bTD 7 \eTD \bTD 8 \eTD \bTD 9 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 4 \eTD \bTD 5 \eTD \bTD 6 \eTD
    \bTD 7 \eTD \bTD 8 \eTD \bTD 9 \eTD \bTD 10 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 5 \eTD \bTD 6 \eTD \bTD 7 \eTD
    \bTD 8 \eTD \bTD 9 \eTD \bTD 10 \eTD \bTD 11 \eTD \eTR
  \bTR \bTD 6 \eTD \bTD 7 \eTD \bTD 8 \eTD
    \bTD 9 \eTD \bTD 10 \eTD \bTD 11 \eTD \bTD 12 \eTD \eTR
\eTABLE
```

I am using Natural Tables since it is easy to configure its output (see <http://www.pragma-ade.com/general/manuals/enatatab.pdf/>). For example, to get the effect shown above, I use the following setup:

```
\setupTABLE[each][each][width=2em,height=2em,align={middle,middle}]
\setupTABLE[r][1][background=color,backgroundcolor=gray]
\setupTABLE[c][1][background=color,backgroundcolor=gray]
```

Natural tables, however, are not the focus of this article. It is rather, what would you do if you are adventurous and have time at hand. The above is a repetitive task, so it should be possible to automate it. That will save typing errors (unless you make a mistake in your algorithm) and make the code reusable. In any ordinary programming language you could easily write something like the following pseudo code

```
start_table
start_table_row
  table_element("(")
  for y in [1..6] do
    table_element(y)
  stop_table_row
for x in [1..6] do
  start_table_row
  table_element(x)
  for y in [1..6] do
    table_element(x+y)
  end
  stop_table_row
end
stop_table
```

But \TeX is no ordinary programming language! Lets try to do this using $\text{Con}\text{\TeX}$ t's equivalent of a for-loop— \dorecure

```
\bTABLE
\bTR
  \bTD $(+)$ \eTD
  \dorecure{6}
  {\bTD \recurselevel \eTD}
  \eTR
\dorecure{6}
{\bTR
  \bTD \recurselevel \eTD
  \edef\firstrecurselevel{\recurselevel}
  \dorecure{6}
  {\bTD \the\numexpr\firstrecurselevel+\recurselevel \eTD}
  \eTR}
\eTABLE
```

This, however, does not work as expected because \dorecure is not fully expandable. One way to get around this problem is to *expand* the appropriate parts of the body of \dorecure

```
\bTABLE
\bTR
  \bTD $(+)$ \eTD
  \dorecure{6}
  {\expandafter \bTD \recurselevel \eTD}
```

```

\eTR
\dorecurse{6}
{\bTR
  \edef\firstrecurselevel{\recurselevel}
  \expandafter\bTD \recurselevel \eTD
\dorecurse{6}
{\expandafter\bTD
  \the\numexpr\firstrecurselevel+\recurselevel\relax
  \eTD}
\eTR}
\TABLE

```

Behold, the `\expandafter`! So, what is this expansion stuff, and why do we need `\expandafter`. T_EX has a esoteric executing model, which was succinctly explained by David Kastrup in his T_EX interview (<http://www.tug.org/interviews/interview-files/david-kastrup.html/>)

“Instead, macros are used as a substitute for programming. T_EX’s macro expansion language is the only way to implement conditionals and loops, but the corresponding control variables can’t be influenced by macro expansion (T_EX’s “mouth” in Knuth’s terminology). Instead assignments must be executed by the back end (T_EX’s “stomach”). Stomach and mouth execute at different times and independently from one another. But it is not possible to solve nontrivial programming tasks with either: only the unholy chimera made from both can solve serious problems. ϵ -T_EX gives the mouth a few more teeth and changes some of that, but the changes are not really fundamental: expansion still makes no assignments.”

So, where do we add the `\expandafters`? It’s simple, once you get the hang of it (Taco Hoekwater in a ConT_EXt mailing list thread (<http://archive.contextgarden.net/message/20060702.141636.a57e6b68.en.html/>))

“The trick to `\expandafter` is that you (normally) write it backwards until reaching a moment in time where TeX is not scanning an argument.

Say you have a macro that contains some stuff in it to be typeset by `\type`:

```
\def\mystuff{Some literal stuff}
```

Then you begin with

```
\type{\mystuff}
```

but that obviously doesn’t work, you want the final input to look like

```
\type{Some literal stuff}
```

Since `\expandafter` expands the token that follows after next token—whatever the next token is—you have to insert it backwards across the opening brace of the argument, like so:

```
\type\expandafter{\mystuff}
```

But this wouldn’t work, yet: you are still in the middle of an expression (the `\type` expects an argument, and it gets `\expandafter` as it stands).

Luckily, `\expandafter` itself is an expandable command, so you jump back once more and insert another one:

```
\expandafter\type\expandafter{\mystuff}
```

Now you are on ‘neutral ground’, and can stop backtracking. *Easy, once you get the hang of it.*”

If you do not get the hang of it, relax. ConT_EXt provides a command `\expanded` that expands its arguments.

```
\bTABLE
\bTR
  \bTD $(+)$ \eTD
\dorecurse{6}
  {\expanded{\bTD \recurselevel \eTD}}
\eTR
\dorecurse{6}
  {\bTR
    \expanded{\bTD \recurselevel \eTD}
    \edef\firstrecurselevel{\recurselevel}
    \dorecurse{6}
    {\expanded{\bTD
      \the\numexpr\firstrecurselevel+\recurselevel\relax \eTD}}
  \eTR}
\eTABLE
```

Using `\expanded` is easier than using `\expandafter`, but you still need to understand T_EX's expansion mechanism to get it right. For example, if you try

```
...
\dorecurse{6}
  {\expanded{\bTR
    \bTD \recurselevel \eTD
    \edef\firstrecurselevel{\recurselevel}
    \dorecurse{6}
    {\expanded{\bTD
      \the\numexpr\firstrecurselevel+\recurselevel\relax \eTD}}
  \eTR}}
...
```

you will get all sorts of T_EX errors, and you need to sprinkle `\noexpand` at correct places to get it to work. So, `\expanded` is not a silver bullet.

In the above mention mailing list thread, Wolfgang Schuster posted a much neater solution.

```
\bTABLE
\bTR
  \bTD $(+)$ \eTD
\dorecurse{6}
  {\bTD #1 \eTD}
\eTR
\dorecurse{6}
  {\bTR
    \bTD #1 \eTD
    \dorecurse{6}
    {\bTD \the\numexpr#1+##1 \eTD}
  \eTR}
\eTABLE
```

This makes T_EX disguise as a **normal** programming language. But only T_EX wizards like Wolfgang can discover such solutions. You need to know the TeX digestive system inside out to even attempt something like this. Inspired by Wolfgang's solution, I tried the same thing with ConT_EXt's lesser known for loops

```

\begin{table}
\begin{tr}
\begin{td}$(+)$\end{td}
\for \y=1 \to 6 \step 1 \do
{\begin{td} #1 \end{td}}
\end{tr}
\for \x=1 \to 6 \step 1 \do
{\begin{tr}
\begin{td} #1 \end{td}
\for \y=1 \to 6 \step 1 \do
{\begin{td} \the\numexpr#1+##1 \end{td}}
\end{tr}}
\end{table}

```

Is your head hurting. Don't worry. luaT_EX provides hope that normal users can do simple programming tasks. Luigi Scarso posted the following code:

```

\startluacode
  tprint = function(s) tex.sprint(tex.ctxcatcodes,s) end
  tprint('\begin{table}')
  tprint('\begin{tr}')
  tprint('\begin{td}$(+)$\end{td}')
  for y = 1,6 do
    tprint('\begin{td} ' .. y .. '\end{td}')
  end
  tprint('\end{tr}')
  for x = 1,6 do
    tprint('\begin{tr}')
    tprint('\begin{td} ' .. x .. '\end{td}')
    for y = 1,6 do
      tprint('\begin{td} ' .. x+y .. '\end{td}')
    end
    tprint('\end{tr}')
  end
  tprint('\end{table}')
\stopluacode

```

Finally luaT_EX offers a simple way of implementing simple algorithms inside T_EX. There is no need to know T_EX's digressive system. Write code as you would write in any other programming language!

If you are a T_EX programming guru who can keep track of T_EX's expansion mechanism, don't fear luaT_EX. There are other options for you: mix T_EX and MetaPost.

```

\let\normalbTABLE\begin{table}
\let\normaleTABLE\end{table}

\unexpanded\def\bTABLE{\normalbTABLE}
\unexpanded\def\eTABLE{\normaleTABLE}

\unexpanded\def\dobTR{\dodoubleempty\parseTR}
\unexpanded\def\dobTD{\dodoubleempty\parseTD}
\unexpanded\def\dobTH{\dodoubleempty\parseTH}
\unexpanded\def\dobTN{\dodoubleempty\parseTN}

\let\bTR\dobTR
\let\bTD\dobTD
\let\bTH\dobTH

```

```
\let\BTN\dobTN

\startMPcode
  string table ;
  table = "\bTABLE \bTR \bTD $(+)$ \eTD" &
  for y = 1 upto 6 :
    "\bTD " & decimal y & "\eTD " &
  endfor
  "\eTR " &
  for x = 1 upto 6 :
    "\bTR \bTD " & decimal x & "\eTD " &
    for y = 1 upto 6 :
      "\bTD " & decimal (x+y) & "\eTD " &
    endfor
    "\eTR" &
  endfor
  "\eTABLE" ;
  label(texttext(table), origin) ;
\stopMPcode
```

Aditya Mahajan
adityam@umich.edu