Dec@ding style files

Andres Löh Universiteit Utrecht andres@cs.uu.nl

November 8, 2002

Have you ever looked at a ${\mathbin{\,{\rm L}}}{\mathop{\rm TE}}{\mathop{\rm X}}$ style (package) file?

Have you ever looked at a LATEX style (package) file?

→ We will do that.

Have you ever looked at a LATEX style (package) file?

- → We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.

Have you ever looked at a ${\mathbin{\rm L\!A}} T_{\!E\!} X$ style (package) file?

- ➔ We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.
- → We will explore some of the theory necessary to understand what is going on in style files.

Have you ever looked at a ${\mathbin{\rm L\!A}} T_{\!E\!} X$ style (package) file?

- ➔ We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.
- → We will explore some of the theory necessary to understand what is going on in style files.
- → We will learn that LATEX offers an extremely powerful, but also extremely confusing programming language.

Have you ever looked at a ${\mathbin{\rm L\!A}} T_{\!E\!} X$ style (package) file?

- ➔ We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.
- → We will explore some of the theory necessary to understand what is going on in style files.
- → We will learn that LATEX offers an extremely powerful, but also extremely confusing programming language.
- → We will **not** learn how to write own programs/styles for LATEX.

Have you ever looked at a LATEX style (package) file?

- ➔ We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.
- → We will explore some of the theory necessary to understand what is going on in style files.
- → We will learn that LATEX offers an extremely powerful, but also extremely confusing programming language.
- → We will **not** learn how to write own programs/styles for LATEX.
- → We will **not** explain everything in detail.

Have you ever looked at a LATEX style (package) file?

- ➔ We will do that.
- → We will learn that there is much more to know about LATEX than is covered by most LATEX books.
- → We will explore some of the theory necessary to understand what is going on in style files.
- → We will learn that LATEX offers an extremely powerful, but also extremely confusing programming language.
- → We will **not** learn how to write own programs/styles for LATEX.
- → We will **not** explain everything in detail.

Don't panic!

 LAT_EX provides the \sepackage command:

LATEX provides the \usepackage command:

\usepackage{tabularx}
\usepackage[german]{babel}

→ There is a huge amount of packages available for LATEX – far more than are shipped with the common distributions.

LATEX provides the \usepackage command:

- → There is a huge amount of packages available for LATEX far more than are shipped with the common distributions.
- → Check www.ctan.org if you are interested.

LATEX provides the \usepackage command:

- → There is a huge amount of packages available for LATEX far more than are shipped with the common distributions.
- → Check www.ctan.org if you are interested.
- The command usepackage essentially includes the corresponding style file into your LATEX source.
 - \usepackage{tabularx} would look for tabularx.sty.
 - \usepackage{babel} would look for babel.sty.

LATEX provides the \usepackage command:

- → There is a huge amount of packages available for LATEX far more than are shipped with the common distributions.
- → Check www.ctan.org if you are interested.
- The command usepackage essentially includes the corresponding style file into your LATEX source.
 - \usepackage{tabularx} would look for tabularx.sty.
 - \usepackage{babel} would look for babel.sty.
- → Options (in square brackets) can be passed to the packages.

→ They can change the behaviour of LATEX (for instance, by redefining existing commands).

- → They can change the behaviour of LATEX (for instance, by redefining existing commands).
- → They can **provide new** commands (and environments).

- → They can change the behaviour of LATEX (for instance, by redefining existing commands).
- → They can **provide new** commands (and environments).
- → In principle, style files are nothing more than LATEX sources themselves.

- → They can change the behaviour of LATEX (for instance, by redefining existing commands).
- → They can **provide new** commands (and environments).
- → In principle, style files are nothing more than LATEX sources themselves.

But ...

An excerpt from the tabularx style file

```
[...]
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnumO=`}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

```
\let\endtabularx\relax
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
    {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
\def\TX@{tabularx}
[...]
```

An excerpt from the tabularx style file

```
[...]
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
   {\ifnumO=`}\fi
   \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
   \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
   \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

```
\let\endtabularx\relax
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
    {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
\def\TX@ftabularx}
[...]
```

An excerpt from the tabularx style file

```
[...]
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnumO=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

```
\let\endtabularx\relax
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
    {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
\def\TX@ftabularx}
[...]
```

→ The code looks generally cryptic.

- → The code looks generally cryptic.
- → It seems to use all sorts of strange commands.

- → The code looks generally cryptic.
- → It seems to use all sorts of strange commands.
- → If one looks, for instance, into the LATEX Companion one will not find any explanation.

- → The code looks generally cryptic.
- → It seems to use all sorts of strange commands.
- → If one looks, for instance, into the LATEX Companion one will not find any explanation.
- → (Nevertheless, the LATEX companion is a very nice book and hereby recommended.)

- → The code looks generally cryptic.
- → It seems to use all sorts of strange commands.
- If one looks, for instance, into the LATEX Companion one will not find any explanation.
- → (Nevertheless, the LATEX companion is a very nice book and hereby recommended.)
- → In fact, we deal here with primitive and LATEX kernel commands ...

→ **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.

- → T_{EX} is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.

- → **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.
- → For T_EX to be usable, Knuth also created a set of useful macros called plainT_EX.

- → **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.
- → For T_EX to be usable, Knuth also created a set of useful macros called plainT_EX.
- → Later, Leslie Lamport developed a far more sophisticated (and complex) macro package that he called IATEX.

- → **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.
- → For T_EX to be usable, Knuth also created a set of useful macros called plainT_EX.
- → Later, Leslie Lamport developed a far more sophisticated (and complex) macro package that he called IATEX.
- → To facilitate the switch for former plainTEX users, he included most of plainTEX's macros in LATEX, but additionally created improved versions of these commands.

- → **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.
- → For T_EX to be usable, Knuth also created a set of useful macros called plainT_EX.
- → Later, Leslie Lamport developed a far more sophisticated (and complex) macro package that he called IATEX.
- To facilitate the switch for former plainTEX users, he included most of plainTEX's macros in LATEX, but additionally created improved versions of these commands.
- → The key to LATEX's success is its class/package system which makes it easy to integrate third-party extensions into LATEX.

- → **T**_E**X** is a typesetting system created by Donald E. Knuth.
- → T_EX itself offers only a small number of primitive commands, but is programmable through a powerful macro language.
- → For T_EX to be usable, Knuth also created a set of useful macros called plainT_EX.
- → Later, Leslie Lamport developed a far more sophisticated (and complex) macro package that he called IATEX.
- To facilitate the switch for former plainTEX users, he included most of plainTEX's macros in LATEX, but additionally created improved versions of these commands.
- → The key to LATEX's success is its class/package system which makes it easy to integrate third-party extensions into LATEX.
- → The term LATEX nowadays refers to all packages available for it. The core macro package originally written by Lamport is called the LATEX kernel or LATEX format.

What do we learn from that?

- T_EX is the name of the underlying typesetting system.
- → When we call latex on the command line, we still call T_EX, but with the LAT_EX format preloaded.
- → When we call tex on the command line, then T_EX with the plainT_EX format would be used.
- There are more formats than just plainTEX and LATEX, some of them more recent, among them the very promising ConTEXt.

What has @ll this t@ do with style files?

If we encounter unknown commands (for instance in in style files), that can have multiple reasons:
If we encounter unknown commands (for instance in in style files), that can have multiple reasons:

→ The command is defined in another style (or the class) file.

If we encounter unknown commands (for instance in in style files), that can have multiple reasons:

- → The command is defined in another style (or the class) file.
- → The command is defined by the LATEX kernel. Maybe it is even a plainTEX command that is included in the LATEX kernel.

If we encounter unknown commands (for instance in in style files), that can have multiple reasons:

- → The command is defined in another style (or the class) file.
- → The command is defined by the LATEX kernel. Maybe it is even a plainTEX command that is included in the LATEX kernel.
- → The command is a primitive command.

If we encounter unknown commands (for instance in in style files), that can have multiple reasons:

- → The command is defined in another style (or the class) file.
- → The command is defined by the LATEX kernel. Maybe it is even a plainTEX command that is included in the LATEX kernel.
- → The command is a primitive command.

If a LATEX book does not explain a certain command, we might have a chance looking at

- → the LAT_EX kernel sources;
- → books about plainT_EX and T_EX itself.

▲T_EX tries to hide a great number of commands from the user.
→ If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.

- → If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.
- The author of a style file can in this manner distinguish between

- → If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.
- The author of a style file can in this manner distinguish between
 - internal macros that are only used inside the package

- → If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.
- The author of a style file can in this manner distinguish between
 - internal macros that are only used inside the package
 - external macros that provide the interface to the package for a user

- → If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.
- The author of a style file can in this manner distinguish between
 - internal macros that are only used inside the package
 - external macros that provide the interface to the package for a user
- → The LATEX kernel itself defines a huge number of internal commands that are also used by package authors.

- → If a command contains an @, it is not accessible in normal source files, but only in style files.
- The author of a style file can in this manner distinguish between
 - internal macros that are only used inside the package
 - external macros that provide the interface to the package for a user
- → The LATEX kernel itself defines a huge number of internal commands that are also used by package authors.
- Note that there is (unfortunately) no namespace management in LATEX. Internal commands defined in one package are still visible in all other packages.

A tour of the tabularx package

The package defines an environment tabularx, which is based upon tabular. Given a total (target) width, it can compute the width of one or more columns automatically.

- The package defines an environment tabularx, which is based upon tabular. Given a total (target) width, it can compute the width of one or more columns automatically.
- The package tabularx is not a typical package, because it is very well documented.

- The package defines an environment tabularx, which is based upon tabular. Given a total (target) width, it can compute the width of one or more columns automatically.
- The package tabularx is not a typical package, because it is very well documented.
- → We will review (a part of) the source file page by page.

- The package defines an environment tabularx, which is based upon tabular. Given a total (target) width, it can compute the width of one or more columns automatically.
- The package tabularx is not a typical package, because it is very well documented.
- → We will review (a part of) the source file page by page.
- → We will introduce and discuss new concepts as we encounter them.

- The package defines an environment tabularx, which is based upon tabular. Given a total (target) width, it can compute the width of one or more columns automatically.
- The package tabularx is not a typical package, because it is very well documented.
- → We will review (a part of) the source file page by page.
- → We will introduce and discuss new concepts as we encounter them.
- → We will concentrate on the general ideas and skip many details.

In the Obeginning

```
%%
%%
%% This is file 'tabularx.sty',
%% generated with the docstrip utility.
%%
%% The original source files were:
%%
%% tabularx.dtx (with options: 'package')
%%
%% This is a generated file.
%%
%% Copyright 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000
%% The LaTeX3 Project and any individual authors listed elsewhere
%% in this file.
[...]
```

In the Obeginning

```
%%
%%
%% This is file 'tabularx.sty',
%% generated with the docstrip utility.
%%
%% The original source files were:
%%
%% tabularx.dtx (with options: 'package')
%%
%% This is a generated file.
%%
%% Copyright 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000
%% The LaTeX3 Project and any individual authors listed elsewhere
%% in this file.
[...]
```

The file starts with commentary, explaining the nature of the file.

In the Obeginning

```
%%
%%
%% This is file 'tabularx.sty',
%% generated with the docstrip utility.
%%
%% The original source files were:
%%
%% tabularx.dtx (with options: 'package')
%%
%% This is a generated file.
%%
%% Copyright 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000
%% The LaTeX3 Project and any individual authors listed elsewhere
%% in this file.
[...]
```

- The file starts with commentary, explaining the nature of the file.
- Obviously, this file has been generated from yet another file, namely tabularx.dtx, with the help of a mysterious tool called docstrip.

→ Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.

- Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.
- The program code is embedded in a file which can be typeset by T_EX, yielding a nicely typeset version of the program code together with its documentation.

- Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.
- The program code is embedded in a file which can be typeset by T_EX, yielding a nicely typeset version of the program code together with its documentation.

docstrip - literate programming in LATEX

→ The docstrip utility (written in LATEX!) has been designed in this spirit, to allow LATEX package writers to use literate programming.

- Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.
- The program code is embedded in a file which can be typeset by T_EX, yielding a nicely typeset version of the program code together with its documentation.

docstrip - literate programming in LATEX

- → The docstrip utility (written in LATEX!) has been designed in this spirit, to allow LATEX package writers to use literate programming.
- A central source file (with extension .dtx) contains documentation as well as all the program code.

- Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.
- The program code is embedded in a file which can be typeset by T_EX, yielding a nicely typeset version of the program code together with its documentation.

docstrip - literate programming in LATEX

- → The docstrip utility (written in LATEX!) has been designed in this spirit, to allow LATEX package writers to use literate programming.
- A central source file (with extension .dtx) contains documentation as well as all the program code.
- → LATEX can be run on the .dtx to generate the package documentation.

- Knuth himself favored a style of programming where the program documents itself.
- The program code is embedded in a file which can be typeset by T_EX, yielding a nicely typeset version of the program code together with its documentation.

docstrip - literate programming in LATEX

- The docstrip utility (written in LATEX!) has been designed in this spirit, to allow LATEX package writers to use literate programming.
- A central source file (with extension .dtx) contains documentation as well as all the program code.
- → LATEX can be run on the .dtx to generate the package documentation.
- The docstrip utility can be run on the .dtx to extract all the program code, i.e. to produce the .sty file.

Pr@ctical information about docstrip

- → If you download a package (for instance from CTAN), you often get just two files: an installation script .ins, and the literate source .dtx.
- Run LATEX on the .ins file. This will call docstrip on the .dtx to generate all the needed source files, among them the .sty style file.
- → Run LATEX on the .dtx file directly to generate the documentation.
- → The docstrip program **is** documented in the LATEX companion.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

\NeedsTeXFormat{LaTeX2e}
\ProvidesPackage{tabularx}
 [1999/01/07 v2.07 'tabularx' package (DPC)]
\DeclareOption{infoshow}{\AtEndOfPackage\tracingtabularx}
\DeclareOption{debugshow}{\AtEndOfPackage\tracingtabularx}
\ProcessOptions
\RequirePackage{array}[1994/02/03]

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

→ NeedsTeXFormat states that the package requires the current LATEX version LATEX 2 $_{\mathcal{E}}$ and will not work with older versions of LATEX.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

\NeedsTeXFormat{LaTeX2e}
\ProvidesPackage{tabularx}
 [1999/01/07 v2.07 'tabularx' package (DPC)]
\DeclareOption{infoshow}{\AtEndOfPackage\tracingtabularx}
\DeclareOption{debugshow}{\AtEndOfPackage\tracingtabularx}
\ProcessOptions
\RequirePackage{array}[1994/02/03]

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

 ProvidesPackage is used to give the name of the package and version information.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

 DeclareOption can be used to declare options that can be passed to the package in square brackets to activate or deactivate specific functionality.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

 ProcessOptions is needed to really parse the options passed to the package and execute the appropriate commands.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

 RequirePackage is the package writer's version of \usepackage. It loads a package, but only if it has not yet been loaded.

We skip the license and the copyright. The package's author is David Carlisle, who wrote a great number of excellent packages and participates actively in the development of the LATEX kernel.

LATEX provides a limited amount of package and version management:

 AtEndOfPackage can be used to store a command for execution at the end of the package.
 Question: Why not execute it here?

Reserving@ registers

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:
\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

newdimen allocates a dimension register. It can store a numerical value plus a unit, for example a length or a width. Valid values would be 1em or 7.3cm.

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

newcount allocates a counter register. It can store a (possibly negative) integer value, such as -2 or 7. Possible applications would be counters for the current page number, or the current chapter number.

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

newif allocates a boolean. It can only store true or false. Decisions can be made depending on the current value of the boolean.

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

There are more: \newtoks allocates a token register. It can store a number of words from the input stream. We will hear more about those later.

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

Inewbox allocates a box register. Boxes can contain portions of typeset text. They can be measured.

\newdimen\TX@col@width
\newdimen\TX@old@table
\newdimen\TX@old@col
\newdimen\TX@target
\newdimen\TX@delta
\newcount\TX@cols
\newif\ifTX@

T_EX has so-called registers, slots in memory for values of a certain number of datatypes:

- \newskip allocates a new skip register. Skips are similar to dimensions, but can contain stretchable and/or shrinkable glue. We will not need them.
- There are yet more that we do not need: \newmuskip for mathematical skips, \newread and \newwrite for file input/output, \newfam for math families, and \newlanguage for hyphenation rules.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnum0=`}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnum0='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnumO='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

The plan

 On encountering a tabularx environment, scan the input until the end of the environment.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnumO='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

- On encountering a tabularx environment, scan the input until the end of the environment.
- Store the contents of the environment somewhere for later use (in a token register).

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnumO='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

- On encountering a tabularx environment, scan the input until the end of the environment.
- Store the contents of the environment somewhere for later use (in a token register).
- ➔ Do several trial runs to determine the width of the X columns.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnumO='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

- On encountering a tabularx environment, scan the input until the end of the environment.
- Store the contents of the environment somewhere for later use (in a token register).
- → Do several trial runs to determine the width of the X columns.
- → Typeset the environment with the computed column widths.

Definitions with \def?

- → In \square T_EX, new commands are defined using \newcommand.
- → $\$ \newcommand is defined in the LAT_EX kernel.
- → \def is the T_EX **primitive** to define new commands.
- → \newcommand uses \def internally.

Definitions with \def?

- ✤ In LATEX, new commands are defined using \newcommand.
- → \def is the T_EX **primitive** to define new commands.
- → \newcommand uses \def internally.

The definition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}[n]{replacement text using #1 to #n}

corresponds (more or less) to

\def\MyCommand#1#2...#n{replacement text using #1 to #n}

Definitions with \def?

- → In LATEX, new commands are defined using \newcommand.
- → \newcommand is defined in the LAT_EX kernel.
- → \def is the T_EX **primitive** to define new commands.
- → \newcommand uses \def internally.

The definition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}[n]{replacement text using #1 to #n}

corresponds (more or less) to

\def\MyCommand#1#2...#n{replacement text using #1 to #n}

Therefore

\def\tabularx#1{%

is not much different from

 $\mbox{newcommand}[1]{%}$

A brief l@@k at the definition of \newcommand

```
\def\newcommand{\@star@or@long\new@command}
\def\new@command#1{%
  \@testopt{\@newcommand#1}0}
\def\@newcommand#1[#2]{%
  \@ifnextchar [{\@xargdef#1[#2]}{\@argdef#1[#2]}}
\log\ef\0argdef#1[#2]#3{%}
   \@ifdefinable #1{\@yargdef#1\@ne{#2}{#3}}}
\long \def \@yargdef #1#2#3{%
  \ifx#2\tw@
    \def\reserved@b##11{[####1]}%
  \else
   \let\reserved@b\@gobble
  \fi
  \expandafter
    \@yargd@f \expandafter{\number #3}#1}
\long \def \@yargd@f#1#2{%
  \def \reserved@a ##1#1##2##{%
    \expandafter\def\expandafter#2\reserved@b ##1#1}%
  \l@ngrel@x \reserved@a 0##1##2##3##4##5##6##7##8##9###1}
```

Who can find the relevant occurrence of \def?

A brief l@@k at the definition of \newcommand

```
\def\newcommand{\@star@or@long\new@command}
\def\new@command#1{%
  \@testopt{\@newcommand#1}0}
\def\@newcommand#1[#2]{%
  \@ifnextchar [{\@xargdef#1[#2]}{\@argdef#1[#2]}}
\log\ef\0argdef#1[#2]#3{%}
   \@ifdefinable #1{\@yargdef#1\@ne{#2}{#3}}}
\long \def \@yargdef #1#2#3{%
  \ifx#2\tw@
    \def\reserved@b##11{[####1]}%
  \else
   \let\reserved@b\@gobble
  \fi
  \expandafter
    \@yargd@f \expandafter{\number #3}#1}
\long \def \@yargd@f#1#2{%
  \def \reserved@a ##1#1##2##{%
    \expandafter\def\expandafter#2\reserved@b ##1#1}%
  \l@ngrel@x \reserved@a 0##1##2##3##4##5##6##7##8##9###1}
```

Who can find the relevant occurrence of \def? There it is!

Where to find th@t?

Where to find th@t?

Look in the sources

If you know approximately where the command comes from, you can check the sources directly. For instance, \newcommand is defined in the file ltdefns.dtx. One can also look in the typeset version of the kernel sources, source2e.ps.

Where to find th@t?

Look in the sources

If you know approximately where the command comes from, you can check the sources directly. For instance, \newcommand is defined in the file ltdefns.dtx. One can also look in the typeset version of the kernel sources, source2e.ps.

Use \show

 T_EX provides the primitive command \show. You can ask for the definition of a command with \show (but you won't get any documentation).

- → Similar to command definitions, LATEX knows environments.
- → Environments can be defined with

\newenvironment{name}{code at beginning}{code at end}

→ They can be used in blocks of the form

```
\begin{name}
[...]
\end{name}
```

- → Similar to command definitions, LATEX knows environments.
- → Environments can be defined with

\newenvironment{name}{code at beginning}{code at end}

→ They can be used in blocks of the form

```
\begin{name}
[...]
\end{name}
```

→ Internally, \newenvironment{name} defines two commands \name and \endname. These are executed by \begin and \end.

- → Similar to command definitions, LATEX knows environments.
- → Environments can be defined with

\newenvironment{name}{code at beginning}{code at end}

→ They can be used in blocks of the form

```
\begin{name}
[...]
\end{name}
```

- → Internally, \newenvironment{name} defines two commands \name and \endname. These are executed by \begin and \end.
- → The environment we are currently in is always available via the internal LATEX command \@currenvir.

- → Similar to command definitions, LATEX knows environments.
- → Environments can be defined with

\newenvironment{name}{code at beginning}{code at end}

→ They can be used in blocks of the form

```
\begin{name}
[...]
\end{name}
```

- Internally, \newenvironment{name} defines two commands \name and \endname. These are executed by \begin and \end.
- → The environment we are currently in is always available via the internal LATEX command \@currenvir.

Now let's have another look at the tabularx sources ...

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnum0=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
   {\ifnum0=`}\fi
   \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
   \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
   \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

With \tabularx, the beginning of the tabularx environment is defined!

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnumO=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

This occurrence of \endtabularx has oviously something to do with the end of the environment (although we don't know yet what \let does).

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnum0=`}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

 Here, the name of the current environment is stored (although we don't know yet what \edef does).

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
    {\ifnum0=`}\fi
    \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
    \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
    \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

This is completely strange (and, in fact, a very dirty trick which is described in the T_EXbook).

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnumO=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

The tabularx environment gets as argument the desired total width of the table. This width is stored in a dimension register.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnumO=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

 We print something to the log, using a command later defined in tabularx.sty.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
   {\ifnumO=`}\fi
   \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
   \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
   \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

 Here, we initialise a globally predefined token register (it is defined in the LATEX kernel) to the empty token list.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnum0=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

→ This calls the command that continues the work.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnum0=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We know a bit more now:

But first more about \def, \edef, and \let ...

About m@cros and expansion

An example

\begin{enumerate}
\item We save the current environment in a new command.
\newcommand{\envsave}{\@currenvir}

\item And now print it:
 \begin{center}
 \envsave
 \end{center}
\end{enumerate}

Question: What do think will be the result?

About m@cros and expansion

An example

```
\begin{enumerate}
\item We save the current environment in a new command.
\newcommand{\envsave}{\@currenvir}
```

```
\item And now print it:
   \begin{center}
   \envsave
   \end{center}
\end{enumerate}
```

Question: What do think will be the result? Answer:

- 1. We save the current environment in a new command.
- 2. And now print it:

center
About m@cros and expansion

An example

```
\begin{enumerate}
\item We save the current environment in a new command.
\def\envsave{\@currenvir}
```

```
\item And now print it:
   \begin{center}
   \envsave
   \end{center}
\end{enumerate}
```

Replacing \newcommand by \def does not change anything:

- 1. We save the current environment in a new command.
- 2. And now print it:

center

About m@cros and expansion

An example

```
\begin{enumerate}
\item We save the current environment in a new command.
\edef\envsave{\@currenvir}
```

```
\item And now print it:
   \begin{center}
   \envsave
   \end{center}
\end{enumerate}
```

But using \edef does change a lot:

- 1. We save the current environment in a new command.
- 2. And now print it:

enumerate

To expand or n@t to expand

- → \def defines a macro. The replacement text is stored as is, and inserted at the position where the macro is called.
- → This replacement is called **expanding** the macro.
- Image: Vedef\name first expands its argument as completely as possible (say, to result and the defines \name to expand to result directly.

→ Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- → But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

\MyCommand

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: \Mycommand\xspace\xspace

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: \Mycommand\xspace\xspace

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: Mycommand\xspace\xspace

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: More: \Mycommand\xspace\xspace

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: More: Mycommand\xspace\xspace\xspace

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 1: Naïve redefinition

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}

Won't work! This is what happens if \MyCommand is expanded:

More: More: More: Mycommand\xspace\xspace\xspace

T_EX runs out of memory ...

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 2: Using \edef

Will work sometimes, but not in general. Assume

```
\newcommand{\MyCommand}{%
   \addtocounter{equation}{1} and some text}
\edef{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}
```

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 2: Using \edef

Will work sometimes, but not in general. Assume

```
\newcommand{\MyCommand}{%
   \addtocounter{equation}{1} and some text}
\edef{\MyCommand}{More: \MyCommand\xspace}
```

The execution of \edef will fail because \addtocounter (being an assignment to a register) cannot (and should not) be completely expanded.

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

\MyCommand

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

- → Easy, you say! Take \renewcommand (or just use \def again).
- But what if we want to use the old meaning (i.e. expansion) of the command in defining the new?

Attempt 3: Using \let

With \let, we can introduce an alias for the current expansion of a command (which is exactly what we need here).

\newcommand{\MyCommand}{something}
\let\OldMyCommand\MyCommand % save meaning of MyCommand
\renewcommand{\MyCommand}{%
 More: \OldMyCommand\xspace} % use saved meaning

Now the expansion runs as expected:

More: *something*\xspace

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnum0=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnum0=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

At the beginning of a tabularx environment, we first save the current environment name in macro TX@. Isn't that always tabularx? Not necessarily (exercise).

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnum0='}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

→ This was the dirty trick. Let's just say that it opens a group.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
   {\ifnum0=`}\fi
   \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
   \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
   \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

→ We store the target length in a register for further use.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
{\ifnum0=`}\fi
\setlength\TX@target{#1}%
\TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
\toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

→ We print some debugging information.

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
   {\ifnumO=`}\fi
   \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
   \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
   \toks@{}\TX@get@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

 We initialise a token register to the empty list and continue with \TX@get@body.
Yet an@ther look

```
\def\tabularx#1{%
\edef\TX@{\@currenvir}%
 {\ifnumO=`}\fi
 \setlength\TX@target{#1}%
 \TX@typeout{Target width: #1 = \the\TX@target.}%
 \toks@{}\TX@gt@body}
```

\let\endtabularx\relax

We can almost completely understand the code now:

→ We let the end-part of the two environment-related macros mean the same as \relax, which is a T_EX primitive that does (almost) nothing.

Sc@nning the contents

The next thing that is accomplished in the tabularx style is that the contents of the environment are scanned and saved.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
    {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

Again, first the plan

- → We scan until the next occurrence of \end in the input.
- → We add the tokens to the register so far.
- → If the \end ends the tabularx, we are done and can then try to typeset the table.
- → If the \end ends some other (nested) environment, we have to repeat the procedure.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- \long modifies \def; arguments to the defined macro may then span multiple paragraphs
- Inewcommand always uses \long\def, but \newcommand* uses plain \def.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

→ \def has another interesting feature: You can specify delimiters for macro arguments.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- \def has another interesting feature: You can specify delimiters for macro arguments.
- Normally, an argument is either grouped with { and } or consists just of a single token. Here, it extends until the next \end in the input stream.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- \def has another interesting feature: You can specify delimiters for macro arguments.
- Normally, an argument is either grouped with { and } or consists just of a single token. Here, it extends until the next \end in the input stream.
- → The \end itself will not be part of the argument.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

→ For multiple arguments one can have multiple delimiters.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

➔ For multiple arguments one can have multiple delimiters.

\def\MyRemark#1.#2\End{%
 \noindent\textbf{#1.}\quad #2 \hfill\$\bullet\$\par}

\MyRemark Nota bene. \TeX's macro definition construct is extremely powerful.\End

will result in **Nota bene.** T_EX's macro definition construct is extremely powerful.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

 In normal documents, use of \def is discouraged. \newcommand is safer in many ways, and using delimiters will decrease readability, especially for other readers.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

→ \toks@ is a token register. We already know that.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- → \toks@ is a token register. We already know that.
- ➔ We can assign something to that token register by saying

\toks@{something}

The tokens in *something* are then saved in the register.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- → \toks@ is a token register. We already know that.
- → We can assign something to that token register by saying

\toks@{something}

The tokens in *something* are then saved in the register.

→ The contents of a token register can be used with

\the\toks@

(In fact, also other register contents can be used this way, with the help of \the.)

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

→ If we just look at the highlighted part, we can read off the intention.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- If we just look at the highlighted part, we can read off the intention.
- The macro argument #1 (i.e. all the tokens until the next \end) should be appended to the previous contents of \toks0.

\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}

- If we just look at the highlighted part, we can read off the intention.
- The macro argument #1 (i.e. all the tokens until the next \end) should be appended to the previous contents of \toks0.
- But we have an expansion problem again, similar to the situation where we needed \edef. But \edef is not an option here, because there is no definition. But \expandafter helps ...

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

→ toks@ is processed by T_EX .

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

- → toks@ is processed by T_EX .
- Being recognised as a token register, T_EX expects a { next to start a token list.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

→ \expandafter isn't a {. Therefore T_EX starts expanding.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

→ \expandafter isn't a {. Therefore T_EX starts expanding.

 \expandafter tells T_EX to skip the next token, expand the following token once, then continue with the skipped token.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

→ The { is skipped (but not discarded!) because of \expandafter.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

→ The \the is expanded.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

- → The \the is expanded.
- The primitive command \the expects a register next, so it looks ahead.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@ brand new}

 The register \toks@ is found, so \the\toks@ expands to the current contents of \toks@.

Let us investigate how the assignment to the token register is processed by T_EX:

\toks@{terribly old brand new}

 The register \toks@ is found, so \the\toks@ expands to the current contents of \toks@.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

 We want to check if we have already found the \end that ends the tabularx environment.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

 We consume the **next** argument from the input stream. After the end we expect the name of an environment.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
   \def\@tempa{#1}%
   \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
   \else\toks@\expandafter
   {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

- We consume the **next** argument from the input stream. After the end we expect the name of an environment.
- → This name is stored in a temporary command \@tempa.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

 The primitive command \ifx compares the two commands \@tempa and \TX@.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

- The primitive command \ifx compares the two commands \@tempa and \TX@.
- If they have the same expansion, everything up to the next \else is executed, i. e. we call yet another command \TX@endtabularx.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

- The primitive command \ifx compares the two commands \@tempa and \TX@.
- → If they are not equal in that sense, everything between the \else and the \fi is executed ...

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

- The primitive command \ifx compares the two commands \@tempa and \TX@.
- → If they are not equal in that sense, everything between the \else and the \fi is executed ... We first add the \end command for the other environment to the token register.

```
\long\def\TX@get@body#1\end
{\toks@\expandafter{\the\toks@#1}\TX@find@end}
\def\TX@find@end#1{%
  \def\@tempa{#1}%
  \ifx\@tempa\TX@\expandafter\TX@endtabularx
  \else\toks@\expandafter
  {\the\toks@\end{#1}}\expandafter\TX@get@body\fi}
```

- The primitive command \ifx compares the two commands \@tempa and \TX@.
- → If they are not equal in that sense, everything between the \else and the \fi is executed ... We first add the \end command for the other environment to the token register. The we loop and scan to the next \end (the \expandafter gets rid of the \fi).

COnditionals in $T_E X$

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

COnditionals in $T_E X$

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

COnditionals in $T_E X$

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

Some of them are:

→ \ifx compares the (one-step) expansions of two commands

C@nditionals in T_EX

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

- → \ifx compares the (one-step) expansions of two commands
- → \ifnum compares two integers

C@nditionals in T_EX

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

- → \ifx compares the (one-step) expansions of two commands
- → \ifnum compares two integers
- → \ifdim compares two dimensions

C@nditionals in T_EX

TEX knows a family of conditional operators that all work the same way:

```
\ifsomething condition
  things to be done if true
\else
  things to be done if false
\fi
```

- → \ifx compares the (one-step) expansions of two commands
- → \ifnum compares two integers
- → \ifdim compares two dimensions
- → \if compares two characters

Flying thr @ugh the rest

Flying thr @ugh the rest

```
[...]
  \loop
    \TX@arith
    \ifTX@
    \TX@trial{}%
  \repeat
    {\let\@footnotetext\TX@ftntext\let\@xfootnotenext\TX@xftntext
        \csname tabular*\expandafter\endcsname\expandafter\TX@target
        \the\toks@
        \csname endtabular*\endcsname}%
    \global\TX@ftn\expandafter{\expandafter}\the\TX@ftn
    \ifnum0='{\fi}%
    \expandafter\end\expandafter{\TX@}
```

Conclusions

Conclusions

If you want to, you can

Conclusions

If you want to, you can – but you don't have to ...