redhat

An infix syntax for Forth (and its compiler)

Andrew Haley

redhat

Previous efforts

- Forthwrite Dec '86:

```
VARIABLE 'EXPRESSION  : EXPRESSION  'EXPRESSION @EXECUTE ;
VARIABLE TEMP  CREATE )
: ,C ( a)   2- , ;
: NEXT ( - a)   -' IF  NUMBER TEMP !  0  ELSE DROP  THEN ;
: CHECK ( a a')  - ABORT" not matched" ;

: FACTOR ( a - a')   DUP ['] ( = IF  DROP  NEXT  EXPRESSION
      ['] ) CHECK  ELSE  ?DUP IF  ,C
         ELSE  TEMP @ [COMPILE] LITERAL  THEN  THEN  NEXT ;
: TERM ( a - a')   FACTOR  BEGIN  DUP ['] * =  OVER ['] / =
      OR WHILE  NEXT FACTOR  SWAP  ,C  REPEAT ;
: EXPRESSION ( a - a')   TERM  BEGIN  DUP ['] + =  OVER ['] - =
      OR WHILE  NEXT TERM  SWAP ,C  REPEAT ;

: INFIX   NEXT ['] ( CHECK  NEXT EXPRESSION  ['] ) CHECK ;
  IMMEDIATE    ' EXPRESSION 'EXPRESSION !

Example of use:

  44 CONSTANT FRED
  : TEST ( -- n )  INFIX ( 3 * FRED / ( ( 3 + 5 ) / 2 ) ) ;
```

redhat

Early Inspiration

- Winfield AFT, 'Pascal in Forth', SOFT, Vol 1, no 4, Sept. 1983, pp59-63 and Vol 1, no 5, Oct. 1983, pp46-51. http://www.ias.uwe.ac.uk/~a-winfie/aw_publications.htm
- Very elegant, but closer to Pascal than to Forth – the resulting syntax is more restricted, and the control structures are those of Pacal, not Forth. Also, restricted to single-length integer expressions and arrays, no structures, etc, etc.

redhat

Previous efforts

- Forthwrite Dec '86:
  - Uses recursive descent
  - Compile only – no use in interpreter
  - No LOCAL variables
  - Extremely simple
  - Only arithmetic expressions
  - Uses data stack
  - Uses `-'` (aka `FIND`) and `,C` (aka `COMPILE,`)

redhat

Previous efforts

- comp.lang.forth Feb 2002, some details elided:

```
: op ( a)   state @ if  compile,  else execute  then ;
: lit   =number @  state @ if  postpone literal  then ;

ops[ relop   > > < < = = ]
ops[ addop   + + - - or or xor xor ]
ops[ mulop   * * / / and and ]
ops[ unop   - negate @ @ ]

\ These are the productions.

defer expr
: expr-list   expr  begin  match ,  while  token expr  repeat ;

: parens  expr-list  match ) 0= abort" )" ;

: primary
   match# if  lit  token  exit  then
   match ( if  token parens  token  exit  then
   this >r  token  match ( if  token  parens  token  then  r> op ;

: factor   unop if  >r  token  recurse  r> op  exit  then  primary ;

: term   factor
   begin  mulop while  >r  token  factor  r> op  repeat ;

: simple-expr   term
   begin  addop while  >r  token  term  r> op  repeat ;

:noname   simple-expr
   begin  relop while  >r  token  simple-expr  r> op  repeat ;
is expr
```

redhat

The problem with locals

"Words that return execution tokens, such as `'` (tick), `[']`, or `FIND`, shall not be used with local names."

This is a horrible restriction! Effectively it means that locals can never be used as factors. Locals cannot be used as part of an expression in this parser because it uses `'` and `COMPILE,`

redhat

Previous efforts

- comp.lang.forth Feb 2002:
  - Uses recursive descent
  - STATE-smart: allows interpretive use
  - Still extremely simple
  - Function calls: `FOO ( 1, BAR, 3 )`
  - Uses return stack for temporary storage of execution tokens that haven't yet been used because they are of low precedence − much cleaner; means we can use data stack for interpretive expression evaluation
  - Written in almost Standard Forth
  - Still doesn't allow LOCAL variables in expressions

redhat

Designing the syntax

- Let's ignore the implementation problems for a little while and look at the syntax we'd like to have. We'll return to the implementation later.

redhat

Designing the syntax

- A word is any string of non-whitespace characters. Words are separated by spaces.
- Numbers are just words, so they don't need to be treated specially. The syntax need make no special provision for them.

redhat

Designing the syntax

- Simple cases:
  - Basic Forth syntax is

    `noun noun ... verb  noun noun ... verb`

  profanely,

    verb (noun , noun , ...) ; verb (noun , noun , ...) ;
- Control structures:
  - `a b > if`   becomes   if (a > b)
  - `10 0 do`   becomes   do (10 , 0)

redhat

Designing the syntax

- More simple cases:
  - Arithmetic expressions:
    - Traditional operator precedence, defined by syntax

      `b negate b b * 4 a * c * - sqrt 2 / a * +`

      becomes

      - b + (sqrt (b * b - 4 * a * c) / 2 * a)

  The reserved tokens are

  + - * / f+ f- f* f/ ( ) < > = f< f> f= or xor and @

  Everything else is just a word, and can be used as a function or an argument.

redhat

Designing the syntax

- To allow multiple statements, we add the ; operator:

  expr ; expr
- Local variables can be assigned with the := operator:

  `a b * to c` becomes   c := a * b
- @ is a problem. We could just treat it as a function like any other Forth word, but then it would be cumbersome to use because of parentheses:

  @ (a) + @ (b) ...

  so we define @ to be a high-precedence unary operator, which is much nicer:

  @ a + @ b ...
- We could arguably do the same with `!` , treating it as a binary operator

redhat

Designing the syntax

- A structure access, as per the Forth 200x structures RFD, is just the application of a function to a pointer.
  Given a struct, we can use its fields with no special treatment:

```
struct point
    1 cells +field p.x
    1 cells +field p.y
end-struct
\ Draw a line from p1 to p2
draw ( p.x ( p1 ) , p.y ( p1 ) , p.x ( p2 ) , p.y ( p2 ) ;
```

- We could define a word `.` as a postfix function operator, but that isn't obviously a big improvement

redhat

Designing the syntax

- I'm still not certain about the absolute best syntax for arrays, but Smalltalk is a good place to start
- For array reads,
  - `a at: i` produces `a i at:`
- And for writes,
  - `<expression> put: ( b , 2 )` produces `b 2 put:`
  - (Maybe `b at: 2 put: <expression>` would be better)
- With an additional shorthand (purely for familiarity's sake):
  - `a [ i ]` is equivalent to `a at: i`

redhat

Designing the syntax

- Because every statement is also an expression, we can have conditionals in expressions, so:

```
a := b + ( if ( c < 10 ) ; 1 ; else ; 2 )
```

  is equivalent to

```
b c 10 < if 1 else 2 + to a
```

redhat

Designing the syntax

- Arrays are tricky. In profane languages *lvalues* are treated differently from *rvalues*: an lvalue is evaluated for its address, but an rvalue is evaluated for its value
- For example,

```
a [ i ] := b [ j ]
```

- We can't simply say that every array access on the LHS of an assignment is evaluated for its address, because of things like

```
a [ b [ i ] ] := b [ j ]
```

  where only the *outermost* array access is evaluated for its address
- It's difficult to do a mapping in a purely syntactical way. If we're simply scanning from left to right we have no way to know that an assignment is imminent; that would require *backtracking*

redhat

Designing the syntax

- Parsing words are the biggest headache. Anything that acts as a prefix operator by using `PARSE` or `WORD` needs special treatment
- String constants are easy enough, though:

```
s" hello " type
```

maps easily to

type (" hello ")

- I don't think the lack of `."` is important

redhat

The problem with TO

"An ambiguous condition exists if either `POSTPONE` or `[COMPILE]` is applied to `TO`."

So `TO` can never be used as a factor either.

This is a very bad design decision: if Forth is about any single thing it's factoring, and this is an important part of the language that *forbids* factoring.

redhat

Escape to Forth

- If all else fails and there really is a Forth expression that cannot be rendered as infix in any way, there's an escape:

```
[." Hello, world"]
```

- This also allows local declarations, etc:

```
[ LOCALS| a b c |]
```

redhat

Implementation

- The problem with TO not being allowed to be ticked or POSTPONED was, as it turned out, a big inspiration
- We can't use XTs, but we can use strings. So, instead of saving XTs on the return stack, we create a string stack and define `>S` and `S>`. Also, we create an output buffer and push into it words from the string stack
- At any stage in the compilation, we only have to decide whether to push a word into the output buffer or onto the string stack

Implementation

```
Source:
-b + sqrt ( b * b - 4 * a * c )
                    ↑
                   >IN


String stack:     Output:
                     . . . | b negate b b * |
                                         ↑
  |   -   |
  | sqrt  |
  |   +   |
  |       |
```

An example

Original FORTRAN:

```
do i = 1, dim1
   do j = 1, dim3
     C(i, j) = 0.
     do k = 1, dim2
        C(i, j) = C(i, j) + A(i, k)*B(k, j)
     enddo
   enddo
enddo
```

Implementation

A great benefit – arguably *the* greatest benefit – of doing this by using strings rather than XTs is that we no longer need to be `STATE`-smart. The infix code is rewritten to be postfix and then passed to `INTERPRET`. `INTERPRET` either compiles or interprets.

An example

Infix Forth:

```
do ( dim1 , 1 ) ;
   do ( dim3 , 1 ) ;
     0.e0 put: C ( j , i ) ;
     do ( dim2 , 1 ) ;
        C [ k , j ] f+ A [ k , i ] f* B [ i , j ] put: C ( k , j ) ;
     loop ;
   loop ;
Loop
```

generates

```
dim1 1 do
  dim3 1 do
    0.e0 j i C put:
    dim2 1 do
      C k j at: A k i at: B i j at: * + k j C put:
    loop
  loop
loop
```

In summary

- Infix Forth is not a translator from some other language to Forth, but an infix form of the language that doesn't change its semantics.
- Most Forth words can still be used and keep their glossary definitions.
- If we're going to translate from FORTRAN, C, etc, to Forth for a standard algorithms library, this is a much better way to do it than translating from infix to postfix by hand. It's easier to do and easier to check.