

GOOL: A Generic Object-Oriented Language

Anonymous Author(s)

Abstract

Text of abstract

Keywords keyword1, keyword2, keyword3

1 Introduction

Given a task, before writing any code a programmer must select a programming language to use. Whatever they may base their choice upon, almost any programming language will work. While a program may be more difficult to express in one language over another, it should at least be possible to write the program in either language. Just as the same sentence can be translated to any spoken language, the same program can be written in any programming language. Though they will accomplish the same tasks, the expressions of a program in different programming languages can appear substantially different due to the unique syntax of each language. Within a single language paradigm, such as object-oriented (OO), these differences should not be as extreme – at least the global structuring mechanisms and the local idioms will be shared. Mainstream OO languages generally contain (mutable) variables, methods, classes, objects and a core imperative set of primitives. Some OO languages even have very similar syntax (such as Java and C# say).

When faced with the task to write a program meant to fit into multiple existing infrastructure, which might be written in different languages, frequently that entails writing different versions of the program, one for each. While not necessarily difficult, it nevertheless requires investing the time to learn the idiosyncrasies of each language and pay attention to the operational details where languages differ. Ultimately, the code will likely be marred by influences of the language the programmer knows best. They may consistently use techniques that they are familiar with from one language, while unaware that the language in which they are currently writing offers a better or cleaner way of doing the same task [4, 15]. Besides this likelihood of writing sub-optimal code, repeatedly writing the same program in different languages is entirely inefficient, both as an up-front development cost, and even more so for maintenance.

Since languages from the same paradigm share many semantic similarities, it is tempting to try to leverage this; perhaps the program could be written in one language and automatically translated to the others? But a direct translation is often difficult, as different languages require the programmer to provide different levels of information, even to achieve the same tasks. For example, a dynamically typed

language like Python cannot be straightforwardly translated to a statically typed language like Java, as additional type information generally needs to be provided¹.

What if, instead, there was a single meta-language which was designed to contain the common semantic concepts of a number of OO languages, encoded in such a way that all the necessary information for translation was always present? This source language could be made to be agnostic about what eventual target language was used – free of the idiosyncratic details of any given language. This would be quite the boon for the translator. In fact, we could try to go even further, and attempt to teach the translator about idiomatic patterns of each target language.

Why would this even be possible? There are commonly performed tasks and patterns of OO solutions, from idioms to architecture patterns, as outlined in [9]. A meta-language that provided abstractions for these tasks and patterns would make the process of writing OO code even easier.

But is this even feasible? In some sense, this is already old hat: most modern compilers have a single internal Intermediate Representation (IR) which is used to target multiple processors. Compilers can generate human-readable symbolic assembly code for a large family of CPUs. But this is not quite the same as generating human-readable, idiomatic high-level languages.

There is another area where something like this has been looked at: the production of high-level code from Domain-Specific Languages (DSL). A DSL is a high-level programming language with syntax and semantics tailored to a specific domain [13]. DSLs allow domain experts to write code without having to concern themselves with the details of General-Purpose programming Languages (GPL). A DSL abstracts over the details of the code, providing notation for a user to specify domain-specific knowledge in a natural manner. Such DSL code is typically translated to a GPL for execution. Abstracting over code details and compiling into traditional OO languages is exactly what we want to do! The details to abstract over include both syntactic and operational details of any specific language, but also higher-level idioms in common use. Thus the language we are looking for is just a DSL in the domain of OO programming languages!

There are some DSLs that already generate code in multiple languages, to be further discussed in Section 6, but none of them have the combination of features we require. We are indeed trying to do something odd: writing a “DSL” for what is essentially the domain of OO GPLs. Furthermore, we have additional requirements:

PL’18, January 01–03, 2018, New York, NY, USA
2018.

¹Type inference for Python notwithstanding

1. The generated code should be human-readable,
2. The generated code should be idiomatic,
3. The generated code should be documented,
4. The generator should allow one to express common OO patterns.

We have developed a Generic Object-Oriented Language (GOOL), demonstrating that all these requirements can be met. GOOL is a DSL embedded in Haskell that can currently generate code in Python, Java, C#, and C++². Others could be added, with the implementation effort being commensurate to their (semantic) distance to the languages already supported.

First we present the high-level requirements for such an endeavour, in Section 2. To be able to give illustrated examples, we next show the syntax of GOOL in Section 3. The details of the implementations, namely the internal representation and the family of pretty-printers, is in Section 4. Common patterns are illustrated in Section 5. We close with a discussion of related work in Section 6, plans for future improvements in Section 7, and conclusions in Section 8.

2 Requirements

One might not expect a DSL to prioritize generation of human-readable, idiomatic, or documented code. After all, the main purpose of a DSL is to allow the user of the DSL — who is probably a domain expert but not a programming expert — to avoid having to write GPL code, so why would they want to look at the generated GPL code? For programs written in most DSLs, the generated code is not itself the goal. The goal is to do something, and the form of the generated code is unimportant, as long as running it achieves that goal. In this respect, GOOL differs from most DSLs. Since the domain of GOOL is OO programming, the user of GOOL is expected to have some programming expertise. In a sense, GOOL is both a GPL and a DSL. GOOL's main purpose, rather than allowing the user to not have to write GPL code, is to allow the user to not have to write GPL code in multiple languages. As with other DSLs, completing some required task will certainly be a goal of a program written in GOOL. But since GOOL is general-purpose, we cannot assume that the generated code will not be an additional goal unto itself. For example, if it is to be integrated into an existing system, other programmers working on the system may need to look at and understand the code and how it impacts their own tasks. Or perhaps the generated code is a library, intended to be used by any project who sees a need for it.

In light of cases like these, the importance of our requirements for GOOL to generate human-readable, idiomatic, and documented code should be clear. These all contribute to understandability of the generated code. Documentation can explain code such that those using a program or library can

do so quickly, without even having to look at the code. Documentation may take the form of comments added ad-hoc throughout the code, or more formal, structured comments that can be compiled into PDF or HTML documents using a tool like Doxygen. Documentation cannot be guaranteed to provide all of the information a user of the generated code may need, however, which is why generating human-readable code is still important.

Details not revealed by the documentation should be discernible by examining and understanding the code. Readable code is also important when it comes to debugging. Being unable to understand parts of a system would make diagnosing bugs very difficult. Pretty-printing and reducing complexity are effective ways to enhance code readability [6]. Some DSLs complicate generated code by generating it into a custom framework, but GOOL must avoid this to retain readability.

It should be noted that our requirements for the generated code to be documented and readable only hold if the code written in GOOL is documented and readable. Inevitably, a user will be able to write undocumented or overly complex code if they choose to do so. Our requirement is that GOOL at least offers a way to document the code, does not strip away code comments, pretty-prints the generated code, and does not introduce more complexity than required to meet the GOOL specification.

The importance of generating idiomatic code is perhaps not as obvious as readable and documented code. Consider a project written entirely in one language. If it uses generated code from GOOL and the code is non-idiomatic, it will be inconsistent with the rest of the code base and less understandable, both because it would be more complicated than it needs to be and because it would not be expressed naturally in the target language, not using the idioms with which the developers would be most familiar.

Our last requirement is altogether different from the others, but is typical of DSLs: GOOL should abstract over common OO patterns, allowing them to be expressed naturally. The patterns in question could abstract over small-scale idioms or could be larger-scale OO design patterns. While the motivation for this requirement is partly to make it even more efficient to write code in GOOL than in any of its target languages, there is more to it than that. This requirement is also necessary to make GOOL truly language-agnostic and to generate idiomatic code. This fact will be demonstrated with the examples of patterns shown in Section 5, but to understand why abstractions over patterns are needed, consider Python's ability to return multiple values with a single return statement. Other OO languages do not allow this, so either GOOL could also disallow it or GOOL could provide syntax for it but throw an error if it was used when targeting one of the languages that does not support it. In the first case, if a user of GOOL wanted to return multiple values and target Python, they would have to work around

²and is close to generating Lua and Objective-C, but those backends have fallen into disuse

the lack of a multiple-value return statement and the generated code would therefore be non-idiomatic. But in the second case, if the user wanted to target both Python and a language that does not support multiple-value return statements, the GOOL code would have to be different when targeting Python than when targeting the other language, so GOOL would not be truly language-agnostic. The higher-level pattern that would require a multiple-value return statement is a function with multiple outputs. If GOOL abstracted over that pattern and provided syntax for defining multiple-output functions, the code generator can generate a multiple-value return statement in Python and something different in the other language. In this way, the same GOOL code can truly be compiled into idiomatic code in any target language.

3 GOOL Syntax

GOOL's syntax was designed to be similar to OO languages while also providing useful abstractions. Basic types in GOOL are `bool` for Booleans, `int` for integers, `float` for doubles, `char` for characters, `string` for strings, `infile` for a file in read mode, and `outfile` for a file in write mode. Lists can be specified with `listType`. For example, `listType int` specifies a list of integers. Types of objects are specified using `obj` followed by the class name, so `obj "FooClass"` is the type of an object of a class called "FooClass".

Variables are specified with `var` followed by the variable name and type. For example, `var "ages" (listType int)` defines a variable called "ages" that is a list of integers. GOOL offers a shortcut for defining list-type variables with `listVar`, so the "ages" variable could alternatively be specified by `listVar "ages" int`. Since GOOL is embedded in Haskell, such a variable definition can be assigned as the value of a Haskell function:

```
ages = listVar "ages" int
```

Then, in future code the variable can be referred to simply by `ages`. Other keywords for specifying variables include `extVar` for variables from external libraries, `classVar` for accessing variables from a class, `objVar` for accessing variables from an object, and `self` for referring to an object in its own class definition, equivalent to `self` in Python or `this` in Java. The infix operator `$->` is an alternative to the `objVar` keyword.

Unlike in most OO languages, the syntax of GOOL distinguishes a variable from its value. To actually use the value of the `ages` variable defined above, one must write `valueOf ages`. This highlights another goal in developing the syntax of GOOL. We did not want to simply look at the syntax of existing OO languages and develop a parallel syntax for GOOL. Instead, we considered semantics, and aimed to provide different syntax for semantically different tasks. In most languages, writing a variable's name is the syntax both for referring to the variable as a variable and referring

to the variable's value, but since these are semantically different tasks, GOOL provides different syntax for each. Having distinguishing syntax for semantically distinguishable tasks enables stricter typing and higher-level syntax that translates to more idiomatic code, which will become apparent in future sections of this paper.

Literal values can be referred to by `litTrue`, `litFalse`, `litInt`, `litFloat`, `litChar`, and `litString`. Similar to those seen in most programming languages, GOOL provides many unary prefix operators and binary infix operators for defining expressions. In GOOL, each operator is prefixed with an additional symbol based on type. Operators that return Booleans are prefixed by a `?`, for example `?!` is used for negation, `?&&` for conjunction, `?||` for disjunction, and `?==` for equality. Operators on numeric values are prefixed by `#`, such as `#~` for negation, `#/^` for square root, `#|` for absolute value, `##` for modulus, and `#^` for exponentiation. Any other operators are prefixed by `$`, such as the previously mentioned `$->` operator for accessing a variable from an object.

A conditional value can be specified with the keyword `inlineIf` followed by the condition, the value if the condition is true, and the value if the condition is false. For example, given a Boolean-type variable `a`, the following conditional value can be constructed:

```
inlineIf (valueOf a)
  (litString "a is true")
  (litString "a is false")
```

Note that since this is really just Haskell, values can extend across multiple lines as long as subsequent lines are indented.

Function application can be done with the keyword `funcApp` followed by the function name, return type, and values to pass as parameters. Assuming one has defined a function "add" for adding two integers, it could be called like so:

```
funcApp "add" int [litInt 5, litInt 4]
```

Other keywords for function application are `extFuncApp` for when the function comes from an external library, `newObj` and `extNewObj` for calling an object constructor, and `objMethodCall` for calling a method on an object. `selfFuncApp` and `objMethodCallNoParams` are two shortcuts for the common cases when a method is being called on `self` or when the method takes no parameters.

If Haskell function `foo` has been defined as GOOL variable `var "foo" int`, a GOOL statement declaring the variable would be `varDec foo`. To declare and define the variable at the same time, `varDecDef foo (litInt 5)` can be used. Or to define the variable when it has already been declared, `assign foo (litInt 5)` can be used. Other GOOL keywords for declarations and definitions are `constDecDef` for declaring and defining constants, `listDec` and `listDecDef` for declaring and defining lists, and `objDecDef` for declaring and defining objects. `objDecNew` is a shortcut for the common case where an object constructor is called to define

an object, and `objDecNewNoParams` is a further shortcut for when the constructor takes no parameters.

Infix and suffix operators for assignments, as seen in most programming languages, are also offered by GOOL. These are all prefixed with `&`. Instead of `assign a (litInt 5)`, an assignment can be written as `a &= litInt 5`, which looks more like traditional programming languages. The other assignment operators are `&+=` for adding a value to a variable, `&++` for adding 1 to a variable, `&-=` for subtracting a value from a variable, and `&~-` for subtracting 1 from a variable (Unfortunately, the more intuitive `&--` could not be used because `--` initiates a comment in Haskell).

Other simple statements in GOOL include `break` and `continue`, `returnState` followed by a value to return, `throw` followed by an error message to throw, `free` followed by a variable to free from memory, and `comment` followed by a string to be displayed as a single-line comment.

GOOL statements can be grouped together into blocks by specifying a list of statements after the `block` keyword. A GOOL body can then be made by specifying a list of blocks after the `body` keyword. A body can be used as a function body, conditional body, loop body, or similar. The purpose of blocks as an intermediate structure between statement and body is to allow for more organized, readable generated code. For example, the generator can choose to insert a blank line between blocks so lines of code related to the same task are visually grouped together. However, for the case where there is no need for distinct blocks in a body, the body can be made directly from a list of statements with `bodyFromStatements` or even from a single statement with `oneLiner`.

As alluded to before, bodies can be used in more complex statements like conditionals and loops. An if-then-else statement can be written in GOOL as `ifCond` followed by a list of condition-body pairs and then a final body for the else. An example is shown below.

```
ifCond [
  (foo ?> litInt 0, oneLiner (
    printStrLn "foo is positive")),
  (foo ?< litInt 0, oneLiner (
    printStrLn "foo is negative"))]
(oneLiner $ printStrLn "foo is zero")
```

`ifNoElse` can be used in place of `ifCond` for when there is no else condition. GOOL also supports `switch` statements. A for-loop can be written in GOOL as `for` followed by a statement to initialize the loop variable, a condition, a statement to update the loop variable, and a body. GOOL also offers `forRange` loops, which are given a starting value, ending value, and step size, as well as `forEach` loops. The following examples assume variable `age` and `ages` and body `loopBody` have already been defined:

```
for (varDecDef age (litInt 0))
  (age < litInt 10) (age &++) loopBody
```

```
forRange age (litInt 0) (litInt 9)
  (litInt 1) loopBody
forEach age ages loopBody
```

While-loops are also available, using keyword `while` followed by the condition and body. Finally, GOOL offers try-catch statements, which are written as `tryCatch` followed by a body to try and a body for when an exception is caught.

A function in GOOL is specified by `function` followed by the function name, scope, either static or dynamic binding, type, list of parameters, and body. Methods are defined similarly, using the `method` keyword, with the only other difference from functions being that the name of the class containing the method must be specified. Parameters are built from variables, using `param` or `pointerParam`. The “add” function called in an earlier example can thus be defined like so, assuming variables “num1” and “num2” have been defined:

```
function "add" public dynamic_ int
  [param num1, param num2]
  (oneLiner (returnState (num1 #+ num2)))
```

The `pubMethod` and `privMethod` shortcuts can be used for public dynamic methods and private dynamic methods, respectively. `mainFunction` followed by a body defines the main function of a program. A documented function can be generated with `docFunc` followed by a brief function description, a list of parameter descriptions, a description of what is returned (if applicable), and lastly the function itself. A documented function will have comments in Doxygen-style, and GOOL offers further support for compiling Doxygen documentation, to be discussed at the end of this section.

Classes are defined with `buildClass` followed by the class name, name of the parent class (if applicable), scope, list of state variables, and list of methods. State variables can be built by `stateVar` followed by an integer, scope, static or dynamic binding, and the variable itself. The integer is a measure of delete priority. `constVar` can be used for constant state variables. Shortcuts for state variables include `privMVar` for private dynamic, `pubMVar` for public dynamic, and `pubGVar` for public static variables. Assuming variables “var1” and “var2” and methods “mth1” and “mth2” have been defined, a class containing them all can be defined as:

```
buildClass "FooClass" Nothing public
  [pubMVar 0 var1, privMVar 0 var2]
  [mth1, mth2]
```

“Nothing” indicates that this class does not have a parent. `privClass` and `pubClass` are shortcuts for private and public classes, respectively. Classes can be documented using `docClass` followed by a description of the class then the class itself. Like with functions, the documentation will be in Doxygen-style.

Functions and classes can be grouped together into a GOOL module using `buildModule`, followed by the module name, a list of libraries to import, the list of functions, and the list of classes. Passing a module to `fileDoc` will put the finishing touches on the generated file, such as imports of standard libraries and preprocessor guards for C++ header files.

```
fileDoc $ buildModule "mod1" ["library1"]
      [func1, func2] [class1, class2]
```

Documenting a file with a Doxygen-style file header can be done with `docMod` followed by a file description, list of author names, date string, and then the file, specified in GOOL, to document.

Finally, at the top of the GOOL hierarchy are programs, auxiliary files, and packages. A program is constructed by passing a program name and list of files to `prog`. Then a program and a list of auxiliary files can be passed to `package` to create a complete package, specified in GOOL. Auxiliary files are non-OO code files that augment the OO program. For example, a Doxygen configuration file is an auxiliary file that can be specified using the `doxConfig` keyword, and a makefile is another auxiliary file that can be specified with the `makefile` keyword. One of the parameters to the `makefile` keyword will toggle generation of a `make doc` rule, which will compile the Doxygen documentation with the generated Doxygen configuration file.

Syntax for higher-level patterns will be discussed in Section 5.

4 GOOL Implementation

GOOL is embedded in Haskell in the finally-tagless style originally described in [7]. In finally-tagless style, the internal representation of an embedded DSL is a group of functions defined in the host language, rather than the more traditional use of data constructors to build an interpretable abstract syntax tree (AST) for the DSL. Whereas an AST of data constructors must have a separately-defined interpreter, the functions themselves in finally-tagless compose to form the interpreter; the definitions of the functions describe how each is interpreted. Thus, the GOOL “keywords” referred to in the previous section were really Haskell functions that, when resolved, yield representations of the code to be generated.

Finally-tagless facilitates development of a family of interpreters for a DSL by having the functions act on representations, where a type class in Haskell is used to abstract over the representation. The authors of [7] coined the term “symantic” to describe such a type class, because the interface of the type class defines the syntax of the DSL and the instances of the type class define the semantics. A separate type class instance is written for each representation, each corresponding to one member in the family of interpreters.

This suits GOOL’s needs nicely, for GOOL requires multiple interpreters (one for each target language) of the same language (GOOL).

GOOL is a collection of these “symantic” type classes and instances. For organizational purposes, the functions comprising GOOL’s syntax are split across many type classes, roughly based on the internal types upon which the functions act. GOOL’s internal types correspond to the types of code being represented, not the types of the values in the target languages, though adding value-types to GOOL’s type system is planned for the future, discussed further in Section 7. Examples of internal types in GOOL, then, are `Variable`, `Value`, `Type`, `Scope`, `Statement`, `Method`, `Class`, `Module`, and `Program`. A `Statement` in GOOL, for example, is a representation of a piece of code that is a statement. Below is an excerpt of GOOL’s definition for the `VariableSym` type class; that is, the type class containing functions for defining variables in GOOL.

```
class (TypeSym repr)
=> VariableSym repr where
  type Variable repr
  var :: Label -> repr (Type repr)
      -> repr (Variable repr)
```

Since variables have types, a type for representing variables must also know how to represent types, thus we constrain our `repr` type variable to be an instance of `TypeSym`, the symantic type class containing functions for representing types, like the `int`, `float`, `string`, and `listType` functions described in Section 3.

The types used in the signatures of GOOL’s functions have the general form `repr (X repr)` for some type `X`, examples of which can be seen in the type signature for `var`. To understand these types, first remember that we will write different instances of this type class for each different language GOOL targets. That means the `repr` type variable will be instantiated with a type that represents code in a specific target language. In the `repr (X repr)` types, the type variable `repr` appears twice because there are two layers of abstraction: abstraction over the target language, handled by the outer `repr`, and abstraction over the underlying types to which GOOL’s types map, handled by the inner `repr`.

This abstraction over the underlying types that GOOL’s types represent happens because `X repr` is a type family. The first line of the body of the `VariableSym` typeclass is `type Variable repr`. This line declares the type family `Variable repr`. Since the type is parameterized by `repr`, each instance we write of this typeclass can define the `Variable` family member differently. Usually different renderers will use the same underlying type for a given GOOL type, but the ability to change it on a per-target-language basis is useful for when a language requires storing more or less information than others.

The type signature for the `var` function says that `var` takes a label and a representation of a type and yields a representation of a variable. This should not be surprising given how we used `var` to define variables like `var "foo" int` in Section 3. `Label` is simply a Haskell type synonym for `String`.

Shown below is the instance of the type class excerpt shown above for generating Java code.

```
instance VariableSym JavaCode where
  type Variable JavaCode = VarData
  var = varD
```

We have instantiated `repr` as `JavaCode`, which is a monad defined as:

```
newtype JavaCode a = JC {unJC :: a}
```

`unJC` extracts the underlying value from a value wrapped in `JavaCode`. Calling `unJC` on a program written in GOOL allows Haskell to infer that the `repr` in the GOOL program should be concretized as `JavaCode` and to resolve the functions using the definitions from the `JavaCode` instances of the type classes, thereby generating Java code.

The second line of the instance states that the underlying type for `Variables` in Java is `VarData`, which is a record that holds data about the variable to be used later. The definition of `VarData` is shown below.

```
data VarData = VarD {
  varBind :: Binding ,
  varName :: String ,
  varType :: TypeData ,
  varDoc  :: Doc }
```

Stored in the `VarData` structure is a variable's binding, either `Static` or `Dynamic`, the name of the variable as a `String`, the type as a `TypeData` structure, which is the underlying type for `Types` in GOOL for Java, and how the variable should appear in the generated code, represented as a `Doc`. `Doc` comes from the `Text.PrettyPrint.HughesPJ` Haskell package and represents formatted text. In common between all of GOOL's underlying data structures is that they each contain a `Doc`. For some types, like a `Block`, the underlying type is in fact nothing more than a `Doc`. The `Program`-level `Docs` are ultimately what will be printed to files to generate code. Keeping in mind that a `VarData` structure will usually be wrapped in a `repr`, such as `JavaCode`, the pieces of the wrapped `VarData` can be accessed in one of two ways. The first way is to use Haskell's `fmap` in combination with the built-in accessor functions for `VarData`. For example, `fmap varDoc` will take a `VarData` and return a `JavaCode Doc`. Functions on `Docs` can then be lifted to work on `JavaCode Docs` using Haskell's `liftA` family of functions. This method only works if the `Variable repr` is known to be equivalent to `VarData`, though. That is, it works in the context of `JavaCode` but not in a generic `repr` context. For when one

needs to access a piece of `VarData` while in a generic `repr` context, GOOL offers its own "syntactic" accessor functions. For example, `variableDoc` is part of the `VariableSym` type class, with signature:

```
variableDoc :: repr (Variable repr)
             -> Doc
```

and definition for the `JavaCode` instance:

```
variableDoc = varDoc . unJC
```

Since `variableDoc` is part of the type class, it can be used in a generic `repr` context, and since its definition is in an instance of the type class where `Variable repr` is known to resolve to `VarData`, it can be defined simply by calling the `varDoc` accessor on the unwrapped `VarData`. GOOL offers many functions similar to `variableDoc`, for accessing the other pieces of `VarData` and for accessing the pieces of the underlying data structures for other internal GOOL types.

5 Higher-level GOOL functions

- simple examples: `log`, `sin`, etc. , args
- bigger examples: `print`, `listAppend`, `listSize`
- even bigger examples: `listSlice`, `inOutFunc`, `inOutCall`, `getMethod`, `setMethod`
- design patterns: `runStrategy`, `checkState`, `addObserver`, `initObserverList`
- auxiliary files

6 Related Work

We divide the Related Work into the following categories

- cat 1
- cat 2
- cat 3

which we present in turn.

Haxe is a general-purpose multi-paradigm language and cross-platform compiler. It compiles to all of the languages GOOL does, in addition to many others. However, it does not offer the high-level abstractions GOOL provides [3] (better reference?). Also, the generated source code is not very readable as Haxe generates a lot of "noise" and strips comments from the original Haxe source code.

Protokit's 2nd version is a DSL and code generator for Java and C++, where the generator is designed to be capable of producing general-purpose imperative or object-oriented code. The Protokit generator is model-driven and uses a final "output model" from which actual code can be trivially generated. Since the "output model" was so similar to the generated code, it presented challenges with regards to semantic, conventional, and library-related differences between the target language [11]. GOOL's finally-tagless approach and syntax for high-level tasks, on the other hand, helped it overcome differences between target languages.

ThingML [10] is a DSL for model-driven engineering targeting C, C++, Java, and JavaScript. While it can be used in a broad range of application domains, they all fall under the umbrella domain of distributed reactive systems, and so it is not quite a general-purpose DSL, unlike GOOL. ThingML's modelling-related syntax and abstractions are a contrast to GOOL's object-oriented syntax and abstractions. The generated code lacks some of the pretty-printing provided by GOOL, specifically indentation, which detracts from the readability.

IBM developed a DSL for automatic generation of OO code based on design patterns [5]. Their DSL was in the form of a visual user interface rather than a programming language, and could only generate code that followed a design pattern. It could not generate any general-purpose code.

There are many examples of DSLs with multiple OO target languages but for a more restricted domain. Google protocol buffers is a DSL for serializing structured data, which can then be compiled into Java, Python, Objective C, and C++ [2]. Thrift is a Facebook-developed tool for generating code in multiple languages and even multiple paradigms based on language-neutral descriptions of data types and interfaces [16]. Clearwater is an approach for implementing DSLs with multiple target languages for components of distributed systems [17]. The Time Weaver tool uses a multi-language code generator to generate "glue" code for real-time embedded systems [8]. The domain of mobile applications is host to a bevy of DSLs with multiple target languages, of which MobDSL [12] and XIS-Mobile [14] are two examples. Conjure is a DSL for generating APIs. It reads YML descriptions of APIs and can generate code in Java, TypeScript, Python, and Rust [1]. All of these are examples of multi-language code generation, but none of them generate general-purpose code like GOOL does.

7 Future Work

8 Conclusion

References

- [1] [n. d.]. Conjure: a code-generator for multi-language HTTP/JSON clients and servers. <https://palantir.github.io/conjure/#/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [2] [n. d.]. Google Protocol Buffers. <https://developers.google.com/protocol-buffers/> Accessed 2019-09-16.
- [3] [n. d.]. Haxe - The cross-platform toolkit. <https://haxe.org> Accessed 2019-09-13.
- [4] Giora Alexandron, Michal Armoni, Michal Gordon, and David Harel. 2012. The effect of previous programming experience on the learning of scenario-based programming. In *Proceedings of the 12th Koli Calling International Conference on Computing Education Research*. ACM, 151–159.
- [5] Frank J. Budinsky, Marilyn A. Finnie, John M. Vlissides, and Patsy S. Yu. 1996. Automatic code generation from design patterns. *IBM systems Journal* 35, 2 (1996), 151–171.
- [6] Raymond PL Buse and Westley R Weimer. 2009. Learning a metric for code readability. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 36, 4 (2009), 546–558.

- [7] Jacques Carette, Oleg Kiselyov, and Chung-chieh Shan. 2009. Finally tagless, partially evaluated: Tagless staged interpreters for simpler typed languages. *Journal of Functional Programming* 19, 5 (2009), 509–543.
- [8] Dionisio de Niz and Raj Rajkumar. 2004. Glue code generation: Closing the loophole in model-based development. In *10th IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS 2004). Workshop on Model-Driven Embedded Systems*. Citeseer.
- [9] Erich Gamma. 1995. *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Pearson Education India.
- [10] Nicolas Harrand, Franck Fleurey, Brice Morin, and Knut Eilif Husa. 2016. Thingml: a language and code generation framework for heterogeneous targets. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 19th International Conference on Model Driven Engineering Languages and Systems*. ACM, 125–135.
- [11] Gábor Kövesdán and László Lengyel. 2017. Multi-Platform Code Generation Supported by Domain-Specific Modeling. *International Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science* 9, 12 (2017), 11–18.
- [12] Dean Kramer, Tony Clark, and Samia Oussena. 2010. MobDSL: A Domain Specific Language for multiple mobile platform deployment. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Networked Embedded Systems for Enterprise Applications*. IEEE, 1–7.
- [13] Marjan Mernik, Jan Heering, and Anthony M Sloane. 2005. When and how to develop domain-specific languages. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 37, 4 (2005), 316–344.
- [14] André Ribeiro and Alberto Rodrigues da Silva. 2014. Xis-mobile: A dsl for mobile applications. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*. ACM, 1316–1323.
- [15] Jean Scholtz and Susan Wiedenbeck. 1990. Learning second and subsequent programming languages: A problem of transfer. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 2, 1 (1990), 51–72.
- [16] Mark Slee, Aditya Agarwal, and Marc Kwiatkowski. 2007. Thrift: Scalable cross-language services implementation. *Facebook White Paper* 5, 8 (2007).
- [17] Galen S Swint, Calton Pu, Gueyoung Jung, Wenchang Yan, Younggyun Koh, Qinyi Wu, Charles Consel, Akhil Sahai, and Koichi Moriyama. 2005. Clearwater: extensible, flexible, modular code generation. In *Proceedings of the 20th IEEE/ACM international Conference on Automated software engineering*. ACM, 144–153.

A Appendix

Text of appendix ...