Declarative Internal DSLs in Lua A Game-Changing Experience

Alexander Gladysh, ag@logiceditor.com LogicEditor.com CTO, co-founder

Lua Workshop 2011

Outline

Introduction

Ad-hoc approach

A case study

The "proper" solution

Where do we use DSLs ourselves?

Why game-changing?

Questions?

Internal Declarative DSL in Lua

```
namespace:method "title"
{
  data = "here";
}
```

...Without sugar

```
_G["namespace"]:method(
    "title"
) ({
      ["data"] = "here";
})
```

Naïve implementation

```
namespace = { }
namespace.method = function(self, name)
  return function(data)
  -- ...do something
  -- ...with name and data
  end
end
```

Hypothetical UI description language

```
ui:dialog "alert"
{
  ui:label "message";
  ui:button "OK"
  {
    on_click = function(self)
      self:close()
    end;
  };
}
```

UI description language "implementation", I

```
function ui:label(title)
  return function(data)
    return GUI.Label:new(title, data)
  end
end
function ui:button(title)
  return function(data)
    return GUI.Button:new(title, data)
  end
end
```

UI description language "implementation", II

```
function ui:dialog(title)
  return function(data)
    local dialog = GUI.Dialog:new(title)
    for i = 1, #data do
       dialog:add_child(data)
    end
    return dialog
  end
end
```

Ad-hoc approach

+ Easy to code simple stuff

But:

- Easily grows out of control
- Difficult to reuse
- Hard to handle errors
- Hard to add new output targets

Practical example: HTTP handler

```
api:url "/reverse"
  doc:description [[String reverser]]
  ГΓ
    Takes a string and reverses it.
 11:
  api:input { data:string "text" };
  api:output
    data:node "result" { data:string "reversed" };
  };
  handler = function(param)
    return { reversed = param.text:reverse() }
  end;
```

What do we want to get from that description?

- HTTP request handler itself, with:
 - Input validation
 - Multi-format output serialization (JSON, XML, ...)
 - ► Handler code static checks (globals, ...)
- Documentation
- ► Low-level networking **client code**
- Smoke tests

Request handler: input validation

```
local handler = function(checker, param)
  return
  {
    text = checker:string(param, "text");
  }
end

INPUT_LOADERS["/reverse.xml"] = handler
INPUT_LOADERS["/reverse.json"] = handler
```

Request handler: output serialization

```
local build formatter = function(fmt)
  return fmt:node("nil", "result")
    fmt:attribute("reversed");
end
OUTPUT["/reverse.xml"] = build_formatter(
    make_xml_formatter_builder()
  ):commit()
OUTPUT["/reverse.json"] = build_formatter(
    make_json_formatter_builder()
  ):commit()
```

Request handler: the handler itself

```
-- Handler code is checked for access to illegal globals.
-- Legal globals are aliased to locals at the top.
-- Necessary require() calls are added automatically.
local handler = function(param)
  return
    reversed = param.text:reverse();
end
HANDLERS["/reverse.xml"] = handler;
HANDLERS["/reverse.json"] = handler;
```

Documentation

```
/reverse.{xml, json}: String reverser
Takes a string and reverses it.
IN
  ?text=STRING
OUT
XMI:
<result reversed="STRING" />
JSON:
{ "result": { "reversed": "STRING" } }
```

Smoke tests

```
test:case "/reverse.xml:smoke.ok" (function()
  local reply = assert(http.GET(
        TEST_HOST .. "/reverse.xml?text=Foo")
    ))
  assert(type(reply.result) == "table")
  assert(type(reply.result.reversed) == "string")
end)
```

Too complicated for ad-hoc solution!

TODO: Spaghetti cat image goes here

The "proper" solution?

- Should be easy to add a new target.
- Should be reusable.
- Should have nicer error reporting.

The process

- ► Load data.
- Validate correctness.
- Generate output.

Let's recap how our data looks like

```
api:url "/reverse"
  doc:description [[String reverser]]
  ГΓ
    Takes a string and reverses it.
  11
  api:input { data:string "text" };
  api:output
    data:node "result" { data:string "reversed" };
  };
  handler = function(param)
    return { reversed = param.text:reverse() }
  end;
```

Surprise! It's a tree!

```
{ id = "api:url", name = "/reverse";
  { id = "doc:description", name = "String reverser";
    text = "Takes a string and reverses it.";
  }:
  { id = "api:input";
    { id = "data:string", name = "text" };
  };
  { id = "api:output";
    { id = "data:node", name = "result";
      { id = "data:string", name = "reversed" };
   };
    handler = function(param)
      return { reversed = param.text:reverse() }
    end;
  };
```

We need a loader that does this: (I)

We need a loader that does this: (II)

```
namespace:method "title"

id = "namespace:method";
name = "title";
}
```

We need a loader that does this: (III)

We need a loader that does this: (IV)

```
namespace:method "title"

[[
    text
]]

{
    id = "namespace:method";
    name = "title";
    text = [[
        text
]];
}
```

We need a loader that does this: (V)

```
namespace:method "title" (function()
  -- do something
end)
\Rightarrow
  id = "namespace:method";
  name = "title";
  handler = function()
    -- do something
  end;
}
```

...And adds some debugging info for nice error messages:

Nested nodes should just... nest:

```
namespace:method "title"
  data = "here";
  foo:bar "baz_1";
  foo:bar "baz_2";
}
  id = "namespace:method";
  name = "title";
  data = "here";
  { id = "foo:bar", name = "baz_1" };
  { id = "foo:bar", name = "baz_2" };
```

Notes on data structure:

- Use unique objects instead of string keys to avoid name clashes.
- Or you may store user-supplied "data" in a separate key.

Metatable magic, I

```
_G["namespace"]:method(
    "title"
  ) ({
    ["data"] = "here";
  })
setmetatable(
    _G, -- actually, the sandbox
        -- environment for DSL code
    MAGIC_ENV_MT
```

Metatable magic, II

```
_G["namespace"]:method(
    "title"
  ) ({
    ["data"] = "here";
  })
MAGIC_ENV_MT.__index = function(t, k)
  return setmetatable(
      { },
      MAGIC_PROXY_MT
end
```

Metatable magic, III

```
_G["namespace"]:method(
    "title"
  ) ({
    ["data"] = "here";
  })
MAGIC_PROXY_MT.__call = function(self, title)
  self.name = title
  return function(data)
    data.name = self.name
    return data
  end
end
```

Things are somewhat more complex: (I)

- ▶ You must detect "syntax sugar" forms (text, handler)...
 - ...just watch out for types, nothing complicated.
- ▶ You have to care for single-call forms (name-only, data-only)...
 - ...store all proxies after first call
 - and extract data from what's left after DSL code is executed.

Things are somewhat more complex: (II)

- Error handling not shown...
 - ...it is mostly argument type validation at this stage,
 - but global environment protection aka strict mode is advisable.
- ▶ Debug info gathering not shown...
 - ...just call debug.getinfo() in __call.
- ▶ You should keep order of top-level nodes...
 - ...make a list of them at the "name" call stage.

Format-agnostic DSL loader

Loads DSL data to the in-memory tree.

- Reusability: Works for any conforming DSL without modifications.
- Output targets: N/A.
- Error reporting: Does what it can, but mostly that is behind its scope.

Bonus DSL syntax construct

```
namespace:method "title"
  : modifier "text"
  : another { modifier_data = true }
{
   data = "here";
}
```

On subnodes: DSL vs plain tables, I

```
What is better?
foo:bar "name"
  subnode =
    key = "value";
  };
...Or...
foo:bar "name"
  foo:subnode
    key = "value";
  };
```

On subnodes: DSL vs plain tables, II

It depends on the nature of the data.

- If subnode is a genuine tree node, use foo:bar.foo:subnode DSL subnodes.
- ▶ But for *parameters* of the tree node, even when they are stored in a sub-table, use plain old foo:bar.subnode tables.
- When unsure, pick whichever is easier for tree traversal in each case.

One third done

- ✓ Load data.
- Validate correctness.
- Generate output.

Validation and generation

- Trading speed for convenience (but not so much).
- Traversing the tree (or rather forest) once for validation pass and once for each output target.

Tree traversal (hat tip to Metalua)

```
namespace:method "title" { -- 3rd
  data = "here";
  foo:bar "baz_1"; -- 1st
 foo:bar "baz_2"; -- 2nd
local walkers = { up = { }, down = { } }
walkers.down["foo:bar"] = function(walkers, node, parent)
  assert(node.name == "baz_1" or node.name == "baz_2")
end
walkers.down["namespace:method"] = function(
    walkers, node, parent
  assert(node.name == "title" and #node.data > 0)
end
walk_tree(dsl_data, walkers)
```

Tree traversal process

- ▶ Bidirectional, depth-first: down, then up.
- ▶ If a handler for a given node.id is not found, it is considered a "do nothing" function. Traversal continues.
- ▶ If down handler returns "break" string, traversal of subtree is aborted.
- Knowing a node parent is useful.

Tree traversal hints

- Store state in walker object.
- Set metatables on up and / or down for extra power.
- ▶ In complex cases gather data in down, act in up.
- ▶ In even more complex cases break in down, and run a custom traversal on the node subtree.

Validation

```
walkers.up["foo:bar"] = function(walkers, node)
  walkers:ensure(
      "check condition A", predicate_A(node),
      node.file_, node.line_
end
walk_tree(dsl_data, walkers)
if not walkers:good() then
  error(
      "data validation failed: "
   .. walkers:message()
end
```

Validation notes

- Don't skip implementing it. Even poor validation is better than none.
- But don't overdo as well. Depending on the nature of the language, overly strict validator may harm usability. Keep optional things optional, and be flexible (just) enough in what input you accept.
- Do validation in a separate pass. In output generation assume data to be valid and do not clutter the code with redundant checks.
- Accumulate all errors before failing. This will improve usability. But don't forget to teach users that errors at the end of the list may be bogus.
- ▶ Report full stack of wrong nodes. From the failed node up to the root.

Almost there

- ✓ Load data.
- √ Validate correctness.
- Generate output.

Output generation, I

```
walkers.down["namespace:method"] = function(walkers, node)
  walkers:cat
    [[<method name=]] (xml_escape(node.name)) [[>]]
end
walkers.up["foo:bar"] = function(walkers, node)
  walkers cat
    [[<bar name=]] (xml_escape(node.name)) [[ />]]
end
walkers.up["namespace:method"] = function(walkers, node)
  walkers:cat [[</method>]]
end
```

Output generation, II

```
function walkers.cat(walkers, v)
  walkers.buf[#walkers.buf + 1] = tostring(v)
  return walkers.cat
end
function walkers.concat(walkers)
  return table.concat(walkers)
end
walk_tree(dsl_data, walkers)
output:write(walkers:concat())
```

Output generation notes

- One tree walker per target. Otherwise make sure that your trusty old cheese grater is still sharp.
- ▶ *Use string ropes or write directly to file.* Or face GC overhead.
- ► You may generate run-time objects instead of strings. But off-line generation is much neater.
- ► Think! A lot of output generation problems are easier than they look.

Validation and output generation

- ...By means of data tree traversal.
 - ► Reusability: High. Almost everything that you have to write is business-logic. No low-level boilerplate code is visible.
 - Output targets: Conforming targets may be added without changing any of existing code.
 - ► Error reporting: You have everything you need to provide good error reports to user.

We're done with DSL handling

- ✓ Load data.
- √ Validate correctness.
- √ Generate output.

Where do we use internal DSLs ourselves?

Most prominent cases:

- ▶ A HTTP webservice API DSL (which we just discussed).
- A config file format DSL family.
- A SQL DB structure DSL.
- Visual Business Logic Editor DSL family.

A config file format DSL family: node description language

```
types:up "cfg:existing_path" (function(self, info, value)
  local _ =
    self:ensure_equals(
        "unexpected type", type(value), "string"
      ):good()
    and self:ensure(
        "path string must not be empty", value ~= ""
      ):good()
    and self:ensure(
        "path must exist", lfs.attributes(value)
end)
```

A config file format DSL family: config description language

Controlled by the node description language.

```
cfg:node "my_tool"
{
   cfg:existing_path "data_path";
}
```

A config file format DSL family: the config data itself

The data itself is the usual automagic table hierarchy.

```
my_tool.data_path = "path/to/file.bin"
```

A config file format DSL family: output targets

- Data loader and validator.
- ▶ Documentation.

A SQL DB structure DSL

```
sql:table "countries"
{
  sql:primary_key "id";
  sql:string "title" { 256 };
  --
  sql:unique_key "title" { "title" };
}
```

A SQL DB structure DSL: output targets

- Initial DB schema SQL code.
- DB schema patches (semiautomated so far).
- ► Full-blown backoffice web-UI for data management.
- Documentation.

The Logic Editor DSL family: high-level data schema DSL

Human-friendly concepts, describing data tree structure and transformation rules:

```
lang:enum "fruit" {
  "fruit.orange", "fruit.apple", "fruit.banana";
  render:js [[Fruits]] {
    [[#{1}]];
    { [[Orange]] }, { [[Apple]] }, { [[Banana]] };
  };
  render:lua {
    [[#{1}]];
    { [[FRUIT.ORANGE]] }, { [[FRUIT.APPLE]] },
    { [[FRUIT.BANANA]] };
  };
```

The Logic Editor DSL family: low-level data schema DSL

Machine-friendly concepts, generated from high-level DSL:

```
node:variant "fruit" {
  "fruit.orange", "fruit.apple", "fruit.banana";
  render:js [[Fruits]] { [[#{1}]] };
  render:lua { [[#{1}]] }: }
node:literal "fruit.orange" {
  render:js { [[Orange]] };
  render:lua { [[FRUIT.ORANGE]] }: }
node:literal "fruit.apple" {
  render: js { [[Apple]] };
  render:lua { [[FRUIT.APPLE]] }; }
node:literal "fruit.banana" {
  render:js { [[Banana]] };
  render:lua { [[FRUIT.BANANA]] }; }
```

The Logic Editor DSL family: output targets

- From high-level DSL:
 - ▶ low-level DSL:
 - schema docs (to be implemented).
- From low-level DSL:
 - schema-specific visual Editor UI;
 - data validators:
 - data-to-code generator;
 - data upgrade code stubs to handle schema changes.

Why game-changing?

► Before:

- DSL is something exotic, hard to maintain.
- ▶ Not much declarative code in codebase except a few special places.
- All declarative code in code-base totally non-reusable ad-hoc lumps of spaghetti.
- Code readability suffers, bugs thrive.

Now:

- DSLs are much easier to write and reuse.
- At least 2/3 of the new code is written in DSL of one kind or another. (But we heavily combine declarative DSL code with Lua functions embedded in it.)
- ▶ Code much more readable, less bugs in generated code.

In future:

A DSL to define DSLs!

Questions?

Alexander Gladysh, ag@logiceditor.com