

Lecture 11

Implementing Small Languages

internal vs. external DSLs, hybrid small DSLs

Ras Bodik Shaon Barman Thibaud Hottelier

Hack Your Language!

CS164: Introduction to Programming Languages and Compilers, Spring 2012 UC Berkeley Lectures 10-12 are exploring small languages both design and implementation

Lecture 10: regular expressions we'll finish one last segment today

Lecture 11: implementation strategies how to embed a language into a host language

Lecture 12: problems solvable with small languages ideas for your final project (start thinking about it)

Today

Semantic differences between regexes and Res

Internal DSLs

Hybrid DSLs

External DSLs

Q: Give a JavaScript scenario where tokenizing depends on the context of the parser. That is, lexer cannot tokenize the input entirely prior to parsing.

A: In this code fragment, / / could be div's or a regex:

4

Regexes are implemented with backtracking

regex: X(.+)+X

REs are implemented by translation to NFA NFA may be translated to DFA. Resulting DFA requires linear time, ie reads each char once Consider the problem of detecting whether a pattern (regex or RE) matches an (<u>entire</u>) string

match(string, pattern) --> yes/no

The regex and RE interpretations of any pattern agree on this problem.

That is, both give same answer to this Boolean question Example: X(.+)+X

It does not matter whether this regex matches the string X==X with X(.)(..)X or with X(.)(.)X, assigning different values to the '+' in the regex. While there are many possible matches, all we are about is whether *any* match exists.

Let's now focus on when regex and RE differ

Can you think of a question that where they give a different answer?

Answer: find a <u>sub</u>string

We extend the original regex correspondingly:

[a-zA-Z]+=.*(\\\n.*)?

This regex does not match our two-line input. Why?

What compiler textbooks don't teach you

The textbook string matching problem is simple:

Does a regex r match the **entire** string s?

- a clean statement suitable for theoretical study
- here is where regexes and FSMs are equivalent

In real life, we face the sub-string matching problem: Given a string s and a regex r, find a substring in s matching r.

- tokenization is a series of substring matching problems

Do you see the language design issues?

- There may be many matching substrings.
- We need to decide **which** substring to return.

It is easy to agree where the substring should **start**:

the matched substring should be the leftmost match

They differ in where the string should **end**:

- there are two schools: RE and regex (see next slide)

Where should the matched string end?



- conceptually, enumerate all matches and return longest

NFA

Operational approach: define behavior of *, | operators
e* match e as many times as possible while allowing the remainder of the regex t o match (greedy semantics)
e|e select leftmost choice while allowing remainder to match



We saw a non-contrived regex can behave differently

- personal story: I spent 3 hours debugging a similar regex
- despite reading the manual carefully
- The (greedy) operational semantics of *
 - does not guarantee longest match (in case you need it)
 - forces the programmer to reason about backtracking

It may seem that backtracking is nice to reason about

- because it's local: no need to consider the entire regex
- cognitive load is actually higher, as it breaks composition

Where in history of *re* did things go wrong?

It's tempting to blame perl

- but the greedy regex semantics seems older
- there are other reasons why backtracking is used

Hypothesis 1:creators of re libs knew not that NFA can

- can be the target language for compiling regexes
- find all matches simultaneously (no backtracking)
- be implemented efficiently (convert NFA to DFA)

Hypothesis 2: their hands were tied

– Ken Thompson's algorithm for re-to-NFA was patented

With backtracking came the greedy semantics

- longest match would be expensive (must try all matches)
- so semantics was defined greedily, and non-compositionally

Regular Expressions Concepts

- Syntax tree-directed translation (re to NFA)
- recognizers: tell strings apart
- NFA, DFA, regular expressions = equally powerful
- but \1 (backreference) makes regexes more pwrful
- Syntax sugar: e+ to e.e*
- Compositionality: be weary of greedy semantics
- Metacharacters: characters with special meaning

Internal Small Languages a.k.a. internal DSLs

Embed your DSL into a host language

The host language is an interpreter of the DSL

Three levels of embedding where we draw lines is fuzzy (one's lib is your framework)

- 1) Library
- 2) Framework (parameterized library)
- 3) Language

When DSL is implemented as a library, we often don't think of it as a language

even though it defines own abstractions and operations

Example: network sockets Socket f = new Socket(mode) f.connect(ipAddress) f.write(buffer) f.close()

GUI Gem Puby rspec

The library implementation goes very far

rfig: formatting DSL embedding into Ruby.

see slide 8 in http://cs164fao9.pbworks.com/f/01-rfig-tutorial.pdf



The animation in rfig, a Ruby-based language

slide!('Overlays',

'Using overlays, we can place things on top of each other.', 'The pivot specifies the relative positions', 'that should be used to align the objects in the overlay.',

overlay('0 = 1', hedge.color(red).thickness(2)).pivot(0, 0),

staggeredOverlay(true, # True means that old objects disappear
 'the elements', 'in this', 'overlay should be centered', nil).pivot(0, 0),

staggeredOverlay(true,

'whereas the ones', 'here', 'should be right justified', nil).pivot(1, 0),
nil) { |slide| slide.label('overlay').signature(8) }

It may be impossible to hide plumbing in a procedure these are limits to procedural abstraction

Framework, a library parameterized with client code

- typically, you register a function with the library
- library calls this client callback function at a suitable point
- ex: an action to perform when a user clicks on DOM node

Example DSL: jQuery

Before jQuery

```
var nodes = document.getElementsByTagName('a');
for (var i = 0; i < nodes.length; i++) {
    var a = nodes[i];
    a.addEventListener('mouseover', function(event) { event.target.style.backgroundColor='orange'; }, false );
    a.addEventListener('mouseout', function(event) { event.target.style.backgroundColor='white'; }, false );
}</pre>
```

jQuery abstracts iteration and events *H* nodes n s, f, n is a wde ...

 Hard to say where a framework becomes a language not too important to define the boundary precisely

Rules I propose: it's a language if

1) its abstractions include compile- or run-time checks ---prevents incorrect DSL programs

ex: write into a closed socket causes an error

we use syntax of host language to create (an illusion) of a dedicated syntax
 ex: jQuery uses call chaining to pretend it modifes a single object:
 jQuery('a').hover(...).css(...)



rake: an internal DSL, embedded in Ruby Author: Jim Weirich

functionality similar to make

- has nice extensions, and flexibility, since it's embedded
- ie can use any ruby commands
- even the syntax is close (perhaps better):
 - embedded in Ruby, so all syntax is legal Ruby

http://martinfowler.com/articles/rake.html

task :codeGen do
 # do the code generation
end

```
task :compile => :codeGen do
    # do the compilation
end
```

```
task :dataLoad => :codeGen do
    # load the test data
end
```

```
task :test => [:compile, :dataLoad] do
    # run the tests
end
```

Ruby syntax rules

Ruby procedure call

por 1 2 landa

dict. Riteral :a => :5

in Python: {"a":"s"}. I key I value

Deconstructing rake (teaches us a lot about Ruby):

task :dataLoad => :codeGen do
load the test data
end

task :test => [:compile, :dataLoad] do
run the tests
end

File task: dependences between files (as in make)

```
file 'build/dev/rake.html' => 'dev/rake.xml' do |t|
  require 'paper'
  maker = PaperMaker.new t.prerequisites[0], t.name
  maker.run
end
```

Rake task: dependences between jobs

```
task :build_refact => [:clean] do
  target = SITE_DIR + 'refact/'
  mkdir_p target, QUIET
  require 'refactoringHome'
  OutputCapturer.new.run {run_refactoring}
end
```

task :second do
 #second's body
end

task :first do
 #first's body
end

task :second => :first

Sort of like make's %.c:%.o

```
BLIKI = build('bliki/index.html')
```

```
FileList['bliki/*.xml'].each_do |src|
  file BLIKI => src
end
```

file BLIKI do
 #code to build the bliki
end

Parsing involved: DSL in a <u>GP language</u>

GP: general purpose language

Parsing involved: GP in a DSL language

GP: general purpose language

Own parser, own interpreter or compiler

Examples we have seen:



Read the article about the rake DSL

This lecture is based in part on

Martin Fowler, "Using the Rake Build Language"

Jeff Friedl, "Mastering Regular Expressions"