
Proposal Embedding data in code.

Justification

- ⊗ A recent thread in the Dyalog forums regarding JSON revived my interest in devising a native notation for embedding arrays in APL functions without repeated catenation and assignment.
- ⊗ The current output is formatted from what I refer to as an attached-text to a function. The function in question calls another utility that returns a selection from the ⌈CR of its caller. I think I remember basing this or at least attempting to justify it on a vague memory of a "Data" facility in the "Basic" language.
- ⊗ Since the advent of direct functions in Dyalog APL wherein we can embed functions between left and right braces "{}" within another function I have felt that it should be possible to do a similar thing to embed multi-dimensional and/or nested data as a part of APL over and above the familiar vector notation.
- ⊗ There follow two related proposals for a data notation, either of which could be embedded into a traditional function or operator or a script while the second, not being a "control structure", would also be suitable in a direct function.
- ⊗ The great advantage of both notations to the programmer is that the format of a constant numeric array or the quotation of a character array can be embedded readily into a function with little intervening markup, is easily both readable and editable in that context and becomes effectively self redefining.
- ⊗ In what follows every use of diamond "◇" can equally be a newline (U+000D) character and vice versa.

:Array

Control Structure

- ⊗ This protocol is for programmers who like lots of visual clues as to what the code is doing.
- ⊗ Definition:

```
┌-----┐
| Array  |  " :Array" -,- name -,- " :Mix" -,- -,-<-----<-,
|        |  ' ->----->' ->----->'
└-----┘
| Expression | -,- data-valued expression -,-
|            | '----- Array -----'
└-----┘
```

Being a control structure this construct is not assignable but its name, that is a part of the definition, could be localised in a header.

- [0] White space and contiguous line-ends are ignored.
- [1] A single expression adds no rank or depth:

```

,-----,
| :Array name ◊ expr0 ◊ :EndArray | ↔ | name←expr0 |
,-----,

```

- [2] Each subsequent expression adds another item to a vector whose length will be the number of expressions and whose (absolute) depth will be 1 more than the maximum absolute depth of all items:

```

,-----,
| :Array name ◊ expr1 ◊ expr2 ◊ :EndArray | ↔ | name←(expr1)(expr2) |
,-----,

```

- [3] With the :Mix keyword each subsequent expression adds another Cell to a resultant array whose rank is determined as one more than the maximum rank of all Cells.

```

,-----,
| :Array name :Mix ◊ expr1 ◊ expr2 ◊ :EndArray | ↔ | name←mix(expr1)(expr2) |
,-----,

```

where mix is equivalent to the final step of the operation of the Rank and Key operators where items having potentially different ranks are assembled.

- [4] Array definitions are recursive; sub-arrays need not be named:

```

,-----,
| :Array name | ↔ | name←expr3((expr4)(expr5))(expr6)(expr7) |
|   expr3   |
|   :Array  |
|     expr4 |
|     expr5 |
|   :EndArray |
|   expr6   |
|   expr7   |
|   :EndArray |
,-----,

```

Possible

extensions:

- ⊗ Within an :Array statement the synonyms ":Cell" and ":EndCell" could be used for cosmetic reasons only:

```

,-----,
| :Array name |
|   expr3   |
|   :Cell   |
|     expr4 |
|     expr5 |
|   :EndCell |
|   expr6   |
|   expr7   |
|   :EndArray |
,-----,

```

- ⊗ Entire cells' existence could be conditional:

```

┌-----┐
│ :Array name │
│   expr3     │
│   :If cond  │
│     :Array  │
│       expr4 │
│       expr5 │
│     :EndArray │
│   :EndIf    │
│   expr6     │
│   expr7     │
│ :EndArray   │
└-----┘

```

- ⊗ :Return could be used for early truncation.

[Array] notation

- ⊗ This construct has a more functional (and limited) nature but unlike the control structure it is also suited to be embedded in a direct function.
- ⊗ Definition:

```

┌-----┐ ┌-----┐
│ Array  │ │ ,-<--- "◇" --<-, │
│        │ │ "[" -'- Expression -'- "]" │
├-----┤ ├-----┤
│ Expression │ │ -,- data-valued expression -,- │
│            │ │ '----- Array -----' │
└-----┘ └-----┘

```

We utilise and reverse the fact that APL expressions as currently defined never start with "[". The other syntax change being that brackets "["] are balanced around diamonds and new-lines rather than between them. Being an expression rather than a control structure this can be directly assigned. Indeed it must be if it is not used within the same expression or returned as the result of a direct function.

- ⊗ Points [0], [1] and [4] above apply equally to this notation.
- ⊗ Only one of points [2] and [3] would apply, as the ":Mix" keyword is necessarily unavailable, unless some other provision were made to decide the issue on a case-by-case basis.
- ⊗ If used without assignment this would require non-redundant parentheses to avoid SYNTAX ERRORS due to index and axis uses of brackets.
- ⊗ For function application:

```

┌-----┐ ┌-----┐ ┌-----┐
│ name←↑[expr3 ◇ expr4] │ │ │ SYNTAX ERROR Invalid axis specification │
└-----┘ └-----┘ └-----┘

```

```
| name←↑([expr3 ♦ expr4]) | ↔ | name←↑(expr3)(expr4) |
```

⊗ For array juxtaposition:

```
| name←X[expr5 ♦ expr6] | ↔ | SYNTAX ERROR Invalid index specification |  
| name←X([expr5 ♦ expr6]) | ↔ | name←X((expr5)(expr6)) |
```

example:

```
schema←[  
  [  
    'Idtable'   'Name'  
    'Name'     'Value'  
    'Char(20)' 'Blob'  
  ] ♦ [  
    'Codetable' 'Itemname'  
    'Itemname'  'APLType'   'APLVersion' 'Value'   'Comment'   'Size'   'Upload'  
    'CharW(80)' 'Dec(1)'   'Char(20)'  'Blob'    'Blob'     'Int32'  'Char(40)'  
  ] ♦ [  
    'Fnametable' 'Filename'  
    'Filename'  'Size'     'Hash'     'Comment'  'Upload'  
    'Char(256)' 'Int32'   'Char(32)' 'Blob'    'Char(40)'  
  ] ♦ [  
    'Fdatatable' '[Filename]'  
    'Filename'   'Value'  
    'Fnametable' 'Blob'  
  ]  
]
```

The result of the above is a 4-list of 3-lists each of which is a list of strings the whole being the schema for a code repository database.