

DSLs as Harnesses for Reliable LLM Agents

Satoshi Nakajima
The Singularity Society
satoshi.nakajima@gmail.com

June 14, 2026

Abstract

A recurring lesson of applied agent engineering is that the *harness*—the designed environment an agent operates in—governs reliability more than the underlying model. We argue that a *domain-specific language* (DSL) is one of the most effective harnesses available for autonomous, long-horizon agents, precisely because it gives up the unbounded expressiveness of general-purpose code in exchange for a small, legible, checkable surface. We make this concrete by describing **Collections**, a declarative *applications-as-data* system implemented in Mulmo-Claude, an open-source LLM-agent application. In Collections, a single JSON schema defines an application’s data model, relationships, computed values, recurrence, user interface, external-data acquisition, and workflows; record files are the database; and the language model is the runtime that operates inside the schema rather than writing imperative code. We show how four well-known harness properties—schema-as-system-of-record, a validator as a free feedback loop, a grammar as a forcing function, and a unit of the language as a unit of context—fall out of this single design decision, and how a deliberate *reliability dial* divides what the host guarantees deterministically (schema validity, derived-value computation, recurrence math, sandboxed rendering, scheduled ingestion) from what the model supplies (judgment, language, domain modeling). We position the approach against token-level constrained decoding and schema-validated tool interfaces—which bound a single generation or call—whereas a collection schema bounds a persistent, on-disk application the agent operates *inside*. We report a longitudinal single-user deployment in which 24 schema-defined applications, 3 external feeds, and 9 bespoke sandboxed UI views accreted over roughly two months without any host code being written per application. We discuss the design’s principal hazard—the escape hatch from the declarative surface to arbitrary code—and its limitations: the open-ended formula and custom-view sub-surfaces that lie outside the finite grammar, indirect prompt injection through ingested feed content, non-replayable execution, and the single-user, single-system scope of our evidence.

Keywords: LLM agents; agent harness; domain-specific languages; end-user software engineering; low-code; applications as data; declarative systems.

1 Introduction

The prevailing lesson of applied AI engineering in 2024–2026 is that the *harness*—the designed environment an agent operates inside: the tools it can call, the format of the information it receives, the feedback that catches its mistakes, and the scaffolding that lets it hand work to its future self—matters more than the model alone [14, 15]. The same model, given a better harness, produces

© 2026 Satoshi Nakajima. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

dramatically better work. For a language model, the interface is not a convenience layer wrapped around the intelligence; it is the cognitive architecture.

This paper argues a narrower and, we believe, more actionable point: **a domain-specific language (DSL) is one of the most powerful harnesses one can give an agent, precisely because it gives up power.** A general-purpose programming language is Turing-complete; that is its glory and, for an autonomous agent, its hazard. There are infinitely many ways to express any behavior, no two codebases agree on conventions, and nothing in the language tells the agent whether a given program is *correct for this domain*. Freedom under uncertainty is where agents thrash: they explore broadly, drift toward locally plausible patterns, and accumulate subtle errors that surface much later. A DSL inverts every one of those properties—it expresses a bounded set of things, in a bounded number of ways, and typically ships with a parser and validator that can decide well-formedness before anything executes.

We ground the argument in a working system. **Collections** is a feature of MulmoClaude, an open-source agent application built on the Claude Agent SDK whose founding philosophy is *the workspace is the database; files are the source of truth; the model is the intelligent interface*. A collection is defined by a single JSON *schema* that simultaneously specifies a data model, inter-record relationships, spreadsheet-like derived computations, completion and notification rules, host-driven recurrence, a rendered user interface, optional bespoke HTML views, and optional scheduled ingestion of external data. The records are plain JSON files on disk. The host platform contains *zero* domain knowledge; it understands only generic concepts (fields, relationships, derived values, views, actions, ingestion). Everything domain-specific lives in the schema, and the language model operates the application by reading and writing records under the schema’s constraints.

The significance for reliability is that a self-built, model-operated application need not be “flaky chat with extra steps.” The DSL is a contract that pins down what must be deterministic while the model supplies flexibility and judgment, and the two live on opposite sides of a deliberate line we call the *reliability dial* (§5). A schema *validator* makes the boundary self-enforcing: a structurally incoherent application is rejected at load, with an actionable message, before it can run.

Contributions.

1. We articulate **DSL-as-harness**: a mapping from a single design decision (constrain the agent’s authoring surface to a validated DSL) to four established harness properties, and an analysis of how that case *shifts* rather than weakens as models improve (§3).
2. We describe **Collections**, a concrete declarative applications-as-data system, including its schema DSL, relationships, derived formulas, host-driven recurrence, sandboxed custom views, and declarative feed ingestion (§4).
3. We formalize the **host/model responsibility split** and the *reliability dial*, and explain the validator and escape-hatch mechanisms that keep the surface both safe and expressive (§5, §6).
4. We report a **longitudinal single-user deployment**: 24 schema-defined applications, 3 external feeds, and 9 bespoke sandboxed views accreted over ~2 months with no per-application host code (§7).
5. We give an **honest account of the limitations**: the escape-hatch hazard, non-replayable execution, and the scope of our evidence (§8).

2 Background and Related Work

Agent harnesses and agent-computer interfaces. Yang et al. [14] showed that a purpose-built agent-computer interface (ACI)—structured tools, capped and guided search, and a linter that rejects syntactically broken edits at the moment of introduction—improves software-engineering agent performance substantially with a fixed model. Yao et al. [15] interleave reasoning and acting; Schick et al. [10] teach models to call external tools. These works establish the empirical primacy of the surrounding environment. Our contribution is to identify the *DSL* as a particularly sharp instance of such an environment and to instantiate it as an applications-as-data substrate.

Self-improving and memory-augmented agents. Voyager [11] accretes a reusable skill library, and Generative Agents [9] maintain a memory stream they reflect over. Both let an agent extend itself over time. Collections differ in substrate: the agent’s accreted capabilities are *declarative DSL artifacts on disk*, not learned weights or imperative code, which makes them inspectable, diffable, and validated. A complementary line of work makes the event log the primary artifact—Nakajima [6] prioritizes an append-only log to obtain deterministic replay and cheap forking. We deliberately forgo byte-for-byte replay (the model step is nondeterministic) in exchange for an agent whose configuration is plain, readable, validated files; §8 returns to this trade.

Domain-specific languages. The software-engineering literature has long studied when and how a deliberately limited language pays off [2, 5]: a DSL trades general expressiveness for analyzability, a smaller error surface, and tooling (parsers, validators) that come “for free.” We apply this classical argument to a new consumer—an autonomous language-model agent—and observe that the properties DSLs were always praised for map directly onto modern harness-engineering guidance.

Constrained decoding and structured outputs. A parallel line of work enforces structural validity at *inference* time: grammar- and schema-constrained decoding masks the token distribution so that only well-formed continuations are sampled (Outlines [12], LMQL [1], Guidance), and OpenAI’s function calling and Structured Outputs [8] make a JSON schema govern a model’s output for a single call. These mechanisms realize our property (3)—grammar as a forcing function—at the *token/model boundary*, and they do so more tightly than we do: Collections uses *post-hoc* JSON-schema validation plus retry, enforcing well-formedness at the *system boundary* rather than during generation. The distinction we draw is one of *scope and persistence*, not of mechanism: constrained decoding shapes one generation, and a function/Structured-Outputs schema shapes one call’s arguments, whereas a collection schema is a durable, on-disk definition of an entire application’s data model, lifecycle, and UI that the agent operates *inside* over many turns. We adopt the inference-time techniques as complementary—they could tighten how the agent emits a schema—rather than as alternatives to the application-as-data substrate.

Schema-validated agent frameworks. Agent frameworks already place machine-checkable schemas between an agent and its environment: LangChain’s typed (Pydantic) tool definitions, AutoGen’s agent configuration [13], and Semantic Kernel’s plugin manifests all validate the structure of *individual tool calls*. This is properties (1) and (2) at the granularity of a callable interface. Collections differs in where the schema sits: rather than defining the boundary of a call the agent makes *across*, the schema defines the interior structure of an application the agent inhabits—a persistent, evolvable configuration the host renders and reconciles, not a per-invocation contract.

The novelty we claim is therefore not “schema-validated agent interface” (which is established prior art) but “schema-*as-the-application*, with the agent as its runtime.”

End-user software engineering and low-code. End-user programming has sought for decades to let non-programmers build software, from the spreadsheet onward [4, 7]; commercial low-code/no-code platforms (Airtable, Notion, Retool, PowerApps) continue this lineage, and by 2024–2026 several added AI-assisted, intent-based authoring (Airtable’s field generation, Notion AI’s schema construction from natural language, Power Automate’s Copilot)—so “intent-driven authoring” is no longer unique to our setting. The persistent constraint in that tradition is nonetheless that the schema remains a *UI/data-layer supplement* a human owns and the AI *assists*, with validation optional. Collections differs on three axes: the schema is the *complete* application definition (data model, computation, recurrence, UI, ingestion) rather than a layer of one; validation is *architectural* (a structurally incoherent schema cannot load) rather than advisory; and the agent *authors the whole DSL program* from intent rather than assisting a human composer. We frame this as the shift from *no-code* (a human composes blocks) to *intent-driven* (an agent composes, and operates, the DSL program).

3 A DSL Is a Harness

When you hand an agent a DSL you are not merely giving it a tool; you are reshaping the space it must search. That reshaping makes four classic harness patterns fall out of a single design decision.

(1) The schema is the system of record. Harness engineering insists that anything the agent cannot read in context effectively does not exist; intent must live in a machine-readable artifact. A DSL satisfies this by construction: its schema *is* the specification. When the agent writes a DSL document, the user’s intent is captured as a structured, inspectable object rather than dissolved into the incidental details of imperative code. It can be diffed, versioned, validated, and reasoned about without running it.

(2) The validator is a free feedback loop. The highest-leverage component in the SWE-agent study was a linter that rejected broken edits at the moment of introduction, before the error could propagate through later steps [14]. Every DSL ships with this loop: the instant the agent emits a malformed structure, a parser or schema checker rejects it with a localized, actionable message. The feedback loop came bundled with the language.

(3) The grammar is a forcing function. Because the vocabulary is finite, the room to hallucinate is structurally smaller. The agent cannot invent an option absent from the grammar; it can only compose the primitives the language provides. Constraint, here, is a feature. Two qualifications matter. First, Collections enforces this property *post hoc*—a parser/validator rejects a malformed schema and the agent retries—rather than at the token level as constrained decoding does (§2); the forcing function therefore acts at the system boundary, not inside the generation step. Second, and more importantly, the finite-grammar guarantee covers the schema’s *structural* vocabulary—field types, relationship kinds, layout and recurrence declarations—but *not* the two open-ended sub-surfaces the schema may embed: derived-field formula strings and custom-view HTML. We bound the formula sub-language deliberately (it is a small, non-Turing-complete expression grammar; §4), but a *well-formed* formula or view can still be semantically wrong, which we treat as a residual reliability surface in §8.

(4) The unit of the language is the unit of context. A well-designed DSL has a natural decomposition—a field, a record, a rule—which becomes the agent’s editing unit. It can work on one piece without holding the whole document in mind, and the language’s structure, not an ad-hoc heuristic, defines the seams (progressive disclosure).

How the value shifts as models improve. A tempting intuition holds that DSLs are a crutch for weak models, to be discarded as models get stronger. We argue the value does not vanish but *shifts among the four properties*, and we are careful to separate two claims the objection conflates. The strongest form of the objection is about *capability scaling*: a frontier model emits structurally valid schemas at near-unit frequency, so the marginal benefit of properties (2) the validator and (3) the grammar—both of which catch *structural* errors—does indeed tend toward zero as structural generation improves. We concede this. But properties (1) and (4) are not error-correction: making intent a diffable, inspectable artifact (1) and decomposing it into editing units (4) are valuable independent of how good the model is at avoiding mistakes; they govern *auditability and progressive disclosure*, which a more capable model exploits more, not less. Separately, there is a *deployment-context* claim: when work is delegated autonomously, over long horizons, with no human reviewing each step and a requirement that execution be verifiable and reversible, a persistent validated contract remains valuable regardless of model strength—not to catch the model’s structural mistakes but to make the system’s behavior checkable by something other than trust. A stronger model inside a DSL harness is thus not wasted capability; it is capability aimed at judgment—what to model, what to express—while the language supplies durability and inspectability that scaling does not provide on its own.

4 The Collections System

Collections applies the DSL-as-harness idea to software itself. A collection is:

`schema.json + records/*.json + model = application.`

There is no database server, no migration framework, and no application-specific backend. The host understands only generic capabilities; everything domain-specific lives in the collection.

4.1 The schema DSL

A schema declares typed *fields*. The current implementation supports 17 field types, including `string`, `text`, `number`, `date`, `datetime`, `boolean`, `markdown`, `enum`, `money`, `image`, `file`, a nested `table` of sub-records, two relationship types (`ref`, `embed`), a computed `derived` field, and a `toggle` that projects an `enum`. Relationships are first-class: a `ref` stores a foreign key and the host renders pickers, links, and navigation generically; an `embed` pulls a fixed record from another collection for display.

4.2 Computation without code

A `derived` field behaves like a spreadsheet formula, but formulas may follow references into other collections:

```
"total": {
  "type": "derived", "display": "money", "currencyField": "currency",
  "formula": "sum(lineItems[].quantity * lineItems[].rate) * (1 + taxRate)"
}
```

The host evaluates derived fields, and crucially returns them *to the model* as well as to the screen, so the agent reasons over the same numbers the user sees. A portfolio can revalue itself when a quote changes elsewhere, with no synchronization code.

The formula is itself a small DSL, and a deliberately bounded one. Its grammar admits only the four arithmetic operators, parentheses, a single aggregation function (sum over a table column or product of table columns), and single-level reference dereferencing (e.g. `ticker.price`); it has no conditionals, loops, string operations, comparisons, user-defined functions, or nested calls. It is therefore *not* Turing-complete—closer to a spreadsheet cell expression than a scripting language—and it is parsed before evaluation, so a malformed formula, an unbound identifier, or a non-finite result yields a null that the host renders as an em-dash rather than a wrong number. This bound limits the *structural* surface of a formula; it does not make a well-formed formula *semantically* correct, a gap we return to in §8.

4.3 Completion, notification, and host-driven recurrence

A schema can mark which field and values count as “done” (`completionField` / `completionDoneValues`), gate notifications on a date (`triggerField` / `triggerLeadDays`), and—via a `spawn` block—provision the next instance of a recurring obligation on a civil-date cadence when the current one closes:

```
"triggerField": "dueOn", "triggerLeadDays": 3,
"spawn": {
  "every": { "unit": "month", "interval": 1, "dayOfMonth": 10 },
  "carry": ["payee", "amount"], "set": { "status": "pending" }
}
```

The author declares *what recurs and when to nudge*; the host’s reconciler owns the deterministic half—raising and clearing reminders and advancing each cycle with create-if-absent (idempotent) semantics. No timer, cron expression, or notification code is written.

4.4 Custom views: bespoke UI as data

Host-rendered field types give every collection a list, a detail form, and—when declared—calendar and Kanban layouts for free. When field types cannot present the data well (a portfolio as an allocation chart, a set of places as a map, a word list as flashcards), a collection may carry a *custom view*: an HTML file the agent authors and the host serves.

```
"views": [
  { "id": "allocation", "label": "Allocation",
    "file": "views/allocation.html", "capabilities": ["read", "write"] }
]
```

A view is an ordinary web page (it may load a charting library from a curated CDN allow-list) but it is rendered inside a sandboxed `iframe` under a strict Content-Security-Policy: an opaque origin, `default-src 'none'`, and network access only back to the host. It receives its records through a capability-scoped, time-limited token rather than ambient access; the declared `capabilities` (`read`, `write`) bound what that token permits. A custom view is thus not a hole in the harness but the same bargain as the rest of the system: the model supplies the bespoke surface, the host supplies the deterministic, sandboxed boundary, and the presentation layer too becomes inspectable, versioned data.

4.5 Feeds: acquisition as data

Some applications track an external source—a podcast’s episodes, a newspaper’s headlines, a JSON API. Such a collection declares an `ingest` block and becomes a *feed*:

```
"ingest": {  
  "kind": "rss", "url": "https://lexfridman.com/feed/podcast/",  
  "schedule": "daily", "idFrom": "guid",  
  "map": { "headline": "title", "url": "link", "published": "pubDate" },  
  "maxItems": 100  
}
```

`kind` selects a retriever (`rss`, `atom`, `http-json`); `map` projects source fields onto collection fields; `schedule` (`hourly`/`daily`/`weekly`/`on-demand`) sets cadence; `maxItems` caps retention. The host owns fetching, parsing, field mapping, de-duplication by id, pruning, and cursor/failure tracking. Because a feed is still a collection, the user can layer their own fields onto the ingested ones—a rating, a note, a resume position—turning a passive mirror into a read–write application over an external source.

4.6 Schema evolution

Because an agent edits schemas in place as needs change, records written under an earlier schema coexist with a later one, and the host must define what happens. Its rule is asymmetric: schemas are validated at *load* (the path-independent gate of §5) and records are validated on *write*, but records are *not* re-validated on *read*. The consequence is that *additive* changes are non-breaking by construction: a record lacking a newly-added field is read without error, the missing value renders as empty, and any derived field that referenced it evaluates to the em-dash null rather than failing. A newly-*required* field or a field-type change is breaking only *prospectively*—existing records still load and display, but the next write to such a record (or a new record) must satisfy the new constraint. There is no migration framework, and this is deliberate: re-validating on read would make a single stale record look like data loss, so the host favors graceful degradation over hard failure, and leaves true migrations (backfilling a required field across old records) to an ordinary agent task. This behavior is exercised in our deployment, not hypothetical: the podcast feed of §7 gained user rating and notes fields after ingestion had populated it, and the pre-existing records absorbed the additive change without migration.

5 The Reliability Dial

The reason a self-built, model-operated application is reliable rather than flaky is a single principle: **the DSL is a contract that pins down what must be deterministic, while the model supplies flexibility, judgment, and language.** Table 1 summarizes the split.

A schema validator makes the boundary self-enforcing. A structurally incoherent application is rejected at load with an actionable reason—examples include a `money` field with neither a literal currency nor a per-record currency field, a `ref` pointing at a non-existent collection, a `triggerField` that does not name a real date field, and a `spawn` whose successor would be born already matching its own predicate (an unbounded respawn).

The craft is *where the dial sits*. Push everything into the DSL and you rebuild the brittle “can’t-express-this” cage that made no-code platforms frustrating; push everything to the model

Host guarantees (deterministic)	Model owns (judgment)
Schema validity (load-time)	What to model
Path safety, record storage	What a record means
Derived-value computation	How a workflow should proceed
Recurrence / civil-date math	When to hand off to a human
Sandboxed view rendering (CSP)	How to present data (authoring the view)
Scheduled ingestion + de-dup	Which external source, mapped how
Record-write validation (every path)	Conducting a seeded-chat workflow
Load-time schema re-validation	Which fields/views to add as needs evolve

Table 1: The host/model responsibility split. Everything on the left runs identically every time; everything on the right is where the model’s flexibility is wanted.

and you lose the durable contract that made it an application at all. The guiding rule is to *extend the declarative layer only when it outperforms the agent*.

6 The Escape Hatch

The same rigidity that makes a DSL a good harness is its failure mode: when the language cannot express what the user needs, an agent will either give up or contort the DSL into something it was never meant to hold. Every well-designed DSL answers this with a deliberate exit to a more expressive layer.

Collections provides two. First, a per-record or collection-level `action` hands off to a seeded chat—a full-tool agent—exactly when a task needs human judgment the form cannot capture (“generate the invoice PDF,” “what was the amount, and was it actually paid?”). This is business logic as prose, behind a declarative door. Second, the *custom view* (§4) is the escape for presentation: when host-rendered field types cannot express a layout, the schema drops to arbitrary HTML in a sandbox rather than distorting the field-type vocabulary. The art is not to maximize constraint but to choose *where* the constraint binds and to provide a clean, legible path out where it does not. A harness with no escape hatch eventually forces the agent to fail or to lie, and both are worse than a slightly leakier abstraction.

It is important to be precise about how bounded the seeded-chat escape actually is, because “full-tool agent” overstates it. The chat runs under a named *role*, and the role’s allow-list determines the tool surface; the agent in the seeded chat can do only what that role grants. Record reads and writes go through the same *record-write validation* that governs every other path, so a seeded chat cannot write a record the schema would reject. Crucially, there is no tool that edits a schema directly, and even if a schema file were modified by any path, it is re-validated by the same load-time validator before the collection can be used again (§5): the validator is a *path-independent gate*, not a write-time check that an escape could sidestep. What the escape genuinely relaxes is the *conduct of the workflow*—the conversation itself is model-driven and unconstrained—not the structural guarantees over what gets persisted. The honest residual, then, is semantic rather than structural, which the next section takes up.

7 Case Study: A Longitudinal Single-User Deployment

We report on one author’s production workspace, which has accreted applications through ordinary use over roughly two months. No host code was written for any of these applications; each is a

Collection	#rec	Collection	#rec	Collection	#rec
subscribers	466	engagements	22	recurring-bills	6
vocabulary	50	restaurants	20	videos	6
todos	23	lessons-biology	12	worklog	6
reading-list	10	members	11	portfolio	4
stock-quotes	10	watchlist	10	html-apps	4
tax-payments	7	clients	3	(7 more)	≤ 2

Table 2: Representative collections by record count in the studied workspace (24 schema-defined collections total). Sizes span from a single-record profile to 466 newsletter subscribers.

schema plus records, authored by the agent in response to natural-language requests.

Scale. The workspace contains 24 schema-defined collections holding ~ 700 records, plus 3 feeds (§4) holding a further ~ 260 ingested records. Collection sizes vary by nearly three orders of magnitude (Table 2), consistent with the claim that the marginal cost of a new application is low enough to justify even a single-record one. Each schema is small—32 lines of JSON on average—and there is, by construction, zero per-application host code behind any of them.

Mechanisms exercised in practice. The deployment uses every major mechanism described in §4: relationships (an `invoice` references a `client` and embeds the issuer profile), derived computation (invoice totals from line items and tax), host-driven recurrence (monthly and annual obligations via `spawn`), and completion/notification gating (todos, tax payments).

Bespoke views. Nine custom HTML views, authored by the agent on request, are deployed—seven over collections and two over feeds. They include a restaurant guide rendered as a transit-style map, a movie watchlist as a poster gallery, a vocabulary list as a flashcard drill, a portfolio as an allocation chart, a stock list as a valuation scatter plot, a scouting collection as per-entity radar charts, and a subscriber collection as a trend line (Figure 1). Each is software with an addressable audience of one—software no vendor would build—produced for the cost of a request. The owner never wrote or read the HTML.

Feeds. Three collections are feeds: an hourly newspaper-technology feed (64 records at time of writing), and two daily podcast feeds (100 records each). One podcast feed is read-write: the schema layers the owner’s own rating, notes, and resume-position fields on top of the ingested episode metadata, and the host serves a custom gallery view over the combined record.

Observations. Two qualitative observations stand out. (i) *No per-application host code* was required for any of the 26 applications; the host’s generic capabilities sufficed, which is the load-bearing claim of applications-as-data. This includes the one instance of schema evolution we observed—the podcast feed gaining user rating and notes fields after ingestion—which the host absorbed as an additive, non-breaking change with no migration code (§4.6); we did not stress breaking changes (a newly-required field or a type change across a large record set), so the no-migration claim is bounded to additive evolution. (ii) The applications *diverge sharply from any mass-market product*: a transit-map restaurant guide and a read-write podcast tracker with personal resume positions reflect one user’s specific needs, supporting the view that a near-zero marginal build cost shifts the natural unit of software from the mass-market product toward the individual.




Figure 1: Three of the nine agent-authored custom views in the studied deployment (two collection views and one feed view): a restaurant collection rendered as a transit-style map (a); a portfolio whose host-computed valuations (§4) drive an allocation chart (b); and an ingested podcast feed turned into a read-write gallery (c), where the owner’s rating, notes, and resume position are layered on top of episode metadata. Each is a self-contained HTML file the host serves in a sandboxed, capability-scoped iframe; the owner described each in natural language and never saw the generated markup.

8 Discussion and Limitations

The escape-hatch hazard. The expressiveness that escape hatches restore is also unconstrained: a custom view or a seeded-chat action runs outside the declarative guarantees. We mitigate this for views with sandboxing and capability-scoped tokens (§4), but the general tension—more expressiveness, fewer guarantees—is fundamental and must be managed per escape, not eliminated.

Non-replayable execution. Because the operating step is a nondeterministic model call, a run cannot be replayed byte-for-byte, and a self-modification’s effect cannot be A/B-replayed against the prior behavior on identical inputs. This is the deliberate trade against log-primary designs [6]. The mitigation is configuration-level rather than run-level: a git-backed workspace makes every schema and view edit auditable and revertable, which is the granularity that matters for an agent editing its own applications.

Unconstrained sub-surfaces within the schema. As noted in §3 and §4, the finite-grammar guarantee covers the schema’s structural vocabulary but not the two expressive sub-surfaces it can embed: derived-field formula strings and custom-view HTML. These are where the harness’s structural guarantee ends and ordinary model-reliability concerns resume. We bound the formula grammar (non-Turing-complete, parsed before evaluation) and sandbox the views (opaque-origin iframe, strict CSP, capability-scoped tokens), so the *blast radius* of an error in either is contained; what is *not* contained is whether a well-formed formula or a well-rendered view is *correct*. Structural validity and semantic correctness are different guarantees, and the DSL provides only the first.

Correctness has no second audience. Mass software accumulates correctness through many users and years; an application with an audience of one does not. A wrong poster gallery is harmless, but a wrong financial or tax view is not, and only the model and the single user ever inspect it. The reliability dial is the relevant defense—push consequential computation into host-guaranteed derived fields rather than leaving it to a generated view—but it *relocates* the valid-but-wrong failure mode rather than removing it. A derived formula is itself a model-authored string: the host evaluates it deterministically but cannot judge whether it is the right formula for the domain. A

plausible-but-erroneous tax formula—say, applying the rate before a discount rather than after—passes schema validation and then executes reliably and wrongly on every record, with no second reviewer to catch it. The mitigation that the substrate does afford is that formulas are short, inspectable, plain-text expressions in the schema file, so *diffing a formula against the user’s stated intent* is a tractable review step in a way that auditing generated imperative code is not; but the residual risk is real and is part of the price of building for one.

Indirect prompt injection via ingested content. Feeds (§4) introduce a threat the sandboxing does not address. Ingested fields—headlines, descriptions, show notes—are untrusted natural language that then enters records the model reads and reasons over, and indirect prompt injection (adversarial instructions embedded in retrieved content that the model subsequently follows) is a documented attack on content-consuming agents [3]. The custom-view CSP sandbox governs UI rendering, not the model’s context, so it offers no protection here; and because the operating agent may hold write-capable tokens, a compromised feed could in principle steer record writes or cross-collection reads within whatever permissions the active role grants. Capability scoping bounds *what* an injected instruction could reach but does not stop the model from acting on embedded text in the first place. We did not observe such an attack in our benign deployment, but we flag it as the feed architecture’s primary unmitigated threat; plausible defenses include processing ingested content in a system-prompt-isolated context and flagging model operations initiated over recently-ingested records for confirmation.

Threats to validity. Our empirical evidence is a single user, a single system, and an author-operated deployment; it demonstrates feasibility and the no-host-code property but does not establish generality, and it reports usage rather than a controlled comparison. Quantifying authoring effort, error rates, and how the reliability dial should be set across users and domains is future work.

9 Conclusion

A domain-specific language is a powerful harness for an autonomous agent precisely because it relinquishes expressiveness for a small, validated, inspectable surface. Collections applies that principle to applications themselves: a schema defines the application, record files are the database, the host runs the deterministic half, and the model operates inside the schema. The result is software an agent can author and refine on request, with the reliability of a declarative contract and the flexibility of a language model held apart by a deliberate dial. Building applications shifts from writing imperative code to declaring—and validating—harnesses; the records are data, the schema is the program, and the model is the runtime.

Availability

MulmoClaude and the Collections implementation are open source. The schema validator, derived-formula evaluator, recurrence reconciler, custom-view sandbox, and feed engine referenced above are part of that codebase, available at <https://github.com/receptron/mulmoclaude>.

References

- [1] Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Martin Vechev. Prompting is programming: A query language for large language models. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages (PLDI)*, 2023. arXiv:2212.06094.
- [2] Martin Fowler. *Domain-Specific Languages*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2010.
- [3] Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world LLM-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec)*, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3605764.3623985. arXiv:2302.12173.
- [4] Andrew J. Ko, Robin Abraham, Laura Beckwith, Alan Blackwell, Margaret Burnett, Martin Erwig, Christopher Scaffidi, Joseph Lawrance, Henry Lieberman, Brad Myers, Mary Beth Rosson, Gregg Rothermel, Mary Shaw, and Susan Wiedenbeck. The state of the art in end-user software engineering. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 43(3):1–44, 2011. doi: 10.1145/1922649.1922658.
- [5] Marjan Mernik, Jan Heering, and Anthony M. Sloane. When and how to develop domain-specific languages. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 37(4):316–344, 2005. doi: 10.1145/1118890.1118892.
- [6] Yohei Nakajima. The log is the agent: Event-sourced reactive graphs for auditable, forkable agentic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.21997*, 2026.
- [7] Bonnie A. Nardi. *A Small Matter of Programming: Perspectives on End User Computing*. MIT Press, 1993.
- [8] OpenAI. Structured outputs. OpenAI Platform documentation, <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/structured-outputs>, 2024.
- [9] Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O’Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, 2023. arXiv:2304.03442.
- [10] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. arXiv:2302.04761.
- [11] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [12] Brandon T. Willard and Rémi Louf. Efficient guided generation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09702*, 2023.
- [13] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed H. Awadallah, Ryen W. White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. AutoGen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.

- [14] John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. SWE-agent: Agent–computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. arXiv:2405.15793.
- [15] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. arXiv:2210.03629.