

Background

This thesis illustrates an approach of implementing a language server for the Nickel language which communicates with its clients, i.e. editors, over the open Language Server Protocol (in the following abbreviated as *LSP*). The current chapter provides the background on the technological details of the project. As the work presented aims to be transferable to other languages using the same methods, this chapter will provide the means to distinguish the nickel specific implementation details.

The primary technology built upon in this thesis is the language server protocol. The first part of this chapter introduces the LSP, its rationale and improvements over classical approaches, technical capabilities and protocol details. The second part is dedicated to Nickel, elaborating on the context and use-cases of the language followed by an inspection of the technical features of Nickel.

Language Server Protocol

Language servers are today's standard of integrating support for programming languages into code editors. Initially developed by Microsoft for the use with their polyglot editor Visual Studio Code¹ before being released to the public in 2016 by Microsoft, RedHat and Codeenvy, the LSP decouples language analysis and provision of IDE-like features from the editor. Developed under open source license on GitHub², the protocol allows developers of editors and languages to work independently on the support for new languages. If supported by both server and client, the LSP now supports more than 24 language features³ including code completion, code navigation facilities, contextual information such as types or documentation, formatting, and more.

JSON-RPC

JSON-RPC (v2) (**j**son-**r**pc?) is a JSON based lightweight transport independent remote procedure call protocol used by the LSP to communicate between a language server and a client.

The protocol specifies the general format of messages exchanges as well as

¹<https://code.visualstudio.com/>

²<https://github.com/microsoft/language-server-protocol/>

³<https://microsoft.github.io/language-server-protocol/specifications/specification-current/>

different kinds of messages. The following snippet lst. 0.1 shows the schema for request messages.

Listing 0.1 JSON-RPC Request

```
// Requests
{
  "jsonrpc": "2.0"
  , "method": String
  , "params": List | Object
  , "id": Number | String | Null
}
```

The main distinction in JSON-RPC are *Requests* and *Notifications*. Messages with an `id` field present are considered *requests*. Servers have to respond to requests with a message referencing the same `id` as well as a result, i.e. data or error. If the client does not require a response, it can omit the `id` field sending a *notification*, which servers cannot respond to, with the effect that clients cannot know the effect nor the reception of the message.

Responses, as shown in lst. 0.2, have to be sent by servers answering to any request. Any result or error of an operation is explicitly encoded in the response. Errors are represented as objects specifying the error kind using an error `code` and provide a human-readable descriptive `message` as well as optionally any procedure defined `data`.

Listing 0.2 JSON-RPC Response and Error

```
// Responses
{
  "jsonrpc": "2.0"
  "result": any
  "error": Error
  , "id": Number | String | Null
}
```

Clients can choose to batch requests and send a list of request or notification objects. The server should respond with a list of results matching each request, yet is free to process requests concurrently.

JSON-RPC only specifies a message protocol, hence the transport method can be freely chosen by the application.

Commands and Notifications

The LSP builds on top of the JSON-RPC protocol described in the previous subsection.

File Notification

Diagnostics

Hover**Completion****Go-To-*****Symbols****code lenses****Shortcomings**

Configuration programming languages

Nickel (**nickel?**), the language targeted by the language server detailed in this thesis, defines itself as “configuration language” used to automatize the generation of static configuration files.

Static configuration languages such as XML(**xml?**), JSON(**json?**), or YAML(**yaml?**) are language specifications defining how to textually represent structural data used to configure parameters of a system⁴. Applications of configuration languages are ubiquitous especially in the vicinity of software development. While XML and JSON are often used by package managers (**composer?**), YAML is a popular choice for complex configurations such as CI/CD pipelines (**gitlab-runner?**) or machine configurations in software defined networks such as Kubernetes and docker compose.

Such static formats are used due to some significant advantages compared to other formats. Most strikingly, the textual representation allows inspection of a configuration without the need of a separate tool but a text editor and be version controlled using VCS software like Git. For software configuration this is well understood as being preferable over databases or other binary formats. Linux service configurations (files in `/etc`) and MacOS `*.plist` files which can be serialized as XML or a JSON-like format, especially exemplify that claim.

Yet, despite these formats being simple to parse and widely supported (**json?**), their static nature rules out any dynamic content such as generated fields, functions and the possibility to factorize and reuse. Moreover, content validation has to be developed separately, which led to the design of complementary schema specification languages like json-schema (**json-schema?**) or XSD (**xsd?**).

These qualities require an evaluated language. In fact, some applications make heavy use of config files written in the native programming language which gives them access to language features and existing analysis tools. Examples include JavaScript frameworks such as webpack (**webpack?**) or Vue (**vue?**) and python package management using **setuptools(setuptools?)**.

Despite this, not all languages serve as a configuration language, e.g. compiled languages and some domains require language agnostic formats. For particularly complex products, both language independence and advanced features are desirable. Alternatively to generating configurations using high level languages, this demand is addressed by more domain specific languages. Dhall (**dhall?**),

⁴some of the named languages may have been designed as a data interchange format which is absolutely compatible with also acting as a configuration language

Cue (**cue?**) or jsonnet (**jsonnet?**) are such domain specific languages (DSL), that offer varying support for string interpolation, (strict) typing, functions and validation.

Infrastructure as Code

A prime example for the application of configuration languages are IaaS⁵ products. These solutions offer great flexibility with regard to resource provision (computing, storage, load balancing, etc.), network setup and scaling of (virtual) servers. Although the primary interaction with those systems is imperative, maintaining entire applications' or company's environments manually comes with obvious drawbacks.

Changing and undoing changes to existing networks requires intricate knowledge about its topology which in turn has to be meticulously documented. Undocumented modification pose a significant risk for *config drift* which is particularly difficult to undo imperatively. Beyond that, interacting with a system through its imperative interfaces demands qualified skills of specialized engineers.

The concept of "Infrastructure as Code" (*IaC*) serves the DevOps principles. IaC tools help to overcome the need for dedicated teams for *Development* and *Operations* by allowing to declaratively specify the dependencies, topology and virtual resources. Optimally, different environments for testing, staging and production can be derived from a common base and changes to configurations are atomic. As an additional benefit, configuration code is subject to common software engineering tooling; It can be statically analyzed, refactored and version controlled to ensure reproducibility.

As a notable instance, the Nix(**nix?**) ecosystem even goes as far as enabling declarative system and service configuration using NixOps(**nixops?**).

To get an idea of how this would look like, `lst. 0.3` shows the configuration for a deployment of the Git based wiki server Gollum(**gollum?**) behind a nginx reverse proxy on the AWS network. Although this example targets AWS, Nix itself is platform-agnostic and NixOps supports different backends through various plugins. Configurations like this are abstractions over many manual steps and the Nix language employed in this example allows for even higher level turing-complete interaction with configurations.

Similarly, tools like Terraform(**terraform?**), or Chef(**chef?**) use their own DSLs and integrate with most major cloud providers. The popularity of these products⁶, beyond all, highlights the importance of expressive configuration formats and their industry value.

Finally, descriptive data formats for cloud configurations allow mitigating security risks through static analysis. Yet, as recently as spring 2020 and still more than a year later dossiers of Palo Alto Networks' security department Unit 42 (**pa2020H1?**) show that a majority of public projects uses insecure configurations. This suggests that techniques(**aws-cloud-formation-security-tests?**) to automatically check templates are not actively employed, and points out the

⁵Infrastructure as a Service

⁶<https://trends.google.com/trends/explore?date=2012-01-01%202022-01-01&q=%2Fg%2F11g6bg27fp,CloudFormation>

importance of evaluated configuration languages which can implement passive approaches to security analysis.

Nickel

Gradual typing

Row types

Contracts

In addition to a static type-system Nickel integrates a contract system akin what is described in (**cant-be-blamed?**). First introduced by Findler and Felleisen, contracts allow the creation of runtime-checked subtypes. Unlike types, contracts check an annotated value using arbitrary functions that either pass or *blame* the input. Contracts act like assertions that are automatically checked when a value is used or passed to annotated functions.

For instance, a contract could be used to define TCP port numbers, like shown in lst. 0.4.

Going along gradual typing, contracts pose a convenient alternative to the **newtype** pattern. Instead of requiring values to be wrapped or converted into custom types, contracts are self-contained. As a further advantage, multiple contracts can be applied to the same value as well as integrated into other higher level contracts. An example can be observed in lst. 0.5

Notice how contracts also enable detailed error messages (see lst. 0.6) using custom blame messages. Nickel is able to point to the exact value violating a contract as well as the contract in question.

Nickel AST

Nickel's syntax tree is a single sum type, i.e., an enumeration of node types. Each enumeration variant may refer to child nodes, representing a branch or hold terminal values in which case it is considered a leaf of the tree. Additionally, tree nodes hold information about their position in the underlying code.

Basic Elements The primitive values of the Nickel language are closely related to JSON. On the leaf level, Nickel defines **Boolean**, **Number**, **String** and **Null**. In addition to that the language implements native support for **Enum** values which are serialized as plain strings. Each of these are terminal leafs in the syntax tree.

Completing JSON compatibility, **List** and **Record** constructs are present as well. Records on a syntax level are HashMaps, uniquely associating an identifier with a sub-node.

These data types constitute a static subset of Nickel which allows writing JSON compatible expressions as shown in lst. 0.7.

Building on that Nickel also supports variables and functions.

Variable Reference Let bindings in their simplest form merely bind a name to a value expression and expose the name to the inner expression. Hence, the **Let** node contains the binding and links to both implementation and scope subtrees. The binding can be a simple name, a pattern or both by naming the pattern as shown in lst. 0.8.

Meta Information One key feature of Nickel is its gradual typing system [ref again?], which implies that values can be explicitly typed. Complementing type information, it is possible to annotate values with contracts and additional metadata such as contracts, documentation, default values and merge priority using a special syntax as displayed in `lst. 0.10`.

```
graph TD; MetaValue[MetaValue] --> LetLet(Let('x')); LetLet --> Num5(Num(5)); LetLet --> VarX(Var('x'));
```

Nested Record Access Nickel supports the referencing of variables that are resolved during runtime. With records bound to a variable, a method to destruct records is required. Nickel restricts field names to strings,

The access of record fields is represented using a special set of AST nodes depending on whether the field name requires an evaluation in which case resolution is deferred to the evaluation pass. While the latter prevents static analysis of any deeper element by the LSP, **StaticAccess** can be used to resolve any intermediate reference.

Notably, Nickel represents static access chains in inverse order as unary operations which in turn puts the terminal `Var` node as a leaf in the tree. Figure 2 shows the representation of the static access performed in lst. 0.12 with the rest of the tree omitted.




Figure 2: AST of typed expression

Record Shorthand Nickel supports a shorthand syntax to efficiently define nested records similarly to how nested record fields are accessed. As a comparison the example in lst. 0.13 uses the shorthand syntax which resolves to the semantically equivalent record defined in lst. 0.14

Yet, on a syntax level Nickel generates a different representation.

Listing 0.3 Example NixOps deployment to AWS

```

{
  network.description = "Gollum server and reverse proxy";
  defaults =
    { config, pkgs, ... }:
    {
      deployment.targetEnv = "ec2";
      deployment.ec2.accessKeyId = "AKIA...";
      deployment.ec2.keyPair = "...";
      deployment.ec2.privateKey = "...";
      deployment.ec2.securityGroups = pkgs.lib.mkDefault [ "default" ];
      deployment.ec2.region = pkgs.lib.mkDefault "eu-west-1";
      deployment.ec2.instanceType = pkgs.lib.mkDefault "t2.large";
    };

  gollum =
    { config, pkgs, ... }:
    {
      services.gollum = {
        enable = true;
        port = 40273;
      };
      networking.firewall.allowedTCPPorts = [ config.services.gollum.port ];
    };

  reverseproxy =
    { config, pkgs, nodes, ... }:
    let
      gollumPort = nodes.gollum.config.services.gollum.port;
    in
    {
      deployment.ec2.instanceType = "t1.medium";
      services.nginx = {
        enable = true;
        virtualHosts."wiki.example.net".locations."/" = {
          proxyPass = "http://gollum:${toString gollumPort}";
        };
      };
      networking.firewall.allowedTCPPorts = [ 80 ];
    };
}

```

Listing 0.4 Sample Contract ensuring that a value is a valid TCP port number

```
let Port | doc "A contract for a port number" =  
  contracts.from_predicate (  
    fun value =>  
      builtins.is_num value &&  
      value % 1 == 0 &&  
      value >= 0 &&  
      value <= 65535  
  )  
in 8080 | #Port
```

Listing 0.5 More advanced use of contracts restricting values to an even smaller domain

```
let Port | doc "A contract for a port number" =  
  contracts.from_predicate (  
    fun value =>  
      builtins.is_num value &&  
      value % 1 == 0 &&  
      value >= 0 &&  
      value <= 65535  
  )  
in  
let UnprivilegedPort = contracts.from_predicate (  
  fun value =>  
    (value | #Port) >= 1024  
  )  
in  
let Even = fun label value =>  
  if value % 2 == 0 then value  
  else  
    let msg = "not an even value" in  
    contracts.blame_with msg label  
in  
  
8001 | #UnprivilegedPort  
    | #Even
```

Listing 0.6 Example error message for failed contract

```

error: Blame error: contract broken by a value [not an even value].
  - :1:1
  |
1 | #Even
  | ----- expected type
  |
  - repl-input-34:22:1
  |
22 | - 8001 | #UnprivilegedPort
  | ---- evaluated to this expression
23 | |      | #Even
  | -----^ applied to this expression

note:
  - repl-input-34:23:8
  |
23 |      | #Even
  |      ^^^^^ bound here

```

Listing 0.7 Example of a static Nickel expression

```

{
  list = [ 1, "string", null],
  "some key" = "value"
}

```

Listing 0.8 Let bindings and functions in nickel

```

// simple bindings
let name = <expr> in <expr>
let func = fun arg => <expr> in <expr>

// or with patterns
let name @ { field, with_default = 2 } = <expr> in <expr>
let func = fun arg @ { field, with_default = 2 } =>
  <expr> in
  <expr>

```

Listing 0.9 Parsed representation of functions with multiple arguments

```

fun first second => first + second
// ...is parsed as
fun first =>
  fun second => first + second

```

Listing 0.10 Example of a static Nickel expression

```
let Contract = {
  foo | Num
    | doc "I am foo",
  hello | Str
    | default = "world"
}
| doc "Just an example Contract"
in
let value | #Contract = { foo = 9, }
in value == { foo = 9, hello = "world", }

> true
```

Listing 0.11 Example of a typed expression

```
let x: Num = 5 in x
```

Listing 0.12 Nickel static access

```
let x = {
  y = {
    z = 1,
  }
} in x.y.z
```

Listing 0.13 Nickel record defined using shorthand

```
{
  deeply.nested.record.field = true,
}
```

Listing 0.14 Nickel record defined explicitly

```
{
  deeply = {
    nested = {
      record = {
        field = true,
      }
    }
  }
}
```
