

New issue

[Jump to bottom](#)

Missing error for XML documents with multiple root element nodes #150



markgollnick opened this issue on Jan 19, 2016 · 6 comments

markgollnick commented on Jan 19, 2016

Bug Description:

xmldom allows incoming documents to have multiple root element nodes. This appears to me to be a violation of the [W3C DOM Level 2 Core Specification](#):

[...] Each document contains zero or one doctype nodes, **one root element node**, and zero or more comments or processing instructions; the root element serves as the root of the element tree for the document. [...]

— from “What the Document Object Model is” (emphasis mine)

The root node is the unique node that is not a child of any other node. All other nodes are children or other descendants of the root node.

— from the Glossary (emphasis mine)

However, the spec *also* says this:

[...] However, **the DOM does not specify that documents must be implemented as a tree or a grove**, nor does it specify how the relationships among objects be implemented. **The DOM is a logical model that may be implemented in any convenient manner.** [...]

— from “What the Document Object Model is” (emphasis mine)

The children of a `DocumentFragment` node are zero or more nodes representing the tops of any sub-trees defining the structure of the document. `DocumentFragment` nodes do not need to be *well-formed XML documents* (although they do need to follow the rules imposed upon **well-formed XML parsed entities, which can have multiple top nodes**). For example, a `DocumentFragment` might have only one child and that child node could be a `Text` node. Such a structure model represents neither an HTML document nor a well-formed XML document.

— from § 1.2 / Fundamental Interfaces / Interface `DocumentFragment` (emphasis mine)

In light of this, for the record, I actually don't dislike the fact that `xmldom` can parse such documents. This comes with a few reservations (outlined below) because it seems like the current behavior is contrary to what the specs (both W3C DOM Level 2 Core *and* [XML 1.1](#)) assert ought to be the case.

Bug Reproduction:

The following code:

```
var DOMParser = require('xmldom').DOMParser;
var xmlData = '<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>\n' +
'<root>\n' +
'  <branch girth="large">\n' +
'    <leaf color="green" />\n' +
'  </branch>\n' +
'</root>\n' +
'<root>\n' +
'  <branch girth="twig">\n' +
'    <leaf color="gold" />\n' +
'  </branch>\n' +
'</root>\n';
var xmlDOM = new DOMParser().parseFromString(xmlData);
console.log(xmlDOM.toString());
```

...produces the following output:

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?><root>
  <branch girth="large">
    <leaf color="green"/>
  </branch>
</root>
<root>
  <branch girth="twig">
    <leaf color="gold"/>
  </branch>
</root>
```

In contrast to this, [libxmljs](#) — which relies on [libxml2](#) — refuses to parse such documents, opting to throw an error instead:

```
var xml = require('libxmljs');
var xmlDoc = xml.parseXmlString(xmlData);
Error: Extra content at the end of the document
```

Firefox behaves in a similar way, and refuses to parse the document:

```
console.log(
  new XMLSerializer().serializeToString(
    new DOMParser().parseFromString(xmlData, 'text/xml')));
```

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<?xml-stylesheet href="chrome://global/locale/intl.css" type="text/css"?>
<parsererror xmlns="http://www.mozilla.org/newlayout/xml/parsererror.xml">XML Parsing Error: junk
after document element
Location: about:blank
Line Number 7, Column 1:<sourcetext>&lt;root&gt;
^</sourcetext></parsererror>
```

Chrome goes a *little* bit farther in that it is at least willing to parse/render the first root element node:

```
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8"?>
<root>
  <parsererror xmlns="http://www.w3.org/1999/xhtml" style="display: block; white-space: pre;
border: 2px solid #c77; padding: 0 1em 0 1em; margin: 1em; background-color: #fdd; color: black">
    <h3>This page contains the following errors:</h3>
    <div style="font-family:monospace;font-size:12px">error on line 7 at column 1: Extra content
at the end of the document
  </div>
    <h3>Below is a rendering of the page up to the first error.</h3>
  </parsererror>
  <branch girth="large">
    <leaf color="green"/>
  </branch>
</root>
```

Expectations/Recommendations/Discussion:

- I expected the above document to fail to parse in xmldom's DOMParser implementation, but it didn't. In light of the specs, this seems like it might be a "false-positive" bug. However, I think there *is* some utility in being able to parse multiple documents in a single stream, *if* the API can be re-tooled just a bit. More on this below.
- In order to be more compliant with the specs, I think that if more than one root node is present in an XML stream — especially if they appear without corresponding `<?xml?>` declarations — then the DOMParser should, bare-minimum, simply opt to not support such streams, and should raise an error informing the consumer that the given XML stream is invalid.
- **Alternatively**, if it is desired to keep the ability to parse multiple documents in a single stream — which I think would be useful functionality to retain: the alternative of requiring users to manually split XML documents crammed into a single stream before they can pass them into xmldom seems counter-intuitive to me, as that should be the job of the parser — then perhaps the DOMParser API could be re-tooled to return an *array* or a *list* of multiple document objects, each one with a singular root element node (rather than a *single* document object with *multiple root elements*, as is the case today), but *only in the event that multiple root elements are detected within the input stream*. I think that this behavior would help xmldom to be more compliant with the specs, *and* it would help to prevent consumers from accidentally generating poorly formed XML output from their parsed document objects, since each parsed document object would have only *one* root node, as the specs indicate ought to be the case.

Conclusion:

On one hand, I think it is a useful thing to be able to parse streams containing multiple XML documents.

On the other hand, to do that silently without issuing even so much as a warning to consumers — especially when the specs say that root nodes should be unique — seems, well, odd. **It seems like the current behavior is more of an artifact or a side-effect of xmldom's current architecture than it is an intentional aspect of its design**, hence my writing this up as a bug rather than a feature request. (If I'm mistaken, do let me know!)

Environment/Versions:

- xmldom v0.1.21



markgollnick commented on Jan 19, 2016

Author

Sorry if this has already been documented elsewhere. I searched around and didn't see this behavior being discussed anywhere, so I figured I'd file it here and see where it went.

frumioj commented on Oct 14

Ultimately responsible for this security bug: <https://nvd.nist.gov/vuln/detail/CVE-2022-39299>

frumioj referenced this issue in node-saml/passport-saml on Oct 14



Merge pull request from [GHSA-m974-647v-whv7](#)

8b7e3f5

karfau commented on Oct 14 • edited ▼

@frumioj xmldom is currently maintained at <https://github.com/xmldom/xmldom>.

What would you suggest that we change in the behavior/implementation (as in what should be the preferred behavior in the context of the issue you linked, what assumption was made, which xmldom didn't fulfill)?

Feel free to involve/ping me in an already ongoing discussions elsewhere or to kick off the process following our [security policy](#).

Thx for the information.

karfau commented 28 days ago

Fixes have been provided for @xmldom/xmldom in the versions 0.7.7, 0.8.4 and 0.9.0-beta.4.

For more details see [GHSA-crh6-fp67-6883](#)



MahmoudNafiseh mentioned this issue 25 days ago

update @xmldom/xmldom package expo/expo-cli#4585

Closed



alxndrstffn mentioned this issue 24 days ago

Upgrade to xmldom 0.8.5 (CVE-2022-39299) mswjs/interceptors#296

Closed



alvaldes mentioned this issue 23 days ago

Dependency Error: xmldom allows multiple root nodes in a DOM Sesame-Disk/cool-storage-microfrontend#39

Open

meganwalker-ibm commented 12 days ago

[GHSA-cr66-fp67-6883](#) notes that 0.7.7 is both affected and fixed. Can the impacted version ranges be clarified?

Affected versions: $\leq 0.7.7$

Patched versions: $\sim 0.7.7$

I guess that should probably be $<$ not \leq ?



1

karfau commented 12 days ago • edited ▾

Thank you for letting me know, you guessed correctly, I fixed it.

Assignees

No one assigned

Labels

None yet

Projects

None yet

Milestone

No milestone

Development

No branches or pull requests

4 participants

