Compiler verification

Verified PEG Parser

From "TRX: A Formally Verified Parser Interpreter"
A. Koprowski and H. Binsztok, 2011

Neven Villani

2021-12-14

Motivation

- At time of writing, CompCert started at the AST: the parsing step is not verified
- But programming is not done directly with ASTs
- This is an attempt at filling this missing initial step

Choice of tools

- Parser extracted from Coq
- Grammar expressed as a PEG

PEG •00000000

Syntax

PEG 0•0000000

Nonprimitives

$$["a_1 \cdots a_n"] := [a_1]; \cdots; [a_n]$$

$$[a-z] := [a]/\cdots/[z]$$

$$e^+ := e; e^*$$

$$e? := e/\varepsilon$$

$$\&e := !!e$$

Examples

$$\{a^n b^n \mid n\}$$

$$X_{a,b} := ([a]; X_{a,b}; [b])?$$

$$S_{a,b} := X_{a,b}; ![\cdot]$$

palindromes

 $\{a^nb^nc^n\mid n\}$

$$Y := ([a]; Y; [a])/([b]; Y; [b])/a/b/\varepsilon$$

$$P := Y; ![\cdot]$$

$$S' := \&(X_{ab}; [c]^*); ([a]^*; X_{bc}); ![\cdot]$$

Semantics

Basic rules:

$$\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}}{([\cdot],[]) \leadsto \bot} \qquad \overline{([x],x :: s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \bot}{(e_1;e_2,s) \leadsto \bot} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'} \qquad (e',s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e;e',s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \bot}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'} \qquad (e^*,s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \bot}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''} \qquad (e^*,s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'} \qquad (e^*,s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'} \qquad (e^*,s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \\
\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s'} \qquad (e',s') \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}}{(e^*,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s''}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto$$

Semantics (cont)

Some more important rules:

$$\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}}{(!e,s) \leadsto \bot} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \bot}{(!e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}}$$

$$\frac{(e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}}{(!e,s) \leadsto \sqrt{s}} \qquad \frac{(e,s) \leadsto \bot}{(!e,s) \leadsto \bot} \qquad \frac{(e',s) \leadsto r}{(e',s) \leadsto m+n+1r}$$

Advantages

- No separate lexing step
- No large parsing table
- Unambiguous, fully deterministic
- More expressive than context-free

Contribution

TRX is proven correct. If G is syntactically valid then:

$$\begin{split} \text{well-formed}(\mathcal{G}) &= \text{true} \Longrightarrow \forall s. \\ & (\text{parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) \text{ terminates}) \\ & \land (\forall v, s'. \text{ parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) = \text{Ok}(v, s') \iff \exists m. \ (v_0, s) \leadsto \sqrt{v_{s'}}) \\ & \land (\text{parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) = \text{Err} \iff \exists m. \ (v_0, s) \leadsto \bot) \end{split}$$

(slightly redundant)

Appropriate characterization since → is fully deterministic

Limitations

• Exponential time (can be solved with memoization)

$$S := A; ![.]$$

 $A := ([a]; A; [b])/([a]; A; [c])/\varepsilon$
 $a^n c^n$

Nontermination

$$S := A; ![.]$$

 $A := A?; [a]$

Termination Well-formedness, Motivation, Limitations

Termination

- Source of nontermination is (mutual) left recursion
- Not so easy to check

$$A := B/(C; !D; A)$$

 ${\cal B}$ can fail, ${\cal C}$ can succeed without consuming, ${\cal D}$ can fail

- Completeness is undecidable
- Well-formedness is easily checkable and implies completeness

Well-formedness

 $e \in \mathbb{P}_0$ if e can accept without consuming input WF fixpoint of well-formedness rules

Well-formedness implies termination

All subexpressions of the grammar

$$E(\mathcal{G}) = \{ e' \mid e' \sqsubseteq e_A, A \text{ nonterminal} \}$$

 \mathcal{G} is well-formed if $E(\mathcal{G}) \subseteq \mathsf{WF}$

This is an overapproximation

 $A := !\varepsilon; A$ terminates but is rejected

Usability Ergonomics, Performance, Improvements

Specification

Most parser interpreters provide a DSL to define the grammar. Not the case of TRX.

- Grammar specified within Coq
- Correctness proof is easy
- Requires familiarity with Coq

Bootstrapping issues

- Parsing grammar description would require a type that contains itself
- Another solution: code generation (significantly more difficult)

Performance

tool	XML parser	Java parser
JAXP	2.3s.	
JavaCC		23.0s. 🛮
TRX-gen	5.1s. []	25.5s. □
TRX-int	40.0s.	289.3s.
TRX-cert	128.9s.	662.4s.
Mouse	206.4s.	269.6s.

Figure 8, page 20

Performance of TRX-cert on two examples

TRX-cert: certified version

TRX-int: prototype with similar functionality

TRX-gen: code generating parser

Performance diagnosis

- verification overhead steps with only logical use
 - not significant
- extraction overhead extracted code under-performs
 - conversions (probably optimized)
 - List.rev is quadratic
 - Char is a Coq natural
 - Ascii is 8 booleans
 - garbage collection spikes
- algorithmic overhead suboptimal algorithm

Summary

Characterization

$$\begin{split} \text{well-formed}(\mathcal{G}) &= \text{true} \Longrightarrow \forall s. \\ & (\text{parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) \text{ terminates}) \\ & \land (\forall v, s'. \text{ parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) = \text{Ok}(v, s') \iff \exists m. \ (v_0, s) \leadsto \sqrt{v_{s'}}) \\ & \land (\text{parse}(\mathcal{G}, s) = \text{Err} \iff \exists m. \ (v_0, s) \leadsto \bot) \end{split}$$

Performance

tool	XML parser	Java parser
JAXP	2.3s.[
JavaCC		23.0s. 🛮
TRX-gen	5.1s. []	25.5s. []
TRX-int	40.0s.	289.3s.
TRX-cert	128.9s.	662.4s.
Mouse	206.4s.	269.6s.