Modular rollback through control logging
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Once upon a time,
there was a parser

Once upon a time,
Once upon a time,

there was a parser with poor error messages.
> val f(x) = x + 1;
> val f(x) = x + 1;

SYNTAX ERROR at 1:6
val f(x) = x + 1;
val \ f(x) = x + 1;
val f(x) = x + 1;

Point of discovery

decl ::= val id = exp ;
| fun id ( ids ) = exp ;
| ...
The real error: `val` should be `fun`

\[ \text{val } f(x) = x + 1; \]

Point of discovery

\[
\text{decl ::= val id = exp ;}
\mid \text{fun id ( ids ) = exp ;}
\mid \ldots
\]
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This paper presents a powerful, practical, and essentially language-independent syntactic error diagnosis and recovery method that is applicable within the frameworks of LR and LL parsing. The method generally issues accurate diagnoses even where multiple errors occur within close proximity, yet seldom issues spurious error messages. It employs a new technique, parse action deferral, that allows the most appropriate recovery in cases where this would ordinarily be precluded by late detection of the error. The method is practical in that it does not impose substantial space or time overhead on the parsing of correct programs, and in that its time efficiency in processing an error allows for its incorporation in a production compiler. The method is language independent, but it does allow for tuning with respect to particular languages and implementations through the setting of language-specific parameters.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a powerful, practical, and essentially language-independent syntactic error recovery method that is applicable within the frameworks of LR and LL parsing. An error recovery method is powerful insofar as it accurately diagnoses and reports all syntactic errors without reporting errors that are not actually present. A successful recovery, then, has two components: (1) an accurate diagnosis of the error, and (2) a recovery action that modifies the text in such a way as to make possible the diagnosis of any errors occurring in its right context. An “accurate” diagnosis is one that results in a recovery action that effects the “correction” that a knowledgeable human reader would choose. This notion of accuracy agrees with our intuition but cannot be precisely defined. In some instances, of course, the nature of the error is ambiguous, but at the very least, the diagnosis and corresponding recovery should not result in an excessive
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2. THE METHOD

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 The Parsing Framework. The method assumes a framework in which an LR or LL parser maintains an input token buffer TOKENS, a state or prediction stack, and a parse stack. The parse configuration thus has three components: the configuration of TOKENS, that of the state or prediction stack, and that of the parse stack. TOKENS is a queue containing part or all of the sequence of remaining input tokens. The current token, denoted CURTOK, is the front element of TOKENS. The token immediately preceding CURTOK in the source program shall be denoted as PREVTOK.
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By backing down the parse stack and considering the possible simple repairs at each of its elements, one can effect a simple repair at a point in the prefix.
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By backing down the parse stack and considering the possible simple repairs at each of its elements, one can effect a simple repair at a point in the prefix.

Token deferral may also be viewed as double parsing. One parser simply checks for syntactic correctness and performs no real reduce actions. The second parser is always $k - 1$ tokens behind, always has correct input, and performs reduce actions on the parse stack. In our implementation the deferred tokens and sequences of reductions are maintained in a deferred tokens queue and a deferred rules queue, respectively.
Modular rollback through control logging

Our mission:
Infiltrate the parser by impersonating its lexer

Our plan:
BurkeFisher: PARSER ➔ PARSER
a functor that wraps a parser, and spies on its control flow

Our agent:
Control.
Delimited Control.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parser</th>
<th>Repairer</th>
<th>Lexer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parse lex s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parser</strong></td>
<td><strong>Repairer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lexer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| reset (fn () =>
  parse wrapLex x) | parse lex s |           |
reset (fn () =>
  parse wrapLex s)

wrapLex s
**Parser**

```
reset (fn () =>
    parse wrapLex s)
```

**Repairer**

```
parse lex s
```

**Lexer**

```
wrapLex s
```

`checkpoint`
Parser

reset (fn () =>
  parse wrapLex s)

wrapLex s

Parser → Repairer

parse lex s

Repairer

checkpoint

Lexer

lex s
Parser

reset (fn () =>
  parse wrapLex s)

Lexer

parse lex s
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wrapLex s

lex s

wrapLex s'
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  parse wrapLex s)
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raise ParseError
Parser

reset (fn () =>
parse wrapLex s)

wrapLex s

Parser

Repairer

parse lex s
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Lexer

wrapLex s'

checkpoint

Lexer

lex s

lex s'

raise ParseError

search for repair
signature PARSER =
sig
  type token
  val exampleToks: token list

type stream
  type lexer = stream -> token * stream
  type result
  exception ParseError

  val parse: lexer -> stream -> result
end
signature PARSER =
sig
  type token
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  type stream
  type lexer = stream -> token * stream
  type result
  exception ParseError

  val parse: lexer -> stream -> result
end

We can’t change these types
signature PARSER =
sig
  type token
  val exampleToks: token list

  type stream
  type lexer = stream -> token * stream
  type result
  exception ParseError

  val parse: lexer -> stream -> result
end

But we can add effects

We can’t change these types
functor BurkeFisher (P: PARSER) =
struct
  open P (* we’ll shadow result and parse, *
  * but otherwise be just like P *)

  datatype result
    = RESULT of P.result
    | REPAIR of token   (* replace this token *)
      * token         (* with this token    *)
    | UNREPAIRABLE

We’ll ignore position information for simplicity
The Burke-Fisher Functor

fun parse lex strm = let
  val chkPts = ref []
  fun push chkPt = chkPts := (chkPt :: !chkPts)
  fun wrapLex strm = let
    val lexResult = lex strm
    in
      shift (fn k => push (lexResult, k); k lexResult)
    end
  in
    RESULT (reset (fn () =>
      P.parse wrapLex strm))
  handle ParseError => repair (!chkPts)

type checkPt = lexResult * (lexResult -> P.result)
fun parse lex strm = let
  val chkPts = ref []
  fun push chkPt = chkPts := (chkPt :: !chkPts)

  fun wrapLex strm = let
    val lexResult = lex strm
    in shift (fn k => push (lexResult, k);
      k lexResult)
    end
  end

The Burke-Fisher Functor

fun parse lex strm = let
  val chkPts = ref []
  fun push chkPt = chkPts := (chkPt :: !chkPts)

  fun wrapLex strm = let
    val lexResult = lex strm
    in shift (fn k => push (lexResult, k);
      k lexResult)
    end
  end

val checkPt = lexResult * (lexResult -> P.result)
fun parse lex strm = let
  val chkPts = ref []
  fun push chkPt = chkPts := (chkPt :: !chkPts)

  fun wrapLex strm = let
    val lexResult = lex strm
    in shift (fn k => push (lexResult, k);
      k lexResult)
    end

  in RESULT (reset (fn () =>
      P.parse wrapLex strm))
  handle ParseError => repair (!chkPts)
The Burke-Fisher Functor

\[
\text{mapFind: } (\alpha \to \beta \text{ option}) \rightarrow \alpha \text{ list } \rightarrow \beta \text{ option}
\]

\[
\text{repair: checkPt list } \rightarrow \text{ result}
\]

\[
\text{fun repair } [] = \text{ UNREPAIRABLE}
| \text{ repair (chkPt::chkPts) } =
| \text{ case mapFind (retry chkPt) exampleToks}
| \text{ of NONE } \rightarrow \text{ repair chkPts}
| \text{ SOME replacement } \rightarrow \text{ REPAIR replacement}
\]
The Burke-Fisher Functor

```
type replacement = token * token

retry: checkPt -> token -> replacement option

fun retry ((oldTok, strm), k) newTok =
  k (newTok, strm); (* execute for effect *)
  SOME (oldTok, newTok)
handle ParseError => NONE
```
Syntax error:
val f(x) = 1+x;
^^^^
Did you mean 'fun'?
Yes, but:
Yes, but:

- What about deletions, insertions?
Yes, but:

• What about deletions, insertions?
• What about metrics and heuristics?
Yes, but:

• What about deletions, insertions?
• What about metrics and heuristics?
• What about space usage?
Yes, but:

- What about deletions, insertions?
- What about metrics and heuristics?
- What about space usage?
- What about side effects?
The twin pearl:
“prompt reading” in Scheme

Some “lost art” from ‘70s-era LISP systems:

- REPL handles TTY line driver
- Parsing concurrent with input
- Syntax errors are *impossible*
- Last closing paren fires off the s-expression
The twin pearl: “prompt reading” in Scheme

The challenge: the **backspace** key

Need to roll back parser control state, *and* TTY state
The twin pearl: “prompt reading” in Scheme

The challenge: the \textit{backspace} key

Need to roll back parser control state, \textit{and} TTY state

The solution:

Weld \textit{performace} of effects to \textit{logging} of their reversal

Requires exposing effectful operations
What have we done?

Rollback can be *functorized*, using infiltration:

- Clear separation of concerns: can change input and rollback strategy independently
- Clean interface between the concerns
- Sketched dealing with side-effects

This is a general technique!
What more can we do?

- BurkeFisher(YourTypechecker)
  - cf SEMINAL
- Web development?
- Understand all of this through Filinski’s lens
  - Come to the Continuation Workshop!
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Thank you