

Compiling Exceptions Correctly

Tobias Nipkow

March 17, 2025

Abstract

An exception compilation scheme that dynamically creates and removes exception handler entries on the stack. A formalization of an article of the same name by Hutton and Wright [1].

1 Compiling exception handling

```
theory Exceptions
imports Main
begin
```

1.1 The source language

```
datatype expr = Val int | Add expr expr | Throw | Catch expr expr

primrec eval :: "expr ⇒ int option"
where
  "eval (Val i) = Some i"
  / "eval (Add x y) =
    (case eval x of None ⇒ None
     | Some i ⇒ (case eval y of None ⇒ None
                  | Some j ⇒ Some(i+j)))"
  / "eval Throw = None"
  / "eval (Catch x h) = (case eval x of None ⇒ eval h | Some i ⇒ Some i)"
```

1.2 The target language

```
datatype instr =
  Push int | ADD | THROW | Mark nat | Unmark | Label nat | Jump nat

datatype item = VAL int | HAN nat

type_synonym code = "instr list"
type_synonym stack = "item list"

fun jump where
  "jump l [] = []"
```

```

| "jump l (Label l' # cs) = (if l = l' then cs else jump l cs)"
| "jump l (c # cs) = jump l cs"

lemma size_jump1: "size (jump l cs) < Suc (size cs)"
⟨proof⟩

lemma size_jump2: "size (jump l cs) < size cs ∨ jump l cs = cs"
⟨proof⟩

function (sequential) exec2 :: "bool ⇒ code ⇒ stack ⇒ stack" where
  "exec2 True [] s = s"
| "exec2 True (Push i#cs) s = exec2 True cs (VAL i # s)"
| "exec2 True (ADD#cs) (VAL j # VAL i # s) = exec2 True cs (VAL(i+j) # s)"
| "exec2 True (THROW#cs) s = exec2 False cs s"
| "exec2 True (Mark l#cs) s = exec2 True cs (HAN l # s)"
| "exec2 True (Unmark#cs) (v # HAN l # s) = exec2 True cs (v # s)"
| "exec2 True (Label l#cs) s = exec2 True cs s"
| "exec2 True (Jump l#cs) s = exec2 True (jump l cs) s"

| "exec2 False cs [] = []"
| "exec2 False cs (VAL i # s) = exec2 False cs s"
| "exec2 False cs (HAN l # s) = exec2 True (jump l cs) s"
⟨proof⟩

```

termination ⟨proof⟩

abbreviation "exec ≡ exec2 True"
abbreviation "unwind ≡ exec2 False"

1.3 The compiler

```

primrec compile :: "nat ⇒ expr ⇒ code * nat"
where
  "compile 1 (Val i) = ([Push i], 1)"
| "compile 1 (Add x y) = (let (xs,m) = compile 1 x; (ys,n) = compile m y
                           in (xs @ ys @ [ADD], n))"
| "compile 1 Throw = ([THROW], 1)"
| "compile 1 (Catch x h) =
  (let (xs,m) = compile (l+2) x; (hs,n) = compile m h
   in (Mark 1 # xs @ [Unmark, Jump (l+1), Label 1] @ hs @ [Label(l+1)], n))"

```

abbreviation

```

  cmp :: "nat ⇒ expr ⇒ code" where
  "cmp 1 e == fst(compile 1 e)"

```

```

primrec isFresh :: "nat ⇒ stack ⇒ bool"
where
  "isFresh 1 [] = True"
| "isFresh 1 (it#s) = (case it of VAL i ⇒ isFresh 1 s

```

```
| HAN l' ⇒ l' < l ∧ isFresh l s)"
```

definition

```
conv :: "code ⇒ stack ⇒ int option ⇒ stack" where
"conv cs s io = (case io of None ⇒ unwind cs s
| Some i ⇒ exec cs (VAL i # s))"
```

1.4 The proofs

Lemma numbers are the same as in the paper.

declare

```
conv_def[simp] option.splits[split] Let_def[simp]
```

lemma 3:

```
"(∀l. c = Label l ⇒ isFresh l s) ⇒ unwind (c#cs) s = unwind cs s"
⟨proof⟩
```

corollary [simp]:

```
"(!!l. c ≠ Label l) ⇒ unwind (c#cs) s = unwind cs s"
⟨proof⟩
```

corollary [simp]:

```
"isFresh l s ⇒ unwind (Label l#cs) s = unwind cs s"
⟨proof⟩
```

lemma 5: "[isFresh l s; l ≤ m] ⇒ isFresh m s"
⟨proof⟩

corollary [simp]: "isFresh l s ⇒ isFresh (Suc l) s"
⟨proof⟩

lemma 6: "∀l. l ≤ snd(compile l e)"
⟨proof⟩

corollary [simp]: "l < m ⇒ l < snd(compile m e)"
⟨proof⟩

corollary [simp]: "isFresh l s ⇒ isFresh (snd(compile l e)) s"
⟨proof⟩

Contrary to what the paper says, the proof of lemma 4 does not just need lemma 3 but also the above corollary of 5 and 6. Hence the strange order of the lemmas in our proof.

lemma 4 [simp]: "∀l cs. isFresh l s ⇒ unwind (cmp l e @ cs) s = unwind cs s"
⟨proof⟩

lemma 7 [simp]: "l < m ⇒ jump l (cmp m e @ cs) = jump l cs"

$\langle proof \rangle$

The compiler correctness theorem:

```
theorem comp_corr:  
  " $\bigwedge l s cs. \text{isFresh } l s \implies \text{exec } (\text{cmp } l e @ cs) s = \text{conv } cs s (\text{eval } e)$ "  
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

The specialized and more readable version (omitted in the paper):

```
corollary "exec (cmp l e) [] = (case eval e of None  $\Rightarrow$  [] | Some n  $\Rightarrow$  [VAL n])"  
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

end

References

- [1] G. Hutton and J. Wright. Compiling exceptions correctly. In *Proc. Conf. Mathematics of Program Construction*, LNCS, 2004.