

Translingual Obfuscation

Abstract—Program obfuscation is an important technique in software protection, by preventing attackers from revealing the logic of the software. In this paper, we introduce *translingual obfuscation*, a new software obfuscation scheme which makes programs obscure by “misusing” the unique features of certain programming languages. Translingual obfuscation translates part of a program from its original language to another language with a more complicated programming paradigm and execution model at the binary level, thus increasing program complexity and impeding reverse engineering. In this paper we start exploring the feasibility of translingual obfuscation with Prolog, a representative of logic programming languages. We implement translingual obfuscation in a tool called BABEL, which can selectively translate C functions into Prolog predicates. By leveraging two important features of the Prolog language, i.e., unification and backtracking, BABEL obfuscates both the data layout and control flow of C programs, making them much more difficult to reverse engineer. Our experiments show that BABEL provides effective and stealthy software obfuscation with only modest cost. With BABEL, we have verified the feasibility of translingual obfuscation, which we believe could be a promising new direction for program obfuscation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Obfuscation is an important technique for software protection, especially for preventing reverse engineering from infringing software intellectual property. Generally speaking, obfuscation is a semantics- or behavior-preserving program transformation that aims to make a program more difficult to understand and reverse engineer. The idea of using obfuscating transformations to prevent reverse engineering can be traced back to Collberg et al. [16], [17]. Since then many obfuscation methods have been proposed [39], [47], [49], [58], [15], [69]. Malware authors also heavily rely on packers to compress or encrypt executable binaries so that their product can avoid malicious content detection [62], [60].

Currently the state-of-the-art obfuscation technique is to incorporate with *process-level virtualization*. In particular, obfuscators such as VMProtect [6] and Code Virtualizer [3] replace the original binary code with new bytecode, and a custom interpreter is attached to interpret and execute the bytecode. The result is that the original binary code does not exist anymore, leaving only the bytecode and interpreter, making it difficult to reverse engineer with static or dynamic analysis [33]. However, recent work has shown that the decode-and-dispatch execution pattern of virtualization-based obfuscation can be a severe vulnerability leading to effective deobfuscation [20], [59], implying that we are in need of obfuscation techniques based on new insights.

We propose a novel and practical obfuscation method called *translingual obfuscation*, which possesses strong security strength along with high stealth and modest cost. The key idea is that instead of inventing brand new obfuscation techniques,

we can exploit some existing programming languages for their unique design and implementation features to achieve obfuscation effects. In general, programming language features are rarely proposed or developed for obfuscation purpose; however, some of them indeed make reverse engineering much more challenging at the binary level, thus can be “misused” for software protection. For example, some programming languages are designed with unique paradigms and have very complicated execution models. To make use of these language features, we can translate a program written in a certain language to another language which is more complicated, in the sense that it consists of features leading to obfuscation effects.

In this paper, we take the Prolog language to obfuscate C programs as an instance for showing the feasibility of the idea of translingual obfuscation. C is a traditional imperative programming language while Prolog is a representative logic programming language. The Prolog language has some prominent features that provide strong obfuscation effects. Programs written in Prolog execute in a *search-and-backtrack* model, which is dramatically different from the execution model of C and much more complicated, therefore translating C code to Prolog leads to obfuscated data layouts and control flows. Especially, *the complexity of Prolog’s execution model manifests mostly in the binary form of the programs*, making Prolog a very suitable language for software protection.

Translating a language to another is usually very difficult, especially when the target and source languages have different programming paradigms. However, we made an important discovery that for obfuscation purpose, language translation could be directed in a special manner. Instead of developing a “clean” translation from C to Prolog, we propose an “obfuscating” translation scheme which retains part of the C memory model, in some sense making two execution models mixed together. We believe this improves the obfuscating effect in a way that no obfuscation methods have achieved before, to the best of our knowledge. Consequently in translingual obfuscation, the obfuscation does not only come from the obfuscating features of the target language, but also from the translation itself. With this new translation scheme we manage to kill two birds with one stone, i.e., solving the technical problems in implementing translingual obfuscation and strengthening the obfuscation simultaneously.

There may be concern that obfuscation techniques without solid theoretical foundations will not withstand reverse engineering attacks in the long run. However, research on fundamental obfuscation theories, despite promising process made recently [42], [29], [55], [12], [10], is still not mature enough to lead to practical protection techniques. There is a widely accepted consensus that no software protection scheme

is resilient to skilled attackers if they inspect the software with intensive effort [18]. A recently proved theorem [11] partially supporting this claim states that, a “universally effective” obfuscator does not exist, i.e., for any obfuscation algorithm, there always exists a program that it cannot effectively obfuscate.

Given the situation, it seems that developing an obfuscation scheme resilient to all reverse engineering threats (known or unknown) is too ambitious at this point. Hence, making reverse engineering more difficult (but not impossible) could be a more realistic goal to pursue.

We have implemented translingual obfuscation in a tool called BABEL. BABEL can selectively transform a C function into semantically equivalent Prolog code and compile code of both languages together into the executable form. Our experiment results show that translingual obfuscation is obscure and stealthy. The expansion of program size is low and the execution overhead is modest compared to a commercial obfuscator. We also show that translingual obfuscation is resilient to one of the most popular reverse engineering techniques.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- We propose a new obfuscation method, namely translingual obfuscation. Translingual obfuscation is novel because it exploits exotic language features instead of ad-hoc program transformations to protect programs against reverse engineering. Our new method has a number of advantages over existing obfuscation techniques, which will be discussed in depth later.
- We implement translingual obfuscation in a tool called BABEL which translates C to Prolog at the scale of subroutines (from C functions to Prolog predicates) for obfuscation purpose. Language translation is always a challenging problem, especially when the target language has a heterogeneous execution model.
- We evaluate BABEL with respect to all four evaluation criteria proposed by Collberg et al. [17]: potency, resilience, cost, and stealth, on a set of real-world C programs with quite a bit of complexity and diversity. Our experiments demonstrate that BABEL provides strong protection against reverse engineering with only modest cost, making translingual obfuscation a feasible and promising new direction of software obfuscation.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II defines our threat model. Section III provides a high-level view on the insights and features of our translingual obfuscation technique. Section IV explains in detail why some features of the Prolog language can be misused for obfuscation purpose. We summarize the technical challenges in implementing translingual obfuscation in Section V. Sections VI and VII present our C-to-Prolog translation method and the implementation details of BABEL, respectively. We evaluate BABEL’s performance in Section VIII. Section IX has a discussion on some important topics about translingual obfuscation, followed by the summary of related work in Section X. Section XI concludes the paper.

II. THREAT MODEL

For attackers who try to reverse engineer a program protected by obfuscation, we assume that they have full access to the binary form of the program. They can examine the static form of the binaries with whatever method available to them. They can also execute the victim binaries in a monitored environment with arbitrary input, thus can read any data that has lived in the memory.

Do note that although we assume attackers have unlimited access to program binaries, they should not possess any knowledge about the source code in our threat model. Assuming attackers can only examine the obfuscated program at the binary level is important, because that would mean any implementation detail of the language used in translingual obfuscation contributes to the effectiveness of obfuscation. As for the particular case of employing Prolog in translingual obfuscation, since Prolog is a declarative programming language, there is a much deeper semantic gap between its source code and binaries, which is highlighted as one of the major sources of translingual obfuscation’s protection effects.

Finally, we explicitly clarify that in this work, attackers are assumed to try to reveal the logical structure of the binaries so that they can reproduce the algorithms by themselves. In practice there are different levels of reverse engineering objectives. Sometimes understanding what a program achieves is sufficient for attackers to fulfill their goals, but in our case attackers need a more thorough understanding on the semantics of the victim binaries.

III. TRANSLINGUAL OBFUSCATION

A. Overview

The basic insight of translingual obfuscation is that some programming languages are more difficult to reverse engineer than others. Intuitively, C is relatively easy to reverse engineer because binary code compiled from C programs share the same imperative execution model with the source code. For programming languages like Prolog and Haskell, however, there is a much deeper semantic gap between the source code and the resulting binaries, since these languages have fundamentally different abstractions from the imperative execution model of the underlying hardware. Indeed this fact does not necessarily make these languages suitable for software protection, which is why our work is essential. We analyze and evaluate the features of a foreign programming language from the perspective of software protection. We also develop the translation technique that transforms the original language to the obfuscating language. Only with these efforts devoted, translingual obfuscation can be a practical software protection scheme.

Translingual obfuscation is not just “yet another obfuscation method” but a new layer of software protection in the obfuscation-deobfuscation arms race, as shown in Fig. 1. Normally we require that the language used by translingual obfuscation can be directly compiled to native code. Different from previous obfuscation methods which either work at the




Fig. 1. Translingual obfuscation is a new protection layer complementary to existing obfuscation methods, pushing the frontier forward in the battle with reverse engineering.

binary level or perform same-language source-to-source transformations, translingual obfuscation translates one language to another (either partially or completely). Therefore, translingual obfuscation can be applied after source-code obfuscation or before binary obfuscation, without affecting the applicability of existing obfuscation methods.

Again, we would like to emphasize that, translingual obfuscation in general makes reverse engineering much more challenging and significantly increases the cost of reverse engineering, even though it may not withstand skilled reverse engineers forever. Translingual obfuscation may not be the silver bullet, but it buys time in the warfare of software protection.

B. Benefits

Translingual obfuscation can provide benefits that cannot be delivered by any single obfuscation method developed before, to the best of our knowledge:

- The security strength of translingual obfuscation could be as strong as virtualization-based obfuscation at least, which is currently the state of the art. Since many programming languages implement their runtime systems as virtual machines, translingual obfuscation are comparable to virtualization-based obfuscation in the aspect of obfuscation effectiveness.
- Unlike most virtualization-based obfuscation implementations, translingual obfuscation provides more variety by introducing a different programming paradigm. If there exists a method to effectively undo the obfuscation effects introduced by a language’s execution model, that would mean there is a chance to significantly simplify the design of that language, which is very unlikely for mature programming languages.
- The translation technique employed in translingual obfuscation leads to a mixture of runtime features from both languages, which contributes to the obfuscation in gen-

eral. The rationale behind our “obfuscating” translation scheme is revealed in Section VI-D.

- Translingual obfuscation is efficient and reliable, thanks to academic and industrial support for the programming languages. Our evaluation shows that programs obfuscated by our translingual obfuscation tool are generally faster than those protected by a popular commercial virtualization-based obfuscation tool. Moreover, as the portion of obfuscated code increases, translingual obfuscation stays reliable by producing correct programs while the virtualization-based obfuscation tool has a chance to make protected programs crash or give incorrect output.
- Translingual obfuscation is not just one obfuscation algorithm, but a general framework. Although we particularly pick Prolog in this paper, there are other languages that could be misused for translingual obfuscation. For example, the New Jersey implementation of ML (SML/NJ) [8] does not even include a runtime stack. Instead, it keeps all closures (i.e., activation records or stack frames, in a functional sense) on a garbage-collected heap, potentially making effective program analysis much more difficult. Another example is Haskell, a pure functional language featuring lazy evaluation [38] which likely breaks some assumptions made by existing reverse engineering techniques.
- Translingual obfuscation could be much more stealthy than virtualization-based obfuscation. Some programming languages allow compiling virtual machine byte code further into native code. Unlike virtualization-based obfuscation which is weak against detection based on byte statistics [41] if without additional cover-up effort [69], translingual obfuscation does not introduce byte statistical anomaly.
- Translingual obfuscation is open design. Unlike virtualization-based obfuscation whose implementation is usually kept secret, many programming languages have open-source implementations, which does not necessarily hurt the security strength of translingual obfuscation. Open design has long been considered as one of the fundamental principles in designing secure systems [56].
- Translingual obfuscation is complementary to existing obfuscation techniques and can be applied simultaneously with them for even stronger software protection.

All these benefits make us believe that translingual obfuscation could provide a new angle in software protection. We elaborate and justify our arguments throughout this paper.

IV. MISUSING PROLOG FOR OBFUSCATION

In this section we briefly introduce the Prolog programming language and explain why we can misuse its language features for obfuscation purpose.

A. Prolog Basics

The basic building blocks of Prolog are *terms*. Both a Prolog program itself and the data it manipulates are built from

terms. There are three kinds of terms: constants, variables, and structures. A constant is either a number (integer or real) or atom. An atom is a general-purpose name, which is similar to a constant string entity in other languages. A structure term is of the form $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, where f is a symbol called a *functor* and the t_i 's are subterms. The number of subterms a functor takes is called its *arity*. It is allowed to use a symbol with different arities, so the notation ' f/n ' is used when referring to a structure term f with n subterms.

Structure terms become *clauses* when assigned semantics. A clause can be a fact, a rule, or a query. A predefined clause is a fact if it has an empty body, otherwise it is a rule. For example, "parent(jack, bill)." is a fact, which could mean that "jack is a parent of bill." On the other hand, a rule can be like the following:

```
grandparent(G, C) :- parent(G, P), parent(P, C).
```

This rule can be written as the following formula in the first-order logic:

$$\forall G, C, P. \text{grandparent}(G, C) \leftarrow \text{parent}(G, P) \wedge \text{parent}(P, C)$$

Boolean clauses with the same name and the same number of arguments define a relation, namely a *predicate*. With facts and rules defined, programmers can issue *queries*, which are formulas for the Prolog system to solve. In accordance with our previous examples, a query could be `grandparent(G, bill)` which is basically asking "who are bill's grandparents?"

A Prolog program is just a set of terms. The Prolog resolution engine maintains an internal database of terms throughout program execution, trying to resolve queries with facts and rules by logical inference.

B. Obfuscation-Contributing Features

1) *Unification*: One of the core concepts in automated logic resolution, hence in logic programming, is unification. Essentially it is a pattern-matching technique. Two first-order terms t_1 and t_2 can be unified if there exists a substitution σ making them identical, i.e., $t_1^\sigma = t_2^\sigma$. For example, two terms $k(s(g), Y)$ and $k(X, t(k))$ are unified when X is substituted by $s(g)$ and Y is substituted with $t(k)$.

Unification is basically how Prolog performs computation. We explain this with a straight example. The following clause defines a simple "increment" procedure.

```
inc(Input, Output) :- Output is Input+1.
```

Now for a query `inc(1, R)`, the Prolog resolution engine will first try to unify `inc(1, R)` with `inc(Input, Output)`, which means `Input` should be unified with 1 and `Output` should be unified with `R`. Once this unification succeeds, the original query is reduced to a subgoal `Output is Input+1`. Since `Input` is now unified with 1, `Input+1` is evaluated as 2. Finally `Output` gets unified with 2 (`is/2` is the evaluate-and-unify operator predicate), making `R` unified with 2 as well.

To support unification, Prolog implement terms as vertices in directed acyclic graphs. Each term is represented by a




Fig. 2. An example memory representation of term $f(X, Y, 1, g(3.2))$ in Prolog, where both X and Y are unified with another variable which itself is un-unified.

<tag, content> tuple, where *tag* indicates whether the type of the term and *content* is either the value of a constant or the address of the term the variable is unified with. Fig. 2 is an example showing how Prolog may represent a term in memory [9].

Unification makes data shapes in Prolog program memory dramatically different from C and much more obscure. The graph-like implementation of unification poses great challenges to binary data shape analyses which aim to recover high-level data structures from binary program images [34], [30], [54], [21]. Even if some of the graph structures can be identified, there is still a gap between this low-level representation and the logical organization of original data, which harshly tests attackers' manual reverse engineering abilities. Unification also complicates data access. To retrieve the true value of a variable, the Prolog engine has to iterate the entire unification list. It is well known that static analysis is weak against loops and indirect memory access. Also, the tags in the term tuples are encoded as bit fields, meaning that bit-level analysis algorithms are required to reveal the semantics of a binary compiled from Prolog code. It is known that achieving bit-level precision is also a great technical challenge for both static and dynamic program analyses, mainly because of scalability issues [57], [36], [70], [24].

2) *Backtracking*: Different from the unification feature of Prolog which mainly obfuscates program data, the backtracking feature obfuscates the control flow. As explained earlier, finding a solution for a resolvable formula is essentially searching for a proper unifier (a substitution), so that the substituted formula can be expanded to consist of only facts and other formulas known to be true. Since there may be more than one solution for a unification problem instance, it is possible that the resolution process will unify two terms in the way that it makes resolving the formula later unfeasible. As a consequence, Prolog needs a mechanism to roll back from an incorrect proof path, which is called *backtracking*.

To make backtracking possible, Prolog saves the program state before taking one of the search branches. This saved state is called a 'choice-point' by Prolog, which is similar to the concept of 'continuation' in functional programming. When searching along one branch fails, the runtime system will restore the latest choice-point and continue to search through one of the untried branches.

This *search-and-backtrack* execution model leads to a totally different control flow scheme in Prolog programs at the




Fig. 3. Different control flows of C and Prolog binaries implementing the same algorithm, due to different execution models (dashed arrows indicate indirect jumps). Both control flow graphs are summarized from post-compilation binaries.

low level, compared to programs in the same logic written by C. Fig. 3 is an example where a C function is transformed into a Prolog clause by our tool BABEL (with manual edits to make the code more readable), along with the program execution flows before and after BABEL transformation. The real control flow of the Prolog version of the function is much more complicated than presented, but we have greatly simplified the flow chart for readability. In the Prolog part of Fig. 3, a choice point is created right after the execution flow enters the predicate `pfoo` which is a disjunction of two subclauses. The Prolog resolution routine will first try to satisfy the first subclause. If it fails, the engine will backtrack to the last choice-point and try the second subclause.

Due to the complicated backtracking model, control flow transfers in Prolog are usually indirect. The implementation of backtracking also involves techniques such as long jump and stack unwinding. Clearly, Prolog has a much more obscure low-level execution model compared to C from the perspective of static analysis. Different from some other control-flow obfuscation techniques which inject fake control flows which are never feasible at runtime, Prolog’s backtracking actually happens during program execution, making translanguag obfuscation also resilient to dynamic analysis. Most importantly, after the C-to-Prolog translation the original C control flows are reformed with a completely different programming paradigm, which is fundamentally different from existing control-flow based obfuscation techniques.

V. TECHNICAL CHALLENGES

To make use of Prolog’s execution model for obfuscating C programs, we need a translation technique to forge the Prolog counterpart of a C function. At this point, there are various challenges to address.

A. Control Flow

As an imperative programming language, C provides the flexibility of crafting program control flows almost at will, with language key words such as `continue`, `break`, and `return`. Prolog programs, however, have to follow the general evaluation procedure of logical formulas, which inherently forbids some “fancy” control flow allowed by C.

B. Memory Model

In C programming, many low-level details are not opaque to programmers. As for memory manipulation, C programmers

can access almost arbitrary memory locations via pointers. Prolog lacks the semantics to express direct memory access. Moreover, the C memory model is closely coupled with other subsystems of the language, e.g., the type system. C types are not only logical abstractions but are also implications on low-level memory layouts. For instance, logically adjacent elements in a C array and fields in a C struct are also physically adjacent in memory. Therefore, some logical operations on C data structures can be implemented as direct memory accesses which are only semantic-equivalent under the C memory model. Below is an example.

```

struct ty {
    int f_a, f_b;
} s[2];

/* s[0].f_a=s[0].f_b=s[1].f_a=0; */
memset((void*)s, 0, 3*sizeof(int));

```

Translating the code snippet above into pure Prolog could be difficult because the translator will have to infer the logic effects of the `memset` statement.

C. Type Casting

C type casting is of full flexibility in the sense that a C programmer can cast any type to any other type, no matter the conversion makes sense or not. This can be realized by violating *load-store consistency*, namely storing a variable of some type into a memory location and later loading the content of the same chunk of memory into a variable of another type. The C union type is a high-level support for type castings with type-inconsistent load-store, but generally C programmers can use pointers to achieve the same effect. Imitating this type casting system could be a notable challenge for other languages.

VI. C-TO-PROLOG TRANSLATION

This section explains how we address the challenges mentioned in the previous section.

A. Control Flow Regularization

There has been a large amount of research on refining C program control flows, especially on eliminating `goto` statements [37], [66], [51], [50]. For now we do not consider `goto` statements. This narrows the application scope of the

tool, but with rich historical work on goto elimination this problem can be alleviated. Given a C function without goto statements, there are two control flow patterns that cannot be directly adopted by Prolog programming: control flow cuts, and loops. We call these patterns “irregular” control flows.

1) *Control Flow Cuts*: Control flow cuts refer to the termination of control flows in the middle of a C function, for example:

```
int foo (int m, int n) {
    if (m)
        return n; // Flow of if branch ends
    else
        n=n+1;
        n=n+2;
        return n; // Flow of else branch ends
}
```

The C language grants programmers much freedom in building control flows, even without goto statements. In Prolog, however, control flows have to be routed based on the short-circuit rules in evaluating logical expressions. With short-circuit effects, parallel statements can be connected by disjunction and sequential statements can be connected by conjunction. To show why the control flow pattern in C code above cannot be implemented by only adopting short-circuit rules, consider a C function with body `{if(e) {a;} else {b;} c;}`. Naturally, it should be translated into a Prolog sentence `((e->a);b),c`, where `->` denotes implication, `;` denotes disjunction, and `,` denotes conjunction. However, this translation is not semantic-preserving when `a` is a return statement, because if the clause `a` is evaluated, either `b` or `c` has to be evaluated to decide the truth of the whole logic formula.

We fix control flow cuts by replicating and/or reordering basic blocks syntactically subsequent to the cuts. For example, we rewrite the previously showed C function into the following structure:

```
int foo (int m, int n) {
    if (m) return n;
    else { n=n+1; { n=n+2; return n; } }
}
```

After the revision, the C code is naturally translated into a new Prolog clause `(e->a);(b,c)`, which is consistent with the original C semantic.

2) *Loops*: Most loops cannot be directly implemented in Prolog. The fundamental reason is that Prolog does not allow unifying a variable more than once. We can address this problem by transforming loops into recursive functions, but in-loop irregular control flows complicates the situation. The irregularity comes from the use of keywords “continue” and “return.” A continue statement cuts the control flow in the middle of a loop, bringing up a problem similar to the aforementioned asymmetric returns in functions. Therefore, irregular control flows resulting from continue statements can

be fixed by the same method, i.e., replicating and/or reordering basic blocks syntactically subsequent to continue statements.

Like a continue statement, a return statement also cuts the control flow in a loop, but its impact reaches outside, because it cuts the control flow of the function enclosing the loop. Hence, a recursive function transformed from a loop needs extra an argument to carry the flag indicating whether an in-loop return has occurred.

B. C Memory Model Simulation

As stated in Section V-B, the C memory model is closely coupled with other subsystems of the language and it is hard to separate them. However, translanguag obfuscation keeps the original C memory model, making preserving semantic equivalence much easier. In our design the Prolog runtime is embedded in the C runtime, so it is possible for Prolog code to directly operate memories within a program’s address space.

The way we handle C memory simulation illustrates the advantage of developing language translations for obfuscation purpose. Unlike tools seeking complete translation from C to other languages, translanguag obfuscation does not have to mimic C memory completely with target language features (e.g., converting pointers to references [22]), meaning we can reduce translation complexity and circumvent various limitations. That being said, partially imitating the C memory model in Prolog is still a non-trivial task.

1) *Supporting C Memory-Access Operators*: The first step to simulating C memory model is to support pointer operations. We introduce the following new clauses into our target Prolog language:

```
rdPtrInt(+Ptr, +Size, -Content)
wrPtrInt(+Ptr, +Size, +Content)
rdPtrFloat(+Ptr, +Size, -Content)
wrPtrFloat(+Ptr, +Size, +Content)
```

These clauses are implemented in C. `rdPtrInt/3` and `rdPtrFloat/3` allow us to load the content of a memory cell (address and size indicated by `Ptr` and `Size`, respectively) into a Prolog variable `Content`. Similarly, `wrPtrInt/3` and `wrPtrFloat/3` can write the content of a Prolog variable into a memory cell. These four clauses simulate the behaviors of the “pointer dereference” operator `(*)` on `rvalue` and `lvalue` in C.

In addition to read-from-pointer and write-to-pointer operations, C also has the “address-of” operator which takes an `lvalue` as the operand and returns its memory location (address). There is no need to explicitly support this operator in Prolog because the address of any `lvalue` in C has a static representation which is known by the C compiler. We can obtain the results of “address-of” operations in the C environment and pass those values into the Prolog environment as arguments.

We also handle several C syntax sugars related to memory access: “subscript” `([])` and “field-of” `(. and ->)`. We convert these operators into equivalent combinations of pointer arithmetic and dereference so that we do not need to coin their

<pre> a=0; p=&a; // p points to a a=1; // a gets 1 b=*p; // b gets a(1) c=0; p=&c; c=1; // c gets 1 *p=3; // c gets 3 d=c; // d gets c(3) </pre>	<pre> a1=0; p1=&a1; // p1 points to a1 a2=1; // a2 gets 1 b1=*p1; // b1 gets a1(0) c1=0; p2=&c1; // p2 points to c1 c2=1; // c2 gets 1 *p2=3; // c1 gets 3 d1=c2; // d1 gets c2(1) </pre>
(a) Original	(b) Renamed

Fig. 4. Memory operations affecting the correctness of C source code SSA renaming.

	<pre> pa=&a; pc=&c; a=0; p=&a; a=1; *pa=a; // Flush b=*p; c=0; p=&c; c=1; *p=3; c=*pc; // Reload d=c; </pre>	<pre> pa=&a1; // const pointer pc=&c1; // const pointer a1=0; p1=&a1; a2=1; // a2 gets 1 *pa=a2; // a1 gets a2(1) b1=*p1; // b1 gets a1(1) c1=0; p2=&c1; c2=1; *p2=3; // c1 gets 3 c3=*pc; // c3 gets c1(3) d1=c3; // d1 gets c3(3) </pre>
(a) Orig.	(b) With flush and reload	(c) Renamed with flush and reload

Fig. 5. Semantic-preserving SSA renaming on C source code with the presence of pointer operations.

counterparts in Prolog. This conversion requires assumptions on compiler implementation and target architecture to calculate type sizes and field displacements.

2) *Maintaining Consistency*: It is a natural scheme that a C-to-Prolog translation maps every C variable to a corresponding Prolog variable. Prolog does not allow variable update, but we can overcome this restriction by transforming C code into a form close to static single assignment (SSA), in which variables are only initialized at one program location and never updated. In the strict SSA form, variables can only be initialized once statically, even if the scopes are disjoint. Prolog does not require this because the language checks re-unification at runtime, meaning variables can be updated in exclusively executed basic blocks, e.g., the then and else branches of the same if statement. Therefore, we do not need to implement the ϕ function in our SSA transformation.

SSA transformation can be implemented by renaming variables. The challenging part is that simply renaming variables in the original C code could modify program semantics because of side effects caused by memory operations, i.e., variable contents can be accessed without referring to variable names. This is the consistency problem we have aforementioned. Fig. 4 shows an instance of the problem.

To address this issue we keep the addresses of local and parameter variables if they are possibly accessed via pointers. Then we flush variable contents back to the memory before a

read-from-pointer operation and reload variable contents from memory after a write-to-pointer operation. Inter-procedural pointer dereferences are also taken into account. When callee functions accept pointers as arguments, we do variable flush before function calls and do variable reload after. Flush makes sure that changes made by Prolog code are committed to underlying C runtime memory before they are read again. Similarly, reload assures that values unified with Prolog logical variables are always consistent with the content in C memory. We perform a sound points-to analysis to compute the set of variables that need to be reloaded or flushed at each program location. After inserting the flush and reload operations, the SSA transformation no longer breaks original program semantics. Fig. 5 illustrates our solution based on the example in Fig. 4.

C. Support for Other C Features

Struct, union, and array. In Section V-B we showed that C data types like struct and array can be manipulated via memory access. Since we have already built support for the C memory model in Prolog, the original challenge now becomes a shortcut to supporting C struct, union, and array. We simply transform the original C code and implement all these operations through pointers. After this transformation the primitive data types provided by Prolog are enough to represent any C data structure.

Type casting. With our C memory simulation method, supporting type castings performed via pointers does not require additional effort, even if they may violate load-store consistency. As for explicit castings, e.g., from integers to floating points, we utilize the built-in Prolog type casting clauses like `float/1`.

External and indirect function call. Since the source code of library functions is usually unavailable, translating them into Prolog is not an option. In general, translations of translanguag obfuscation can support external subroutine invocation with the help of foreign language interfaces. As for C+Prolog obfuscation, most Prolog implementations provide the interface for calling C functions from a Prolog context. The same interface can also be used to invoke functions via pointers.

D. Obfuscating Translation

Our translation scheme fully exploits the obfuscation-contributing features introduced in Section IV-B, generally because:

- The conversion from C data structures to Prolog data structures happens by default, and every C assignment is translated to Prolog unification.
- Intra-procedural control-flow transfers originally coded in C are now implemented by Prolog’s backtracking mechanism. This significantly complicates the low-level logic of the resulting binaries.

Especially, we would like to highlight the method we use to support the C memory model in Prolog. At the high level, the original C memory layout is kept after the translation. However, the behavior of the C-part memory becomes much

different from the original program. To maintain the consistency between the C-part memory and Prolog-part memory, we introduce the flush-reload method which disturbs the sequence of memory access. In this way, the memory footprint of the obfuscated program is no longer what it was during most time of the program execution.

We believe our translation method is one of the factors that make translanguag obfuscation resilient to both semantic-based and syntax-based binary diffing, as will be shown in Section VIII-B.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION OF BABEL

A. Overview

BABEL is our translanguag obfuscation prototype. The workflow of BABEL has three steps: C code preprocessing, C-to-Prolog translation, and C+Prolog compilation. The preprocessing step reforms the original C source code so that the processed program becomes suitable for line-by-line translation to Prolog. The second step translates C functions to Prolog predicates. In the last step, BABEL combines C and Prolog code together with a carefully designed interface.

We choose GNU Prolog [23] as the Prolog implementation employed by BABEL. Like many other Prolog systems, GNU Prolog compiles Prolog source into the “standard” Warren Abstract Machine (WAM) [65] byte code. The uniqueness of GNU Prolog is that it can further compile WAM byte code into native code. This feature makes BABEL more distinguishable from virtualization-based obfuscation tools which compile the original program to bytecode and execute it with a custom virtual machine. We have a more detailed discussion on the differences between translanguag obfuscation and virtualization-based obfuscation in Section IX.

B. Translating C to Prolog

Before actually translating C to Prolog, we need to preprocess the C code first. The preprocessing includes the following steps, which is done with the help of the CIL library [48].

- 1) Simplify code into the three-address form without switch statements and ternary conditional expressions.
- 2) Convert loops to tail-recursive functions.
- 3) Regularize conditional branches with asymmetric returns.
- 4) Rewrite C code so that all global, struct, union, and array variables are accessed through pointers.
- 5) Insert variable flush and reload.
- 6) Eliminate memory operators, i.e., “address-of”, “subscript”, and “field-of” operations.
- 7) Rename variables so that the C code is in the form of SSA.

After the preprocessing we can translate C to Prolog line by line. The translation rules are listed in Fig. 6. Note that by the time we start translating C to Prolog, the preprocessed C code does not contain any switch and loop statements, because they are transformed into either nested if statements or recursive

functions. As discussed in Section VI-A, we do not consider goto statements.

We take translating arithmetic and logical expressions as a trivial task, but that leads to a limitation in our translation. Due to the fact that Prolog does not subdivide integer types, integer arithmetic operations in Prolog are not equivalent to their C counterparts. For example, given two C variables x and y of type `int` (4 bytes long) and their addition $x+y$, the equivalent expression in Prolog should be $(X+Y) \setminus 0xffffffff$, assuming that X and Y are the corresponding logical variables of x and y . Therefore, if a C program intentionally relies on overflows or underflows of integer arithmetic, there is a chance that our plain translation will fail. However, fully emulating C semantics will incur considerable performance penalty.

Previous work on translating C to other languages faces the same issue, and many of them chose to ignore it [14], [44], [64]. The C-to-JavaScript converter Emscripten provides the option to fully emulate C semantics [72]. It also has a set of optional heuristics to infer program points where full emulation is necessary for optimization, but this method is not guaranteed to work. We do not particularly take this issue into account when implementing BABEL. However, we expect BABEL’s translation to have a low failure chance because of our implementation of write-to-pointer operation in Prolog and the variable flush/reload method. Since the write-to-pointer operation specifies data sizes, the truncation automatically takes place whenever an integer variable is flushed and reloaded. As for GNU Prolog on 64-bit platforms, all integers are represented by 61-bit two’s complement (3 bits are occupied by a WAM tag), which is large enough to represent most practical integer and pointer¹ values.

C. Combining C and Prolog

BABEL combines the C and Prolog runtime environments together, and the program starts from executing C code. When the execution encounters an obfuscated function (which is now a wrapper for initiating queries to the corresponding Prolog predicate), it setups a context prior to evaluating the Prolog predicate. In the setup process the wrapper allocates local variables whose addresses are referred to in the preprocessed C function. The wrapper then passes the addresses along with function parameters to the Prolog predicate through the C-to-Prolog interface. Fig. 7 illustrates how the two languages are combined.

D. Customizing Prolog Engine

Although GNU Prolog has the some nice features which make it a good candidate for implementing BABEL, it still does not fully satisfy our requirements, thus requiring some customizations. A notable issue about GNU Prolog is that its interface for calling Prolog from C is not reentrant. This is critical because by design users of BABEL can freely choose the functions they want to obfuscate. To support this feature, it is almost impossible to avoid stack traces that interleave C

¹Most 64-bit CPUs only implement a 48-bit virtual address space.

Assignment	$(foo = e;)^T$	$\rightarrow (Pfoo \text{ is } e^T)$
Pointer arithmetic	$(p2 = p1 + \text{intVal};)^T \mid \text{TypeOf}(p1) = T^*$	$\rightarrow (\sigma(p2) \text{ is } \sigma(p1) + \text{SizeOf}(T) * \sigma(\text{intVal}))$
Pointer dereference	$(foo = *p;)^T \mid \text{TypeOf}(p) = T^*$	$\rightarrow \text{rdPtr}(\sigma(foo), \text{SizeOf}(T), \sigma(p))$
Write by pointer	$(*p = foo;)^T \mid \text{TypeOf}(p) = T^*$	$\rightarrow \text{wrPtr}(\sigma(p), \text{SizeOf}(T), \sigma(foo))$
Empty Block	$\{\}\ ^T$	$\rightarrow (\text{true})$
Non-empty Block	$\{s_1 \dots s_n\}^T$	$\rightarrow (s_1^T, \dots, s_n^T)$
Conditional	$(\text{if } (e) \{b_{then}\} \text{ else } \{b_{else}\})^T$	$\rightarrow (e^T \rightarrow \{b_{then}\}^T; \{b_{else}\}^T)$
Function call	$(\text{ret} = \text{fun}(a1, \dots, a_n);)^T$	$\rightarrow \text{predFun}(\sigma(a1), \dots, \sigma(a_n), \sigma(\text{ret}))$
Indirect function call	$(\text{ret} = \text{funptr}(a1, \dots, a_n);)^T$	$\rightarrow \text{predIndFun}(\sigma(\text{funptr}), \sigma(a1), \dots, \sigma(a_n), \sigma(\text{ret}))$
Function return	$(\text{return } e;)^T$	$\rightarrow (\mathcal{R} \text{ is } e^T)$
Function definition	$(\text{fun}(T_1 a1, \dots, T_n a_n) \{b_{body}\})^T$	$\rightarrow \text{predFun}(\sigma(a1), \dots, \sigma(a_n)) \text{ :- } b_{body}^T.$

Fig. 6. Definition of \mathcal{T} , BABEL’s C-to-Prolog translation. e , s , b , and T denote C expressions, statements, blocks, and types, respectively. σ is the bijective mapping from C identifiers to corresponding Prolog identifiers. \mathcal{R} denotes the Prolog identifier used to hold the returned value in the translated predicate. predFun can be either a real Prolog predicate or a wrapper of a foreign C function, depending on whether the target function is translated or not. predIndFun is a wrapper for a special foreign C function which further calls into funptr with given arguments.




Fig. 7. The context for executing obfuscated code in BABEL.

and Prolog subroutines. We found that the non-reentrant issue results from the use of a global WAM state across the whole GNU Prolog engine. We fixed it by maintaining a stack to save the WAM state before a new C-to-Prolog interface invocation and restore the state after the call is over.

Another issue is that GNU Prolog does not implement garbage collection, so memory consumption can easily overflow with complicated computation. This problem is not as severe as it looks because we do not have to maintain a heap for Prolog runtime throughout the whole execution. Since we know that life cycles of all Prolog variables are bounded by the scope of predicates, we can safely empty the Prolog heap when there are no Prolog subroutines in the stack.

VIII. EVALUATION

Collberg et al. [17] proposed to evaluate an obfuscation technique with respect to four measures: *potency*, *resilience*, *cost*, and *stealth*. Potency measures how obscure and complex the program has become after obfuscated. Resilience measures how well the obfuscation transformation holds up under attacks from a deobfuscator. Resilience indicates how well programs obfuscated by BABEL can withstand reverse engineering effort. Cost measures the size and time overhead introduced into protected programs by the obfuscator. Stealth measures the difficulty in detecting the existence of obfusca-

tion given obfuscated binaries. We evaluate BABEL and see to what extent it meets these four criteria.²

To show our tool can work with real-world software of different categories, we apply BABEL to six open source C programs that have been in practical use for years to decades. Among the six programs, four are CPU-bound applications and the rest two are IO-bound servers. Table I shows the details of these programs.

We define the term *obfuscation level* as the percentage of obfuscated functions in a C program. For example, an obfuscated bzip2 instance at the 20% obfuscation level is a bzip2 binary compiled from source code consisting of 80% of the original functions in C and Prolog predicates translated from the other 20% C functions by BABEL.

We achieve all obfuscation levels by randomly selecting candidates from all functions that can be obfuscated by BABEL, but note that this random selection scheme is just for avoiding subjective picking in our research. In practice, BABEL users should manually choose functions which are critical and in need of protection. This is the same as popular commercial virtualization-based obfuscation tools on the market [3], [6].

²We notice that it is generally hard to evaluate obfuscation techniques, especially the resilience. Reverse engineering could be very ad-hoc in practice. Generally, attackers can make use of any reverse engineering tools, some of which are even not publicly available to defenders. In previous literature, obfuscation methods are usually evaluated on one or a few metrics instead of across all four criteria. We try to be comprehensive in our evaluation whenever it is feasible.

TABLE I
PROGRAMS USED FOR BABEL EVALUATION.

Program	Description	LoC	# of Func.
bzip2	Data compressor	8,117	108
mcf	Vehicle scheduler	2,685	25
regex	Regular expression engine	1,391	22
svm_light	Super vector machine	7,101	103
oftpd	Anonymous FTP server	5,211	96
mongoose	Light-weight HTTP server	5,711	203

A. Potency

We use two groups of static metrics to show how much complexity BABEL has injected into the protected programs. The first group consists of basic statistics about the call graph and control-flow graph (CFG), including the number of edges in both graphs and the number of basic blocks. These metrics have been used to evaluate obfuscation techniques in related work [15].

In addition to basic statistics, we also calculate two measures used to quantify program complexity, proposed by historical software engineering research. The measures are the cyclomatic number [45] and the knot count [67]. Both measures reflect Gilb’s statement that logic complexity is a measure of the degree of decision making within a system [32], and have been proposed as the metrics for evaluating obfuscation effects [17]. The cyclomatic number is defined as $e - n + 2$ where e and n are the numbers of nodes and edges in the CFG. Intuitively, the cyclomatic number represents the amount of decision points in a program [19]. The knot count is the amount of edge crossings in the CFG when all nodes are placed linearly and all edges are drawn on the same side.

Table II shows the comparison between binaries with and without BABEL obfuscation on the complexity measures we have chosen, at the obfuscation level of 30%. To be conservative, by the time of measurement we have stripped the code belonging to GNU Prolog runtime itself, so the extra complexity (if there is any) should be purely credited to BABEL’s obfuscation. We use IDA Pro, an advanced commercial disassembler [5], to disassemble the binary and generate call graphs and control-flow graphs. As can be seen, the obfuscated binaries have a significant advantage on nearly all metrics (up to 75.5 times of the original program). The only two exceptions are the cyclomatic numbers of oftpd and mongoose, but the geometric mean of all six programs still shows that BABEL can vastly increase program complexity. Note that different from static complexity produced by obfuscation methods using opaque predicates, the additional control-flow branches injected by BABEL are “real” in the sense that both true and false branches are feasible.

B. Resilience

The resilience of an obfuscation technique measures how much effort is required to effectively reduce its potency.

We choose binary diffing, a commonly used reverse-engineering method, as BABEL’s opponent. A binary differ can calculate the similarity between two binary executables.

We consider binary diffing as an anti-obfuscation technique because it reveals the connection from the obfuscated program to its original version. Given a program binary and its obfuscated version, if a binary diffing tool produces high similarity score in the comparison, then in some sense the differ has successfully undone the obfuscation effect. Most historical work on semantic deobfuscation known to us uses similarity-based metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of their techniques [59], [20], [71]. Deciding the similarity of untrusted programs, especially binaries, has been such an important topic in computer security that DARPA has initiated the four year, \$43 million dollar Cyber Genome Program to support related research [7].

Binary similarity can be calculated based on either the syntax or the semantic. The syntax mostly refers to the control flows of the binary, and syntax-based binary diffing usually takes a graph-theoretic approach which compares the call graphs of two binaries and further the control flow graphs of pairs of functions between two binaries to look for any graph or subgraph isomorphism. The intuition is, if two binaries have similar call graphs, the functions located at corresponding nodes in the call graph isomorphism are likely to be similar ones; if two functions have similar control flows, they are likely to have the same computation logic.

On the other hand, semantic-based binary diffing focuses more on the observable behavior of the binaries. There are various ways to describe program behavior, e.g., the post- or pre-condition of a given chunk of code, or certain effects the code produces such as memory accesses and system calls. If two binaries have matched behavior, a semantic-based binary diffing tool will consider them similar.

In general, syntax-based similarity is less strict than semantic-based similarity. This naturally leads to different trends of behaviors of two types of binary differs: syntax-based differs tend to report more false positives while semantic-based differs tend to get more false negatives. To avoid bias as much as we can in the evaluation, we pick binary differs of both kinds to test BABEL’s resilience to reverse engineering. We employ CoP [40] and BinDiff [2], of which CoP is a semantic-based binary differ and BinDiff is syntax based [25], [63]. To measure BABEL’s resilience to a differ, we randomly pick 30% functions from each program in Table I, obfuscate them with BABEL, and then use the differ to calculate the similarity between the original and obfuscated functions. Depending on the differ used, the verdict on similarity will be measured differently, which we will explain with more details in the rest of this section.

1) *Resilience to Semantic-Based Binary Diffing*: CoP, a “semantic-based obfuscation-resilient” binary similarity detector [40], is currently one of the state-of-the-art semantic-based binary diffing tools. The detection algorithm of CoP is founded on the concept of “longest common subsequence of semantically equivalent basic blocks.” By constructing symbolic formulas to describe the input-output relations of basic blocks, CoP checks the semantic equivalence of two basic blocks with a theorem prover. It is reported that this new binary diffing

TABLE II
PROGRAM COMPLEXITY BEFORE AND AFTER OBFUSCATION AT 30% OBFUSCATION LEVEL.

Program	# of Call Graph Edges			# of CFG Edges			# of Basic Blocks			Cyclomatic Number			Knot Count		
	Orig.	BABEL	Ratio	Orig.	BABEL	Ratio	Orig.	BABEL	Ratio	Orig.	BABEL	Ratio	Orig.	BABEL	Ratio
bzip2	493	11066	22.4	3993	19302	4.0	2702	17529	6.5	1293	1775	1.4	1340	8819	6.6
mcf	91	6874	75.5	605	15766	26.1	419	14851	35.4	188	950	5.1	86	4134	48.1
regex	175	9251	52.9	552	13438	24.3	387	11984	31.0	167	1456	8.7	841	5314	6.3
svm_light	1072	12110	11.3	4785	20658	4.3	3113	18334	5.9	1674	2326	1.4	1686	5893	3.5
oftpd	942	12422	13.2	2025	18238	9.0	1646	17879	9.0	381	361	0.95	1114	5446	4.9
mongoose	1046	12943	12.4	2997	21268	8.1	2215	20713	9.4	784	657	0.84	1134	5332	4.7
Geom.Mean	449.9	10538.9	23.4	1839.4	17888.5	9.6	1306.5	16633.9	12.4	522.3	1051.9	2.0	768.8	5667.9	7.4




Fig. 8. Distributions of similarity scores between the original and BABEL-obfuscated functions in the evaluated programs.

technique can defeat many traditional obfuscation methods. CoP is built upon several cutting-edge techniques in the field of reverse engineering, including the binary analysis toolkit BAP [13] and the constraint solver STP [26]. CoP defines similarity score as the count of matched basic blocks divided by the number of all basic blocks in the original function.

Fig. 8 is the box plot showing the distribution of similarity scores. For all programs, the score median is below 20% and the third quartile is below 30%. Considering the original paper of CoP reports over 70% similarity in most of their tests on transformed or obfuscated programs, the scores calculated from BABEL-obfuscated functions are not convincing evidence of similarity.

One may notice that there are a few outliers in Fig. 8, i.e., the similarity scores for some functions can reach 100%. These functions are all “simple” ones—they have only one basic block and very few lines of C code. With the presence of false positives, it is not surprising that the binary differ can report 100% similarity for these functions considering CoP’s definition on similarity score.

2) *Resilience to Syntax-Based Binary Diffing*: BinDiff is a proprietary syntax-based binary diffing tool which is the de facto industrial standard with wide availability. It has motivated the creation of several academia-developed binary differs such as BinHunt [28] and its successor iBinHunt [46].

Given two binaries, BinDiff will give a list of function pairs that are considered “similar” based on a set of different algorithms. BinDiff have a pool of algorithms used to calculate similarity. In addition to the similarity level like CoP reports, BinDiff also reports its “confidence” on the results, based on which algorithm is used to get that score. It is not completely

TABLE III
FUNCTION MATCHING RESULT FROM BINDIFF ON BABEL-OBFUSCATED PROGRAMS

Program	# of Obfuscated	# of Matched	Match Rate
bzip2	32	6	18.75%
mcf	7	3	42.87%
regex	7	2	28.57%
svm_light	30	8	26.67%
oftpd	28	0	00.00%
mongoose	60	24	40.00%
Overall	164	43	26.22%




Fig. 9. Binary size expansion of obfuscated program. 0% obfuscation level means only the Prolog runtime is integrated without actually translating any original C code.

clear to us how each of BinDiff’s algorithms work and how BinDiff rank their confidence level. Therefore, we report how many obfuscated functions are correctly matched to their originals by BinDiff regardless of the similarity score and the confidence. This makes sure BABEL does not take any unfair advantage over its opponent in the evaluation of performance.

Table III shows how many obfuscated functions in each program are matched (although some of them get low similarity score or confidence). Overall, only 26.22% of the obfuscated functions are matched by BinDiff. Note that matching does not imply deobfuscation or successfully recovering program logic, especially for syntax-based binary differs. We interpret the results from BinDiff as a bottom line of BABEL’s resilience to reverse engineering techniques in general. In that sense, we believe BABEL’s performance is satisfying.

C. Cost

TABLE IV
TIME OVERHEAD INTRODUCED BY BABEL AND CODE VIRTUALIZER (CV).

Program	Execution Slowdown (Times)					
	10% obfuscated		20% obfuscated		30% obfuscated	
	BABEL	CV	BABEL	CV	BABEL	CV
bzip2	1.7	8.1	2.6	78.3	4.0	×
mcf	1.1	1.9	1.2	2.4	1.4	×
regex	24.1	343.4	33.5	393.6	69.5	×
svm_light	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.5	1.7	36.2
oftpd	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
mongoose	1.0	2.0	1.2	2.8	1.6	3.9

× indicates that the corresponding test failed due to program crash or incorrect output.

1) *Binary Size*: For all of our evaluation programs, we calculate binary sizes at different obfuscation levels. The growing trend is displayed in Fig. 9. Roughly, BABEL expands binary sizes linearly with respect to obfuscation level and original binary size. The x axis does not start from 0% because we want to present the cost of just embedding the obfuscation environment. The data show that the space occupied by the runtime system itself is about constant.

2) *Execution Speed*: We measure execution slowdown introduced by BABEL at the obfuscation level of 10%, 20%, and 30%. We use the test cases shipped with the software as performance test input for CPU-bound applications. For FTP server oftpd, we transfer 10 files ranging from 1KB to 128MB. For HTTP server mongoose, we sequentially send 100 quests for a 1KB HTML page. We conduct the experiments on a desktop with Xeon E5-1607 3.00GHz CPU and 4GB memory running 64-bit Ubuntu 12.04 LTS, over a 1Gbps Ethernet link. We run each test 10 times and report the average slowdown. For servers, time spent on network communication is included by measurement.

Additionally, we compare BABEL with Code Virtualizer, a commercial software obfuscation tool [3], with respect to performance. Code Virtualizer is a virtualization-based obfuscator and has been on market since 2006. In the comparison, we configure Code Virtualizer to minimize obfuscation strength and maximize execution speed. We then apply Code Virtualizer to the same code region obfuscated by BABEL. The implication of our comparison setting is that, if BABEL can achieve comparable or better performance than a mature commercial product, the runtime overhead introduced by BABEL should be acceptable in practical use.

Table IV gives the experiment results. BABEL clearly outperforms Code Virtualizer on 5 out of 6 tested programs, and the competition on the remaining one is a tie. In particular, BABEL’s obfuscation is reliable in the sense that the obfuscated programs exit normally and give correct output on test input, while Code Virtualizer fails to provide reliable obfuscation on half of the tested programs when obfuscation level reaches 30%.

One may notice that both BABEL and Code Virtualizer impose considerably high performance overhead on the obfuscated version of regex, a regular expression engine. Ac-




Fig. 10. Instruction distributions of SPECint2006 programs (mean and standard deviation) and BABEL-obfuscated integer programs.

cording to our investigation, the major cause is that we happen to pick many hot-spots to obfuscate. As for BABEL, another reason for high performance overhead is that there are many nested branches and switch statements in regex. Due to Prolog’s execution model, each branch leads to an explicit choice-point creation and taking the false branch is achieved through backtracking, which is much more time-consuming than the original C execution model. It is unclear whether Code Virtualizer gets penalized by the same characteristic of regex. Regardless, BABEL still performs better than Code Virtualizer in this case.

D. Stealth

By evaluating stealth we investigate whether BABEL introduces abnormal statistical characteristics to the obfuscated code. Some previous work measures obfuscation stealth by byte entropy of program binaries [69], for byte entropy has been used to detect packed and encrypted binary [41]. Since BABEL does not re-encode original binary code, we employ another statistical feature, the distribution of instructions, for stealth evaluation. This metric has also been employed by previous work [49], [15].

To tell whether BABEL-obfuscated programs have *abnormal* instruction distributions, we need to compare them with *normal* programs. We select the SPEC2006 benchmarks as the representatives of normal programs. We group common x86 instructions into 27 classes and calculate the means and standard deviations of percentages for each group within SPEC2006 programs. Since integer programs and floating-point programs have different distributions, we compare bzip2, mcf, regex, oftpd, and mongoose with SPECint2006; then we compare svm_light with SPECfp2006. In stealth evaluation, we pick the 30% obfuscation level.

Fig. 10 presents the comparisons for integer programs. For the majority of instruction groups, their distributions in BABEL-obfuscated programs fall into the interval of normal means minus/plus normal standard deviations. There are some exceptions such as mov, call, ret, cmp, and xchg. However, their distributions are still bounded by the minimum and maximum of SPEC distributions (not shown in the figure). Hence we believe these exceptions are not significant enough




Fig. 11. Comparing translingual obfuscation and virtualization-based obfuscation.

to conclude that BABEL-obfuscated programs are abnormal in terms of instruction distribution. For the floating-point program comparison, the observation is the same. Due to limited space, we do not present the detailed data.

There may be concern that solely the existence of a Prolog execution environment can be the evidence of obfuscation. This can be tackled by developing a customized Prolog engine. Previous work has shown that a Prolog engine can be implemented with less than 1,000 lines of Pascal or C code [35], [68].

IX. DISCUSSION

A. Comparing with Virtualization-Based Obfuscation

The virtualization-based obfuscation is currently the state of the art in binary obfuscation. Some features of translingual obfuscation resemble the idea of virtualization-based obfuscation, but we want to emphasize a significant difference here. Currently, most implementations of virtualization-based obfuscation tend to encode original native machine code with a RISC-like virtual instruction set and interpret the encoded binary in a decode-dispatch pattern [61], [52], [31]. The obfuscation strength comes from the secrecy of encoding and interpretation details. Translingual obfuscation, however, does not need to re-encode the original binary as long as the foreign language employed supports compilation into native code. Also, translingual obfuscation *intentionally* relies on obfuscation-contributing language features that comes from a heterogeneous programming model. Fig. 11 shows the relationship and key differences between the two methods.

Most importantly, as we have showed in Fig. 1, translingual obfuscation is not a direct competitor against virtualization-based obfuscation (a binary obfuscation technique). They can be mixed together and cooperate for stronger obfuscation.

B. Reverse Engineering Prolog and Defeating Translingual Obfuscation

It is quite natural and reasonable to raise the question that how difficult it is to reverse engineer the Prolog language in

general, since this directly relates to the security foundation of translingual obfuscation. First we would like to stress out for another time that we do not argue it is impossible to reverse engineer Prolog. Instead, the point is that Prolog is more difficult to crack than C. It has taken the community decades to develop disassembly and decompile techniques for C alone, and we expect that it will take longer to recover the logic from native code compiled from Prolog-translated C source. In translingual obfuscation, Prolog is not used in the regular way. Instead, the Prolog code is generated via an obfuscating translation scheme (Section VI).

There is another point that gives translingual obfuscation the potential to significantly delay attackers. As stated in Section III-B, translingual obfuscation is not limited to Prolog. There are many other programming languages that we can misuse for protection. By mixing these languages in a single obfuscation procedure, the difficulty of reverse engineering will be further increased.

X. RELATED WORK

Software obfuscation can be on either source level or binary level. On source code level, Popov et al. [49] obfuscate programs by replacing control transfers with exceptions, implementing real control transfers in exception handling code, and inserting redundant junk transfers after the exceptions. Sharif et al. [58] encrypted equality conditions that dependent on input data with some one-way hash functions. The evaluation shows that it is virtually impossible to reason about the inputs that satisfy the equality condition with symbolic execution. Moser et al. [47] demonstrate that opaque predicates can effectively hide control transfer destination and data locations from advanced malware detection techniques.

Obfuscation-oriented program transformations can also be performed at the binary level. Mimimorphism [69] transforms a malicious binary into a mimicry benign program, with statistical and semantic characteristics highly similar to the mimicry target. As a result, obfuscated malware can successfully evade statistical anomaly detection. Chen et al. [15] propose a control-flow obfuscation method making use of Itanium processors' architectural support for information flow tracking. They use the deferred exception tokens in Itanium processor registers to implement opaque predicates for obfuscation purpose. There are other binary obfuscation methods which heavily relies on compression, encryption, and virtualization [33], [43], [53]. Among these obfuscation techniques, binary packers using compression and encryption can be vulnerable to dynamic analysis because the original code has to be restored at some execution point. As for virtualization-based obfuscation most current approaches are implemented in the decode-dispatch scheme [61]. Recent effort [52], [59] has identified the characteristics of the decode-dispatch pattern in the virtualization-obfuscated code so that they can be effectively reverse engineered.

As for deobfuscation, most recent work picks virtualization-based obfuscation as the opponent. Sharif et al. [59] adopts a outside-in approach which first reverse engineer the virtual

machine before actually deobfuscating the protected program. This approach heavily relies on some assumptions about the structure and working process of the virtual machine. If the virtualizer does meet these assumptions, the deobfuscator is likely to fail. Another deobfuscation technique presented by Coogan et al. [20] chooses the inside-out scheme which uses equational reasoning to simplify the execution traces of protected programs. In this way, the deobfuscator extracts instructions which are truly relevant to program logic. A very recent research by Yadegari et al. [71] improves the inside-out approach with more generic simplification algorithms which can deobfuscate programs protected by nested virtualization. Without access to these tools, we cannot directly test BABEL's resilience to them. However, since BABEL completely reforms C programs' data layout and reimplement the control flows with a much different programming paradigm, we are very confident with BABEL's security strength against these approaches.

While all of the aforementioned deobfuscation techniques require dynamic analysis, There are also static reverse engineering tools. BinDiff [2] and CoP [40], the binary differs we use in evaluation, is the state of the art of such tools. Other examples of this kind include DarunGrim2 [4], Bdiff [1], BinHunt [27], and iBinHunt [46]. Although these tools can defeat certain types of program obfuscation, none of them are designed to handle the complexity of translangual obfuscation.

XI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we present translangual obfuscation, a new software obfuscation method based on translations between different programming languages. We implement BABEL, a tool that translates part of a C program into Prolog and exploits Prolog's unique language features to make the program obscure. We evaluate BABEL with respect to potency, resilience, cost, and stealth on real-world C programs from different categories. The experiment results show that translangual obfuscation is an adequate and practical software protection technique.

REFERENCES

- [1] "Binary Diff (bdiff)," <http://sourceforge.net/projects/bdiff/>.
- [2] "BinDiff," <http://www.zynamics.com/bindiff.html>.
- [3] "Code Virtualizer: Total obfuscation against reverse engineering," <http://oreans.com/codevirtualizer.php>.
- [4] "DarunGrim: A patch analysis and binary diffing tool," <http://www.darungrim.org/>.
- [5] "IDA: About," <https://www.hex-rays.com/products/ida/>.
- [6] "VMProtect software protection," <http://vmpsoft.com>.
- [7] "Darpa-baa-10-36, cyber genome program proposers' day - federal business opportunities: Opportunities," https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=0eff97ec44aada63117f050bc43d86f&tab=core&_cview=0, last reviewed, 06/026/2015.
- [8] A. W. Appel and D. B. MacQueen, "Standard ML of New Jersey," in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Programming Language Implementation and Logic Programming (PLILP'91)*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Maluszynski and M. Wirsing, Eds., vol. 528. Springer, August 1991, pp. 1–13.
- [9] H. At-Kaci, *Warren's Abstract Machine: A Tutorial Reconstruction*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1991.
- [10] B. Barak, S. Garg, Y. T. Kalai, O. Paneth, and A. Sahai, "Protecting Obfuscation against Algebraic Attacks," in *Advances in Cryptology EUROCRYPT 2014*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, P. Q. Nguyen and E. Oswald, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, May 2014, no. 8441, pp. 221–238.
- [11] B. Barak, O. Goldreich, R. Impagliazzo, S. Rudich, A. Sahai, S. Vadhan, and K. Yang, "On the (Im)Possibility of Obfuscating Programs," *J. ACM*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 6:1–6:48, May 2012.
- [12] E. Boyle, K.-M. Chung, and R. Pass, "On Extractability Obfuscation," in *Theory of Cryptography*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Y. Lindell, Ed. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Feb. 2014, no. 8349, pp. 52–73.
- [13] D. Brumley, I. Jager, T. Avgerinos, and E. J. Schwartz, "Bap: A binary analysis platform," in *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, ser. CAV'11. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2011, pp. 463–469.
- [14] F. Buddrus and J. Schödel, "Cappuccino—A C++ to Java translator," in *Proceedings of the 1998 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, ser. SAC '98. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1998, pp. 660–665.
- [15] H. Chen, L. Yuan, X. Wu, B. Zang, B. Huang, and P.-c. Yew, "Control flow obfuscation with information flow tracking," in *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, ser. MICRO 42. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2009, pp. 391–400.
- [16] C. Collberg, C. Thomborson, and D. Low, "A taxonomy of obfuscating transformations," The University of Auckland, Tech. Rep., 1997.
- [17] —, "Manufacturing cheap, resilient, and stealthy opaque constructs," in *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages (POPL)*, 1998.
- [18] C. Collberg and C. Thomborson, "Watermarking, tamper-proofing, and obfuscation - tools for software protection," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 735–746, Aug. 2002.
- [19] S. D. Conte, H. E. Dunsmore, and V. Y. Shen, *Software Engineering Metrics and Models*. Redwood City, CA, USA: Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., 1986.
- [20] K. Coogan, G. Lu, and S. Debray, "Deobfuscation of virtualization-obfuscated software: A semantics-based approach," in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '11. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 275–284.
- [21] A. Cozzie, F. Stratton, H. Xue, and S. T. King, "Digging for data structures," in *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, ser. OSDI'08. USENIX Association, 2008, pp. 255–266.
- [22] E. D. Demaine, "C to Java: converting pointers into references," *Concurrency - Practice and Experience*, vol. 10, no. 11-13, pp. 851–861, 1998.
- [23] D. Diaz and P. Codognet, "Design and implementation of the GNU Prolog system," *Journal of Functional and Logic Programming*, vol. 2001, no. 6, 2001.
- [24] W. Drewry and T. Ormandy, "Flayer: Exposing application internals," in *Proceedings of the First USENIX Workshop on Offensive Technologies*, ser. WOOT '07. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 2007, pp. 1:1–1:9.
- [25] H. Flake, "Structural comparison of executable objects," in *Detection of Intrusions and Malware & Vulnerability Assessment, GI SIG SIDAR Workshop, DIMVA 2004, Dortmund, Germany, July 6.7, 2004, Proceedings*, 2004, pp. 161–173.
- [26] V. Ganesh and D. L. Dill, "A decision procedure for bit-vectors and arrays," in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, ser. CAV'07. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2007, pp. 519–531.
- [27] D. Gao, M. Reiter, and D. Song, "BinHunt: Automatically finding semantic differences in binary programs," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Information and Communications Security (ICICS '08)*, 2008.
- [28] D. Gao, M. K. Reiter, and D. Song, "BinHunt: Automatically Finding Semantic Differences in Binary Programs," in *Information and Communications Security*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, L. Chen, M. D. Ryan, and G. Wang, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, no. 5308, pp. 238–255.
- [29] S. Garg, C. Gentry, S. Halevi, M. Raykova, A. Sahai, and B. Waters, "Candidate Indistinguishability Obfuscation and Functional Encryption for all Circuits," in *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, Oct. 2013, pp. 40–49.

- [30] R. Ghiya and L. J. Hendren, "Is it a tree, a dag, or a cyclic graph? a shape analysis for heap-directed pointers in c," in *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, ser. POPL '96. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1996, pp. 1–15.
- [31] S. Ghosh, J. Hiser, and J. W. Davidson, "Replacement attacks against vm-protected applications," in *Proceedings of the 8th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS Conference on Virtual Execution Environments*, ser. VEE '12. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2012, pp. 203–214.
- [32] T. Gilb, *Software metrics*, ser. Winthrop computer systems series. Winthrop Publishers, 1977.
- [33] F. Guo, P. Ferrie, and T. Chiueh, "A study of the packer problem and its solutions," in *Proceedings of 11th International Symposium on Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection (RAID)*, 2008, pp. 98–115.
- [34] N. D. Jones and S. S. Muchnick, "A flexible approach to interprocedural data flow analysis and programs with recursive data structures," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, ser. POPL '82. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1982, pp. 66–74.
- [35] S. N. Kamin, *Programming Languages: An Interpreter-Based Approach*. Boston, MA, USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 1990.
- [36] N. Kettle and A. King, "Bit-precise reasoning with affine functions," in *Proceedings of the Joint Workshops of the 6th International Workshop on Satisfiability Modulo Theories and 1st International Workshop on Bit-Precise Reasoning*, ser. SMT '08/BPR '08. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2008, pp. 46–52.
- [37] D. E. Knuth and R. W. Floyd, "Notes on avoiding go to statements," *Information processing letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 23–31, 1971.
- [38] J. Launchbury, "A natural semantics for lazy evaluation," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, ser. POPL '93. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1993, pp. 144–154.
- [39] C. Linn and S. Debray, "Obfuscation of executable code to improve resistance to static disassembly," in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '03. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2003, pp. 290–299.
- [40] L. Luo, J. Ming, D. Wu, P. Liu, and S. Zhu, "Semantics-based obfuscation-resilient binary code similarity comparison with applications to software plagiarism detection," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Foundations of Software Engineering*, ser. FSE 2014. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 389–400.
- [41] R. Lyda and J. Hamrock, "Using entropy analysis to find encrypted and packed malware," *IEEE Security and Privacy*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 40–45, 2007.
- [42] A. Lpez-Alt, E. Tromer, and V. Vaikuntanathan, "On-the-fly Multiparty Computation on the Cloud via Multikey Fully Homomorphic Encryption," in *Proceedings of the Forty-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '12. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2012, pp. 1219–1234.
- [43] L. Martignoni, M. Christodorescu, and S. Jha, "Omniunpack: Fast, generic, and safe unpacking of malware," in *Proceedings of the 2007 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2007, pp. 431–441.
- [44] J. Martin and H. Muller, "Strategies for migration from C to Java," in *Fifth European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering*, 2001, 2001, pp. 200–209.
- [45] T. J. McCabe, "A complexity measure," *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 308–320, Jul. 1976.
- [46] J. Ming, M. Pan, and D. Gao, "iBinHunt: Binary hunting with interprocedural control flow," in *Proceedings of the 15th Annual International Conference on Information Security and Cryptology (ICISC '12)*, 2012.
- [47] A. Moser, C. Kruegel, and E. Kirda, "Limits of static analysis for malware detection," in *Proceedings of the 23th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC 2007)*, December 2007.
- [48] G. C. Necula, S. McPeak, S. P. Rahul, and W. Weimer, "CIL: Intermediate language and tools for analysis and transformation of C programs," in *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Compiler Construction*, 2002.
- [49] I. V. Popov, S. K. Debray, and G. R. Andrews, "Binary obfuscation using signals," in *Proceedings of 16th USENIX Security Symposium on USENIX Security Symposium*, 2007.
- [50] T. A. Proebsting and S. A. Watterson, "Kakatoa: Decompilation in Java (dose bytecode reveal source?)," in *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on USENIX Conference on Object-Oriented Technologies (COOTS) - Volume 3*, ser. COOTS'97. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 1997, pp. 14–14.
- [51] L. Ramshaw, "Eliminating go to's while preserving program structure," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 893–920, 1988.
- [52] R. Rolles, "Unpacking virtualization obfuscators," in *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Conference on Offensive Technologies*, ser. WOOT'09. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 2009, pp. 1–1.
- [53] P. Royal, M. Halpin, D. Dagon, R. Edmonds, and W. Lee, "Polyunpack: Automating the hidden-code extraction of unpack-executing malware," in *Proceedings of 2006 Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC)*. IEEE Computer Society, 2006, pp. 289–300.
- [54] M. Sagiv, T. Reps, and R. Wilhelm, "Solving shape-analysis problems in languages with destructive updating," *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–50, Jan. 1998.
- [55] A. Sahai and B. Waters, "How to Use Indistinguishability Obfuscation: Deniable Encryption, and More," in *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '14. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 475–484.
- [56] J. Saltzer and M. Schroeder, "The protection of information in computer systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 1278–1308, Sept 1975.
- [57] A. Sepp, B. Mihaila, and A. Simon, "Precise static analysis of binaries by extracting relational information," in *Reverse Engineering (WCRE), 2011 18th Working Conference on*, Oct 2011, pp. 357–366.
- [58] M. Sharif, A. Lanzi, J. Giffin, and W. Lee, "Impeding malware analysis using conditional code obfuscation," in *Proceedings of 15th Network and Distributed System Security Symposium (NDSS)*, 2008, 2008.
- [59] —, "Automatic reverse engineering of malware emulators," in *Proceedings of the 2009 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, ser. SP '09. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2009, pp. 94–109.
- [60] M. Sikorski and A. Honig, *Practical Malware Analysis: The Hands-On Guide to Dissecting Malicious Software*. No Starch Press, February 2012.
- [61] J. E. Smith and R. Nair, *Virtual Machines: Versatile platforms for systems and processes*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2005.
- [62] P. Szor, *The Art of Computer Virus Research and Defense*. Addison-Wesley Professional, February 2005.
- [63] D. Thomas and R. Rolf, "Graph-based comparison of executable objects," in *Proceedings of the Symposium sur la Securite des Technologies de l'Information et des Communications*, 2005.
- [64] M. Trudel, C. Furia, M. Nordio, B. Meyer, and M. Oriol, "C to o-o translation: Beyond the easy stuff," in *2012 19th Working Conference on Reverse Engineering (WCRE)*, Oct. 2012, pp. 19–28.
- [65] D. H. D. Warren, "An abstract Prolog instruction set," SRI International, Tech. Rep. 309, October 1983.
- [66] M. H. Williams and G. Chen, "Restructuring pascal programs containing goto statements," *The Computer Journal*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 134–137, 1985.
- [67] M. Woodward, M. Hennell, and D. Hedley, "A measure of control flow complexity in program text," *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, vol. SE-5, no. 1, pp. 45–50, Jan. 1979.
- [68] D. Wu, A. W. Appel, and A. Stump, "Foundational proof checkers with small witnesses," in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Principles and Practice of Declarative Programming*, ser. PPDP '03. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2003, pp. 264–274.
- [69] Z. Wu, S. Gianvecchio, M. Xie, and H. Wang, "Mimimorphism: A new approach to binary code obfuscation," in *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, ser. CCS '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 536–546.
- [70] B. Yadegari and S. Debray, "Bit-level taint analysis," in *Source Code Analysis and Manipulation (SCAM), 2014 IEEE 14th International Working Conference on*, Sept 2014, pp. 255–264.
- [71] B. Yadegari, B. Johannesmeyer, B. Whitely, and S. Debray, "A generic approach to automatic deobfuscation of executable code," in *Proceedings of the 2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, 2015, to appear.
- [72] A. Zakai, "Emscripten: An LLVM-to-JavaScript compiler," in *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference Companion on Object Oriented Programming Systems Languages and Applications Companion*, ser. OOPSLA '11. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 301–312.