CSC 501 – Semantics of Programming Languages

- Subtitle: An Introduction to Formal Methods.
- Instructor: Dr. Lutz Hamel
- Email: lutzhamel@uri.edu
- Office: Tyler, Rm 251



There are no required books in this course; however, occasionally I will assign readings based on material available on the web.

The aim of this course is to

- Familiarize you with the basic techniques of applying formal methods to programming languages.
- This includes constructing models for programming languages and using these models to prove properties such as correctness and equivalence of programs.
- Look at all major programming language constructs including assignments, loops, type systems, and procedure calls together with their models.
- Introduce mechanical theorem provers so that we can test and prove properties of non-trivial programs.

Definition: In **programming language semantics** we are concerned with the *rigorous mathematical study* of the *meaning* of programming languages. The meaning of a language is given by a *formal system* that describes the possible computations expressible within that language. **Definition:** In computer science and software engineering, **formal methods** are techniques for the specification, development and verification of software and hardware systems based on *formal systems*.

Definition: A **formal system** consists of a *formal language* and a set of *inference rules*. The formal language is composed of primitive symbols that make up well formed formulas and the inference rules are used to derive expressions from other expressions within the formal system. A formal system may be formulated and studied for its intrinsic properties, or it may be intended as a description (i.e. a model) of external phenomena.¹

In order to be truly useful in computer science, we require our formal systems to be *machine executable*.

Implementation Issues Formally specified models can be considered machine-independent specifications of program behavior. They can act as "yard sticks" for the correctness of program implementations, transformations, and optimizations.

- *Verification* Basis of methods for reasoning about program properties (e.g. equivalence) and program specifications (program correctness).
- Language Design Can bring to light ambiguities and unforeseen subtleties in programming language constructs.

When programming we can observe two mental activities:

- We construct *correct looking* programs *syntactically* correct programs.
- We construct *models* of the intended computation in our minds. Consider,

```
x := 1
while (x <= 10) do
    writeln(x)
    x := x + 1
end whiledo</pre>
```

Any person with some familiarity of programming immediately has a mental picture that this program will generate a list of integers from 1 through 10. Mirroring our intuition, language definitions consist of two parts:

Syntax The formal description of the **structure** of well-formed expressions, phrases, programs, etc.

Semantics The formal description of the **meaning** of the syntactic features of a programming language usually understood in terms of the runtime **behavior** each syntactic construct evokes. The formal description of the behavior of all the syntactic features of a language is considered a **model** of the language. Syntax and semantics of a programming language are usually related via an *evaluation relation* or *interpretation*, say h. Then we say that the interpretation h takes each syntactic element and maps it into the appropriate semantic construct.

We often represent this with the diagram

```
Semantics
```

Note: In order for the interpretation h to make any sense we will have to define the syntax and semantics in terms of sets.

The formal systems we will be using in this course are:

- First-order logic extended with natural deduction natural semantics.
- The *first order predicate calculus* (often also called first order logic) to construct semantics of programming languages.

- Read Chapter 0 in "Denotational Semantics" by David Schmidt (available from the course website).
- Read Sections 2.1 and 2.2 in "Denotational Semantics" by David Schmidt.