One of the great advantages of formal semantics is that we can actually prove that a program will behave correctly for *all* expected input values.

In order for this to work we need the notion of a *program specification*.

The program specification act as the *yard stick* for the expected program behavior for any set of input values.

## **Program Specifications**

 $\Rightarrow$  A program specification is a universally quantified sentence over states in first order logic.

Consider the following program specification for some program p and variables x and y:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \forall s, \exists P, Q, VX, VY & [(P, s) \longrightarrow Q \land \\ & \operatorname{lookup}(y, s, VY) \land \operatorname{lookup}(x, Q, VY) \land \\ & \operatorname{lookup}(x, s, VX) \land \operatorname{lookup}(y, Q, VX)] \end{array}$$

This specification states that running the program P in state s will give rise to some state Q. Furthermore, looking up the variable y in state s is the same as looking up the variable x in state Q and *vice versa*.

This is a program specification for a *swap* program that swaps the values of x and y.

Now, consider the program P written in our simple language IMP defined in 'sem.pl':

 $P \equiv \operatorname{assign}(t, x) \operatorname{seq} \operatorname{assign}(x, y) \operatorname{seq} \operatorname{assign}(y, t)$ 

Without formal semantics and a program specification we would simply try "a bunch" of values, and if the results look good we would infer that the program works. But there will always be a doubt that it will work for all states since trying a bunch of values does not constitute a proof.

However, given our formal semantics we can prove that this program *satisfies* the specification and therefore we can prove that the program works for all possible states.

## **Program Specifications**

```
% swap.pl
:-['sem.pl'].
:- >>> 'show that program P="assign(t,x) seq assign(x,y) seq assign(y,t))"'.
:- >>> 'satisfies the program specification:'.
:- >>> ' (P,s)-->>Q,lookup(y,s,VY),lookup(x,Q,VY),lookup(x,s,VX),lookup(y,Q,VX)'.
program(assign(t,x) seq assign(x,y) seq assign(y,t)).
:- asserta(lookup(x,s,vx)).
:- asserta(lookup(y,s,vy)).
:- program(P),
        (P,s) -->> Q,
        lookup(y,s,VY),
        lookup(x,s,VX),
```

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト

3

lookup(y,Q,VX).

Now consider the program specification

$$\forall s, \exists P, Q, V1, V2 \quad [(P, s) \longrightarrow Q \land \\ lookup(z, s, V1) \land lookup(z, Q, V2) \land \\ V2 = 2 * V1]$$

It is easy to see that the program  $P \equiv assign(z, mult(2, z))$  satisfies the specification.

But so does this program  $P \equiv assign(z, add(z, z))$ .

 $\Rightarrow$  Program specifications are *implementation independent*!

## **Program Specifications**

```
% double.pl
:-['sem.pl'].
```

```
:- >>> 'show that program P="assign(z,add(z,z)))"'.
:- >>> 'satisfies the program specification:'.
:- >>> ' (P,s) -->> Q,lookup(z,s,V1),lookup(z,Q,V2),V2 = 2*V1'.
```

```
program(assign(z,add(z,z))).
```

```
:- asserta(lookup(z,s,vz)).
:- asserta(2*I xis I+I). % property of integers
```

```
:- program(P),
    (P,s) -->> Q,
    lookup(z,s,V1),
    lookup(z,Q,V2),
    V2 = 2 * V1.
```