

Lingua Project

(10) Program correctness in Lingua

(Sec. 9.1 and 9.2)

The book "**Denotational Engineering**" may be downloaded from:
<https://moznainaczej.com.pl/what-has-been-done/the-book>

Andrzej Jacek Blikle

April 5th, 2025

Propositional calculus of Mc'Carthy

(non-transparent operations)

if $x \neq 0$ and $1/x < 10$ then $x := x+1$ else $x := x-1$ fi

If **and** is transparent, then our program aborts for $x = 0$.

The solution of John McCarthy:

ff **and-m** ee = ff — lazy evaluation from left to right

error or undefinedness

or-m	tt	ff	ee
tt	tt	tt	tt
ff	tt	ff	ee
ee	ee	ee	ee

and-m	tt	ff	ee
tt	tt	ff	ee
ff	ff	ff	ff
ee	ee	ee	ee

not-m	
tt	ff
ff	tt
ee	ee

Propositional calculus of Mc'Carthy

(some properties)

and-m, or-m — associative (if only one ee)

$p \text{ and-m } q \neq q \text{ and-m } p$ — not commutative

$p \text{ or-m } (\text{not } p) \neq \text{ff}$ — never false

and-m is distributive over **or-m** only on the right-hand side, i.e.

$$p \text{ and-m } (q \text{ or-m } s) = (p \text{ and-m } q) \text{ or-m } (p \text{ and-m } s)$$

Propositional calculus of Kleene

Even „more lazy” than McCarthy’s calculus

or-k	tt	ff	ee
tt	tt	tt	tt
ff	tt	ff	ee
ee	tt	ee	ee

and-k	tt	ff	ee
tt	tt	ff	ee
ff	ff	ff	ff
ee	ee	ff	ee

not-k	
tt	ff
ff	tt
ee	ee

Now commutativity

$p \text{ or-k } q = q \text{ or-k } p$

$p \text{ and-k } q = q \text{ and-k } p$

hence in particular

$tt \text{ or-k } ee = ee \text{ or-k } tt = tt$

$ff \text{ and-k } ee = ee \text{ and-k } ff = ff$

If ee may be an infinite computation, then Kleene's calculus requires a simultaneous evaluation of arguments.

Syntactic categories of Lingua-V

(V stands for „validating”)

Lingua-V includes all categories of Lingua (in colloquial version) plus five new categories:

1. **conditions** – representing partial 3-valued (Kleene’s) partial predicates.
2. **assertions** – instructions aborting programs when a condition is not satisfied
3. **specified programs** – programs with nested assertions
4. **metaconditions** – describing relationships between conditions
5. **metaprograms** – specified programs with **pre-** and **post-conditions**

An example of a metaprogram:

pre x, k is integer and-k $k > 0$:	- a precondition
$x := 0$;	
asr $x = 0$ rsa ;	- an assertion
while $x+1 \leq k$ do $x := x+1$ od	
post $x = k$	- a postcondition

Conditions

Some specific notation

$\text{cod} : \text{ConDen} = \text{WfState} \rightarrow \text{BooValE}$ – the denotations of conditions

$\text{val} : \text{BooVal} = \{\text{tv}, \text{fv}\} \mid \text{Error}$

$\text{tv} = (\text{tt}, \text{'boolean'})$

$\text{fv} = (\text{ff}, \text{'boolean'})$

$\text{con} : \text{Condition}$ – the syntactic domain of conditions

$[\] : \text{Condition} \mapsto \text{ConDen}$ – the semantics of conditions

$[\text{con}] : \text{WfState} \rightarrow \text{BooValE}$ – the denotation of con (transparent for errors)

$\{\text{con}\} = \{\text{sta} \mid [\text{con}].\text{sta} = \text{tv}\}$ – the truth domain of con

$\text{NT} : \text{Condition}$ – a special condition called nearly true

$[\text{NT}].\text{sta} =$

$\text{is-error.sta} \rightarrow \text{error.sta}$ – transparency for errors

$\text{true} \rightarrow \text{tv}$

con is error-sensitive if it has one of two following properties:

if is-error.sta then $[\text{con}].\text{sta} = \text{error.sta}$

if is-error.sta then $[\text{con}].\text{sta} = \text{fv}$

con is error-transparent

con is error-negative

Value-oriented conditions

Value-oriented conditions include:

1. all value expressions with boolean values but with Kleene's operators,
2. some specific conditions, e.g.:
 - vex-1 = vex-2 – (in Lingua, we do not allow for the comparison of arbitrary values)
 - increasingly ordered (ide) – where ide points to an array
 - vex is value – vex evaluates cleanly
 - ...

Basic value-, type-, reference-oriented conditions

(constructors of conditions)

- (1) **att** at-ide **is** tex **with** yex **in** cl-ide **as** pst
 - at-ide is declared with tex and yex in class cl-ide...
- (2) ty-ide **is type** **in** cl-ide,
 - ty-ide is declared as type constant in class cl-ide
- (3) **var** ide **is** tex **with** yex,
 - ide is a declared variable of type tex and yoke yok
- (4) rex **is reference**,
 - reference expression rex evaluates cleanly
- (5) vex **is value**,
 - value expression vex evaluates cleanly
- (6) vex **is** tex
 - vex evaluates cleanly and its value is of type indicated by tex (which evaluates cleanly)
- (7) tex **is type**,
 - type expression tex evaluates cleanly
- (8) cli **is class**,
 - cli is either empty-class or an identifier of a declared class
- (9) ide **child of** cli
 - ide is an identifier of a declared class which is a child of class indicated by cli
- (10) tex1 **covers** tex2,
 - tex1 and tex2 evaluate cleanly and...
- (11) ide **is free**
 - ide has not been declared

Procedure-oriented conditions

(constructors of conditions)

Examples:

- pr-ide (val fpv ref fpr) begin body end imperative in cl-ide,
- fu-ide (val fpv ref tex) begin body return vex end functional in cl-ide,
- ob-ide (val fpv ref ob-ide) begin body end objectional in cl-ide,
- procedure cl-ide.pr-ide opened ,
- (pass actual val apa-v ref apa-r to formal val fpa-v ref fpa-r with cl-ide to con

Procedure-oriented conditions (cont.)

[pr-ide (**val** fpc-v **ref** fpc-r) **begin** body **end imperative in** cl-ide].sta =
is-error.sta → error.sta
let
((cle, pre, cov), sto) = sta
cle.cl-ide = ? → 'class unknown'
let
(cl-ide, tye, mee, obn) = cle.cl-ide
mee.pr-ide = ? → 'pre-procedure unknown'
let
declared-pre-proc = mee.pr-ide
expected-pre-proc = create-imp-pre-pro.([fpd-v], [fpd-r], [body])
declared-pre-proc ≠ expected-pre-proc → fv
true → tv

Our condition claims three facts:

1. cl-ide is a name of a declared class,
2. pr-ide is a name of a procedure in this class,
3. pre-procedure pointed by pr-ide is equal to a pre-procedure that would be created by a declaration

proc pr-ide (**val** fpc-v, **ref** fpc-r) **begin** body **end**.

(a claim about a denotational effect of a declaration)

Procedure-oriented conditions (cont.)

```
[ pass actual val apa-v ref apa-r to formal val fpa-v ref fpa-r with cl-ide to con]
                                     : WfState → BooValE
[ pass actual val apa-v ref apa-r to formal val fpa-v ref fpa-r with cl-ide to con].sta =
is-error.sta      → error.sta
let
  (env, sto) = sta
  new-sto    = pass-actual.(fpa-v, fpa-r, apa-v, apa-r, cl-ide).env.sto
is-error.new-sto → error.new-sto
let
  new-sta = (env, new-sto)
true      → [con].new-sta
```

Condition con is satisfied after passing of actual parameters to formal parameters by a procedure call.

Assertions

`asr` : Assertion = **asr** Condition **rsa**

`[asr]` : WfState $\rightarrow$ WfState

[asr con rsa].sta =

is-error.sta $\rightarrow$ sta

`[con].sta` = ? $\rightarrow$?

`[con].sta` : Error $\rightarrow$ sta $\blacktriangleleft$ `[con].sta`

`[con].sta` = fv $\rightarrow$ sta $\blacktriangleleft$ 'assertion not satisfied'

true $\rightarrow$ sta

An error message will be generated by assertions in two situations:

1. when the value of the condition is an error,
2. when the condition is not satisfied.

Anchored class transformers

Class transformers:

$\text{ctd} : \text{ClaTraDen} = \text{Identifier} \mapsto \text{WfState} \rightarrow \text{WfState}.$



the identifier of a class
to be transformed

Anchored class transformers:

$\text{act} : \text{AncClaTra} = \text{ClaTra} \text{ in Identifier}$

with the following semantics:

$[\text{ctr in ide}] : \text{WfState} \rightarrow \text{WfState}$

$[\text{ctr in ide}] = [\text{ctr}].\text{ide}.$

Specified programs

sin : SpeIns =	specified instructions (specinstructions)
Instruction	
Assertion	
SpeIns ; SpeIns	
asr con in SpeIns rsa	on-zone instructions
off con in SpeIns on	off-zone instructions
if ValExp then SpeIns else SpeIns fi	
if-error ValExp then SpeIns fi	
while ValExp do SpeIns od	
skip-ins	
sde : SpeDec =	specified declarations (specdeclarations)
Declaration	
Assertion	
SpeDec ; SpeDec	
skip-dec	

Specified programs (cont.)

sct : SpeClaTra = specified class transformers (spectransformers)
AncClaTra |
Assertion |
SpeClaTra ; SpeClaTra |
skip-sct

spp : SpeProPre = specified program preambles (specpreambles)
SpeDec |
SpeIns |
SpeProPre ; SpeProPre |
skip-spp

spr : SpePro = specified programs (specprograms)
SpeProPre ; **open procedures** ; SpeIns |
SpeProPre |
SpeClaTra

Algorithmic conditions

con : AlgCondition =

SpePro @ Condition |
Condition @ SpePro

left algorithmic conditions
right algorithmic conditions

[] : AlgCondition $\mapsto$ WfState $\mapsto$ {tv, fv}

[spr @ con].sta =

($\exists$ sta1 : {con}) [spr].sta = sta1 $\rightarrow$ tv
true $\rightarrow$ fv

i.e. [con].([spr].sta) = tv

[con @ spr].sta =

($\exists$ sta1 : {con}) [spr].sta1 = sta $\rightarrow$ tv
true $\rightarrow$ fv

We assume that
conditions are closed
under @.

Since algorithmic conditions
are 2-valued, they are
unambiguously identified by
their **truth domains**:

{spr @ con} = [spr] • {con}
{con @ spr} = {con} • [spr]

None of them is error-transparent and:

- if spr is error transparent and con is error sensitive, then spr @ con is error negative,
- con @ spr need not be error sensitive.

Metaconditions

(formulas of our 2-valued logic of programs)

Atomic metaconditions:

$\text{con1} \Rightarrow \text{con2}$ iff (def) $\{\text{con1}\} \subseteq \{\text{con2}\}$

$\text{con1} \Leftrightarrow \text{con2}$ iff (def) $\{\text{con1}\} = \{\text{con2}\}$

$\text{con1} \sqsubseteq \text{con2}$ iff (def) $[\text{con1}] \subseteq [\text{con2}]$

$\text{con1} \equiv \text{con2}$ iff (def) $[\text{con1}] = [\text{con2}]$

metaimplication; stronger than

weak equivalence

better definedness; more defined than

strong equivalence

MetaConditions = the least language that includes atomic metaconditions and is closed under 2-valued propositional connectives and quantifiers.

$x > 0$ **and-kl** $\sqrt[2]{x} > 2 \equiv x > 4$

$\sqrt[2]{x} > 2 \Leftrightarrow x > 4$

$\sqrt[2]{x} > 4 \Rightarrow x > 3$

$\sqrt[2]{x} < 2 \sqsubseteq x < 4$

but $\equiv$ does not hold,

but neither $\Leftrightarrow$ nor $\sqsubseteq$ holds.

if $\sqrt[2]{x}$ undefined for $x < 0$

$\text{con1} \equiv \text{con2}$

iff

$\text{con1} \sqsubseteq \text{con2}$ and $\text{con2} \sqsubseteq \text{con1}$

$\text{con1} \Leftrightarrow \text{con2}$

iff

$\text{con1} \Rightarrow \text{con2}$ and $\text{con2} \Rightarrow \text{con1}$

$\text{con1} \sqsubseteq \text{con2}$

implies

$\text{con1} \Leftrightarrow \text{con2}$

$\text{con1} \equiv \text{con2}$

implies

$\text{con1} \sqsubseteq \text{con2}$

$\text{con1} \Leftrightarrow \text{con2}$

implies

$\text{con1} \Rightarrow \text{con2}$

Three linguistic levels

- Lingua – a (classical) programming language
- Lingua-V – a language of validating programming metaprograms used to talk about programs
- MetaLingua – a language of a logic to talk about metaprograms

implies-kl : Condition x Condition $\mapsto$ Condition	constructor in Lingua-V
$\Rightarrow$: Condition x Condition $\mapsto$ {tt, ff}	constructor in MetaLingua
implies : {tt, ff} x {tt, ff} $\mapsto$ {tt, ff}	classical implication in MetaLingua

$$(\text{con1 } \mathbf{implies-k} \text{ con2}) \equiv \mathbf{NT} \text{ implies } \text{con1} \Rightarrow \text{con2}$$

$\text{con1} \Rightarrow \text{con2}$ does not imply $(\text{con1 } \mathbf{implies-kl} \text{ con2}) \equiv \mathbf{NT}$.

Despite that the metaimplication $\sqrt[2]{x} > 4 \Rightarrow x > 3$ holds, the condition

$\sqrt[2]{x} > 4$ **implies-k** $x > 3$

is undefined for $x < 0$.



Thank you for
your attention