

Software and language are intrinsically related, since software may process language, and in the context of computing: formal languages in which algorithms are expressed and software is implemented, and in so-called “natural” spoken languages.

There are at least two layers of formal language in software: programming language in which the software as its symbolic controls. In the case of compilers, shells, and macro languages, for example, these layers can overlap. “Natural” language is what can be processed as data by software; since this processing is formal, however, it is restricted to syntactical operations.

While differentiation of computer programming languages as “artificial languages” from languages like English as “natural languages” is conceptually important and undisputed, it remains problematic in its pure terminology: There is nothing “natural” about spoken language; it is a cultural construct and thus just as “artificial” as any formal machine control language. To call programming languages as it obscures that “machine languages” are human creations.

High-level machine-independent programming languages such as Fortran, C, Java, and Basic are not even direct mappings of machine logic. If programming languages be called cybernetic languages. But these languages can also be used on machines—in programming handbooks, for example, in programmer’s direct and indirect jokes, or as abstract formal languages for expressing logical constructs, such as in Hugh Kenner’s use of the Pascal programming language to describe aspects of the structure of Samuel Beckett’s writing.¹

In this sense, computer control languages could be more broadly defined as syntactical languages as opposed to semantic languages. But this distinction is both formal and semantic; although their scope extends beyond the limits of anything that can be expressed in a computer control language can be seen as a formal (and as such rather primitive) subset of common human language.

Language

168

To complicate things even further, computer science has its own difficulties in the construction of a programming language interpreter or compiler, as this interpreter doesn’t perform “interpretations” in a hermeneutic or semantic text explication, the computer science notion of “interpretation” is linguistic and common sense understanding of the word, but syntactical manipulations of symbols.

What might more suitably be called the semantics of computer programming languages: English words like “if,” “then,” “goto,” and “print,” in conjunction with arithmetical and logical operations “paste”; in graphical software controls, such as symbols and icons. Ferdinand de Saussure states that the signs of communication are arbitrary² because it’s purely a cultural-social convention relating signs to concepts. Likewise, it’s purely a cultural convention that the sign is restrained by what the human voice can pronounce.

Hello you!

And hello me!

What else is there to say?

With many apologies to the Beach Boys and anyone else who finds this objectionable