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## Qutline

## Outline of the Lecture

Monotone Logic Programs
introduction, basic constructs, logic foundations, unification, semantics, database and recursive programming, termination, complexity

Incomplete Data Structures and Constraints
incomplete data structures, definite clause grammars, constraint logic programming, answer set programming

## Full Prolog

semantics (revisited), cuts, correctness proofs, meta-logical predicates, nondeterministic programming, efficient programs, complexity

## Summary of Last Lecture

## Answer Set Programming

- novel approach to modelling and solving search and optimisation problems
- $\neg$ programming, but a specification language
- $\neg$ Turing complete
- purely declarative
- restricted to finite models

Example ((part of) 8-queens problem)

$$
:-\operatorname{not}(1=\operatorname{count}(Y: \text { queen }(X, Y))) \text {, row }(X)
$$

- expresses that exactly one queen appears in every row and column
- is read as a rule: "if $X$ is a row, $1=\operatorname{count}(\mathrm{Y}:$ queen $(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}))$ holds"


## Negative Definitions

## Definition

negative definitions define a relation with the help of negation

Example
$\operatorname{land}(X)$ :- not sea(X).

## Fact

negative definitions are dangerous as their scope is usually larger than expected and they are difficult to maintain, if underlying definitions get refined

Example
:- land(27).
:- land(kar rinne).
:- land(milka kuh).

## Semantics (revisited)

## Definitions

- SLD-derivation of monotone logic program $P$ and goal clause $G$ consists of
1 maximal sequence $G_{0}, G_{1}, G_{2}, \ldots$ of goal clauses
2 sequence $C_{0}, C_{1}, C_{2}, \ldots$ of variants of rules in $P$
3 sequence $\theta_{0}, \theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \ldots$ of substitutions
such that
- $G_{0}=G$
- $G_{i+1}$ is resolvent of $G_{i}$ and $C_{i}$ with mgu $\theta_{i}$
- $C_{i}$ has no variables in common with $G, C_{0}, \ldots, C_{i-1}$
- SLD refutation is finite SLD derivation ending in $\square$
- computed answer substitution of SLD refutation of $P$ and $G$ with substitutions $\theta_{0}, \theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{m}$ is restriction of $\theta_{0} \theta_{1} \cdots \theta_{m}$ to variables in $G$


## Semantics (revisited)

## Monotone Logic Programs and Herbrand Models

(yet another connection between proofs and programs)

## Definitions

- the Herbrand universe for a program $P$ is the set of all closed terms built from constants and function symbols appearing in the program
- the Herbrand base is the set of all ground goals formed from predicates in $P$ and terms in the Herbrand universe
- an interpretation is a subset of the Herbrand base
- an interpretation $I$ is a model if it is closed under rules:

$$
\forall \text { rules } A:-B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}: \quad \text { if } B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n} \in I \text {, then } A \in I
$$

- the minimal model of $P$ is the intersection of all models


## Theorem

the minimal model is unique

## Semantics (revisited)

Definition (search tree)
a search tree (aka SLD tree) of a goal $G$ is a tree $T$ such that

- the root of $T$ is labelled with $G$; the nodes of $T$ are labelled with conjunctions of goals, where one goal is selected (wrt a selection function)
- $\exists$ edge from node $N$ for each clause, whose head unifies with the selected goal; edges are labelled with (partial) answer substitutions
- leaves are success nodes, if $\square$ has been reached or failure nodes otherwise

Definition (proof tree)
a proof tree for a program $P$ and a goal $G$ is a tree, whose nodes are goals and whose edges represent reduction of goals such that

- the root is the query $G$
- the edges are labelled with (partial) answer substitutions
- a proof tree for $G_{1}, \ldots, G_{n}$ is set of proof trees for $G_{i}$
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## Semantics (revisited)

## Declarative, Operational, and Denotational Semantics

## Definition

- the declarative semantics of $P$ (aka its meaning) is the minimal model of $P$
- we also say that the meaning of a logic program $P$, is the set of (ground unit) goals deducible from $P$

Definitions
the operational semantics describes the meaning of a program procedurally

## Definition

the denotational semantics assign meanings to programs based on associating with the program a function over the domain computed by the program

## The Execution Model of Prolog

## Rule Order

Fact
The rule order determines the order in which solutions are found

Example

| parent(terach, abraham). | parent(abraham,isaac). |
| :--- | :--- |
| parent(isaac, jakob). | parent(jakob, benjamin). |

ancestor1 (X,Y) : - parent (X,Y).
ancestor1(X,Z) :- parent(X,Y), ancestor1(Y,Z).

Example

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { append1 }([\mathrm{X} \mid \mathrm{Xs}], \mathrm{Ys},[\mathrm{X} \mid \mathrm{Zs}]):- & \text { append2 }([], \mathrm{Ys}, \mathrm{Ys}) . \\
\text { append1 }(\mathrm{Xs}, \mathrm{Ys}, \mathrm{Zs}) . & \text { append2 }([\mathrm{X} \mid \mathrm{Xs}], \mathrm{Ys},[\mathrm{X} \mid \mathrm{Zs}]):- \\
\text { append1 }([], \mathrm{Ys}, \mathrm{Ys}) . & \text { append2 }(\mathrm{Xs}, \mathrm{Ys}, \mathrm{Zs}) .
\end{array}
$$

Logic Programming

## Intermission: Redundancy

## Redundant Solutions

## Example

$$
\operatorname{minimum}\left(N_{1}, N_{2}, N_{1}\right):-N_{1} \leqslant N_{2} .
$$

$$
\operatorname{minimum}\left(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right):-\mathrm{N}_{2} \leqslant \mathrm{~N}_{1} .
$$

- minium(2,2,M)

Example
minimum $\left(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{1}\right):-\mathrm{N}_{1} \leqslant \mathrm{~N}_{2}$.
$\operatorname{minimum}\left(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right):-\mathrm{N}_{2}<\mathrm{N}_{1}$

Observation
similar care is necessary with the definition of partition, etc

## Goal Order

Fact

## Goal order determines the SLD tree

Example
grandparent1(X,Z) : - parent(X,Y), parent(Y,Z). grandparent2(X,Z) : - parent (Y,Z), parent(X,Y).

Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { reverse1 }([X \mid X s], Z s):-\quad \text { reverse } 1(X s, Y s), \quad \text { append } 1(Y s,[X], Z s) . \\
& \text { reverse1 }([],[]) . \\
& \text { reverse } 2([X \mid X s], Z s):-\operatorname{append} 1(Y s,[X], Z s), \quad \operatorname{reverse} 2(X s, Y s) . \\
& \text { reverse2 }([],[]) . \\
& :-\operatorname{reverse} 1([a, b, c, d], X s), X s=[d, c, b, a] . \\
& :-\operatorname{reverse} 2([a, b, c, d], X s), X s=[d, c, b, a] .
\end{aligned}
$$

```
Intermission: Redundancy
```


## Redundant Solutions (part II)

```
Example
    member(X,[X|Xs])
    member(X,[Y|Xs]) :- member(X,Xs).
?- member(X, [a,b,a]).
X \mapsto a ;
X \mapsto b ;
X \mapsto a ;
false
```

Example
member_check(X, [X|Xs]).
member_check(X,[Y|Ys]) : $-X \neq Y$, member_check(X,Ys).

Fact
some care is necessary in pruning the search tree, as this may change the meaning of a program

## Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { select }(X,[X \mid X s], X s) . \\
& \operatorname{select}(X,[Y \mid Y s],[Y \mid Z s]):-\operatorname{select}(X, Y s, Z s) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { select_fst }(X,[X \mid X s], X s) . \\
& \text { select_fst }(X,[Y \mid Y s],[Y \mid Z s]):-\operatorname{dif}(X, Y), \text { select_fst(X,Ys,Zs). }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Observation

select ( $\mathrm{a},[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{c}],[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}]$ ) is in the meaning of the 1st program; select_fst ( $a,[a, b, a, c],[a, b, c]$ ) is not in the meaning of the 2nd

## GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

## Examples of Cuts

## Example (With Cuts)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{merge}([X \mid X s], \quad[Y \mid Y s],[X \mid Z s]):- \\
& X<Y,!, \operatorname{merge}(X s,[Y \mid Y s], Z s) . \\
& \operatorname{merge}([X \mid X s],[Y \mid Y s],[X, Y \mid Z s]):- \\
& X=Y,!, \operatorname{merge}(X s, Y s, Z s) . \\
& \operatorname{merge}([X \mid X s],[Y \mid Y s],[Y \mid Z s]):- \\
& X>Y,!, \operatorname{merge}([X \mid X s], Y s, Z s) . \\
& \operatorname{merge}(X s,[], X s):-!. \\
& \operatorname{merge}([], Y s, Y s):-!.
\end{aligned}
$$

## Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{minimum}(X, Y, X):-X \leqslant Y,!. \\
& \operatorname{minimum}(X, Y, Y):-X>Y,!.
\end{aligned}
$$

## Removal of Duplicates

no_doubles ([], []).
no_doubles ([X|Xs],Ys) : -
member (X,Xs), !, cut no_doubles(Xs,Ys).
no_doubles([X|Xs], [X|Ys]) : -
no_doubles (Xs,Ys).
: - no_doubles ([a,b,a, c, b] , X).
$\mathrm{X} \mapsto[\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{b}]$;
false

## Effect of Cut

! succeeds
! fixes all choices between (and including) moment of matching rule's head with parent goal and cut
if backtracking reaches !, the cut fails and the search continues from the last choice made before the clause containing! was chosen
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Fact
cuts can greatly increase the efficiency by removing redundant computations

```
Example
ordered([x]).
ordered([X,Y|Xs]):- X \leqslant Y, ordered([Y|Xs]).
bubblesort(Xs,Ys):-
    append(As, [X,Y|Bs],Xs),
    X > Y, !,
    append(As, [Y,X|Bs],Xs1),
    bubblesort(Xs1,Ys).
    bubblesort(Xs,Xs):-
        ordered(Xs), !.
    - bubblesort([3,2,1],Xs)
Xs }\mapsto[1,2,3
```

ordered ([x]).
ordered ([X,Y|Xs]):-X X , ordered([Y|Xs]).
bubblesort(Xs,Ys):-
$\operatorname{append}(\mathrm{As},[\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y} \mid \mathrm{Bs}], \mathrm{Xs})$,
X > Y, !,
append (As, $[\mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{X} \mid \mathrm{Bs}], \mathrm{Xs} 1$ ),
bubblesort(Xs1,Ys).
bubblesort(Xs,Xs):-

Xs $\mapsto[1,2,3]$

Definition (Negation as Failure)

- negation \+ is implemented using cut
- the principle of negation is limited and known as negation as failure

Example
not $\mathrm{X}:-\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{fail}$.
not $X$.

Observation
if $G$ does not terminate, $\operatorname{not}(G)$ may or may not terminate

## Example

married(abraham, sarah).
married (X,Y) : - married(Y,X)
: - not married(abraham,sarah).

Example (Truth Tables for Propositional Formulas)
$\operatorname{and}(A, B):-A, B$.
or $(A, B):-A ; B$.
implies (A, B) : $-\operatorname{or}(\operatorname{not}(A), B)$.
bind(true).
bind(false).
table(A, B, E) : - bind(A), bind(B), row(A,B,E), fail.
table(_,_,_) :-nl.
row(A,B,_) : - wr(A), write(' '), wr(B), write(' '), fail.
row (_,_, E) :-E, !, wr (true), nl.
row(_,_,_) :- wr(false), nl.
wr(true) : - write('T').
wr(false) :- write('F').
$:-\operatorname{table}(A, B$, or $(A, i m p l i e s(B, o r(B, a n d(A, B))))$.

- table(A,B,false).


## Cut-Fail Combinations

Example (Implementing $\neq$ )

$$
\mathrm{X} \neq \mathrm{X} \rightarrow \text { !, fail. }
$$

$\mathrm{X} \neq \mathrm{Y}$.

Example (Implementing if_then_else)
if_then_else ( $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{R}$ ) : - $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{Q}$.
if_then_else ( $P, Q, R$ ) : - R.

Example (Implementing same_vars)
same_vars (foo, Y) : - $\operatorname{var}(\mathrm{Y}),!, f a i l$.
same_vars (X,Y) : $-\operatorname{var}(X), \operatorname{var}(Y)$.

## Cut and Generate and Test

Example (integer division with cut)
is_integer (0).
is_integer (N) :-
is_integer (N1),
N is $\mathrm{N} 1+1$.
divide(N1,N2, Result) :-
is_integer (Result),
Product1 is Result * N2,
Product2 is (Result +1$) *$ N2,
Product1 $=<$ N1
Product2 $>$ N1,
!. $/ *$ what happens if removed? */
$:-\quad$ divide (27, 6, Res $), \quad$ Res $=4$.

