

## Logic Programming

Georg Moser



Winter 2016

# 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
- ¬ Turing complete
- purely declarative
- restricted to finite models

## Example ((part of) 8-queens problem)

- :- not (1 = count(Y : queen(X,Y))), row(X)
- expresses that exactly one queen appears in every row and column
- is read as a rule: "if X is a row, 1 = count(Y : queen(X,Y)) holds"

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI Logic Programming

#### **Negative Definition**

Definition

negative definitions define a relation with the help of negation

#### Example

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

```
GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI Logic Programming
```

163/1

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:

 $\forall$  rules  $A: -B_1, \ldots, B_n$ : if  $B_1, \ldots, B_n \in I$ , then  $A \in I$ 

• the minimal model of *P* is the intersection of all models

#### Theorem

the minimal model is unique

## 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

Logic Programming

- 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  $G_i$

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

#### 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

Logic Programmin

## Rule Order

#### Fact

The rule order determines the order in which solutions are found

#### Example

parent(terach,abraham).
parent(isaac,jakob).

parent(abraham,isaac).
parent(jakob,benjamin).

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

### Example

```
      append1([X|Xs],Ys,[X|Zs]) : -
      append2([],Ys,Ys).

      append1(Xs,Ys,Zs).
      append2([X|Xs],Ys,[X|Zs]) : -

      append1([],Ys,Ys).
      append2([Xs,Ys,Zs).
```

Logic Programming

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

167/1

#### Intermission: Redundancy

## **Redundant Solutions**

#### Example

 $: - \min(2,2,M)$ 

#### Example

### 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

 $\label{eq:reversel} \begin{array}{l} \mathsf{reversel}\left(\left[X \,|\, Xs\right], Zs\right) \;:=\; \mathsf{reversel}\left(Xs\,, Ys\right), \;\; \mathsf{appendl}(Ys\,, \left[X\right], Zs\,). \\ \mathsf{reversel}\left(\left[\right]\,, \left[\right]\right). \end{array}$ 

reverse2([X|Xs],Zs) :- append1(Ys,[X],Zs), reverse2(Xs,Ys). reverse2([],[]).

Logic Programming

:- reverse1([a,b,c,d],Xs), Xs=[d,c,b,a]. :- reverse2([a,b,c,d],Xs), Xs=[d,c,b,a].

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

168/1

#### 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

select(X,[X|Xs],Xs).
select(X,[Y|Ys],[Y|Zs]) : - select(X,Ys,Zs).

### Example

select\_fst(X,[X|Xs],Xs).
select\_fst(X,[Y|Ys],[Y|Zs]) :- dif(X,Y), select\_fst(X,Ys,Zs).

### Observation

select(a,[a,b,a,c],[a,b,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

Logic Programming

```
GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI
```

## Examples of Cuts

```
Example (With Cuts)
merge([X|Xs], [Y|Ys],[X|Zs]) : -
    X < Y, !, merge(Xs,[Y|Ys],Zs).
merge([X|Xs],[Y|Ys],[X,Y|Zs]) : -
    X = Y, !, merge(Xs,Ys,Zs).
merge([X|Xs],[Y|Ys],[Y|Zs]) : -
    X > Y, !, merge([X|Xs],Ys,Zs).
merge(Xs,[],Xs) : - !.
merge([],Ys,Ys) : - !.
```

#### Example

#### Cuts

Removal of Duplicates

```
no_doubles([],[]).
no_doubles([X|Xs],Ys) : -
    member(X,Xs), !,
    no_doubles(Xs,Ys).
no_doubles([X|Xs],[X|Ys]) : -
    no_doubles(Xs,Ys).
```

: - no\_doubles([a,b,a,c,b],X).

 $X \mapsto [a,c,b]$ ;

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

Logic Programming

cut

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

172/1

#### Cuts

#### Fact

cuts can greatly increase the efficiency by removing redundant computations  $% \left( {{{\left[ {{{c_{{\rm{m}}}} \right]}}}} \right)$ 

#### Example

```
ordered([X]).
ordered([X,Y|Xs]) : - X \leq 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]

171/1

## Definition (Negation as Failure)

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

#### Example

not X :- X, !, fail.
not X.

### Observation

```
if G does not terminate, not(G) may or may not terminate
```

### Example

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

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

175/1

#### Cuts

```
Example (Truth Tables for Propositional Formulas)
```

```
and(A,B) := A, B.
or(A,B) := A; B.
implies(A,B) := or(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').
:= table(A,B,or(A,implies(B,or(B,and(A,B))))).
```

Logic Programming

```
: - table(A,B,false).
```

#### its

## **Cut-Fail Combinations**

Example (Implementing  $\neq$ ) X  $\neq$  X  $\rightarrow$  !, fail. X  $\neq$  Y.

Example (Implementing if\_then\_else)
if\_then\_else(P,Q,R) :- P, !, Q.
if\_then\_else(P,Q,R) :- R.

Example (Implementing same\_vars)
same\_vars(foo,Y) : - var(Y), !, fail.
same\_vars(X,Y) : - var(X), var(Y).

GM (Department of Computer Science @ UI

```
176/1
```

#### Cuts

## Cut and Generate and Test

Example (integer division with cut)

```
is_integer(0).
is_integer(N) :-
is_integer(N1),
N is N1 + 1.
```

Logic Programming

:- divide (27,6,Res), Res=4.