

# Programming Languages: Logic Paradigm

Onur Tolga Şehitoğlu

Computer Engineering, METU

8 May 2008

# Outline

- 1 Logic Programming Paradigm
- 2 Prolog basics
- 3 Prolog Terms
- 4 Unification
- 5 Declarations
- 6 Procedural Interpretation

# Logic Programming Paradigm

- Based on logic and declarative programming
- 60's and early 70's
- Prolog (**P**rogramming in **l**ogic, 1972) is the most well known representative of the paradigm.
- Prolog is based on Horn clauses and SLD resolution
- Mostly developed in fifth generation computer systems project
- Specially designed for theorem proof and artificial intelligence but allows general purpose computation.
- Some other languages in paradigm: ALF, Frill, Gödel, Mercury, Oz, Ciao,  $\lambda$ Prolog, datalog, and CLP languages

# Constraint Logic Programming

- Clause: disjunction of universally quantified literals,

$$\forall(L_1 \vee L_2 \vee \dots \vee L_n)$$

- A logic program clause is a clause with exactly one positive literal

$$\begin{aligned}\forall(A \vee \neg A_1 \vee \neg A_2 \dots \vee \neg A_n) &\equiv \\ \forall(A \Leftarrow A_1 \wedge A_2 \dots \wedge A_n) &\end{aligned}$$

- A goal clause: no positive literal

$$\forall(\neg A_1 \vee \neg A_2 \dots \vee \neg A_n)$$

- Proof by refutation, try to unsatisfy the clauses with a goal clause  $G$ . Find  $\exists(G)$ .
- Linear resolution for definite programs with constraints and selected atom.

# What does Prolog look like?

```
father(ahmet, ayse).  
father(hasan, ahmet).  
mother(fatma, ayse).  
mother(hatice, fatma).  
parent(X,Y) :- father(X,Y).  
parent(X,Y) :- mother(X,Y).  
grandparent(X,Y) :- parent(X,Z), parent(Z,Y).
```

- CLP on first order terms. (Horn clauses).
- **Unification**. Bidirectional.
- **Backtracking**. Proof search based on trial of all matching clauses.

# Prolog Terms

## ■ Atoms:

- 1 Strings with starting with a small letter and consist of

`[a-zA-Z_0-9]*`

`a aDAM a1_2`

- 2 Strings consisting of only punctuation

`* *** .+ .<.>.`

- 3 Any string enclosed in single quotes (like an arbitrary string)

`'ADAM' 'Onur_Sehitoglu' '2_*_4_<_6'`

## ■ Numbers

`1234 12.32 12.23e-10`

- Variables:

- 1 Strings with starting with a capital letter or `_` and consist of

`[a-zA-Z_0-9]*`

`Adam _adam A093`

- 2 `_` is the universal match symbol. Not variable

- Structures:

- starts with an atom head
- has **one** or **more** arguments (any term) enclosed in paranthesis, separated by comma
- structure head cannot be a variable or anything other than atom.

`a(b) a(b,c) a(b,c,d) ++(12) +(*) *(1,a(b)) 'hello_world'(1,2)`

✓

`X(b) 4(b,c) a() ++() _(3)` ✗

- some structures defined as infix:

`+(1,2) ≡ 1+2` , `:(a,b,c,d) ≡ a :- b,c,d`

`is(X,+(Y,1)) ≡ X is X + 1`



## Syntactic Sugars

- Prolog interpreter automatically maps some easy to read syntax into its actual structure.
- List: `[a,b,c]`  $\equiv$  `.(a,.(b,.(c,[])))`
- Head and Tail: `[H|T]`  $\equiv$  `.(H,T)`
- String: `"ABC"`  $\equiv$  `[65,66,67]` (ascii integer values)
- use `display(Term)`. to see actual structure of the term.

# Unification

Bi-directional (both actual and formal argument can be instantiated)

- 1 if  $S$  and  $T$  are atoms or number, unification successful only if  $S = T$
- 2 if  $S$  is a variable,  $S$  is instantiated as  $T$ , if it is compatible with current constraint store ( $S$  is instantiated to another term, they are unified)
- 3 if  $S$  and  $T$  are structures, successful if:
  - head of  $S =$  head of  $T$
  - they have same arity
  - unification of all corresponding terms are successful

$\mathcal{A}$ : list of atoms,  $\mathcal{N}$ : list of numbers,  $\mathcal{V}$ : list of variables,  
 $\mathcal{S}$ : list of structures,  $\mathcal{P}$  current constraint store  
 $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $arity(s)$ : number of arguments of structure,  
 $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $head(s)$ : head atom of the structure,  
 $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $arg_i(s)$ :  $i^{th}$  argument term of the structure,  
 $p \models \mathcal{P}$ :  $p$  is consistent with current constraint store.

$S \equiv T; \mathcal{P} =$

$(S, T \in \mathcal{A} \vee S, T \in \mathcal{N}) \wedge S = T \rightarrow true; \mathcal{P}$

$S \in \mathcal{V} \wedge S \equiv T \models \mathcal{P} \rightarrow true; S \equiv T \wedge \mathcal{P}$

$T \in \mathcal{V} \wedge S \equiv T \models \mathcal{P} \rightarrow true; S \equiv T \wedge \mathcal{P}$

$S, T \in \mathcal{S} \wedge head(S) = head(T) \wedge arity(S) = arity(T) \rightarrow$   
 $\quad \forall i, arg_i(S) \equiv arg_i(T); \mathcal{P}$

# Unification Examples

- $X = a \rightarrow \checkmark$  with  $X = a$
- $a(X,3) = a(X,3,2) \rightarrow \times$
- $a(X,3) = b(X,3) \rightarrow \times$
- $a(X,3) = a(3,X) \rightarrow \checkmark$  with  $X = 3$
- $a(X,3) = a(4,X) \rightarrow \times$
- $a(X,b(c,d(e,f))) = a(b(c,Y),X) \rightarrow X = b(c,d(e,f)), Y = d(e,f)$

# Declarations

Two types of clauses:

- $p1(\text{arg1}, \text{arg2}, \dots) \text{ :- } p2(\text{args}, \dots), p3(\text{args}, \dots) .$   
means if  $p2$  and  $p3$  true, then  $p1$  is true. There can be arbitrary number of (conjunction of) predicates at right hand side.
- $p(\text{arg1}, \text{arg2}, \dots) .$   
sometimes called a **fact**. It is equivalent to:  
 $p(\text{arg1}, \text{arg2}, \dots) \text{ :- } \text{true} .$
- $p(\text{args}) \text{ :- } q(\text{args}) ; s(\text{args}) .$   
Is disjunction of predicates.  $q$  or  $s$  implies  $p$ . Equivalent to:  
 $p(\text{args}) \text{ :- } q(\text{args}) .$   
 $p(\text{args}) \text{ :- } s(\text{args}) .$
- A prolog program is just a group of such clauses.

# List Examples

```
% list membership
memb(X, [X|Rest]) .
memb(X, [_|Rest]) :- memb(X, Rest).

% concatenation
conc([],L,L).
conc([X|R] , L , [X|R_and_L]) :- conc(R, L, R_and_L).

% second list starts with first list
prefixof([],_).
prefixof([X|Rx], [X|Ry]) :- prefixof(Rx, Ry).

% second list contains first list
sublist(L1, L2) :- prefixof(L1, L2).
sublist(L, [_|R]) :- sublist(L, R).
```

# Procedural Interpretation

- For goal clause all matching head clauses (LHS of clauses) are kept as backtracking points (like a junction in maze search)
- Starts from first match.
- To prove head predicate, RHS predicates need to be proved recursively.
- If all RHS predicates are proven, head predicate is proven.
- When fails, prolog goes back to last backtracking point and tries next choice.
- When no backtracking point is left, goal clause fails.
- All predicate matches go through unification so goal clause variables can be instantiated.

## Arithmetics and operators

- $X = 3+1$  is not an arithmetic expression!
- operators (`is`) force arithmetic expressions to be evaluated
- all variables of the operations needs to be instantiated  
`12 is 3+X` does not work!
- Comparison operators force LHS and RHS to be evaluated:  
`X>Y`, `X<Y`, `X>=Y`, `X =< Y`, `X := Y`, `X == Y`
- `is` operator forces RHS to be evaluated: `X is Y+3*Y` `Y` needs to have a numerical value when search hits this expression.
- note that `X is X+1` is never successful in Prolog. Variables are instantiated once.



## Greatest Common Divisor (Euler's)

$gcd(m, n) = gcd(n, m - n)$  if  $n < m$

$gcd(m, n) = gcd(n, m)$  if  $m < n$

```
gcd(X,X,X) .  
gcd(X,Y,D) :- X < Y, Y1 is Y-X, gcd(X,Y1,D).  
gcd(X,Y,D) :- Y < X, gcd(Y, X, D).
```