

Concepts of Programming Languages

Logic Programming and Prolog (I)

Prof. Dr. Ulrike Pado

A Proof Engine

- Prolog is an engine for logically proving your queries given a set of facts and rules previously provided
- You will receive “yes” as an answer to your query if a proof has been found (“no” otherwise)
- Alternatively, you can ask “For which elements does the query hold?” and you will receive all these elements back

Applications: Computational Linguistics

- Analysing sentence structure
 - “What structure can be assigned to the sentence
A man sees a clown with a telescope?”
- Representing human knowledge
 - “What is the relationship between a railway station
and an airport?”

Applications: Artificial Intelligence

- Expert systems:
 - “Which therapies are recommended for the following symptoms?”
 - “Which issues could have caused the following system state?”
 - Scheduling problems (HFT time table, parcel delivery, ...)
 - IBM's Watson!

LISP and Prolog

- Languages for reasoning about abstract content (as opposed to number crunching)
 - LISP: Mathematical functions
 - Prolog: First-order logic
- Programs as data
 - LISP: modify and evaluate arguments
 - Prolog: Program code is statement of knowledge

Today's Goals

- More about proofs
- First-order logic (FOL) and Horn clauses
- Creating proofs in FOL: Horn clause inference and unification
- Prolog syntax
- Next time: Proof search (finding all possible proofs)

Logic: Proofs

A proof of a hypothesis is constructed from

- a set of axioms (possibly empty)
- a set of inference mechanisms

We will call a set of axioms a knowledge base
(Prolog terminology)

Axioms (Facts and Rules)

- Examples:
 - All right angles are equal. (Fact)
 - Socrates is human. (Fact)
 - Whoever is human, is mortal. (Rule)
- Axioms in the knowledge base count as proven
- In logic, it is desirable to have a minimal set of axioms (assumptions)
- In logic programming, all relevant knowledge is encoded as axioms

Inference Mechanism:

Modus Ponens

- When the “if”-part of a conditional rule can be proven, we deduce the “then”-part is true also
- Example:
 - Socrates is human.
 - If Socrates is human, then Socrates is mortal.
 - Therefore, Socrates is mortal.
- In logic, there are a number of valid inference mechanisms
- Logic programming uses only modus ponens

Successful Proofs

A hypothesis is proven if

- it can be derived from the axioms given the inference mechanism (positive proof)
- proving its negation leads to a contradiction such as $a \ \& \ \sim a$ (refutation, proof by contradiction)

Today's Goals

- More about proofs
- First-order logic (FOL) and Horn clauses
- Creating proofs in FOL: Horn clause inference and unification
- Prolog syntax

First-order logic (FOL)

- **Terms** (taken to describe **objects**): socrates
- **Predicates** (taken to describe **properties**):
human (socrates)
 - First-order: Predicates cannot be variables
- **Connectors** (to express rules):
→ (if – then), ~ (not), & (and), v (or)
- **Quantifiers**: $\forall x$ (for all x), $\exists x$ (there is an x)

FOL Example Formulas and Rules

- `human(socrates) & mortal(socrates)`
- `teaches(socrates,plato)`
- $\exists x \text{ professor}(x) \ \& \ \text{busy}(x)$
“There is (at least) one busy professor”
- $\forall x \text{ professor}(x) \rightarrow \text{busy}(x)$
“Anybody who is a professor is busy”

Horn Clauses

(named for logician Alfred Horn)

- Special formulation of conditional rules that relies only on disjunction and negation
- Allows modus ponens-type inference to prove a FOL hypothesis given the knowledge base
- Horn clause inference is Turing complete
 - Forms the basis of Prolog

Horn Clauses: Example

- Formulate rule as disjunction of terms
 - $\forall x \text{ professor}(x) \rightarrow \text{busy}(x)$ becomes
 $\forall x \sim \text{professor}(x) \vee \text{busy}(x)$
- Assume universal quantification of variables
 - $\sim \text{professor}(x) \vee \text{busy}(x)$
- Allow at most one non-negated term

Today's Goals

- More about proofs
- First-order logic (FOL) and Horn clauses
- Creating proofs in FOL: Horn clause inference and unification
- Prolog syntax

(Much Simplified) Inference

Assume $\sim\text{professor}(x) \vee \text{busy}(x)$

- Non-negated term $\text{busy}(x)$ is proven if the positive version of all negated terms can be proven
- $\text{busy}(x)$ is sometimes called the **goal clause** in logic programming (though this has a different meaning for Horn clauses originally)
- The task of proving $\text{busy}(x)$ becomes proving $\text{professor}(x)$ and any other **fact clauses**
- Proving these fact clauses involves either lookup of facts in the knowledge base or modus ponens inference (if the fact is the goal clause of a rule)

Horn Clause Inference: Example

Hypothesis: `busy(pado)`

Assume KB: $\sim\text{professor}(x) \vee \text{busy}(x)$
`professor(pado)`

- Find goal clause that corresponds to hypothesis, replacing variables if necessary
 - Replace `x` by `pado`
- Prove negation of fact clauses
 - `professor(pado)` is in KB

Replacing Variables

- Find goal clause that corresponds to hypothesis, replacing variables if necessary
- **Unification**: Substitute a term (or a predicate) for a variable – if this can be done consistently!

Unification Rules

- Two terms unify if they are the same string or number
- A variable unifies with a term, a predicate or another variable, taking the other term's value
- Two predicates unify if
 - they share a "name"
 - they have the same number of arguments
 - their arguments unify

Unification in General

- Unification is a general mechanism
- Used, e.g., in type inference
- Powerful and efficient way to share information
- After two terms are unified, they are *the same term*

Danger! Infinite Loops!

- When unifying a predicate with a variable, beware of loops:
 - $X = f(X)$
 - $f(X) = f(f(X))$
 - and so on, into infinity

What to do with $X=f(X)$?

- a) The terms unify, because ultimately, there will be infinitely many $f(f(f(\dots$ on both sides
 - b) The terms don't unify, because we cannot compute their unification with finite equipment
-
- Standard unification algorithms take the second stance and perform an **occurs check** for the variable in the predicate
 - Prolog takes the first!

$X=f(X)$? Yes

- Prolog does not run occurs checks before every unification operation for efficiency reasons
- Old Prolog implementations performed unification until they ran out of memory...
- Modern implementations deal gracefully, but still accept recursive unification

Today's Goals

- More about proofs
- First-order logic (FOL) and Horn clauses
- Creating proofs in FOL: Horn clause inference and unification
- Prolog syntax

Logic and Programming

We want to know (given a knowledge base)

- whether a query is true given what we know
 - Does the patient have measles?
- which variable bindings make the query true
 - Which illnesses could cause a red rash and a fever?

Stating Knowledge

- **Facts**

- Pizza is tasty: `tasty(pizza).`
- If a fact is in the knowledge base, it counts as logically proven

- **Rules**

- If pizza is tasty, then students will eat it:
`eat(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza).`
- We know the “if”-part is true, therefore we can deduce the “then”-part is true also

More Complex Rules

- AND: comma

- `eats(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza),
cheap(pizza).`

- OR: semicolon

- `eats(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza);
cheap(pizza).`

- NOT: not

- `eats(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza),
not(expensive(pizza)).`

Success and Failure

- Prolog answers queries according to its success in proving them
 - `tasty(pizza).` **yes**
 - `eats(student,pizza).` **yes**
 - `gone(pizza).` **yes**
 - `eats(student,pasta).` **no**

```
tasty(pizza).  
eats(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza).  
gone(pizza) :- eats(student,pizza).
```

Queries with Variables: Unification

- Substitute a variable for a term to find all terms that satisfy the query
 - `tasty(X)` **X=pizza**
 - `eats(X,Y)` **X=student**
Y=pizza
- In a query with variables, hit “;” after receiving the first variable binding to see the next option

```
tasty(pizza).  
eats(student,pizza) :- tasty(pizza).  
gone(pizza) :- eats(student,pizza).
```

Recursion and Cases

- Recursion instead of loops
- Different rules for different cases instead of if/else

if the list is empty _____ recursive base case

```
printlist([]) :- write(' Done!').
```

```
else printlist([H|T]) :- write(H), recursive call
                           printlist(T).
```

Prolog Literature

- Blackburn, Bos & Striegnitz, "Learn Prolog Now!" (e-Book)
- Clocksin & Mellish, "Programming in Prolog"