

Concepts of programming languages

Janus

Joris ten Tusscher, Joris Burgers, Ivo Gabe de Wolff,
Cas van der Rest, Orestis Melkonian



Universiteit Utrecht

[Faculty of Science
Information and Computing
Sciences]

Relational Programming

Injective Programming

λ -Turing Complete

backwards deterministic

restricted language constructs

Relational Programming

Turing Complete

backwards non-deterministic

search procedure (aka *resolution*)



Prolog basics

A logic programs consists of *facts* and *rules*.

```
parent(alice, joe).  
parent(bob, joe).  
parent(joe, mary).  
parent(gloria, mary).
```

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

```
descendant(X, Y) :- ancestor(Y, X).
```



The user can then *query* the runtime system, as such:

```
?- parent(X, joe).
```

```
X = alice;
```

```
X = bob.
```

```
?- ancestor(X, mary).
```

```
X = joe;
```

```
X = gloria;
```

```
X = alice;
```

```
X = bob.
```

```
?- ancestor(X, mary), descendant(X, alice).
```

```
X = joe.
```



Demonstration - Type Inference

Assume a type predicate, relating expressions with types:

```
type(expr, t) :- ... .
```

You would normally use it to perform *type-checking*:

```
?- type(1 + 1, int).  
true.  
?- type(1 + 1, string).  
false.
```



But you can also performing *type-inference*:

```
?- type(1 + 1, Type).  
Type = int.  
?- type("hello world", Type).  
Type = string.  
?- type(\x:int -> x, Type).  
Type = int -> int.  
?- type(\x -> x, Type).  
Type = ?42 -> ?42.  
?- type(\x -> x, int -> Type).  
Type = int.
```



Going in the reverse direction, you can query the expression:

```
?- type(Expr, int).  
Expr = 1;  
Expr = 2;  
...  
Expr = 1 + 1;  
Expr = 1 + 2;  
...  
Expr = if true then 1 else 1;  
...
```

Of course, this does not make much sense without a sufficiently expressive type system.



Demonstration - Program Synthesis

Assume you have implemented a *relational interpreter*:

```
eval(program, result) :- ... .
```

```
?- eval(map (+ 1) [1 2 3], Result).  
Result = [2 3 4].
```

But you can also perform *program synthesis* by-example:

```
?- eval(F 1, 2), ..., eval(map F [1 2 3], [2 3 4]).  
...  
F = \x -> x + 1;  
...  
F = \x -> x - 10 + 10 + 1;  
...
```



Quine generation is pretty straightforward:

```
?- eval(Quine, Quine).  
...  
Quine = (\a -> a ++ show a) "(\a -> a ++ show a) ";  
...
```



Logic Programming IRL

In practice, bi-directionality breaks with the usage of *extra-logical* features:

- ▶ **Variable projection:** inspecting values at runtime
- ▶ **Cut (!):** disables backtracking in certain places
- ▶ **Assert/Retract:** Dynamically insert/remove facts

MiniKanren is a more recent logic programming language, which avoids extra-logical features (as much as possible).



Higher abstraction

- ▶ Relational programming, as well as functional programming, both belong to the *declarative* paradigm.
- ▶ They both raise the level of abstraction, by enabling the programmer to express *what* needs to be done, instead of *how*.

Question

How can we combine them, to get the best of both worlds?



Hanus: Janus embedded in Haskell

In our research project, we use *TemplateHaskell* and *QuasiQuotation* to embed Janus in Haskell:

```
[hanus |  
  procedure encode(im :: Image, ret :: [Byte]) {  
    -- Janus commands containing Haskell code  
    -- e.g. janus_variable += <Haskell code>  
  }  
|]  
encode :: Image -> [Byte]  
encode = call encode  
decode :: [Byte] -> Image  
decode = uncall encode
```

Come and check out our poster in de Vagant!



Thanks!

Feel free to ask any questions



Universiteit Utrecht

[Faculty of Science
Information and Computing
Sciences]