


CS2136: Paradigms of Computation



Class 07:

Creating & Altering the Database
Prolog & Logic Programming
First-Order Predicate Calculus

Copyright 2001, 2002, 2003 Michael J. Ciaraldi and David Finkel

Creating and Altering the Database



Creating the Database



- z Some Prolog implementations let you type in facts and rules.
- z SWI-Prolog compiles facts and rules when you load in a Prolog source file.

Creating the Database II



z Clocksin & Mellish:

y consult(filename)

x Adds clauses to the in-memory database.

y reconsult(filename)

x Supersedes clauses for same predicate.

x Adds clauses for new predicates.

z SWI-Prolog:

y consult(filename)

x Acts like C & M reconsult.

Altering the Database



z Clocksin & Mellish:

y asserta(clause).

x Inserts clause at beginning of database.

y assertz(clause).

x Inserts clause at end of database.

y retract(clause).

x Removes clause from database.

Altering the Database II



z SWI-Prolog:

y asserta, assertz, retract

x Same as previous slide.

y assert(*clause*)

x Same as assertz.

Logic Programming



Logic Programming



z Basic Idea:

- y Don't tell the program what to do when.
- y Tell it what is true and let it draw conclusions.

z Looked at another way:

- y Don't say how to solve the problem.
- y Say what a solution looks like.

z Yet another way:

- y Declarative semantics.
- y Not procedural semantics.

Relating Prolog to Logic Programming



z Consider the Prolog statement:

y `mother(X,Y) :- parent(X,Y),female(Y).`

z This...

y Expresses a proposition we hypothesize is true.

y Says how to show that someone is a mother.

Predicate Calculus



- z Not directly related to the differential or integral calculus you already know.

What is "Calculus"?

- z Calculus (from www.dictionary.com):
 1. Pathology. An abnormal concretion in the body, usually formed of mineral salts and found in the gallbladder, kidney, or urinary bladder, for example.
 2. Dentistry. Tartar.

(continued...)

What is “Calculus”?

z Calculus (from www.dictionary.com):

3. Abbr. calc. Mathematics

a. The branch of mathematics that deals with limits and the differentiation and integration of functions of one or more variables. [What we usually think of.]

b. A method of analysis or calculation using a special symbolic notation. [What we will talk about today.]

c. The combined mathematics of differential calculus and integral calculus. [What we usually think of.]

4. A system or method of calculation: “ [a] dazzling grasp of the nation's byzantine budget calculus” (David M. Alpern).

Predicate Calculus: First- and Second-Order

z predicate calculus - an extension of the propositional calculus that allows the use of predicates, logical statements which may include variables. First-order predicate calculus only allows simple variables. Second-order predicate calculus allows variables that may themselves be predicates. The language Prolog is, for the most part, a first-order predicate calculus system.

x <http://www.ai.usma.edu:8080/overview/GLOSSARY.HTM>

Predicate Calculus (the 50-minute version)

- z We have “Terms”, which can be either:
 - y Constants (like Prolog atoms).
 - y Variable symbols (like in Prolog).
 - y Compound terms (function symbol + arguments), e.g.:
 - x wife(henry)
 - x distance(point1,X)
- z “Atomic Propositions” express relationships between objects.
 - y Predicate symbols + arguments, e.g.:
 - x human(mary)
 - x likes(Man,wine(chianti))

Differences between PC and Prolog



z In Prolog, a structure can be:

- y a goal

- y an argument in another structure

- y both

z In PC:

- y Function symbols are functors used to construct arguments.

- y Predicate symbols are functors used to construct propositions.

Making Compound Propositions from Atomic

z Logical connectives:
y α, β are any proposition.

| Connective | PC Syntax | Book Syntax | Meaning |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Negation | $\neg\alpha$ | $\sim\alpha$ | "not α " |
| Conjunction | $\alpha\wedge\beta$ | $\alpha\&\beta$ | " α and β " |
| Disjunction | $\alpha\vee\beta$ | $\alpha\#\beta$ | " α or β " |
| Implication | $\alpha\supset\beta$ | $\alpha\rightarrow\beta$ | " α implies β " |
| Equivalence | $\alpha\equiv\beta$ | $\alpha\leftrightarrow\beta$ | " α is equivalent to β " |

Implication: What does " $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ " (pronounced " α implies β ") mean?

- z Whenever α is true, β is true.
- z This is equivalent to $(\sim \alpha) \# \beta$
- z Does not imply causality.
- z Truth table:

| a | b | $a \rightarrow b$ |
|-------|-------|-------------------|
| false | false | true |
| false | true | true |
| true | false | false |
| true | true | true |

Equivalence: What does " $\alpha \equiv \beta$ " (pronounced " α is equivalent to β ") mean?

- z Whenever α is true, β is true, and vice versa.
- z This is equivalent to $(\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \& (\beta \rightarrow \alpha)$
- z Also equivalent to $(\alpha \& \beta) \# (\sim \alpha \& \sim \beta)$
- z Truth table:

| a | b | $a \rightarrow b$ |
|-------|-------|-------------------|
| false | false | true |
| false | true | false |
| true | false | false |
| true | true | true |

Quantifiers

- z Meaning of these propositions is only defined when variables are introduced by quantifiers.
- z v is a variable, P is a proposition.

| Quantifier | PC Syntax | Book Syntax | Meaning |
|-------------|---------------|----------------------|---|
| Universal | $\forall v.P$ | $\text{all}(v,P)$ | "P is true whatever v stands for" |
| Existential | $\exists v.P$ | $\text{exists}(v,P)$ | "There is something v can stand for, such that P is true" |

Universal Quantifier:

What does " $\forall v.P$ " or "all(v,P)" mean?



z For all v , P is true.

z Example:

y all(X , man(X) \rightarrow human(X))

y "For all X , if X is a man, X is human."

y "All men are human."

Existential Quantifier:

What does " $\exists v.P$ " or "exists(v,P)" mean?

z There is a v , such that P is true.

z Example:

y exists(Z , father(john, Z) & female(Z))

y "There exists a Z , such that john is the father of Z and Z is female."

y "John has a daughter."

Quantifiers in Prolog I



z In Prolog rules:

y For any variable in the head of the rule, a universal quantifier.

y For any variable in the body of the rule that doesn't appear in the head, existential quantifier.

Quantifiers in Prolog II

z Example:

y `mom(X) :- mother(X, Y).`

y In English: X is a mom if X is the mother of Y

y With quantifiers:

for all X, X is a mom if there exists a Y so that X is the mother of Y.

y Symbolically:

$\forall X \text{ mom}(X) \text{ :- } \exists Y \text{ mother}(X, Y).$

Now What?



- z There are ways to manipulate the propositions into standard forms, and do things with them.
- z Beyond the scope of this course, but we can look at some things.

Resolution



- z Suppose we take certain things to be true, what follows logically from them?
- z J. Alan Robinson discovered the Resolution Principle, which can determine this mechanically.
- z Fit two clauses together, then drop out the same atomic formula from both sides.

Resolution Example

- z In this notation, “;” means “or”.
- z Clauses:
 - y `sad(chris);angry(chris) :- workday(today), raining(today).`
 - y `unpleasant(chris) :- angry(chris),tired(chris).`
- z Merge to get:
 - y `sad(chris);angry(chris);unpleasant(chris) :- workday(today),raining(today), angry(chris),tired(chris).`
- z Simplify to:
 - y `sad(chris);unpleasant(chris) :- workday(today),raining(today),tired(chris).`

Problems With Resolution

- z Resolution may generate many clauses.
 - y How do you get them all?
 - y How do you know which ones you want?
- z Resolution does not guarantee that you can prove some clause is true.
- z Resolution can show if a set of clauses is consistent or inconsistent.
 - y Inconsistent if they resolve to the empty clause
":- ."

What Good Does This Do?



z You can assert something is true by putting it on the left side of an ":-".

y loyal(rover) :- .

z You can assert something is false by putting it on the right side of an ":-".

y :- loyal(rover).

z So...

Proving Through Resolution



- z Start with a set of clauses which are consistent.
- z Add the negation of the clause you are trying to prove.
- z See if they resolve to the empty clause, meaning they are inconsistent.
- z If so, the clause is true.

Next Time



z More Prolog & FOPC!