## Lecture 9 — August 31, 2015

#### • Today:

- Declarative Programming
- Unification
- Lambda calculus
- Readings:
  - Finish SICP 4.4
  - <u>http://docs.racket-lang.org/datalog/datalog.html</u>

#### CSE130, Summer Session II

# Logic Programming

- Different way to program: No procedures!
- Math: Declarative Knowledge: What Is
  - The definition of a square root:

 $\sqrt{x}$  is the *y* such that  $y^2 = x$  and  $y \ge 0$ 

- CS: Imperative Knowledge: How To
  - The algorithm to compute a square root:

```
(define (sqrt x)
  (let loop ([guess 1.0])
    (if (< (abs (- (square guess) x)) 0.00001)
      guess
      (loop (average guess (/ x guess))))))
(define (square n) (* n n))
(define (average a b) (/ (+ a b) 2))</pre>
```

# Logic Programming

• The relation between Celsius and Fahrenheit:

 $F - 32 = (9/5) \cdot C$ 

- This formula provides enough information to let us know how to:
  - Convert from Fahrenheit to Celsius; and
  - Convert from Celsius to Fahrenheit
- No explicit input or output:
  - One piece of declarative knowledge can be used as the basis of several kinds of how-to knowledge
  - E.g., in procedural programming, the **sqrt** procedure maps inputs to outputs: *"What is the square root of 289?"* but you can't use it to ask *"What is 17 the square root of?"*

#### Facts and Queries

- Idea: Why not program in declarative terms instead?
  - Specify facts (what is true) an let the system figure out the "how to" part
- For example, queries over a Prolog/Datalog database:

```
% Facts:
son_of(adam, abel).
son_of(adam, cain).
son_of(cain, enoch).
son_of(enoch, irad).
% Prolog/Datalog Queries:
?- son_of(adam, Who). % Who is Adam the father of?
Who = abel
Who = cain
?- son_of(Who, cain). % Who is Cain's father?
Who = adam
```

- Variables start with Uppercase letters.
- Atoms start with lowercase letters (an atom is like a 'symbol in Lisp)

## Prolog/Datalog Rules

 Instead of stating all facts directly, we can *infer* other facts from logical rules:

% Facts				
<pre>son_of(adam, abel).</pre>				
<pre>son_of(adam, cain).</pre>				
<pre>son_of(cain, enoch).</pre>				
<pre>son_of(enoch, irad).</pre>	horo V V and 7			
% Rules	are the variables			
grandson_of( $\underline{X}$ , $\underline{Z}$ ) :- son_of( $\underline{X}$ , $\underline{Y}$ ), son_of( $\underline{Y}$ , $\underline{Z}$ ).				

• Now we can ask:

```
?- grandson_of(adam, Who). % Who is the grandson of Adam?
Who = enoch
?- grandson_of(Who, irad). % Who is Irad the grandson of?
Who = cain
```

 Read the ": –" like a backwards implication and the commas as logical conjunction: (*x* sonof *y* ∧ *y* sonof *x*) ⇒ *x* grandsonof *y*

## Prolog/Datalog Rules

• We can specify a general relation implied from the facts and the rules:

```
% Facts
son_of(adam, abel). son_of(adam, cain).
son_of(cain, enoch). son_of(enoch, irad).
% Rules
grandson_of(X, Z) :- son_of(X, Y), son_of(Y, Z).
relation(X, Y, son) := son_of(X, Y).
relation(X, Y, father) :- son_of(Y, X).
relation(X, Y, grandson) :- grandson_of(X, Y).
relation(X, Y, grandfather) :- grandson_of(Y, X).
?- relation(enoch, cain, R). % What is Enoch and Cain's
R = father
                                % relation?
?- relation(_, X, grandfather). % Who are all of the
                                % grandfathers, based on
X = adam
                                % just this information?
X = cain
```

The "\_" means "don't care"

#### Lists in Prolog: member

 Prolog (but not Datalog), supports lists: The built-in member predicate can be used to make queries:

```
?- member(a, [a, b, c, d]).
true
?- member(z, [a, b, c, d]).
false
?- member(X, [a, b, c, d]).
X = a
X = b
X = c
X = d
?- member(e, [a, b, X, d]).
X = e
```

## Lists in Prolog: Cons

- In Prolog, a cons cell is specified using [Head|Tail]
- An empty list is specified with []
- The [Head|Tail] notation doesn't necessarily create a cons cell, it can be used to retrieve the head and tail

```
?- A=[1, 2], A=[H|R].
A = [1, 2],
                          A is bound first: forces H and R to match
H = 1,
R = [2]
?-H=1, R=[2], A=[H|R].
A = [1, 2],
                         H and R are bound first: forces A to match
H = 1,
R = [2]
?- X=[4, 8, 16], [XCar|XCdr]=X, [XCadr|_]=XCdr.
X = [4, 8, 16],
XCadr = 8,
XCar = 4,
XCdr = [8, 16]
```

## Lists in Prolog: member

- Rules state what is true
- When given variables, Prolog's solver will try to find all matches for the variables that result in truth

```
member(X, [X|_]).
member(X, [_|Tail]) :- member(X, Tail).
```

The first rule says:

• If X is the head of the list, then X is a member of the list

The second rule says:

 If X is a member of the tail of the list, then X is a member of the list

```
?- member(X, [1, 2]).
X = 1;
X = 2.
```

### Lists in Prolog: append

• The built-in append predicate relates three lists:

```
?- append([1], [2], L).
L = [1, 2].
?- append(A, B, [1, 2, 3]).
A = [],
B = [1, 2, 3];
A = [1],
B = [2, 3];
A = [1, 2],
B = [3];
A = [1, 2, 3],
B = [];
false.
```

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

#### Expressing the merge process

 In Scheme, we could describe how to *merge* the contents of two lists like so:

> (merge '(0 2 4 6 8) '(1 3 5 7 9))
'(0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9)

#### But what is merge, really?

Let's look into the logic of the program:

(cond [(null? x) y]
 [(null? y) x] ...

- for all y: '() and y merge to y
- for all x: x and '() merge to x

if (cdr x) and y merge to Z and a < (car y), then (cons a (cdr x)) and y merge to (cons a Z).

### Lists in Prolog: merge

• [3, 6, 9] and [4, 8] merge to What (L)?

```
?- merge([3, 6, 9], [4, 8], L).
L = [3, 4, 6, 8, 9].
```

- [1, 3, 5] and What merge to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]?
  ?- merge([1, 3, 5], L, [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]).
  L = [2, 4].
- What and WhatElse merge to [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]?

?- merge(What, WhatElse, [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]). This has 2<sup>6</sup> = 64 answers, not just one!

• Do [1, 3] and [2, 7] merge to [1, 2, 3, 7]?

?- merge([1, 3], [2, 7], [1, 2, 3, 7]).
true.

## Weaknesses and strengths

- Need to be careful about forming infinite loops
- Excels in database information retrieval; e.g. query systems
- Excels in domain-specific tasks:
  - Yacc is a declarative language: "here is a grammar for a language" not "here is a parsing procedure."
  - Bddbddb uses Datalog to make queries to Java bytecodes: "does this field point to values returned by this method?"

## Pattern matching examples

- Matches any three-element list that begins with an a and ends with a c:
  - [a, X, c]
- Matches any three-element list that begins with job, a second element of anything, and the third is a list of two elements that begins with computer:
  - [job, X, [computer, Y]]
- Matches any three-element list that begins with an a and whose second and third element can be anything as long as they are the same as each other:
  - -[a, X, X]

## Pattern matching algorithm

• We can keep track of variable assignments (in order to maintain consistency) by using frames.

(match (?x ?y ?y ?x) (a b b a) frame) frame: x = a
result: ?y = b

(match (?x ?y ?y ?x) (a b b a) *frame*) *frame:* y = a result: fail

• Match takes in: a pattern, a datum, and a frame.

(match *pattern-with-question-marks datum frame*)

## Pattern matching algorithm

```
(define (pattern-match pat dat frame)
  (cond [(eq? frame 'failed) 'failed]
        [(equal? pat dat) frame]
        [(var? pat) (extend-if-consistent pat dat frame)]
        [(and (pair? pat) (pair? dat))
         (pattern-match (cdr pat)
                        (cdr dat)
                         (pattern-match (car pat)
                                        (car dat)
                                        frame))]
        [else 'failed]))
(define (extend-if-consistent var dat frame)
  (let ([binding (binding-in-frame var frame)])
    (if binding
        (pattern-match (binding-value binding) dat frame)
        (extend var dat frame))))
(define (var? exp)
  (tagged-list? exp '?))
```

## Unification

• Unification is a generalization of pattern matching, where the datum can have variables too.

## Unification algorithm

```
(define (pattern-match p1 p2 frame)
  (cond [(eq? frame 'failed) 'failed]
        [(equal? p1 p2) frame]
        [(var? p1) (extend-if-possible p1 p2 frame)]
        [(var? p2) (extend-if-possible p2 p1 frame)]
        [(and (pair? p1) (pair? p2))
         (unify-match (cdr p1) (cdr p2)
           (unify-match (car p1) (car p2) frame))]
        [else 'failed]))
(define (extend-if-possible var val frame)
  (let ([binding (binding-in-frame var frame)])
    (cond [binding
           (unify-match (binding-value binding) val frame)]
      [(var? val)
       (let ([binding (binding-in-frame val frame)])
         (if binding
             (unify-match var (binding-value binding) frame)
             (extend var val frame))))
      [(depends-on? val var frame) 'failed]
      [else (extend var val frame)])
```

### The Lambda Calculus

- Developed in 1930's by Alonzo Church and his students
- Studied in logic and computer science
- Church Thesis: "Effectively calculable functions from positive integers to positive integers are just those definable in the lambda calculus."
- Alan Turing around the same time developed Turing Machines, shown to be equivalent to lambda calculus.

## The Lambda Calculus

- The only values are functions that take a single argument
- Normal order semantics

Expression  $\rightarrow$  Id

Expression  $\rightarrow$  (lambda Id. Expression)

Expression  $\rightarrow$  (Expression Expression)

- We'll abbreviate lambda as  $\lambda$ .
- We sometimes omit the parenthesis, in which case:
  - Application associates to the left:
    x y means (x y)
    x y z means ((x y) z)
  - Abstraction extends to the right, as far as possible:
    λx.x λy.x y means λx.(x (λy.x y)
    λx.x λy.x y z means λx.(x (λy.((x y) z)))

## The identity function

- Let's define:
- 1. The identity function:

2. A function that, given an argument y, discards it, and returns the **identity** function:

3. A function that, given a function **f**, invokes it on the **identity** function:

## Simulating multiple arguments

- To define meaningful **cons**, +, \* operations we'll need to simulate multiple arguments.
- Idea: To compute a + b, pass a to a function 
   that returns a function that, when applied to b, returns a + b.
  - That is: (+ a b) = ((⊕ a) b)

  - E.g., (
     • 1) is the "increment by 1" function; also known as the successor function, or succ

# Currying

- This simulating-multiple-arguments technique is called *currying*, named after Haskell Curry.
- Let's use currying to define cons:

cons = 
$$(\lambda a. (\lambda b.$$
  
( $\lambda$ selector. ((selector a) b))))  
=  $\lambda a. \lambda b. \lambda$ selector. (selector a b)  
car =  $\lambda p.(p (\lambda a. \lambda b. a))$   
cdr =  $\lambda p.(p (\lambda a. \lambda b. b))$ 

• The conspiracy!

## Make your own Boolean

- Key Idea: We want to *encode the behavior of values*.
- E.g., to define Booleans:
  - Q: "What can we do with a Boolean?"
  - A: "Make a binary choice"
  - Q: "How can you view this as a function?"
  - A: "A Boolean is a function that takes two choices, returns one"

true =  $\lambda x$ .  $\lambda y$ . x false =  $\lambda x$ .  $\lambda y$ . y

true  $a b \rightarrow a$ false  $a b \rightarrow b$ 

## Complete the conspiracy

- We don't have to let the "low-level implementation" of Booleans to be exposed to everyone (e.g., everyone knows which of the true and false alternatives is first).
- Instead, wrap this detail inside of "if," which acts like the Scheme **if** because  $\lambda$ -calculus has normal order evaluation:

true =  $\lambda x$ .  $\lambda y$ . x false =  $\lambda x$ .  $\lambda y$ . y if =  $\lambda p$ .  $\lambda$ then.  $\lambda$ else. (p then else)

## Boolean logic

- Let's define:
- 1. Not: Takes in a single argument b, assumed to be a Boolean, and returns the negation of b:

2. Or: Takes in two Booleans, b and c, and returns true if b or c are true:

3. And: Takes in two Booleans, b and c, and returns true if b and c are true:

## Church numerals

- Q: "What can we do with a natural number?"
- A: "Iterate a number of times over some function"
- So, a number n can be a function that takes in a function, call it s, and applies that function to a base value, call it z, n times.
- E.g.:

0	=	λs.	λz.	Ζ			/* s applied three times */
1	=	λs.	λz.	(s	z)		/* s applied once */
2	=	λs.	λz.	(s	( s	z))	/* s applied twice */
3	=	λs.	λz.	(s	( s	(s z)))	/* s applied three times */

## Church numerals

- Numbers are functions that make a promise: "If you give me any zero function z and any successor function s, then I'll apply s to z the number of times as the number that I represent."
- Successor, given n, returns n+1:

succ = 
$$\lambda n. (\lambda s. \lambda z. (s (n s z)))$$

• "Let's apply s to z n times, and then apply s once more."

### Addition and multiplication

```
plus = \lambda n. \lambda m. (\lambda s. \lambda z. (m s (n s z)))
plus = \lambda n. \lambda m. (n succ m)
```

- Apply s to z, *n* times
- Then, apply s to that, *m* times
- Thus, we could let succ = (plus 1)
- Apply "something" to zero, *m* times.

mult =  $\lambda n. \lambda m.(m$  0))

• Now, (expt n m) =  $n^m$ 

expt =  $\lambda n$ .  $\lambda m$ .

#### Subtraction

• Defined in terms of a predecessor function.

$$-pred(n) = n - 1$$
 if  $n > 0$ 

-pred(n) = 0 if n = 0

We won't worry about negative numbers,
 instead, n - m = 0 if m ≥ n.

subtract =  $\lambda n$ .  $\lambda m$ . (m pred n)

#### Predecessor

- This one is much harder, and stumped logicians for a while.
- Initialize *a*, *b* to 0.
- Repeatedly transform:
  - $-a \leftarrow a + 1$

```
-b \leftarrow a
```



- After the transform is applied *n* times, *b* is the predecessor of *n*!
- We don't even need to loop:

```
nextpair = λp.
cons (succ (car p)) (car p)
pred = λn.
cdr (n nextpair (cons zero zero))
```