

5.6 Meta-Programming

Freitag, 19. Juni 2015 08:30

Prolog can manipulate terms (Sect 561) and programs (Sect 562). In particular, a program can manipulate itself while it is running.

5.6.1. Manipulation of terms and formulas

pre-defined predicates to manipulate/access/recognize certain forms of terms:

- `number/1` : checks whether arg. is a number
- `var/1` : `var(t)` is true iff `t` is an (uninstantiated) variable

?-var(X).

true

?-X=2, var(X).

false

- `nonvar/1` : `nonvar(t)` is true iff `t` is no variable

?-nonvar(a).

true

?-X=2, nonvar(X).

X=2

?-nonvar(X). — although there is an instantiation

? - nonvar (X). — although there is an instantiation of X such that nonvar is true
false

• atomic/1: atomic(t) is true iff t is a let/pred symbol of arity 0 or a number

? - atomic(a). true ? - atomic(-2). true

? - atomic(a(a)). false ? - atomic(X). false

• Compound/1: compound(t) is true iff t is a term/formula which does not just consist of a symbol of arity 0 or a number or a variable

? - compound(a). false ? - compound(X). false

? - compound(1+2). true ? - compound(a(a)). true

These predicates can be used to recognize certain forms of terms. But we also want to extract certain parts of terms (decomposition) and to con-

struct new terms.

Solution: transform terms to lists or vice versa

e.g. $f(a, b)$ can be transformed to
 $[f, a, b]$
A red arrow points from f in the list to f in the term, labeled $f/2$.
Another red arrow points from a in the list to a in the term, labeled $f/1$.

Pre-defined predicate: $=.. / 2$
(infix notation)

$t =.. l$ is true iff
 l is the ^{list-}representation of the term t

?- $f(a, b) =.. L.$

$L = [f, a, b]$

?- $1 + 2 =.. L.$

$L = [+ , 1, 2]$

?- $f(g(a), b) =.. L.$

$L = [f, g(a), b]$

? - $T = .. [f, a, b]$.

$T = f(a, b)$

? - $T = .. [f]$.

$T = f$.

? - $X = .. Y$.

error

? - $X = .. [Y, a, b]$.

error

? - $X = .. [f | L]$.

error

error if the leading fct. symbol and its arity are indetermined

Example for using =.. : Represent and enlarge different geometrical figures

square (Side)

← term to represent  } Side

rectangle (Side₁, Side₂)

←  } Side 1
Side 2

triangle (Side₁, Side₂, Side₃)

circle (Radius)

Prog: enlarge (square (Side), Factor, square (NSide)) :- NSide is Factor * Side.

enlarge (rect (S₁, S₂), F, rect (NS₁, NS₂)) :- NS₁ is F * S₁, NS₂ is F * S₂.

enlarge (triangle (S_1, S_2, S_3), ...) :- ...

enlarge (circle (R), ...) :- ...

Disadvantage: new enlarge-clause for each geometrical figure, although all these clauses essentially do the same.

Better solution:

enlarge (Fig, Factor, NFig) :- Fig =.. [Type | Param],
multlist (Param, Factor, NParam),
NFig =.. [Type | NParam].

multlist ([], -, []).

multlist ([X|L], Factor, [NX|NL]) :- NX is Factor * X,
multlist (L, Factor, NL).

There are additional predicates to access/manipulate parts of terms:

• functor/3: functor (t, f, n) is true iff
f/n is the leading fct/pred symbol
of t

?- functor (g(f(x), x, g), F, N).

F = g, N = 3

?- functor (T, g, 3).

$$T = g(X, Y, Z).$$

• arg/3: $\text{arg}(n, t, a)$ is true iff a is the n -th argument of t

$$?- \text{arg}(3, g(f(x), x, g), A).$$

$$A = g$$

$$?- \text{functor}(D, \text{date}, 3)$$

$$\text{arg}(1, D, 19)$$

$$\text{arg}(2, D, 6)$$

$$\text{arg}(3, D, 2015).$$

$$D = \text{date}(19, 6, 2015).$$

Ex: Predicate to check whether a term is Variable-free:

$$\text{ground}(T) :- \text{nonvar}(T),$$

$$T =.. [\text{Functor} | \text{Argumentlist}],$$

$$\text{groundlist}(\text{Argumentlist}).$$

$$\text{groundlist}([]).$$

$$\text{groundlist}([T | Ts]) :- \text{ground}(T), \text{groundlist}(Ts).$$

5.6.2 Manipulation of Programs

Prolog-program $\hat{=}$ data base of clauses which can be read and modified

?- clause (t_1, t_2) .

is true iff there is a program clause

$$B :- C_1, \dots, C_k$$

$\leftarrow k=0$ is possible
needed for facts:

$$B :- \text{true}.$$

such that

clause (t_1, t_2) unifies with
clause $(B, (C_1, \dots, C_k))$.

Ex: times $(_, 0, 0)$.

times $(X, Y, Z) :- Y > 0, Y1 \text{ is } Y-1, \text{times}(X, Y1, Z1),$
 $Z \text{ is } Z1 + X.$

?- clause $(\text{times}(X, Y, Z), \text{Body})$.

$Y=0, Z=0, \text{Body}=\text{true};$

$\text{Body} = (Y > 0, Y1 \text{ is } Y-1, \dots, Z \text{ is } Z1 + X).$

While "clause" can be used to read the code of the running program, there also exist predicates that can modify the text of the running program:

assert / 1 and retract / 1

?- assert (t).

proof always succeeds, but as a side-effect, the clause t is added at the end of the program.

(The predicate `asserta(t)` adds the clause t at the beginning of the program. The pred.

`assertz` is like `assert`.)

Ex: ?- assert (p(0)).

true

?- p(X).

X=0

?- clause (p(X), B).

X=0, B=true

?- assert (square(X,Y) :- times(X,X,Y)).

true

clauses built with "clause" cannot be asserted.
"clause" is static

Predicates can be static or dynamic.

By default, all predicates in the prog. are static.

Clauses for static predicates cannot be added or removed by `assert` + `retract`.

Predicates introduced by "assert" are dynamic.

Moreover, predicates in the program can be declared to be dynamic by a corresponding directive:

Ex: `:- dynamic times/3.`
`times (_, 0, 0).`
`times (X, Y, Z) :- Y > 0,`

?- `times(2, 3, Z).`

`Z = 6`

?- `asserta(times(X, 1, X)).`

`true`

?- `clause(times(X, Y, Z), B).`

`X = Z, Y = 1, B = true`

?- `retract(t)`

proof succeeds iff there is a prog. clause that unifies with `t`. As a side effect, this prog. clause is removed.

Ex: ?- `retract(times(X, Y, X) :- Body).`

`Y = 1, Body = true; ← removes times(X, 1, X)`

$X=0, Y=0, \text{Body}=\text{true}; \leftarrow \text{removes times}(_, 0, 0)$
 $\text{Body} = \dots \leftarrow \text{removes times}(X, Y, Z) :- Y > 0, \dots$

assert + retract can lead to completely non-understandable programs \Rightarrow use them only for certain purposes.

Sensible use of assert + retract: compute results and store them for later use.

Ex: Store results of computations in a table to re-use these results later on and avoid their repeated re-computation.

#	0	1	...	9
0	0	0		0
1	0	1		9
:	0	
9	0	9		81

$\text{member}(X, [X|L]).$

$\text{member}(X, [_|L]) :-$
 $\text{member}(X, L).$

maketable :- $L = [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9],$

$\text{member}(X, L)$

$\text{member}(Y, L),$

Z is $X * Y,$

$\text{assert}(\text{mult}(X, Y, Z)),$

fail.

$\leftarrow \text{enforces backtracking}$

~ X and Y will range over all numbers from 0, ..., 9
~ 100 new facts are added to the program.

? - makedata.

false

? - mult(X, Y, 8).

X=1, Y=8;

X=2, Y=4;

X=4, Y=2;

X=8, Y=1.

There exists a pre-defined predicate

findall/3

which finds all solutions to a query (i.e., without needing the user to press ;).

findall(t, g, l) is true iff the following

holds:

- Prolog tries to prove the query g and builds up the full SLD tree.
- Then it collects all answer substitutions

$\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ (in left-to-right depth-first search)

• Then $\text{findall}(t, g, l)$ is true iff

l is the list $[\sigma_1(t), \sigma_2(t), \dots, \sigma_n(t)]$.

Ex: family program including the rule

$\text{fatherOf}(F, C) :- \text{married}(F, W), \text{motherOf}(W, C)$.

? - $\text{findall}(C, \text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, C), L)$.

$L = [\text{susanne}, \text{peter}]$
 $\sigma_1(C)$, $\sigma_2(C)$

? - $\text{findall}(\text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, C), \text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, C), L)$.

$L = [\text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, \text{susanne}), \text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, \text{peter})]$
 $\sigma_1(\text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, C))$, $\sigma_2(\text{fatherOf}(\text{gerd}, C))$

findall could be programmed ourselves using assert and retract :

$\text{findall}(X, \text{Query}, X\text{list}) :- \text{Query},$
 $\text{assert}(\text{answer}(X)),$
 $\text{retract}(\text{answer}(X))$

```

fail
;
collectAnswers (Xlist).
collectAnswers ([X|Rest]) :- retract (answer(X)),
|
|
collectAnswers (Rest).
collectAnswers ([]).

```

Since Prolog-programs can also be regarded as terms, one can use Prolog to write meta-programs (programs that operate on programs, e.g., compilers and interpreters)

and meta-interpreters (interpreter for a prog. language that is written in this prog. language).

In particular, one can also easily write interpreters for variants of Prolog.

Simplest meta-interpreter (Meta-Interpreter 0)

prove (Goal) :- Goal.

If prog. contains $p(0)$

? - prove($p(X)$).

$X=0$

Meta-Interpreter 1 (for pure logic programs)

prove($true$) :- !.

prove($(Goal_1, Goal_2)$) :- !, prove($Goal_1$), prove($Goal_2$).

prove($Goal$) :- clause($Goal, Body$), prove($Body$).

Variant of this meta-interpreter where composed goals are handled from right to left:

Meta-Interpreter 2

Variant of meta-interpreter 1 which also returns the length of the proof:

Meta-Interpreter 3

? - prove($fatherOf(gera, C), N$).

$C = \text{Susanne}, N = 3$