

A Prolog program is a data base of clauses. It can read its own code during runtime using the pre-defined predicate `clause/2`.

Here, `clause(t1, t2)` is true iff

there is a prog. clause  $B :- C_1, \dots, C_k$   
 such that `clause(t1, t2)` unifies with  
`clause(B, (C1, ..., Ck))`

Ex: Prog contains 2 clauses:

`times(-, 0, 0).` ← is regarded as `times(-, 0, 0) :- true.`

`times(X, Y, Z) :- Y > 0, Y1 is Y-1, times(X, Y1, Z1),  
 Z is Z1 + X.`

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

`Y=0, Z=0, Body=true ;`

`Body = ( Y > 0, Y1 is Y-1, times(X, Y1, Z1), Z is Z1 + X )`

↑  
stands for

`Y > 0, ( Y1 is ... , ( times(X ... ), Z is ... ) )`

Up to now, we considered the data base of prog. clauses to be static. But it is possible to

modify a Prolog-program. during its execution  
( $\Rightarrow$  dynamic),

assert/1: <sup>proving</sup> assert(t) always succeeds and  
as a side-effect, the clause t  
is added at the end of the  
program.

Ex: times-prog.

?-assert(p(0)).  $\leftarrow$  fact p(0).  
true is added at the  
end of the prog.

?-p(X).

X=0.

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

true

?-square(3,Y).

Y=9.

There are also predicates asserta/1 and assertz/1.  
adds clause at  $\rightarrow$  the beginning of the prog  
 $\uparrow$  ... at the end of the prog. (like assert)

One can only modify prog. clauses for dynamic predicates: All predicates introduced by assert are dynamic. But the pred. in the program are static unless they are explicitly declared as dynamic.

To this end, one needs a corresponding directive in the program:

$\text{:- dynamic times/3.}$

$\text{times(-, 0, 0).}$

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

$?- \text{asserta(times(X, 1, X)).}$

$\text{true}$

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

$X=Z, Y=1, B=\text{true}$

$\text{retract/1}$  is used to remove clauses (of dynamic predicates)

$\text{retract(t)}$  succeeds iff a prog. clause unifies with  $t$ . As a side effect, the first prog. clause that unifies with  $t$

is removed.

Ex: times

?- retract(times(X, Y, Z) :- B).

↑ first clause for times is deleted.

By pressing ; several times, one can delete all clauses for times.

Instead:

?- retract(times(X, Y, Z)).

would only delete facts of times

Prog clauses can also contain assert and retract → prog. can modify itself while it is running. ⇒ Can lead to non-understandable programs (use assert + retract with care).

A useful application of assert + retract is to save intermediate results for later use.

Ex: We want to save intermediate results of multiplication.  
⇒ Create table which stores  $X * Y$  for all numbers  $X$  and  $Y$  between 0 and 9.

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

member(X, L),

member(Y, L),

? X \* Y

← { member(X, [X|\_]).  
member(X, [\_|Ys]) :-

member(Y, L),  
Z is X & Y,  
assert(times(X, Y, Z)),  
fail.

member(X, [Ys]) :-  
member(X, Ys).

↑ creates 100 times-facts due to  
backtracking

?- maketable.

false

?- times(X, Y, 8).

X=1, Y=8 ; X=2, Y=4 ; X=4, Y=2 ; X=8, Y=1.

Ex: Predicate findall should not only find the first solution to a query (and wait for the user to press ";") but it should find all solutions to a query. This predicate is predefined in Prolog, but we could define it ourselves with assert and retract.

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

One builds up the complete SLD tree for the query g and computes all answer substitutions  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ .

Then findall(t, g, l) is true iff l is the list  $[\sigma_1(t), \dots, \sigma_n(t)]$ .

E.g.: Consider the family-example.

?- findall(Y, fatherOf(gerd, Y), L).

L = [susanne, peter].

?- findall(fatherOf(gerd, Y), fatherOf(gerd, Y), L).



Variants of logic programming.

$\text{prove}(\text{true}) :- !.$

$\text{prove}((\text{Goal}_1, \text{Goal}_2)) :- !, \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_1), \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_2).$

$\text{prove}(\text{Goal}) :- \text{clause}(\text{Goal}, \text{Body}), \text{prove}(\text{Body}).$

Uses built-in unification of Prolog, but implements treatment of clauses itself

• Now one can modify this interpreter to experiment with alternative semantics of logic programming.

We now implement an interpreter which handles sequences of literals from right to left:

$\text{prove}(\text{true}) :- !.$

$\text{prove}((\text{Goal}_1, \text{Goal}_2)) :- !, \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_2), \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_1).$

$\text{prove}(\text{Goal}) :- \text{clause}(\text{Goal}, \text{Body}), \text{prove}(\text{Body}).$

• Another possibility is a meta-interpreter which also computes the length of proofs (i.e., the number of needed resolution steps):

$\text{prove}(\text{true}, 0) :- !.$

$\text{prove}((\text{Goal}_1, \text{Goal}_2), N) :- !, \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_1, N_1), \text{prove}(\text{Goal}_2, N_2),$   
 $N \text{ is } N_1 + N_2.$

$\text{prove}(\text{Goal}, N) :- \text{clause}(\text{Goal}, \text{Body}), \text{prove}(\text{Body}, N_1),$   
 $N \text{ is } N_1 + 1.$