INTRODUCTION TO PROLOG

PRINCIPLES OF PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES

Norbert Zeh Winter 2018

Dalhousie University

Where, declaratively, Haskell expresses a computation as a system of functions, a Prolog program describes predicates of objects and relations between objects.

Where, declaratively, Haskell expresses a computation as a system of functions, a Prolog program describes predicates of objects and relations between objects.

The program consists of

- A set of facts, predicates and relations that are known to hold, and
- A set of rules, predicates and relations that are known to hold if other predicates or relations hold.

Where, declaratively, Haskell expresses a computation as a system of functions, a Prolog program describes predicates of objects and relations between objects.

The program consists of

- A set of facts, predicates and relations that are known to hold, and
- A set of rules, predicates and relations that are known to hold if other predicates or relations hold.

To run a Prolog program, you pose a **query**. The program "magically" reports all answers to your query that it can prove using the rules and facts included in the program.

```
% Facts <-- This is a comment
person height(norbert, (6,0)).
person height(nelly, (5,1)).
person height(luca, (5,3)).
person_height(mateo, (3,11)).
% Rules
taller shorter(X, Y) :-
  person height(X, (FX, )), person height(Y, (FY, )), FX > FY.
taller shorter(X, Y) :-
  person_height(X, (FX, IX)), person_height(Y, (FY, IY)),
  FX = := FY, IX > IY.
```

% Queries

- :- person_height(norbert, (F, I)). % F = 6, I = 0.
- :- taller_shorter(luca, nelly). % true.
- :- taller_shorter(X, nelly). % X = norbert; X = luca.

```
% true.
% X = norbert• X = lu
```

ATOMS, NUMBERS, AND VARIABLES

Atoms:

- Composed of letters, digits, and underscores
- Start with a lowercase letter
- Examples: nelly person0 other_Item

Numbers:

- Integers: 1 -3451913
- Floating point: 1.0 -12.318 4.89e-3

Variables:

- Composed of letters, digits, and underscores
- Start with an uppercase letter
- Examples: Person _has_underscore
- Special variable: _ (wildcard)

TERMS

Simple term:

• Atom, number or variable

Complex term:

- Predicate:
 - (atom)(<term)[,...])</pre>
 - Examples: taller_shorter(X,Y) person_height(norbert,(6,0))
- Infix relation:
 - <term> <rel> <term>
 - Examples: X = pred(Y, Z) Number > 4
- Tuple:
 - · ($\langle term \rangle$ [,...])
 - Examples: (6,0) (Tail, Head)
- List:
 - [(term)[,...][|(list)]]
 - Examples: [] [X] [_|_] [A,B|Rest]

FACTS AND RULES

Fact:

- States what holds.
- $\langle term \rangle$.
- Examples: loves_teaching(norbert). married(norbert,nelly).

Rule:

- States how to deduce new facts from known facts.
- $\langle head \rangle$:- $\langle term_1 \rangle$,....
- $\langle head \rangle$ holds if $\langle term_1 \rangle, \dots$ hold simultaneously.
- Example: taller_shorter(X, Y) :-

person_height(X, (FX, IX)),
person_height(Y, (FY, IY)), FX =:= FY, IX > IY.

FACTS AND RULES

Fact:

- States what holds.
- $\langle term \rangle$.
- Examples: loves_teaching(norbert). married(norbert,nelly).
- Can be read as a rule: (*term*) :- true.

Rule:

- States how to deduce new facts from known facts.
- $\langle head \rangle$:- $\langle term_1 \rangle$,....
- $\langle head \rangle$ holds if $\langle term_1 \rangle, \dots$ hold simultaneously.
- Example: taller_shorter(X, Y) :-

person_height(X, (FX, IX)),
person_height(Y, (FY, IY)), FX =:= FY, IX > IY.

The goals of a rule are combined **conjunctively**:

```
between(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X > Smaller, X < Bigger.</pre>
```

says that X is between Smaller and Bigger if X > Smaller and X < Bigger. You should read "," as "and". The goals of a rule are combined **conjunctively**:

```
between(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X > Smaller, X < Bigger.</pre>
```

```
says that X is between Smaller and Bigger if X > Smaller and X < Bigger.
You should read "," as "and".
```

We express **disjunction**, the possibility to make a predicate true in different ways, by stating multiple facts or rules for this predicate:

```
elem_list(Elem, [Elem|_]).
elem_list(Elem, [_|Tail]) :- elem_list(Elem, Tail).
```

Elem is a member of List if

- Elem is the head of List or
- Elem is an element of the tail of List.

```
outside(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X < Smaller; X > Bigger.
```

says that X is outside the range (Smaller, Bigger) if X < Smaller or X > Bigger.

```
You should read ";" as "or".
```

```
outside(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X < Smaller; X > Bigger.
```

says that X is outside the range (Smaller, Bigger) if X < Smaller or X > Bigger.

```
You should read ";" as "or".
```

In fact, this is also how you ask Prolog for more answers:

```
a_number(1).
a_number(2).
```

```
outside(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X < Smaller; X > Bigger.
```

says that X is outside the range (Smaller, Bigger) if X < Smaller or X > Bigger.

```
You should read ";" as "or".
```

In fact, this is also how you ask Prolog for more answers:

```
a_number(1).
a_number(2).
```

```
?- a_number(X).
X = 1
```

```
outside(X, Smaller, Bigger) :- X < Smaller; X > Bigger.
```

says that X is outside the range (Smaller, Bigger) if X < Smaller or X > Bigger.

```
You should read ";" as "or".
```

In fact, this is also how you ask Prolog for more answers:

```
a_number(1).
a_number(2).
```

```
?- a_number(X).
X = 1 ;
X = 2.
```

Intuitively, two terms unify if the variables on both sides can be replaced with terms to make the two terms the same.

• Every occurrence of a given variable needs to be replaced with the same term.

Intuitively, two terms unify if the variables on both sides can be replaced with terms to make the two terms the same.

• Every occurrence of a given variable needs to be replaced with the same term.

Examples: (= tests whether two terms unify, \= tests whether they don't)

• X = X X = Y X = a(Y) a(X,y,z) = a(y,X,z) a \= b all succeed (individually).

Intuitively, two terms unify if the variables on both sides can be replaced with terms to make the two terms the same.

• Every occurrence of a given variable needs to be replaced with the same term.

Examples: (= tests whether two terms unify, \= tests whether they don't)

• X = X X = Y X = a(Y) a(X,y,z) = a(y,X,z) a \= b all succeed (individually).

• X = a, X = b fails because X = a forces X to equal a and then a $\geq b$.

• Two identical terms unify.

- Two identical terms unify.
- A variable unifies with any other term.

- Two identical terms unify.
- A variable unifies with any other term.
- If T_1 and T_2 are complex terms, they unify if
 - They have the same functor and arity,
 - Their corresponding arguments unify, and
 - The resulting variable instantiations are compatible.

- Two identical terms unify.
- A variable unifies with any other term.
- If T_1 and T_2 are complex terms, they unify if
 - They have the same functor and arity,
 - Their corresponding arguments unify, and
 - The resulting variable instantiations are compatible.
- If none of the above rules applies to T_1 and T_2 , then T_1 and T_2 do not unify.

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = _9341$$

$$Y = _9341$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = _9341$$

$$Y = _9341$$

$$9341 = a$$

$$9341 = a$$

$$1$$

$$x = _9341$$

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = _9341$$

$$Y = _9341$$

$$9341 = a$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$1$$

$$x = _9341 = a$$

$$X = Y, X = a, Y = b$$

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = _9341$$

$$Y = _9341$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$true$$

$$X = Y, Y = a$$

$$X = _9341$$

$$Y = _9341$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$-9341 = a$$

$$true$$

X = Y, X = a, Y = b
X = _9341
Y = _9341
_9341 = a, _9341 = b
_9341 = a
a = b
$$\dagger$$

Logically, this should fail because there is no (finite) instantiation of X that makes the two sides equal.

Logically, this should fail because there is no (finite) instantiation of X that makes the two sides equal.

In Prolog, this query succeeds with the answer X = f(X).

Logically, this should fail because there is no (finite) instantiation of X that makes the two sides equal.

In Prolog, this query succeeds with the answer X = f(X).

In the interest of efficiency, Prolog does not check whether a variable occurs in its own replacement.

Logically, this should fail because there is no (finite) instantiation of X that makes the two sides equal.

In Prolog, this query succeeds with the answer X = f(X).

In the interest of efficiency, Prolog does not check whether a variable occurs in its own replacement.

If you want to test for unification with occurs check, use unify_with_occurs_check/2, so

?- unify_with_occurs_check(X, f(X)).
false.
f(a). f(b). f(c). g(a). g(b). g(c). h(a). h(c). k(X) :f(X), g(X), h(X).

f(a). f(b). f(c). g(a). g(b). g(c). h(a). h(c). k(X) :f(X), g(X), h(X).

k(Y)

f(a).
f(b).
f(c).
g(a).
g(b).
g(c).

$$k(X) := f(X), g(X), h(X).$$

 $k(X) = f(A) =$

















Sequences and collections are represented as lists.

Sequences and collections are represented as lists.

Since list elements can themselves be lists, we can use lists to represent complicated data structures such as trees (even though they are often better represented as deeply nested complex terms). Sequences and collections are represented as lists.

Since list elements can themselves be lists, we can use lists to represent complicated data structures such as trees (even though they are often better represented as deeply nested complex terms).

- Empty list: []
- Multiple heads: [a,b|[c,d]] = [a,b,c,d]

What we do need is a way to build up arbitrarily complex relations

What we do need is a way to build up arbitrarily complex relations ... inductively

What we do need is a way to build up arbitrarily complex relations ... inductively ... using recursion.

Summing a list of integers:

```
sum([], 0).
sum([X|Xs], Sum) :-
    sum(Xs, Sum1), Sum is Sum1 + X.
```

Summing a list of integers:

```
sum([], 0).
sum([X|Xs], Sum) :-
    sum(Xs, Sum1), Sum is Sum1 + X.
```

Better:

```
sum([], 0).
sum([X|Xs], Sum) :-
Sum #= Sum1 + X, sum(Xs, Sum1).
```

```
odd(X) :- 1 is X mod 2.
```

```
?- maplist(odd,[1,3,5]).
true.
?- maplist(odd,[1,2,3]).
false.
```

odd(X) :- 1 is X mod 2.

```
?- maplist(odd,[1,3,5]).
true.
?- maplist(odd,[1,2,3]).
false.
```

```
?- maplist(<,[1,3,5],[2,7,8]).
true.
?- maplist(<,[1,3,9],[2,7,8]).
false.</pre>
```

```
odd(X) :- 1 is X mod 2.
```

```
?- maplist(odd,[1,3,5]).
true.
?- maplist(odd,[1,2,3]).
false.
```

```
?- maplist(<,[1,3,5],[2,7,8]).
true.
?- maplist(<,[1,3,9],[2,7,8]).
false.</pre>
```

```
add(X,Y,Sum) :- Sum is X+Y.
```

```
?- maplist(add,[1,3,5],[4,8,9],Sums).
Sums = [5,11,14].
```

Primitives:

- true, false
- fail (is the same as false)

Primitives:

- true, false
- fail (is the same as false)

Unification:

 \cdot = (arguments unify), \= (arguments do not unify)

Primitives:

- true, false
- fail (is the same as false)

Unification:

• = (arguments unify), \= (arguments do not unify)

Arithmetic and numeric comparisons: (Use with caution.)

- +, -, *, /, //
- $\cdot \ <, >, >=, =<, =:=, = \setminus=$
- \cdot 5 \= 2+3 but X is 2+3, 5 = X

Primitives:

- true, false
- fail (is the same as false)

Unification:

• = (arguments unify), \= (arguments do not unify)

Arithmetic and numeric comparisons: (Use with caution.)

- +, -, *, /, //
- $\cdot \ <, >, >=, =<, =:=, = \setminus=$
- 5 \geq 2+3 but X is 2+3, 5 = X

Lots more

Given the facts

f(e). g(a). g(b). g(c). g(d). g(e).

the following two predicates are logically the same:

h1(X) := f(X), g(X). h2(X) := g(X), f(X).

Given the facts

f(e). g(a). g(b). g(c). g(d). g(e).

the following two predicates are logically the same:

h1(X) := f(X), g(X). h2(X) := g(X), f(X).

Which one is more efficient?

Given the facts

f(e). g(a). g(b). g(c). g(d). g(e).

the following two predicates are logically the same:

h1(X) := f(X), g(X). h2(X) := g(X), f(X).

Which one is more efficient?

- h1 instantiates X = e and then succeeds because g(e) holds.
- h2 instantiates X = a, X = b, ... and fails on all instantiations except X = e.

Consider the facts

```
child(anne,bridget). child(bridget,caroline).
child(caroline,donna). child(donna,emily).
```

and the following logically equivalent definitions of a descendant relationship:

```
descend1(X,Y)
  :- child(X,Z), descend1(Z,Y).
descend1(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
```

```
descend2(X,Y)
  :- descend2(Z,Y), child(X,Z).
descend2(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
```

Consider the facts

```
child(anne,bridget). child(bridget,caroline).
child(caroline,donna). child(donna,emily).
```

and the following logically equivalent definitions of a descendant relationship:

```
descend1(X,Y)
  :- child(X,Z), descend1(Z,Y).
descend1(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
descend2(Z,Y), child(X,Z).
descend2(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
```

Now ask the queries descend1(anne,bridget) and descend2(anne,bridget). What happens?

Consider the facts

```
child(anne,bridget). child(bridget,caroline).
child(caroline,donna). child(donna,emily).
```

and the following logically equivalent definitions of a descendant relationship:

```
descend1(X,Y)
  :- child(X,Z), descend1(Z,Y).
descend1(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
descend2(Z,Y), child(X,Z).
descend2(X,Y) :- child(X,Y).
```

Now ask the queries descend1(anne,bridget) and descend2(anne,bridget). What happens?

- descend1(anne,bridget) succeeds.
- descend2(anne,bridget) does not terminate.

! (read "cut") is a predicate that always succeeds, but with a side effect:

- It commits Prolog to all choices (unification of variables) that were made since the parent goal was unified with the left-hand side of the rule.
- This includes the choice to use this particular rule.


































a(1). b(1). b(2). c(1). c(2). d(2). e(2). f(3). p(X) :- a(X). p(X) :- b(X), c(X), !, d(X), e(X). p(X) :- f(X).

?- p(X).

a(1). b(1). b(2). c(1). c(2). d(2). e(2). f(3). p(X) :- a(X). p(X) :- b(X), c(X), !, d(X), e(X). p(X) :- f(X).

?- p(X).

p(X)

























```
p(X,Y) :- q(X,Y).
p(3,6).
```

```
q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y).
q(4,7).
```

a(1). a(2). b(4). b(5).
```
p(X,Y) :- q(X,Y).
p(3,6).
```

```
q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y).
q(4,7).
```

```
a(1). a(2).
b(4). b(5).
```

```
p(X,Y) :- q(X,Y).
p(3,6).
```

```
q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y).
q(4,7).
```

```
a(1). a(2).
b(4). b(5).
```

q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y). q(4,7).

a(1). a(2). b(4). b(5).

q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y). q(4,7).

a(1). a(2). b(4). b(5).

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $g(4,7).$

a(1). a(2). b(4). b(5).

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$



$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$



?- p(X,Y). X = 1, Y = 4

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$



?- p(X,Y). X = 1, Y = 4 ;

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$

?- p(X,Y). X = 1, Y = 4 ;

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$

?- p(X,Y). X = 1, Y = 4 ; X = 1, Y = 5

$$q(X,Y) := a(X), !, b(Y).$$

 $q(4,7).$

?- p(X,Y). X = 1, Y = 4 ; X = 1, Y = 5 ;

CUT: SECOND EXAMPLE

```
p(X,Y) :- q(X,Y).
p(3,6).
```

```
q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y).
q(4,7).
```

```
a(1). a(2).
b(4). b(5).
```

```
?- p(X,Y).
X = 1, Y = 4 ;
X = 1, Y = 5 ;
```

CUT: SECOND EXAMPLE

```
p(X,Y) :- q(X,Y).
p(3,6).
```

```
q(X,Y) :- a(X), !, b(Y).
q(4,7).
```

```
a(1). a(2).
b(4). b(5).
```

```
?- p(X,Y).
X = 1, Y = 4 ;
X = 1, Y = 5 ;
X = 3, Y = 6.
```

A predicate to compute the maximum:

 $\max(X,Y,X) :- X \ge Y.$ $\max(X,Y,Y) :- X < Y.$

A predicate to compute the maximum:

```
\max(X,Y,X) :- X \ge Y.
\max(X,Y,Y) :- X < Y.
```

max(4,3,Z)

A predicate to compute the maximum:

 $\max(X,Y,X) :- X \ge Y.$ $\max(X,Y,Y) :- X < Y.$

$$max(4,3,Z)$$

X = 4, Y = 3, Z = 4
4 >= 3

A predicate to compute the maximum:

max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y.max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



A predicate to compute the maximum:

max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y.max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



A predicate to compute the maximum:

max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y.max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



A predicate to compute the maximum:

max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y.max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



This is correct but inefficient.

A more efficient implementation:

A more efficient implementation:

A more efficient implementation:

$$X = 4, Y = 3, Z = 4$$

$$4 \ge 3, !$$

A more efficient implementation:

 $max(X,Y,X) := X \ge Y, !.$ max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



A more efficient implementation:



A more efficient implementation:

 $max(X,Y,X) := X \ge Y, !.$ max(X,Y,Y) := X < Y.



Even more efficient?

max(X,Y,X) :- X >= Y, !.
max(X,Y,Y).

Even more efficient?

```
max(X,Y,X) :- X >= Y, !.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- max(4,3,Z).
```

Z = 4.

Even more efficient?

```
max(X,Y,X) :- X >= Y, !.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- max(4,3,Z).
Z = 4.
?- max(3,5,Z).
Z = 5.
```

Even more efficient?

```
max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y, !.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- \max(4, 3, Z).
Z = 4.
?- \max(3, 5, Z).
Z = 5.
?- \max(3, 4, 3).
false.
```

Even more efficient?

```
max(X,Y,X) := X >= Y, !.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- \max(4, 3, Z).
Z = 4.
?- max(3,5,Z).
Z = 5.
?- \max(3, 4, 3).
false.
?- \max(4,3,3).
true. % <-- incorrect</pre>
```

Avoiding the second comparison correctly:

max(X,Y,Z) :- X >= Y, !, X = Z. max(X,Y,Y).

```
max(X,Y,Z) :- X >= Y, !, X = Z.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- max(4,3,Z).
```

```
Z = 4.
```

```
max(X,Y,Z) :- X >= Y, !, X = Z.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- max(4,3,Z).
Z = 4.
?- max(3,5,Z).
Z = 5.
```

```
max(X,Y,Z) := X >= Y, !, X = Z.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- max(4,3,Z).
Z = 4.
?- \max(3, 5, Z).
Z = 5.
?- \max(3, 4, 3).
false.
```

```
max(X,Y,Z) := X >= Y, !, X = Z.
max(X,Y,Y).
?- \max(4, 3, Z).
Z = 4.
?- \max(3, 5, Z).
Z = 5.
?- \max(3, 4, 3).
false.
?- \max(4,3,3).
false.
```
This is called "negation as failure".

NEGATION: CUT AND FAIL

In general, Prolog has no notion of a predicate not being true! It can only decide whether it can prove the predicate using the information in the database.

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?"

NEGATION: CUT AND FAIL

In general, Prolog has no notion of a predicate not being true! It can only decide whether it can prove the predicate using the information in the database.

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?" (Is this predicate false?)

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?" (Is this predicate false?)

```
Solution:
neg(P) :- P, !, fail.
neg(_).
```

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?" (Is this predicate false?)

```
Solution:
neg(P) :- P, !, fail.
neg(_).
```

Example:

?- neg(true).
false.

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?" (Is this predicate false?)

```
Solution:
neg(P) :- P, !, fail.
neg(_).
```

Example:

```
?- neg(true).
false.
?- neg(false).
true.
```

This is called "negation as failure".

It is useful to be able to ask the question: "Are you unable to prove this predicate?" (Is this predicate false?)

```
Solution:
```

```
neg(P) :- P, !, fail.
neg(_).
```

Example:

```
?- neg(true).
false.
?- neg(false).
true.
```

Prolog has a built-in function \+ that does exactly what neg does. Thus, these two queries become \+ true. and \+ false.

In these cases, we would like to prevent Prolog from searching for additional solutions, in the interest of efficiency.

In these cases, we would like to prevent Prolog from searching for additional solutions, in the interest of efficiency.

once(P)

- Fails if P fails.
- Succeeds if P succeeds but finds only one solution.

In these cases, we would like to prevent Prolog from searching for additional solutions, in the interest of efficiency.

once(P)

- Fails if P fails.
- Succeeds if P succeeds but finds only one solution.

a(1). a(2). ?- a(X). X = 1 ; X = 2.

In these cases, we would like to prevent Prolog from searching for additional solutions, in the interest of efficiency.

once(P)

- Fails if P fails.
- Succeeds if P succeeds but finds only one solution.

a(1). a(2). ?- a(X). X = 1; X = 2. a(1). a(2). ?- once(a(X)). X = 1. X = 1.

In these cases, we would like to prevent Prolog from searching for additional solutions, in the interest of efficiency.

once(P)

- Fails if P fails.
- Succeeds if P succeeds but finds only one solution.

a(1). a(2). ?- a(X). X = 1; X = 2. a(1). a(2). ?- once(a(X)). X = 1.

Implementation: once(P) :- call(P), !.

Prolog has an if-then construct:

```
If -> Then behaves the same as once(If), Then.
```

Example:

```
a(1). a(2). b(1,3). b(1,4). b(2,5). b(2,6).
p(Y) :- a(X) -> b(X,Y).
```

```
?- p(Y).
Y = 3;
Y = 4.
```

There's also a version that acts like if-then-else: If -> Then; Else. It acts as if implemented as

```
If -> Then; Else :- If, !, Then.
If -> Then; Else :- !, Else.
```

Example:

max(X,Y,Z) :- X < Y -> Z = Y; Z = X.

Backtracking produces the different solutions to a query one at a time. Sometimes, we may want to collect all solutions. Backtracking produces the different solutions to a query one at a time. Sometimes, we may want to collect all solutions.

Finding all solutions:

a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).

```
?- findall((X,Y), a(X,Y), List).
List = [(1,4), (1,3), (2,4), (2,3)].
```

Backtracking produces the different solutions to a query one at a time. Sometimes, we may want to collect all solutions.

Finding all solutions:

```
a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).
```

```
?- findall((X,Y), a(X,Y), List).
List = [(1,4), (1,3), (2,4), (2,3)].
```

```
?- findall(Y, a(X,Y), List).
List = [4, 3, 4, 3].
```

Grouping solutions:

```
a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).

?- bagof(Y, a(X,Y), List).

X = 1, List = [4, 3];

X = 2, List = [4, 3].
```

Grouping solutions:

```
a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).
?- bagof(Y, a(X,Y), List).
X = 1, List = [4, 3] ;
```

```
X = 2, List = [4, 3].
```

```
?- bagof(Y, X<sup>a</sup>(X,Y), List).
List = [4, 3, 4, 3].
```

Grouping solutions, sorted, without duplicates:

```
a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).

?- setof(Y, a(X,Y), List).

X = 1, List = [3, 4];

X = 2, List = [3, 4].
```

Grouping solutions, sorted, without duplicates:

```
a(1,4). a(1,3). a(2,4). a(2,3).

?- setof(Y, a(X,Y), List).

X = 1, List = [3, 4];

X = 2, List = [3, 4].
```

```
?- setof(Y, X<sup>a</sup>(X,Y), List).
List = [3, 4].
```

:- use_module(library(clpfd)).

What does it do?

:- use_module(library(clpfd)).

What does it do?

Standard arithmetic:

?- X is 4+3. X = 7.

:- use_module(library(clpfd)).

What does it do?

Standard arithmetic:

Constraints:

?- X #= 4+3. X = 7.

:- use_module(library(clpfd)).

What does it do?

```
Standard arithmetic:
```

```
?- X is 4+3.
X = 7.
```

?- 7 is X+3. ERROR: Arguments are not sufficiently instantiated Constraints:

:- use_module(library(clpfd)).

What does it do?

```
      Standard arithmetic:
      Constraints:

      ?- X is 4+3.
      ?- X #= 4+3.

      X = 7.
      X = 7.

      ?- 7 is X+3.
      ?- 7 #= X+3.

      ERROR: Arguments are not
      X = 4.

      sufficiently instantiated
      X = 4.
```

Standard comparisons:

?- 4 > 3.

true.

Constraints:

?- 4 #> 3.

true.



Standard comparisons:	Constraints:	
?- 4 > 3. true.	?- 4 #> 3.	
	true.	
?- X > 3.	?- X #> 3.	
ERROR: Arguments are not	X in 3sup.	
SUTTICIENTLY INSTANTIATED		

Sometimes, a solution satisfying all the constraints is reported directly:

```
?- X #> 3, X #< 5.
X = 4.
```

Sometimes, a solution satisfying all the constraints is reported directly:

```
?- X #> 3, X #< 5.
X = 4.
```

Usually, you need to use label to generate a solution/solutions:

```
?- X #> 3, X #< 6.
X in 4..5.
```

Sometimes, a solution satisfying all the constraints is reported directly:

```
?- X #> 3, X #< 5.
X = 4.
```

Usually, you need to use label to generate a solution/solutions:

```
?- X #> 3, X #< 6.
X in 4..5.
?- X #> 3, X #< 6, label([X]).
X = 4 ;
X = 5.
```

The most basic constraint specifies the range of values a variable or a list of variables can take:

SudokuCell in 1..9.

ListOfAllSudokuCells ins 1..9.

X #= Y+Z.

W*X #> Y+Z.

X #>= 3.

•••

We can use

all_different([X,Y,Z]) or all_distinct([X,Y,Z])

to ensure X, Y, and Z are distinct.
We can use

```
all_different([X,Y,Z]) or all_distinct([X,Y,Z])
```

to ensure X, Y, and Z are distinct.

This works for any arbitrary list.

We can use

```
all_different([X,Y,Z]) or all_distinct([X,Y,Z])
```

to ensure X, Y, and Z are distinct.

This works for any arbitrary list.

Usually, **all_distinct** is the better choice.

- all_distinct propagates more strongly.
- all_different is (in the short term) more efficient.

ALL-DIFFERENT CONSTRAINTS (2)

?- maplist(in, Vs, [1\/3..4, 1..2\/4, 1..2\/4, 1..3, 1..3, 1..6]),
 all_distinct(Vs).

false.

ALL-DIFFERENT CONSTRAINTS (2)

```
?- maplist(in, Vs, [1\/3..4, 1..2\/4, 1..2\/4, 1..3, 1..3, 1..6]),
        all_distinct(Vs).
false.
```

```
?- maplist(in, Vs, [1\/3..4, 1..2\/4, 1..2\/4, 1..3, 1..3, 1..6]),
    all_different(Vs).
_896 in 1\/3..4,
all_different([_896, _902, _908, _914, _920, _926]),
_902 in 1..2\/4,
_908 in 1..2\/4,
_914 in 1..3,
_920 in 1..3,
_926 in 1..6.
```

The standard solution search in Prolog employs backtracking. The order in which different variable assignments are tried depends entirely on the structure of the predicates we specify and may require "imperative" tuning to achieve decent performance.

The standard solution search in Prolog employs backtracking. The order in which different variable assignments are tried depends entirely on the structure of the predicates we specify and may require "imperative" tuning to achieve decent performance.

clpfd employs some low-level wizardry to ensure variables are fixed the moment existing constraints and other variable assignments leave us with only one possible value. This in turn may force other variables to have only one possible value left, so they are fixed in turn, and so on. The standard solution search in Prolog employs backtracking. The order in which different variable assignments are tried depends entirely on the structure of the predicates we specify and may require "imperative" tuning to achieve decent performance.

clpfd employs some low-level wizardry to ensure variables are fixed the moment existing constraints and other variable assignments leave us with only one possible value. This in turn may force other variables to have only one possible value left, so they are fixed in turn, and so on.

This is called **constraint propagation** and is at the heart of efficient constraint solvers. Depending on the problem, it can be orders of magnitude faster than simple backtracking.

... are Prolog's means to parse input.

... are Prolog's means to parse input.

We need to talk about them, but not before we introduce context-free grammars in the context of syntatic analysis.