Lecture 31: Declarative Programming

Imperative vs. Declarative

- So far, our programs are explicit directions for solving a problem; the problem itself is *implicit* in the program.
- *Declarative* programming turns this around:
  - A "program" is a description of the desired characteristics of a solution.
  - It is up to the system to figure out how to achieve these characteristics.
- Taken to the extreme, this is a very difficult problem in AI.
- However, people have come up with interesting compromises for small problems.
- For example, *constraint solvers* allow you to specify relationships between objects (like minimum or maximum distances) and then try to find configurations of those objects that meet the constraints.

Structured Query Language (SQL)

- For example the database world has *relational databases* and *object-relational databases*, which represent relations between data values as *tables*, such as:

ID	Last Name	First Names	Level	GPA
29313921	Smith	Michelle	2	3.6
38474822	Jones	Scott	3	3.2
89472648	Chan	John	2	3.7
48837284	Thompson	Carol	3	3.7

- SQL is a language for making *queries* against these tables:

```
SELECT * FROM Students WHERE level='2';
```

  which selects the first and third *rows* of this table.
- We don't say *how* to find these rows, just the criteria they must satisfy.
- So SQL can be thought of as a kind of declarative programming language.

Prolog and Predecessors

- Way back in 1959, researchers at Carnegie-Mellon University created GPS (General Problem Solver [A. Newell, J. C. Shaw, H. A. Simon])
  - Input defined objects and allowable operations on them, plus a description of the desired outcome.
  - Output consisted of a sequence of operations to bring the outcome about.
  - Only worked for small problems, unsurprisingly.
- *Planner* at MIT [C. Hewitt, 1969] was another programming language for theorem proving: one specified desired goal assertion, and system would find rules to apply to demonstrate the assertion. Again, this didn't scale all that well.
- Planner was one inspiration for the development of the *logic-programming language Prolog*.

Prolog (Lisp Style)

- In our sample language, the data values are (uninterpreted) Scheme values.
- Some of these values will be deemed to be "true."
- A *logic program* tells us which ones.
- As for Scheme, we'll write logic programs using Scheme data; you tell the data from the program by how it is used.
- For example, `(likes brian potstickers)` might be such an assertion:

  `likes` is a *predicate* that relates `brian` and `potstickers`.
- We don't interpret the arguments of the predicate: they are just uninterpreted data structures.

Logical Variables

- We also allow one other type of expression: a symbol that starts with '?' will indicate a *logical variable*.
- Logical variables can stand for any possible Scheme value (including one that contains logical variables).
- As an assertion, `(likes brian ?X)` says that any replacement of `?X` that makes the assertion true.
- As a query, `(likes brian ?X)` asks if there exists any value for `?X` that makes the query true.
- When the same logical variable occurs multiple times in an expression, it is replaced uniformly.
- For example, `(<= ?X ?X)` might assert that everything is less than or equal to itself (or ask if there is anything less than or equal to itself).

Facts and Rules

- The system will look to see if the queries are true based on a database of *facts* (axioms or postulates) about the predicates.
- It will inform us of what replacements for logical variables make the assertion true.
- Each fact will have the form

  `(fact` *Conclusion Hypothesis1 Hypothesis2 . . .*`)`

  Meaning "For any substitution of logical variables in the Conclusion and Hypotheses, we may derive the conclusion if we can derive each of the hypotheses."

Example: Family Relations

- First, we enter some facts with no hypotheses (with our logic system prompt to emphasize that this is not regular Scheme):

```
logic>  (fact (parent george paul))
logic>  (fact (parent martin george))
logic>  (fact (parent martin martin_jr))
logic>  (fact (parent martin donald))
logic>  (fact (parent martin robert))
logic>  (fact (parent george ann))
```

- We can now ask specific questions, such as

```
logic> (query (parent martin george))
Success!
```


Existential Queries

- With logical variables, we can find everything that satisfies a relation.

```
logic>  (query (parent martin ?who))
Success!
who: george
who: martin_jr
who: donald
who: robert
```


Multiple Criteria

- We also allow queries in which multiple criteria must be satisfied:

```
logic>  (query (parent ?gp ?p) (parent ?p ?c))
Success!
gp:  martin      p:  george     c:  paul
gp:  martin      p:  george     c:  ann
```

- As illustrated here, `?p` is always replaced with the same value in both clauses in which it appears.

The Closed World

```
logic>  (fact (parent george paul))
logic>  (fact (parent martin george))
logic>  (fact (parent martin martin_jr))
logic>  (fact (parent martin donald))
logic>  (fact (parent george ann))

logic> (query (parent martin paul))
Failed.
```

- Here, the facts don't imply that Martin is the parent of Paul, so the query fails.
- Of course, in real life it does not follow that just because you don't know something, it's false.
- However, our system makes the "closed world assumption": Anything not derivable from the given facts is false.
- On the other hand, the system is not set up to draw conclusions from this. . .
- . . . so can't define `(non-ancestor ?x ?y)` to be true if one can't prove `(ancestor ?x ?y)`.

Compound Facts

- Now some general rules about relations:

```
logic>     (fact (grandparent ?X ?Y) (parent ?X ?Z) (parent ?Z ?Y))
```

- The general form is

  (Conclusion Hypothesis1 Hypothesis2...)

- From these, we ought to be able to conclude that Martin is Ann's grandparent, for example.

Recursive Facts

- Now let's generalize grandparent to ancestor:

```
logic>    (fact (ancestor ?X ?Y) (parent ?X ?Y))
logic>    (fact (ancestor ?X ?Y) (parent ?X ?Z) (ancestor ?Z ?Y))
```

- That is, an ancestor is either your parent, or a parent of one of your ancestors (recursively).

Relations, Not Functions

- In this style of programming, we don't define functions, but rather relations.
  - Instead of saying "(abs -3) yields 3",...
  - We say "(abs -3 3) is true" (or, "-3 stands in the abs relation to 3.")
  - Instead of "(add x y) yields z",...
  - we say "(add x y z) is true."
- The distinction between operand and result is eliminated.
- This will allow us to run programs "both ways": from inputs to outputs, or from outputs to inputs.