

Logic Programming II

09.11.2009

Christian M. Hansen
chrisha@ifi.uio.no

Department of Informatics – University of Oslo

Based on slides by Martin Giese and Arild B. Torjusen

1

INF 3110/4110 – 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

2

INF 3110/4110 – 2009

Facts and rules

- ◆ Remember: A declarative program admits two interpretations
 - **Declarative:** **What** is being computed.
 - **Procedural:** **How** the computation takes place
- ◆ A Prolog program consists of a sequence of *clauses*
- ◆ clauses are *facts* (H) or *rules* (H :- A₁, ..., A_k)
 - `person(anne, sofia, martin, 1960)`
 - `child(X,Y) :- person(X,Z,Y,U)`
- ◆ Declaratively, the rule H :- A₁, A₂ is read as:
 - "H is implied by the conjunction A₁, A₂"
- ◆ Procedurally, the rule H :- A₁, A₂ is interpreted as:
 - "To answer the query H, answer the conjunctive query A₁, A₂"

3

INF 3110/4110 – 2009

Queries and unification

- ◆ We initiate a computation by posing a *query* (|?- A₁, ..., A_k)
 - | ?- `child(paul,Parent)`
- ◆ For queries without variables we will get a yes/no answer.
- ◆ For queries with variables the result is the substitutions for (assignment of) the variables which will make the query true.
- ◆ The process of matching a query with facts and rules is called *unification*. The result of the unification is a *substitution*.

4

INF 3110/4110 – 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

5

INF 310/410 - 2009

Consulting vs. Querying

- ◆ Prolog treats all expressions entered after `| ?-` as *queries*
 - Program:
`hungry(anne).`
`hungry(sofia).`
 - Typing `| ?- hungry(martin).` produces *no*
- ◆ In order to define new predicates, or redefine existing ones, enter *consulting* mode
 - `| ?- consult(file).` or `| ?- [file].` consults `file.pl`
 - `| ?- consult(user).` or `| ?- [user].` consults user to enter facts and rules directly
 - End user consulting mode with `Ctrl+D`

INF 310/410 - 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

7

INF 310/410 - 2009

Lists in Prolog

- ◆ Basic idea: same as in ML.
- ◆ Conceptually, a list is either:
 - `nil`, the empty list
 - `cons(hd,tl)`, the list with head `hd` and a tail `tl`
- ◆ A list of prime numbers:
`cons(2,cons(3,cons(5,cons(7,nil))))`
- ◆ BUT: use special syntax `[]` and `[hd | tl]`
`[2 | [3 | [5 | [7 | []]]]]`

8

INF 310/410 - 2009

Prettier Syntax for Lists

- `[]` : the empty list
- `[a,b,c]` : a list with three elements, same as
`[a | [b | [c | []]]]`
- `[a,b|X]` : another way of writing
- `[a | [b | X]]`

Unification: just like always...

- `[a, b, c] ≡ [A | B]` will be unified as
- `A/a` and `B/[b, c]`

9

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Unification on lists

- ◆ `[a,b,c]` unifies with `[Head | Tail]`
Result: `Head=a` and `Tail=[b,c]`
- ◆ `[a]` unifies with `[H | T]`
Result: `H=a` and `T=[]`
- ◆ `[a,b,c]` unifies with `[a | T]`
Result: `T=[b,c]`
- ◆ `[a,b,c]` does **not** unify with `[b | T]`
- ◆ `[]` does **not** unify with `[H | T]`
- ◆ `[]` unifies with `[]`

10

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Unification on lists: Example

- Assume the following fact: `p([H | T], H, T)`.
- Query:

`| ?- p([a,b,c], X, Y).`

`X=a`

`Y=[b,c]`

`yes`

11

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Unification on lists: Example

- Assume the following fact: `p([H | T], H, T)`.
- Query:

`| ?- p([a], X, Y).`

`X=a`

`Y=[]`

`yes`

`| ?- p([], X, Y).`

`no`

12

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Find an element in a list

- Check if the first element is the one we are searching for.
- If not, we look for the element in the rest of the list.
- Either we find X or the list becomes empty.

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

```
member(2,[1,2,3]) ? -> member(2,[2,3]) ? -> yes
```

13

INF 310/410 - 2009

Append two lists

- We will define a relation to concatenate two lists *Xs* and *Ys* into a third list *Zs*:

```
| ?- append([1, 2, 3], [4,5], Result). Should give  
Result = [1,2,3,4,5].
```

- Prolog program:

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

14

INF 310/410 - 2009

Functions?

- ◆ There are no functions in Prolog, but **relations**
 - Functions are a particular case of relations
 - This allows using Prolog programs in multiple ways
- ◆ A function $f: A \rightarrow B$ can be represented in Prolog as a relation `relf(a,b)`
 - `relf(a,b)` may be understood as $f(a)=b$
- ◆ So, in `append(List1, List2, Result)`.
 - `List1` and `List2` may be seen as input parameters
 - `Result` is the output parameter
- ◆ Compare with ML:
 - ML: `fun fst(x::xs) = x`
 - Prolog: `fst([X|Xs],X) .`
`| ?- fst([1,2,3],X). X = 1 ? ;`

15

INF 310/410 - 2009

Anonymous variables

- ◆ When we are not interested in the value of a certain parameter, we may use `_`
- ◆ Example: In the program
`member(X, [X|Rest]).`
`member(X, [Head | Tail]) :- member(X, Tail).`
we are not interested in the `Head` parameter (nor in the `Rest` parameter).
- ◆ We can write it as follows:
`member(X, [X|_]).`
`member(X, [_| Tail]) :- member(X, Tail).`

16

INF 310/410 - 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

17

INF 310/410 - 2009

Multiple uses of a Prolog program (1)

- ◆ Some Prolog programs may be used both for testing and for computing
- ◆ Example: `member(X, Xs)` means `X` is a member of the list `Xs`

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

18

INF 310/410 - 2009

Multiple uses of a Prolog program (1)

- ◆ For testing:

```
| ?- member(wed, [mon, wed, fri]).  
yes
```

- ◆ For computing:

```
| ?- member(X, [mon, wed, fri]).  
X = mon ?  
X = wed ?  
X = fri ?  
no
```

19

INF 310/410 - 2009

Multiple uses of a Prolog program (2)

- ◆ It's possible to use the same program to concatenate two lists and to split a list in all possible ways

- ◆ Example: `append(Xs,Ys,Zs)`

- ◆ To concatenate two lists:

```
| ?- append([first, second, third], [fourth,  
fifth], Zs).
```

```
Zs = [first, second, third, fourth, fifth].
```

20

INF 310/410 - 2009

Multiple uses of a Prolog program (2)

- ◆ To split a list in all possible ways:
| ?- append(Xs, Ys, [first, second, third, fourth, fifth]).

Xs = [] Ys = [first,second,third,fourth,fifth] ?

Xs = [first] Ys = [second,third,fourth,fifth] ?

Xs = [first,second] Ys = [third,fourth,fifth] ?

Xs = [first,second,third] Ys = [fourth,fifth] ?

Xs = [first,second,third,fourth] Ys = [fifth] ?

Xs = [first,second,third,fourth,fifth] Ys = [] ?

21

INF 310/4110 - 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

22

INF 310/4110 - 2009

Arithmetic in Prolog

- ◆ Prolog programs presented so far were *declarative*: they admitted a dual reading as a formula
 - Operations of arithmetic are functional, not relational
- ◆ Arithmetic compromises Prolog's declarativeness
 - Solved in constraint logic programming languages

23

INF 310/4110 - 2009

Arithmetic operators

- ◆ Built-in data structures:
 - Integers: 1,2,3,... (+, -, *, //)
 - Floating points: 2.3, 3.4456, 5.4e-13,... (+, -, *, /)
- ◆ Infix vs prefix notation*
 - 45+35
 - '+'(45,35)
- ◆ It is possible to have user-defined operators with specified priority, associativity, etc

*We will see later how to evaluate expressions

24

INF 310/4110 - 2009

Arithmetic comparison relations

- ◆ Prolog allows comparison of **ground arithmetic expressions** (*gae*, i.e. expressions without variables). *gaes* have *values*
- ◆ Built-in comparison relations: `<`, `<=`, `=:=` ("equal"), `=\=` ("different"), `>=` and `>`
- ◆ Queries
 - `| ?- 6*3 := 9*2.`
yes
 - `| ?- 8 > 5+3.`
no
 - `| ?- 34 >= X+4.`
uncaught exception: error(instantiation_error,(>=)/2)
- ◆ Note difference between
 - `=` (unifiability relation) `1+1=2` gives no, `X = 1` gives `X = 1`
 - `==` (syntactic equality) `1+1 == 2` gives no, `X == x` gives no
 - `\==` (syntactic inequality) `1+1 \== 2` gives yes.
 - `:=` (value equality) `1+1 := 2` gives yes
 - `=\=` (value inequality) `1+1 =\= 2` gives no

25

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Example: ordered lists

```
ordered([]).
ordered([X]).
ordered([X,Y|Ys]) :- X =< Y, ordered([Y|Ys]).
```

◆ Queries

- `| ?- ordered([3,4,67,8]).`
no
- `| ?- ordered([3,4,67, 88]).`
yes
- `| ?- ordered([3,4,X,88]).`
{INSTANTIATION ERROR: 4=<_30 - arg 2}

26

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Evaluation of arithmetic expressions

- ◆ We need to introduce a way to evaluate expressions
 - `| ?- X := 3+4.` yields an error
 - `| ?- X = 3+4.`
`X = 3+4`
- ◆ Evaluation is done using "is"
 - `| ?- X is 3+4.`
`X = 7`
 - "is" is a builtin predicate which has been defined as an operator for simpler syntax, we could also write:
`| ?- is(X,3+4).`
`X = 7`

27

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Example: Factorial

```
factorial(0,1).
factorial(N,F) :- N>0, N1 is N-1,
                factorial(N1,F1),
                F is N*F1.
```

◆ Queries

- `| ?- factorial(5,X).`
`X = 120`
Yes
- The following query gives an error however:
- `| ?- factorial(X,120).` "X>0" is not allowed!
uncaught exception: error(instantiation_error,(>)/2)

28

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Example: Length of lists

- ◆ An intuitive definition **but wrong**

```
length([],0).
```

```
length([_ | Ts], N+1) :- length(Ts,N).
```

- ◆ Query

- | ?- length([3,5,56,7],X).

```
X = 0+1+1+1+1
```

```
Yes
```

- ◆ What's the problem?

Expressions are not automatically evaluated in Prolog!

29

INF 310/410 - 2009

Example: Length of lists

- ◆ A good definition

```
length([],0).
```

```
length([_ | Ts], N) :- length(Ts,M), N is M+1.
```

- ◆ Queries

- | ?- length([3,5,56,7],X).

```
X = 4
```

```
Yes
```

- | ?- length(X,5).

```
X = [_,_,_,_]
```

```
yes
```

30

INF 310/410 - 2009

length(X,5)

```
length([],0).
```

```
length([_ | Ts], N) :- length(Ts,M), N is M+1.
```

```
:- length(X,5)
```

```
:- length(Ts,M), 5 is M+1
```

```
1. :- 5 is 0+1 Ts/[], M/0 FAIL
```

```
2. :- length(Ts1,M1), M is M1+1, 5 is M+1 Ts/[_ ,Ts1]
```

```
2.1 :- M is 0+1, 5 is M+1 Ts1/[], M1/0, Ts/[_ ,Ts1]
```

```
2.1 :- 5 is 1+1 Ts1/[], M1/0, Ts/[_ ,Ts1], M/1 FAIL
```

```
2.2 :- length(Ts2,M2), M1 is M2+1, M is M1+1, 5 is M+1
```

```
Ts1/[], M1/0, Ts/[_ ,Ts1], Ts1/[_ ,Ts2]
```

```
...
```

31

INF 310/410 - 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ **Cut and negation**
- ◆ Problems with Prolog

32

INF 310/410 - 2009

Cut - !

- ◆ *Cut* is a built in system predicate which affects the procedural behaviour of a program
- ◆ Its main function is to reduce the search space of Prolog computations by dynamically pruning the search tree
- ◆ Example:

```
p(s1) :- A1  
...  
p(si) :- B, !, C  
...  
p(sk) :- Ak
```
- ◆ We compute *p(t)* using the *i*-th clause, *B* succeeds, and *!* is encountered:
 - All alternative ways of computing *B* are discarded
 - All computations of *p(t)* using the *i*-th to *k*-th clauses are discarded as backtrackable alternatives
- ◆ *Cut* gives more control to the programmer, but compromises the declarative reading of the Prolog programs and makes it difficult to see what will happen in the computation.

33

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

rsiblings example

- ◆ Recall the *rsiblings* rule.

```
rsiblings(X,Y) :- child(X,Parent1),  
                  child(Y,Parent1),  
                  X \== Y,  
                  child(X,Parent2),  
                  child(Y,Parent2),  
                  Parent1 \== Parent2.
```
- ◆ | ?- *rsiblings*(anne,X).
- ◆ X = paul ? ;
- ◆ X = paul ? ;
- ◆ no

34

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

rsiblings with cut

- ◆ With *cut*

```
rsiblings(X,Y) :- child(X,Parent1),  
                  !,  
                  child(Y,Parent1),  
                  X \== Y,  
                  child(X,Parent2),  
                  child(Y,Parent2),  
                  Parent1 \== Parent2.
```
- ◆ | ?- *rsiblings*(anne,X).
- ◆ X = paul ? ;
- ◆ no
- ◆ | ?- *rsiblings*(X,anne).
- ◆ no

35

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

rsiblings with cut, next try...

- ◆

```
rsiblings(X,Y) :- child(X,Parent1),  
                  child(Y,Parent1),  
                  X \== Y,  
                  !,  
                  child(X,Parent2),  
                  child(Y,Parent2),  
                  Parent1 \== Parent2.
```
- ◆ | ?- *rsiblings*(anne,X).
- ◆ X = paul
- ◆ yes
- ◆ | ?- *rsiblings*(X,anne).
- ◆ X = paul
- ◆ yes
- ◆ But what if anne has more than one sibling?

36

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Cut destroys declarativity

Cut makes it possible to control program execution
-> Added efficiency.

On the other hand:

- Programs become hard to understand.
- Need to document in which ways predicates can be called.
- Compromises the original intension of the language.

37

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Negation as failure

- ◆ Negation can be defined by cut.
`not(X) :- X, !, fail .`
`not(_)`.
- ◆ The built-in negation operator is `\+`
`?- \+ person(haakon,sonja,harald,1973) .`
`yes`
- ◆ The query `\+ A` succeeds if and only if the query `A` fails.
- ◆ Corresponds to our "normal" notion of negation if the negated query always terminates and is ground.
Consider negation of non-ground term `X=1`:
`\+ (X=1)`
`no`

38

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

IO in Prolog

- Various predicates for input/output.
 - `print(f(a))` prints out a term.
 - `display('Hello World')` prints a string.

```
print_list([]) :- print(nothing).
print_list([X]):- write('only '), print(X).
print_list([X|Ys]) :- print(X), print_list_help(Ys).
```

```
print_list_help([]).
print_list_help([X|Xs]) :- write(' and '),print(X),
    print_list_help(Xs).
```

39

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Outline

- ◆ Repetition
- ◆ Consulting vs. Querying
- ◆ Lists in Prolog
- ◆ Different views of a Prolog program
- ◆ Arithmetic in Prolog
- ◆ Cut and negation
- ◆ **Problems with Prolog**

40

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Problems with Prolog

- No types
- No (standardized) module system
- Non-declarative arithmetic
- Need to use cut
- Cut makes automated optimization hard
- IO disagrees with backtracking

41

INF 310/410 – 2009

Problem with IO

- ◆ IO and backtracking breaks program semantics
- ◆ Example:

<code>io_problem :- print(one), fail.</code>	prints	onetwo
<code>io_problem :- print(two).</code>		
<code>io_problem :- fail, print(one).</code>	prints	two
<code>io_problem :- print(two).</code>		

- ◆ The programs are semantically identical...
 - and (,) is commutative
- ◆ ...and should produce the same output: **two**

42

INF 310/410 – 2009

Further reading

- ◆ Mitchell's book – Chapter 15
- ◆ See also the tutorial by J. Power: [removed?]
<http://www.cs.may.ie/~jpower/Courses/PROLOG/>
- ◆ Learn Prolog Now! – www.learnprolognow.org
- ◆ Even further reading: Sterling and E. Shapiro:
The art of Prolog, 1994. MIT Press Series.

43

INF 310/410 – 2009

Mitchell's chap 15 – an overview.

- 15.1 History of logic programming
- 15.2 Brief overview of the logic programming paradigm
- 15.3 Equations solved by unification of atomic actions.
The formal basis for unification and the unification algorithm.
- 15.4 Clauses as parts of procedure declarations – Deals with Clauses = Rules and Facts and how they are computed.
 - 1 Simple Clauses - The point is to make a relationship between logic programming and imperative programming.
 - 2 Computation process
 - 3 Clauses
- 15.5 Prolog's approach to programming
More about how computations take place. Multiple uses of prolog programs (testing vs. computing). Several examples.
- 15.6 Arithmetic in prolog
- 15.7 Control, ambivalent syntax and meta-variables.
- 15.8 Assessment of prolog.
- 15.9 Bibliography
- 15.10 Summary

44

INF 310/410 – 2009

Prolog

"There is no question that Prolog is essentially a theorem prover à la Robinson. Our contribution was to transform that theorem prover into a programming language"

Colmerauer & Roussel (1996)

45

INF 310/410 - 2009

Appendix

◆ Mercury

INF 310/410 - 2009

The Mercury Language

- Logic PL developed at Univ. Of Melbourne
- First release 1995
- Compiled
- Strict type (and `mode`) system
- Module system
- No cut
- Clean integration of IO
- Includes functional features
- A `pure` language

47

INF 310/410 - 2009

The Module System

◆ hello.m

```
:- module hello.
```

```
:- interface.
```

```
:- import_module io.
```

```
:- pred main(io::di, io::uo) is det.
```

```
:- implementation.
```

```
main(IOState_in, IOState_out) :-
```

```
io.write_string("Hello World\n", IOState_in, IOState_out).
```

48

INF 310/410 - 2009

The Module system (cont.)

- Can have private/public predicates, types
- Can compile modules separately
- Can refer to names with module prefix:
`io.write_string`
is predicate `write_string` in module `io`

49

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

The Type system

- ◆ Type system similar to ML
- Built-in types `int`, `float`, `string`, etc
- User-defined types
 - `:- type weekday ---> mon;tue;wed;thu;fri;sat;sun.`
 - `:- type intOrString ---> anInt(int);aString(string).`
- Parameterized (polymorphic) types
 - `[1,2,3]` is of type `list(int)`
 - `{"a",12}` is of type `{string,int}`
 - `:- type maybe(T) ---> nothing ; just(T).`
- Function types (Lambda terms)

50

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

The Type system (cont)

Need to declare types of predicates:

- `:- pred append(list(T), list(T), list(T)).`
- `:- pred length(list(T), int).`

Compiler checks that predicates are used with correct types.

51

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

The mode system

In Prolog, predicates can be used in different ways.

- `:- append([1,2],[3,4,5],Zs).`
- `:- append(Xs,Ys,[1,2,3,4,5]).`

In Mercury, declare this with **modes**:

- `:- mode append(in,in,out) is det.`
- `:- mode append(out,out,in) is multi.`

→ Predicates can be declared with multiple modes.

52

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

The mode system (cont)

Predicate has only one mode: Shorthand

- `:- pred append(list(T)::in,list(T)::in,list(T)::out).`
- `:- pred length(list(T)::in,int::out).`

Compiler checks that predicates are only used according to declared modes.

Implementation can be shared among modes or not.

53

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

IO

◆ `hello.m`

`:- module hello.`

`:- interface.`

`:- import_module io.`

`:- pred main(io::di, io::uo) is det.`

`:- implementation.`

`main(IOState_in, IOState_out) :-`

`io.write_string("Hello World\n", IOState_in, IOState_out).`

54

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

IO (cont.)

Special modes for IO:

- **di: destructive input:**
 - Destroys input
 - The reference is therefore worthless afterwards.
- **uo: unique output:**
 - Guarantee: only this reference to the output.
 - Therefore be used for destructive input.

55

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

IO (cont.)

To do more output:

`:- pred io.write_string(string::in, io::di, io::uo) is det.`

`:- pred io.write_int(int::in, io::di, io::uo) is det.`

`:- pred io.nl(io::di, io::uo) is det.`

`main(IO0, IO3) :-`

`io.write_string("The meaning of life is ", IO0, IO1),`

`io.write_int(42, IO1, IO2),`

`io.nl(IO2, IO3).`

56

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

Functions

If a function is a function, why encode it as predicate?

`:- pred fib(int::in, int::out) is det.`

```
fib(N, X) :-  
  ( if N =< 2  
    then X = 1  
    else fib(N-1, A), fib(N-2, B), X = A + B  
  ).
```

57

INF 310/410 - 2009

fib as a function

`:- func fib(int) = int.`

```
fib(N) = X :-  
  ( if N =< 2  
    then X = 1  
    else X = fib(N-1) + fib(N-2)  
  ).
```

or:

```
fib(N) = ( if N =< 2 then 1 else fib(N-1) + fib(N-2) ).
```

58

INF 310/410 - 2009

A note on functions

- In Prolog, `1+1` is just a term. To evaluate, use `X` is `1+1`
- In Mercury `1+1` is evaluated, since `+` is declared as a function
- Programming with terms still possible
- Not all symbols are equal.
 - Possible cause for confusion
 - Usually easier to use

59

INF 310/410 - 2009

What about the cut?

Why use cut?

- For if-then-else;
`p(X) :- c(X), !, if-part(X).`
`p(X) :- else-part(X).`
- In Mercury, use if then else construct:
`p(X) :- if c(X) then if-part(X) else else-part(X).`
- To reduce search space
- In Mercury, use modes and determinism

60

INF 310/410 - 2009

Mercury, Conclusion

- Mercury is a modern language, incorporating many ideas of PL design that did not exist when Prolog was invented.
- Has many aspects and details that make it harder to learn. (types, modes, determinism, terms vs. functions, higher order, modules, etc.)
- Has a cleaner, more `logical' semantics than Prolog.

61

INF 3110/4110 - 2009

More Logic PLs

- Higher-order logic programming, Lambda-Prolog
 - Like Prolog, but lambda terms instead of first order
 - Higher-order unification
 - *Not* a functional language!
- Constraint Logic Programming languages
 - Prolog just gathers instantiations for variables.
 - Instead, gather **constraints** that need to be satisfied.

E.g. $X > 3$, $X < 6$, $X \neq 5$

System infers instantiation $X=4$

62

INF 3110/4110 - 2009